

The London School of Architecture - Access and Participation Plan (2025-26 to 2028-2029)

1. Introduction and strategic aim

In May 2025, London School of Architecture (LSA) merged with University of the Built Environment. This LSA access and participation plan (APP) was written prior to this merger, but University of the Built Environment will honour the commitments (including financial support) made within this APP and oversee its delivery.

The LSA is a small independent higher education provider and a charity. This APP details how we work to support access to higher education and training in design and the built environment, support and success of its students on the MArch programme. Our institutional values include social justice and combating climate change. The LSA was initially set up to support access and participation within the Built Environment and Architectural Sector. We registered with OfS and defined an ambitious first APP, which also helped to build the some of the foundations of our infrastructure to delivering intervention strategies. The APP 2024-29 is an iteration of our Access plans and has guided the development of this new plan.

The LSA is also supported by a diverse network of mostly London based architecture practices known as the Practice Network. This supports the school in terms of placement provision for students, contributions to academic projects and to ensure that the programme and the skills developed with students are relevant to industry and linked to current architectural practice.

The LSA is registered with the Royal Institute of Architects (RIBA) and the Architects Registration Board (ARB) so that staff, students and the MArch programme are recognised by these professional bodies.

The LSA is located in Dalston, Hackney having moved to a new location in Beechwood Road in the summer of 2023. We intend to make this location our home for a number of years and create strong links with the local community and provide value to residents, makers, and the local built environment. Beechwood Road is comprised of a large accessible studio space that offers a flexible space to learn and independently study. There is also a basement workshop occupied by a local furniture maker who offers workshop space to LSA students. There is an additional seminar room that houses our library that is collocated with our administrative offices that are home to our small academic and professional services team. We are tenants of the diocese in Hackney and enjoy a good relationship with the adjoining church and have access to book church space when needed for events, talks and additional teaching space.

The LSA offers one masters programme that is the MArch in Designing Architecture. Validated by the RIBA, this represented Part 2 of the current structure of architectural education. Recognised by the ARB, students can register to join the ARB on graduation.

The LSA welcomes cohorts of approximately 60 students each year and so supports 120 students over the two years of the MArch programme.

A unique feature of The LSA is that students have the opportunity to continue to develop their skills in a workplace environment thorough the placement in Year 1 with an architect practice in year 1 of the masters programme. They receive a recommended London Living Wage for a part time job so that their academic and design learning are linked to their work environment. They gain practice experience as well as earn while they learn. This provides a valuable opportunity to build professional experience as well as their own professional network. The LSA facilitates a community of learning, practice and people to support students through their journey from considering a career in design and the built environment through to being a qualified architect

with continued learning opportunities. Our size means that we know all our students and can support them as they take their very individual design pathways to their chosen professional destination.

Part of our founding mission was to find alternative routes for architecture thereby making architectural education more affordable and accessible. Access and outreach is part of our DNA, and that's why we're developing Part 0 as a vehicle to deliver

Part 0 provides a holistic and integrated vision for widening access to built environment careers to young people and career-changers. It is a campaign to open up space for a joined up conversation about foundational learning across the built environment, and describes a set of programmes that we are currently running, with support from Foundation for Future London and R&Co4Generations.

Our innovative, targeted interventions aimed at 13-19 year olds and career changers – from Levels 2-5 – will widen access to future-facing built environment practice, emphasising green skills, removing economic, cultural and social barriers to equity and diversity

1.1 Mission Statement

The LSA Mission:

- **Network:** To bring together outstanding students, practices, professionals, educators and social entrepreneurs to generate and champion essential new approaches to the design of the urban built environment.
- **Institution:** To maintain the school as independent and financially sustainable, achieving the highest standards of governance and academic delivery, in our physical and virtual studio, with a spirit of agility, openness and responsiveness.
- **Programme:** To provide career-long learning programmes that generate incremental and disruptive innovations in the design of cities and urban environments and critically equip our graduates for the green economy and a just transition.
- **Talent:** To be the route of choice for gifted learners to become spatial leaders, recruiting talented candidates from across the whole of society by proactively addressing soft and hard barriers to the profession/industry.
- **Impact:** To influence the future of architecture and the city and particularly London, by producing provocative design/research for global dissemination and by being nimble agents of change within the capital itself.

The core pillars of our mission remain unchanged and the strategic objectives allow us to further each of them. Further to our strategic mission, we strive to bring together outstanding students, practices, professionals, educators and social entrepreneurs to generate and champion essential new approaches to the design of the urban built environment through our educational programme offer. This aims to diversify and widen access to education and professions in the built environment as well as ensure that we make effective interventions to support our students to succeed and progress into employment.

Our programmes work closely with industry to create innovations in the design of cities and urban environments, and which critically equip our graduates for the green economy.

We aim to recruit talented candidates from across the whole of society by proactively addressing soft and hard barriers to education and the professions.

Our Access ambitions support fair access and participation and deliver on our outreach agenda, adding to the social value of development and focus on the green skills needed for

professions in the built environment. Our master's in designing architecture (Part 2) will be a strengthened and sustainable option for students to continue their architecture education and deliver value for money for our students as they earn. At the same time, they learn through a paid placement with an architecture practice in the LSA's Practice Network of London wide industry partners. Our graduates with this practice experience and embedded practical and design skills in the curriculum produce graduates armed with the tools for changing practice.

The Practice Network will remain fundamental to who we are and how we teach, and will bring in a wider range of ethically aligned industry partners, mobilised to engage with young people and communities to tackle the challenges faced by humanity and the planet.

At the London School of Architecture, we believe in equal opportunities for all students. In the last four years we have improving and embedding access and participation throughout the student lifecycle and will learn from this practice and continue to develop new evidenced based initiatives to support the access, success and progression of all of our students with particular focus on those groups who we can see are more at risk.

2. Risks to equality of opportunity

After conducting our assessment of performance (see annex A), which relies primarily on the Office for Students Access and Participation Dashboard, supplemented by other relevant data (such as HESA, UCAS, and internal institutional data, alongside appropriate broader research), we have identified three key indicators of risk to equality of opportunity as priorities for this Plan. We have also noted three significant external risks that are of note in our context. These have been selected with reference to the Equality of Opportunity Risk Register (EORR) and informed by our context at LSA.

In determining which risk areas to focus on in this Plan, we consider our relatively small size and specialism in the creative industries as key contextual factors. As a smaller provider, the data we have drawn upon is small cohort data which means that analysis of data and statistical significance is limited. This also limits our ability to make valid assessments and interpretations, particularly in exploring disaggregated data and intersections of characteristics. We have explored and provided assessment where we considered it meaningful.

Annex A contains other areas for improvement identified during our performance assessment, along with explanations for why these areas have not been selected for prioritisation under this Plan.

Of priority under this Plan, the indicators of risk we have identified and the corresponding potential risks to equality of opportunity, are as follows:

2.1 Risk Area 1 – Access: There is a risk that students from the most economically disadvantaged backgrounds (IMD Q1) and Global Majority students are experiencing inequitable access to knowledge and skills, information, advice and guidance relating to

architecture, and appropriate support through transition-in. We have identified two indicators of risk that suggest these risks might be occurring:

- LSA enrol fewer students from IMD Q1 (most disadvantaged) areas, as compared to IMD Q5 areas (least disadvantaged). 10.3%pp and the gap in pp between them; consider 2/4yr aggregates and comment on-trend. The sector has -2.8%pp
- LSA has a lower proportion of students from the Global Majority than white students 28.5%. For example, the percentage of each and the gap in between them; consider 2/4yr aggregates and comment on the trend. The sector average gap is 34.4%

2.1.1 Links to the Equality of Opportunity Risk Register

Along with education sector and industry evidence (see Annex B), our institutional experience and student consultations suggest that these differential student outcomes may be a result of EORR **Risk 2**, Information and guidance; **Risk 3**, perceptions of higher education; **Risk 4**, application success rates, **Risk 7**, insufficient personal support, **Risk 6**, insufficient academic support, **Risk 10**, cost pressures.

Risk 2 – Information and Guidance Schools and colleges frequently lack resources and direction regarding entry into the architecture and built environment field or specialised providers. We recognise this challenge; however, through our Part 0 access work e.g. Extended Project Qualification aimed at ages 13-19, we proactively address the knowledge and accessibility gap in architecture. The application process for studying at an LSA differs from the usual UCAS procedure; students commonly apply directly to the institution, which introduces additional factors, including an earlier submission deadline.

Risk 3 – Perceptions of Higher Education

There is a persistent belief that a qualification in an arts discipline is exclusive to the privileged and wealthy. Students from the global majority or economically disadvantaged backgrounds frequently face discouragement in their pursuit of a career and degree in architecture, often opting instead for programs seen as more likely to provide a reliable income and secure employment due to systemic obstacles. These views are further reinforced by findings from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) and Architectural Journal (AJ) (2024) when assessing the diversity within the workforce of our creative sectors.

Risk 4 – Application Success Rates

Given the characteristics of our offerings, we incorporate contextual admissions into our application process, acknowledging that interviews might pose a challenge for some candidates, whether due to self-esteem or insufficient interview experience. Discussions with LSA staff and students indicated that this concern is not as significant for our current students and prospective applicants.

Risk 6 & 7 – Insufficient Personal Support & Insufficient Academic Support

With our small class sizes and teaching approach, every student benefits from small group instruction, and many also receive individual tutoring. This fosters strong working relationships between students and staff, enabling quick resolution of academic concerns. As a result, Risk 6 was deemed irrelevant for the LSA. However, this may not apply to all students, so we will keep assessing this risk moving forward.

Risk 10 – Cost Pressures

Rising financial pressures could impact a student's capacity to finish their program or achieve strong academic results. Being located in London, combined with the growing expenses for living and housing, intensifies the financial burden on students. The LSA will maintain ongoing analysis to better understand this issue for our students and evaluate our financial assistance programs to ensure we provide the most effective support, focusing on gathering insights from students in IMD Quintile 1 or the Global Majority.

2.2 Risk Area 2 – Continuation: There is a risk that a lack of access to a range of appropriate support, and other capacity issues, may be affecting continuation (movement from Year 1 to Year 2) for students with Disabilities. We have identified one indicator of risk that suggests this risk might be occurring:

Data is very small across the last four years for students with disabilities (n =20). However, LSA's gap in continuation rates is larger than the sector's average of 0.5 percentage points, with the gap increasing over time.

2.2.1 Links to the Equality of Opportunity Risk Register

Along with education sector and industry evidence (see Annex B), our institutional experience and student consultations suggest that these differential student outcomes may be a result of EORR Risks **6 and 7**

Risk 6 & 7 – Insufficient Personal Support & Insufficient Academic Support

With our small class sizes and teaching approach, every student benefits from small group instruction, and many also receive individual tutoring. This fosters strong working relationships between students and staff, enabling quick resolution of academic concerns. As a result, Risk 6 was deemed irrelevant for the LSA. However, this may not apply to all students, so we will keep assessing this risk moving forward.

2.3 Other Risks and Challenges

Through conducting our assessment of performance, we also identified other risks to equality of opportunity, which will not be addressed through this APP due to our size, capacity, and resource. These decisions have been carefully considered and we will continue to monitor these performance areas annually and consider them through our whole provider approach. The additional risks, not covered in the APP, are female students are less likely to progress from the LSA into employment as an architect. This is shown by RIBA and ARB data. The LSA enrolls 45% female students each year and the RIBA data 2021/22 47% of Part 2 students were female but for 2024 the ARB show 32% of women compared to 64% men employed in architecture. We will monitor our SUCCESS interventions and whether they have a positive impact on female students as well as those from global majority heritage and/or with mental health difficulties so we can see the impact of intersections between groups and isolate the risk for female students.

Specialist Architecture Provision

The LSA's specialist provision as a Part 2-only architecture institution presents a significant risk to equality of opportunity for Global Majority students. This risk arises from structural barriers at earlier stages of architectural education.

Students from these underrepresented groups may face financial constraints, inequitable access to information, and systemic biases that limit their entry into Part 1 programs, thereby restricting their progression to Part 2 at the LSA. Furthermore, the additional costs of relocating and navigating a fragmented education pipeline exacerbate these challenges, potentially excluding them from opportunities.

Small datasets

When deciding which risk areas to concentrate on in this APP, we took into account our status as a small provider and our specialisation in Architecture. Given our smaller size, the data we utilised comes from a small cohort, limiting our capacity for comprehensive data analysis and statistical significance. This constraint also impacts our ability to make accurate assessments and interpretations, particularly when examining disaggregated data and intersections of various characteristics. Nevertheless, we have conducted evaluations and provided insights where we deemed it meaningful.

LSA Architecture nuances

The LSA's architectural education model is unique in that it offers a two-year program for students who have already completed their Part 1 studies at another institution. This structure, while innovative, presents certain challenges and opportunities.

One key concern is the potential hesitation students may feel about having to transfer institutions between Part 1 and Part 2. Relocating and adapting to a new academic environment can be a barrier for entry for some students. Recognising this, the LSA has implemented several initiatives to ease this transition. Nevertheless, this structural shift also presents equal risks and opportunities for both the LSA and its architectural program. Since the LSA only provides Part 2 education, it must rely on other institutions to offer students Part 1. The successful recruitment of diverse candidates for Part 2 hinges on their access to opportunities at the Part 1 stage.

A critical risk area is the dependence on other higher education institutions to admit and support students from underrepresented global majority backgrounds at the Part 1 level. If these institutions do not provide adequate opportunities for such students, it limits the LSA's ability to recruit and support them in the Part 2 phase. Thus, without successful access to Part 1, students from minority backgrounds may not reach the LSA's Part 2 program, thereby hindering the LSA's efforts to foster greater diversity in architectural education.

3. Objectives

From the assessment of performance (Annex A) and consideration of Risks (above, and Annex B), we have identified the following objectives that are our priorities under this Plan:

Lifecycle Stage	Objectives	Intervention Strategy
PTA_1	To reduce the gap in access for students from low socio-economic backgrounds, as measured by IMD Quintile 1 compared to their counterparts, measured by IMD quintile 5 to a 5pp gap by 2032-33	IS1
PTA_2	To increase the proportion of entrants from global majority heritage backgrounds on the MArch programme, to 33% by 2032-33.	IS1, IS2
PTS_1	To reduce the continuation gap between disabled students and non-disabled students, 5pp by 2032-33.	IS1, IS2

4. Intervention strategies and expected outcomes

We have developed strategies to address risks to equality of opportunity and achieve our objectives. These strategies:

- Outline activities to mitigate risks and meet objectives and targets.
- Identify who will design, deliver, and evaluate the activities, along with an estimated cost.
- Include an evaluation plan.
- Are based on evidence from sector best practices and local insights from students.

We are dedicated to sharing the evaluation findings. Publication plans are indicative and will expand as dissemination opportunities arise. Relevant evaluation outcomes will inform ongoing practice improvements.

4.1 Intervention Strategy 1 - A whole lifecycle, personalised approach to supporting students from low socio-economic and global majority backgrounds access LSA.

Objective and targets

Objective: To reduce the gap in access for students from low socio-economic backgrounds, as measured by IMD Quintile 1 compared to their counterparts, measured by IMD quintile 5 to a 5pp gap by 2032-33 & To increase the proportion of entrants from global majority heritage backgrounds on the MArch programme, to 33% by 2032-33.

Targets: PTA_1 & PTA_2

Risks to equality of opportunity: **Risk 2**, Information and guidance; **Risk 3**, perceptions of higher education; **Risk 4**, application success rates, **Risk 7**, insufficient personal support, **Risk 6**, insufficient academic support, **Risk 10**, cost pressures.

Summary of Evidence Base and Rationale

We have conducted a literature review, which includes specific references to the range of materials OfS has identified in its guidance, plus a range of other research and best practice references.

Summary of Strategy 1 - Rationale

The intervention strategy aims to close the access gap for students from low socio-economic backgrounds (IMD Quintile 1) compared to their more affluent peers (IMD Quintile 5) by 5 percentage points by 2032-33. This objective is supported by various evidence-based programs that enhance access to higher education and boost academic success. Crafting Cities workshops and the National Saturday Club equip students with vital design skills and knowledge, laying a solid foundation for their educational journeys. The Extended Project Qualification (EPQ) offers students essential UCAS points and fosters design expertise, further increasing their university prospects. The Supported Admissions initiative provides tailored guidance to applicants, which enhances their confidence and improves application success rates among underrepresented groups. Moreover, the Peer Support for Transition program promotes motivation and mental health through peer connections, increasing enrolment and retention rates. The Coaching Skills for Industry Success module focuses on career preparedness and professional networking, improving employability outcomes for students from disadvantaged backgrounds to which LSA provides Access. Finally, the Diverse Counselling and Coaching Offer supports students' emotional well-being and self-esteem, reinforcing their academic pursuits. These programs are systematically evaluated through data analysis, surveys, and focus groups, allowing for continuous improvement and ensuring that the strategies effectively address the barriers faced by these students. Collectively, these initiatives form a holistic approach to support students from low socio-economic and global majority backgrounds, ultimately working towards reducing the access gap to higher education.

Evaluation: Evaluation for this intervention strategy will generate OfS Type 1 (T1) and Type 2 (T2) standards of evaluation, which will establish whether the intended outcomes are being achieved. We do not plan to evaluate the strategy as a whole but each component part, as per the evaluation details in the Intervention Strategy Table that follows. The strategy will commence from September 2025, with publication and sharing of findings as per the publication plan below.

Summary of publication plan	
Format of findings	When findings will be shared
We will produce an annual summary progress and review report, which will:	Progress 'highlights' will be shared annually

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide insights on the effectiveness and progress of relevant activities in this Strategy based on the achievement of intended outcomes. 2. Capture learning and insights that inform practice improvements and any appropriate changes and developments. <p>Highlights and themes from this report will be shared online, for example through our website / SEER website.</p>	
We will produce an 'Evaluation To Date' or an 'End of Project' Report (whichever is relevant) capturing all evaluation and findings, disseminated online via our website and the SEER website, and via channels mentioned below where appropriate.	4 years on from Plan commencement (Autumn/Winter 2028) and/or at the conclusion of projects.
We will also contribute at conferences and through workshop and events hosted by networks such as SEER and RIBA, ARB, Hackney Council.	At minimum every 2 years, starting from 2025-26
We will contribute to other calls for evidence, such as through TASO	As they arise, at minimum every 2 years.

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
Crafting Cities: after school workshops for years 7-9 to develop design skills and knowledge	Staff, volunteer, industry expert time	<p>Intermediate outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved cognitive and metacognitive outcomes. Improved self-perceptions about academic abilities and confidence. Improved sense of belonging in HE /pathways to HE. Increased knowledge and awareness of HE. Increased knowledge of HE pathways and the HE application process. Increased knowledge of financial support and student loans. Improved confidence and preparation for HE selection process. Improved soft skills such as team working and public speaking <p>Longer-term Outcomes</p>	<p>Process Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis: Number and % of pupils attending activities with target characteristics (T1). Output analysis: the number of activities delivered (T1). Output analysis: the number of organisations part of the programme (T1). Output analysis: the number of events delivered for the programme (T1). Post-activity polls gathering stakeholder (practitioner and students) experiences and perceptions (T2). <p>Impact Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline and annual student survey exploring interim outcomes and perceptions of Improved creative skills outcome (T2). Annual end-of-year Teacher/Staff/ Practitioner Survey exploring: (a) perceptions of achievement of interim outcomes for students; and (b) interim outcomes for practitioners (T2). 2-3 student focus groups per annum from 2025-26, to explore themes from surveys (T2). (Y12-13 cohorts) Data Analysis: Number and % of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applying to HE / LSA
National Saturday Club: Programme of skills building workshops for 13-16 year olds to build design awareness and knowledge through response to a design brief.	Workshop development time		
Extended Project Qualification (EPQ): academic programme for year 12 students that provides 28 UCAS points and develops design skills and knowledge	Marketing & recruitment activity time		
	Workshop material costs		
	Academic mentor time / moderation & submission costs		

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved creative skills. Applications to HE. Offers from HE providers. Enrolments in HE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging with the LSA community <p><i>At present, we do not have a mechanism for tracking student enrolments into HE, particularly due to the associated costs. We will explore this collaboratively with our SEER partners in 2024-25.</i></p>
<p>Supported Admissions: students receive an individualised response throughout the applicant journey based on the profile information collected about their socio-economic background.</p> <p>Applicants are asked to provide information about background and previous educational experience.</p> <p>A staged communication plan to encourage engagement, provide information and create a sense of belonging.</p> <p>Contextual Interview Access: applicants from</p>	<p>Communication Manager time</p> <p>Part 2 (Programme Lead) Time</p>	<p>Intermediate outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students from target groups have access to improved applicant advice Improved application/registrations rates from students from target groups Increased confidence during the application process Bespoke advice for applicants Reapplication for LSA <p>Longer-term Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refined information about target student groups Information to refine and improve the application process and communication. 	<p>Process Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis: Number and % of pupils engaging and % of pupils with target characteristics (T1). Some post-activity polls gathering student experience and perceptions (T2). Annual end-of-year Staff Survey exploring whether content was appropriate and effective, and to explore challenges. (T1) <p>Impact Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 student focus groups at minimum every two years from 2024-25, to explore key themes from polls and surveys. (T2) Tracking of students Data Analysis: offer, accept and enrolment rates by target groups. (T2) Data Analysis: number of placements found independently vs supported placements (T2)

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
target groups are provided with portfolio advice and offered an opportunity to reapply to later application cycle and progress to interview			
<p>Peer Support for Transition: Students receive support from each other and alumni, focussing on transition phase from admission to census date.</p> <p>Student Buddy Scheme matches new students with year 2 students. Students can be matched according to similar lived experiences.</p>	<p>Programme manager time</p> <p>Student & alumni volunteer time</p>	<p>Intermediate outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved motivation and engagement in learning and community. Increase help-seeking behaviours Improved self-perceptions about confidence and belonging. Improved mental health and wellbeing. <p>Longer-term Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved enrolment rates for target students. Improved continuation rates for target students. Improved completion rate 	<p>Process Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis: Number and % of pupils engaging with peers and buddies and % with target characteristics (T1). <p>Impact Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 student focus groups at minimum every two years from 2025-26, to explore student experiences with peers and buddies. (T2) Data Analysis: entrant rates by target groups (T2). Data Analysis: continuation and completion rates by target groups (T2).

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
<p>Coaching Skills for Industry Success (Group work module)</p> <p>Year 1 Students take part in a pre-module day long workshop to develop skills in group work, form group ethos and working agreement with industry leads</p>	<p>Consultant time</p> <p>Module leader time</p> <p>Industry lead time</p>	<p>Intermediate outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge and capacity relating to career and employability skills. Increased level of professional networks and contacts. Increased knowledge and understanding of the labour market, professional standards and competencies. Improved self-perceptions about career and employability capacities, readiness and confidence. Improved motivation and engagement in learning. <p>Longer-term Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved career management and development, employability and professional connections amongst target students. Improved attainment rates for target students. 	<p>Process Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis: Number and % of pupils engaging and % of pupils with target characteristics (T1). Output analysis: Number of sessions run (T1) Data analysis: Analysis of referrals vs self-sign up for extra-curricular activities, by student characteristics. (T1) Some post-activity polls gathering student experience and perceptions (T2). Annual end-of-year Staff Survey exploring whether content was appropriate and effective, and to explore challenges. (T1) <p>Impact Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline and annual student survey exploring perceptions and confidence in respect of career development and management / employability skills and professional networks. (T2) 2-3 student focus groups at minimum every two years from 2024-25, to explore key themes from polls and surveys. (T2) Data Analysis: continuation and completion rates by target groups. (T2) Data Analysis: attainment by target students. (T2)

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved progression rates for target students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis: progression into employment and into highly skilled employment or post-graduate study pathways for target students.

Investment

Total approximate cost of Intervention Strategy 1 (2025-26 to 2028-29): **£39,500**

Intervention Strategy 2 - Support for students with disabilities/mental health needs to stay on programme and continue to graduation.

Objective and targets

Objective: To reduce the continuation gap between disabled students and non-disabled students, 5%pp by 2032-33.

Targets: PTS_3

Risks to equality of opportunity: **Risk 8**, mental health, **Risk 7**, insufficient personal support risk

Summary of Evidence Base and Rationale

We have conducted a literature review, which includes specific references to the range of materials OfS has identified in its guidance, plus a range of other research and best practice references.

Summary of Strategy 2 - Rationale

The proposed intervention strategy is designed to enhance support for students with disabilities and mental health needs, aiming to minimise the continuation gap between disabled and non-disabled students by 5 percentage points by 2032-33. Evidence suggests that initiatives like Peer Support programs and the Student Buddy Scheme significantly boost motivation and self-esteem, which are crucial for improving retention among disabled students. Additionally, the Culture of Care initiative promotes mental wellness through activities such as yoga and meditation, contributing to better emotional health and reduced stigma, both of which correlate with increased academic success and persistence. The Review of Learning & Teaching Adjustments emphasizes the importance of inclusivity in teaching methods, helping to address the unique challenges faced by these students, thereby fostering greater engagement and confidence. Finally, the Disabled Student Support system provides tailored accommodations through Learning Support Plans, which enhance both academic performance and self-assurance. Each intervention is carefully evaluated through data analysis and surveys to assess its impact and inform necessary adjustments. Collectively, these strategies create a supportive educational environment that not only addresses the specific needs of disabled students but also aims to promote their success and longevity in the academic program.

Evaluation: Evaluation for this intervention strategy will generate OfS Type 1 (T1) and Type 2 (T2) standards of evaluation, which will establish whether the intended outcomes are being achieved. We do not plan to evaluate the strategy as a whole but each component part, as per the evaluation details in the Intervention Strategy Table that follows. The strategy will commence from September 2025, with publication and sharing of findings as per the publication plan below.

Summary of publication plan	
Format of findings	When findings will be shared
We will produce an annual summary progress and review report, which will:	Progress 'highlights' will be shared annually

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide insights on the effectiveness and progress of relevant activities in this Strategy based on the achievement of intended outcomes. 2. Capture learning and insights that inform practice improvements and any appropriate changes and developments. <p>Highlights and themes from this report will be shared online, for example through our website / SEER website.</p>	
We will produce an 'Evaluation To Date' or an 'End of Project' Report (whichever is relevant) capturing all evaluation and findings, disseminated online via our website and the SEER website, and via channels mentioned below where appropriate.	4 years on from Plan commencement (Autumn/Winter 2028) and/or at the conclusion of projects.
We will also contribute at conferences and through workshop and events hosted by networks such as SEER and Royal Institute of British Architecture (RIBA) & Hackney Council, Architects Registration Board (ARB)	At minimum every 2 years, starting from 2025-26
We will contribute to other calls for evidence, such as through TASO	As they arise, at minimum every 2 years.

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
Peer Support: (See Intervention Strategy 1) Student Buddy Scheme (See Intervention Strategy 1)	(See Intervention Strategy 1) (See Intervention Strategy 1)	(See Intervention Strategy 1) (See Intervention Strategy 1)	(See Intervention Strategy 1) (See Intervention Strategy 1)
Culture of Care wellbeing events: a programme of events are designed in collaboration with students to promote wellbeing. For example, yoga, crafting, meditation.	Operations Manager time Communication manager time Instructor cost and time	Intermediate outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved cognitive and metacognitive outcomes. Improved motivation and engagement in learning. Improved self-perceptions about academic abilities and confidence. Improved student emotional and mental well-being. Improved module/assessment grades. Longer-term Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved continuation rates for target students. 	Process Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis: Number and % of pupils engaging and % of pupils with target characteristics (T1). Output analysis: Number of sessions run (T1) Some post-activity polls gathering student experience and perceptions (T2). Annual end-of-year Staff Survey exploring whether content was appropriate and effective, and to explore challenges. (T1) Impact Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 student focus groups at minimum every two years from 2024-25, to explore key themes from polls and surveys. (T2) Data Analysis: continuation and completion rates by target groups. (T2)

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved completion and attainment rates for target students. Reduced stigma of addressing mental health needs 	
<p>Review of learning & teaching adjustments and embedding into the curriculum.</p> <p>Individual recommended adjustments for students will be considered for inclusion into a teaching approach and assessment methods so that the programme itself becomes more inclusive and accessible over time.</p>	Registrar & Faculty time to review learning support plans and module delivery.	<p>Intermediate Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved student motivation and engagement in learning. Improved student self-perceptions about academic abilities, confidence and belonging. (Tutors) Improved understanding of student experiences and challenges affecting student outcomes; and in-curricula strategies for effective support. <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved continuation rates for target students. Improved completion and attainment rates for target students. 	<p><u>Process Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis: Number and % of pupils engaging and % of pupils with target characteristics (T1). Output analysis: Number of adjustments recommended (T1) Some post-activity polls gathering student experience and perceptions (T2). Annual end-of-year Staff Survey exploring whether review and approaches were appropriate and effective, and to explore challenges. (T1) <p><u>Impact Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced module evaluation questionnaires (termly) exploring student experiences and feedback. (T2) Data Analysis: continuation rates for target students. Data Analysis: completion and attainment rates for target students.

Activity	Inputs	Outcomes	Evaluation
Disabled student support Students are asked to disclose support needs during the application process, with follow-up at registration. Students are then referred to the institution's Disability Team, which provides support under our validation agreement. The team reviews medical evidence, offers appointments, and creates Learning Support Plans.	The programme manager will review assessments and learning support plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved learning engagement through personalised support tailored to individual needs. Enhanced academic performance due to accommodations provided in Learning Support Plans. Increased confidence and well-being from having clear, accessible support systems in place. Better communication with tutors ensuring consistent guidance and alignment with the student's learning goals. 	<p><u>Process Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Analysis: Number and % of pupils disclosing a disability and % of pupils with target characteristics (T1). Output analysis: Number of adjustments recommended (T1) Some post-activity polls gathering student experience and perceptions (T2). <p><u>Impact Evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey and focus group exploring student experiences and feedback. (T2) Data Analysis: continuation rates for target students. Data Analysis: completion and attainment rates for target students.

Investment : Total approximate cost of Intervention Strategy 2 (2025-26 to 2028-29): £39,500

5. Whole provider approach

We take a whole provider approach (WPA) to access and participation, which we have considered under this Plan via participation in emerging research on the WPA, working with our SEER colleagues and led by Professor Liz Thomas¹. We have evaluated our current WPA context and identified areas where we can go further, as part of the commitments in this Plan. The following provides a summary against the key domains in the WPA approach.

5.1 Our Institutional Journey

The LSA has been actively working to address architectural education barriers and widen access to diverse groups. The current strategic plan highlights the creation of Part 0, specifically aimed at supporting fair access and participation. This includes initiatives such as outreach to young people aged 13-19 and career changers. By establishing Part 0, LSA has introduced a “ladder of learning” that supports students from underrepresented groups, addressing both soft and hard barriers to entry into architecture and built environment careers. This focus aligns with the model’s objectives of increasing access for underrepresented groups.

In response to changing regulatory frameworks and the growing emphasis on technical education, LSA has embraced modular learning experiences and flexible pathways. The goal is to create more affordable and accessible routes to practice within the architecture field.

The introduction of Level 4 and Level 5 qualifications as part of LSA's vision for Part 0 creates a bridging opportunity between traditional academic routes and technical or professional education, further widening access.

The current strategic plan reflects LSA's awareness of social and environmental responsibility. LSA's programme development integrates urgent topics like the climate emergency, social justice, and green skills. The school's strategy includes promoting access for individuals who want to contribute to a just transition in the built environment sector.

Initiatives like retrofitting and the circular economy are core to the LSA's future programmes, aligning with the Widening Access Maturity Model's goal of creating equitable pathways that resonate with the current global challenges.

LSA's commitment to student-centric education is evident throughout the strategic plan. The school is dedicated to enhancing the student experience, with particular attention to providing high-contact teaching and fostering a supportive studio culture.

The strategy highlights the importance of fostering a progressive and inclusive learning environment. LSA aims to intensify connections between students and contemporary practice, ensuring that students are well-equipped for career success in architecture and the built environment.

Widening Access: LSA has made significant progress in establishing pathways (e.g., Part 0, Level 4/5 programmes) that open the door to architecture for underrepresented groups. Its innovative approach to education through modular learning, combined with a focus on diversity, positions LSA as a forward-thinking institution.

Student Success: LSA's strategies for mentorship, career-long learning, and a supportive student environment ensure that students are well-prepared for both immediate academic

success and long-term career achievement. The institution's focus on EDI within the faculty and operations team further enhances the potential for all students to succeed.

5.2 Our institutional and senior leadership commitment

Through the current Access and Participation Plan (2021-2024): The LSA sets specific targets to increase the diversity of its student body, mainly focusing on students from low socio-economic backgrounds and global majority backgrounds.

By 2032-33, LSA aims to have 20% of its MArch program students from these underrepresented groups. This reflects the institution's commitment to inclusivity and equity in admissions.

The LSA Contextual Admissions Practices

LSA employs contextual admissions to support diversity, offering additional personalised interview processes and bespoke reapplication support for students from underrepresented backgrounds. This practice ensures that admissions decisions are not solely based on traditional metrics but also consider individual circumstances.

Financial Support

The introduction of LSA bursaries and a redesigned hardship fund showcases a financial commitment to ensure that no student is denied access to education due to financial barriers. This support helps create an environment where students from all economic backgrounds can thrive.

Student Retention and Success

LSA aims to reduce gaps in continuation rates between disabled and non-disabled students, with a specific goal to limit this gap to 10% by 2032-33. This demonstrates a focus on admitting diverse students and ensuring their success and retention throughout the program.

The institution has implemented mentorship schemes, such as the Student Buddy Scheme and the Alumni Human Library, to provide additional support and foster a sense of belonging.

Holistic Support for Student Wellbeing

LSA's Culture of Care initiative emphasises the importance of supporting both the academic and emotional well-being of students. Expanding counselling services and mental health support mechanisms reflects the school's dedication to ensuring student success beyond academics.

Evaluation and Data-Driven Progress:

The strategic plan commits to using OfS Type 1 (T1) and Type 2 (T2) evaluations to monitor the success of diversity and participation initiatives. This commitment to evidence-based assessment ensures that the school's diversity and student success progress is measurable and accountable.

Senior management at LSA has led and guided the Access and Participation Plan (APP) work. The former registrar played a key role in developing and implementing the APP, while the current registrar continues to lead these efforts, ensuring ongoing commitment to widening participation. Both the academic director and head of school have contributed by providing

strategic commentary, aligning the APP with LSA's educational goals and overall vision. This collective leadership demonstrates LSA's strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion at the highest levels of the institution.

5.3 Our WPA student experience: Working across the student lifecycle and experience for all students

The London School of Architecture (LSA) adopts a whole-provider approach to the student experience, working across the entire student lifecycle to ensure all students, regardless of background, receive comprehensive support. This approach begins with outreach initiatives aimed at increasing access for students from low socio-economic and global majority backgrounds, with targeted workshops like the "Crafting Cities" programme and the National Saturday Club aimed at building early design skills and awareness of higher education opportunities. Our EPQ programme also provides students with a direct pathway into Architecture at the University and Apprenticeship levels. LSA also supports applicants through personalised admissions processes, offering tailored advice, portfolio guidance, and interview support to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Once enrolled, students benefit from peer support schemes, such as the Student Buddy Scheme, and the Human Library programme, where students are matched with alumni for mentorship, fostering a sense of belonging and helping them navigate academic and personal challenges.

Throughout the student lifecycle, LSA emphasises enhancing the overall student experience. Academic support and coaching are provided to all students, but with a particular focus on equity groups, ensuring that underrepresented students have the resources to succeed. This includes initiatives like "Coaching Skills for Industry Success," which develops career-readiness and builds confidence and professional networks, particularly benefiting students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Mental health and wellbeing are prioritised through diverse counselling services, wellbeing events, and a culture of care embedded across the institution. These interventions ensure that all students, including those with disabilities or mental health needs, have the necessary support to continue their studies and achieve their full potential.

LSA's interventions and practices, designed with equity at the forefront, are embedded into the institution's "business as usual" operations. Cross-institutional interventions have been developed to benefit underrepresented and equity groups while being integrated into LSA's broader organisational framework.

- **Outreach Programs for Schools and Communities** - We have successfully launched several initiatives to develop design skills and awareness among younger students. Our Crafting Cities workshops engage students in years 7-9, fostering early design skills, while the National Saturday Club workshops target 13-16-year-olds to build their design awareness. For year 12 students, we introduced the Extended Project Qualification (EPQ), providing both skill development and the opportunity to earn 28 UCAS points, further supporting their academic progression.
- **Support for Admissions and Application Processes** - To enhance access for applicants from underrepresented backgrounds, we implemented a staged

communication plan tailored to their needs. Additionally, we developed a contextual interview process, offering personalised advice and encouraging reapplication when appropriate, helping ensure applicants have the best possible chance of success.

- **Peer Support and Alumni Engagement** - We have strengthened peer and alumni support networks by launching the Student Buddy Scheme, which pairs incoming students with Year 2 peers to ease their transition into university life. Furthermore, the establishment of the Alumni Human Library offers targeted mentorship from alumni, enabling students to gain valuable insights and guidance as they navigate their studies and career pathways.
- **Financial Support** - To alleviate financial barriers, we introduced the LSA Bursaries for students from low socio-economic backgrounds. We also rebranded and increased the visibility of the hardship fund, ensuring that students facing financial difficulties are more aware of the support available to them. Financial support initiatives such as LSA bursaries and the Stephen Lawrence Day Foundation Scholarships ensure that students from low-income and global majority backgrounds receive financial aid and technical equipment, mentorship, and professional development opportunities. This support alleviates financial pressures and helps disadvantaged students participate fully in academic and extracurricular activities.
- **Coaching and Employability Skills Development** - We have prioritised employability skills by conducting pre-module workshops that focus on group work and industry-related competencies. Additionally, we have created pathways for students to establish industry contacts and acquire career knowledge through workshops centred on a collaborative ethos, further enhancing their readiness for the job market.
- **Support for Students of Global Majority Heritage** - In a major step toward inclusivity, we introduced the Stephen Lawrence Day Foundation Scholarships, which offer students from global majority backgrounds financial support, mentorship, and technical resources. These scholarships aim to remove barriers and promote success for students from these communities. We have expanded our support for students' mental health and well-being by enhancing the availability of diverse counselling and coaching services. Our Culture of Care events, which promote well-being through activities like yoga and crafting, have fostered a supportive and inclusive environment for all students.

5.4 HEP structures that prioritise and facilitate widening access and student success

LSA fosters collaboration between external partners & local communities to deliver interventions that support widening access and student success. For example, working with the National Saturday Club to deliver sessions for students (13-18) in the London borough of Hackney and Tower Hamlets. Collaborating with The Stephen Lawrence Day Foundation to support Part 2 students through their scholarships.

The London School of Architecture's Institutional Strategy, Diversity Policy, Admissions Handbook, and Access and Participation Plan (APP) align through their shared commitment to broadening access to architectural education, particularly for underrepresented groups, and supporting students throughout their academic journey.

- ***Institutional Strategy / Vision***

In terms of widening access, LSA's Part 0 programme addresses the APP's PTA_1 objective, which aims to increase the number of students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds registered for the MArch programme to 20% by 2032-33. Part 0 focuses on outreach to young

people aged 13-19, providing a pathway into architecture and built environment careers. The strategy includes initiatives like the National Saturday Club and Extended Project Qualification (EPQ) programme, which aim to develop students' design skills and provide UCAS points for university applications. This intervention aligns with Intervention Strategy 1 (IS1) of the APP, which takes a whole lifecycle, personalised approach to supporting students from low socio-economic backgrounds. Additionally, LSA's commitment to financial bursaries for students from disadvantaged backgrounds further supports this goal by addressing financial pressures, a key risk identified in the APP.

The APP's PTA_2 objective, to increase the number of students from global majority backgrounds to 20% by 2032-33, also aligns closely with LSA's commitment to diversity as outlined in the strategic plan. The school has established scholarships like the Stephen Lawrence Day Foundation Scholarships to support students from global majority backgrounds, ensuring that financial barriers are reduced. Additionally, LSA's efforts to decolonise design and integrate diverse perspectives into the curriculum promote an inclusive academic environment that encourages students from global majority backgrounds to thrive. These initiatives reflect the APP's Intervention Strategy 2 (IS2), which focuses on supporting students from global majority backgrounds to achieve their academic potential and stay on track.

LSA's strategic focus on fostering student success aligns with the APP's PTS_1 objective, which aims to reduce the continuation gap between disabled and non-disabled students to 10% by 2032-33. The student buddy scheme and the LSA Alumni Human Library are examples of peer support systems designed to improve student engagement and motivation. These schemes help create a sense of belonging for students, fostering an inclusive environment where students feel supported academically and personally. The strategic plan's emphasis on improving mental health and well-being aligns with the APP's Intervention Strategy 3 (IS3), which focuses on providing mental health support and ensuring students with disabilities or mental health needs are able to continue and complete their studies. LSA's culture of care events, such as yoga and meditation workshops, further reinforce its commitment to student well-being, ensuring students receive the support they need to succeed.

- **EDI Policy**

The Diversity Policy emphasises the LSA's aim to create an inclusive environment by recognising and celebrating diverse identities. The institution strives to ensure equality in recruitment and career development, reflecting its commitment to diversity in both its student body and workforce. The policy underscores the importance of recruiting from various backgrounds and fostering an environment where all individuals can thrive irrespective of socio-economic status, race, or disability. This aligns with the APP's goals, particularly in increasing the number of students from disadvantaged socio-economic and global majority backgrounds by 2032-33. The policy supports the LSA's ambition to improve access for marginalised communities by monitoring workforce diversity and embedding equity in employment practices.

Diversity and inclusion are fundamental to the values and mission of The LSA. We exist to provide opportunities to a diverse student body and an environment where support and success recognised and reflects their lived experiences. We ensure that staff are diverse and make conscious efforts to recruit women and people from a range of background and heritage to our faculty and staff body.

The institution's Disability team provides learning support plans for students who share a disability or learning difference or long-term health condition. Each year an review is conducted of recommended adjustments and we embed these into learning and teaching where possible so that we have an ongoing mechanism for making the curriculum more inclusive if students need and learning styles. We also support students to access neurodiversity assessments and apply for disabled student allowance so that they can access external as well as internal support.

- ***Admissions Policy***

Similarly, the Admissions Handbook highlights a merit-based, non-discriminatory approach to applicant selection, ensuring that no individual is disadvantaged due to their race, disability, or socio-economic background. It prioritises transparency in the admissions process and provides tailored advice and support to students from underrepresented groups, such as those with disabilities or from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds. This dovetails with the APP's Intervention Strategy 1, which aims to personalise support for students from low-income backgrounds, ensuring they have equal opportunities to succeed. The handbook's mention of Learning Support Plans for students with disabilities mirrors the APP's goal of reducing the continuation gap between disabled and non-disabled students.

- ***Student Recruitment Strategy***

The London School of Architecture's Student Recruitment Marketing Strategy for 2024/25 aligns closely with the commitments and objectives outlined in the Access and Participation Plan (APP). A key objective of the APP is to increase the representation of students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and global majority groups, which is reinforced by the recruitment strategy's targeted efforts to attract a more diverse applicant pool. For example, the use of inclusive imagery and messaging tailored towards BAME and LGBTQi+ applicants demonstrate the LSA's commitment to engaging underrepresented communities. This focus directly supports the APP's goal of increasing the number of students from global majority backgrounds to 20% by 2032-33.

The recruitment strategy's engagement through social media and targeted outreach aligns with the APP's emphasis on personalised support across the student lifecycle, particularly for students from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds. The focus on building visibility for the LSA's intellectual and socially conscious agenda, as well as promoting student work and faculty profiles, helps reduce barriers for students who may perceive higher education as inaccessible due to their background. This dovetails with the APP's strategies to improve perceptions of higher education among target groups and provide clear pathways into the architecture profession through activities like workshops and mentorships.

5.5 Staff and student engagement and contribution to widening access and student success.

Students, including current students, alumni, and recent graduates, have been engaged at various levels. They were briefed on the APP and given the opportunity to provide feedback. A dedicated APP Student Working Review Group was also established, allowing students to attend and share input on the current APP. Explain how the capacity of staff (including academics, professionals, support and managers) and students is developed to promote equality, diversity, inclusion and success and to tackle discrimination.

Collaboration is at the heart of the LSA and we work in partnership with our small cohort of student throughout the 2 years they spend with us. Our size means that we get to know our

students well and they are able to develop close and supportive relationships with each other as well as staff, visiting faculty and architects within the practice network. Our culture of care is part of how we aim to create a sense of belonging and wellbeing where students can thrive and produce their best work. It is part of architecture training and the profession to work within a studio context and we aim to develop this environment for students so that they have a space to work and collaborate in groups and with each other.

Our size means that we work very closely together across teams and at all levels. All student-facing staff have been involved in theory of change workshops to understand how their work contributes to the support and success of students and the interventions we make to address risk throughout the student journey.

We have student representatives for each year of the programme, and it is the responsibility of these students to gather feedback and communicate to their year group. We have regular student course forum meetings where the agenda is led by the student representatives. Staff listen and fix issues and provide feedback to student questions, continuing the feedback loop and our ongoing conversation between students and staff. This is complemented by our regular Faculty Forum meetings where we can disseminate student feedback to a wider academic staff network.

We have a weekly online student newsletter which has received positive feedback and has high receive and open rates.

We work with a local Counselling and Therapy provider to support 4 weeks of free counselling to students who are experiencing emotional challenges. This provider has a diverse bank of therapists and so students can choose to work with someone who shares their lived experience. We also offer individual coaching sessions for students who are 'stuck' in their creative design process and so have a space in which to work on positive future focussed solutions with an external coach.

Our small size and close community and working relationships with students means that we know when students are experiencing difficulty. This may be from unexplained absence, a change in appearance or behaviour. Appropriate members of staff are mental health first aid trained and experienced in student support. They meet weekly to discuss any students who may need support and agree on responses and approached to catch issues as they appear and proactively manage student wellbeing.

5.6 Our use of data and evidence

As a smaller, specialised institution, analysing data presents difficulties due to resource limitations and the influence of small group sizes. Due to the size of our school, staff-student interactions within teaching, learning, and the wider student encourage qualitative, personalised data collection. However, we are working toward enhancing our overall data and

evidence base, emphasising outcomes related to access and participation. The overarching goals throughout the plan:

- Establish and apply more structured and consistent data collection and monitoring processes tied to access and participation outcomes (such as interim performance metrics, student engagement, and analysis by demographics).
- Ensure that these analyses and insights are used broadly across the institution, correlating with key priorities, to enhance practices and guide strategic decisions.
- Improve our data collection, processing, and analysis capabilities, with a specific focus on access and participation indicators.
- Provide sufficient staff resources, training, and professional development related to evaluation, data analysis, and monitoring. To support this, we will join the SEER service in 2024-25, offering evaluation, research, data analysis, and staff training.
- Create and implement a robust strategy for sharing and communicating findings.

Over time, we aim to develop a more precise, data-driven understanding of our student outcomes supported by evidence-based practices. The resources available through SEER will accelerate this process significantly, and we are eager to engage with a network that addresses the unique challenges faced by smaller, specialised institutions, offering collaborative evaluation and research opportunities that allow for benchmarking and collective analysis to offset the limitations of small cohorts.

6. Student consultation

Over the past few years, the structure of student representation and the overall student experience at the LSA has evolved across various platforms. Whilst the institution does not currently have a student union, it utilises the student voice through specific student groups to help support and provide feedback on initiatives and interventions, alongside its formal student representatives. At the LSA, student representation primarily occurs through Course Representatives, who serve as the voice for their year group within their specific program of study. These representatives perform various responsibilities, such as organising informal meetings with their peers. Additionally, three Student-Course Forums are held each academic year, where the course reps meet with members of the Executive group, the program lead, and the registrar to discuss ongoing issues.

Throughout the development of this plan, students have been given multiple opportunities to provide input. At key stages of the process, efforts were made to collect feedback from students, although the level of response varied. The Registrar convened a team that included student representatives. This group was introduced to the APP submission process and informed about the expectations for their participation. Throughout the year, the working group regularly consulted with students on the development of the APP. For this submission, the Registrar offered guidance on how students could prepare and submit their portion of the APP, and led a session to help students access the relevant data and understand its development. During the last academic year, a broader consultation on Access and Participation activities was opened to the entire student body, ensuring that all students could engage with the process.

Student Feedback

The student feedback regarding the London School of Architecture's Access and Participation Plan (APP) is largely positive, with areas highlighted for improvement. Students expressed satisfaction with the quality and transparency of the data provided, noting that sufficient information was made available for them to contribute meaningfully to the APP submission. The group selected to participate represented diverse backgrounds and cohorts, and they felt confident that their collective experiences allowed them to offer a broad perspective.

Regarding the university's identification of risks to equality, students acknowledged that the institution's small size posed challenges but appreciated the careful, context-based approach used to address these risks. They agreed that the intervention strategies, including outreach, peer support, financial bursaries, and coaching, were largely credible. However, they emphasised better communication about available support programs, particularly for peer support and bursaries. Some initiatives, like coaching skills, were seen as less effective, and students suggested further strategies to support those balancing work and study.

Initiatives such as the Student Buddy Scheme and the Culture of Care were praised, though better signposting and visibility were recommended, especially during intense periods of the course. Students also expressed concerns about implementing individual learning plans, particularly students with disabilities, indicating a need for better adjustments and spatial adaptations.

Students recognised that the APP represents a shift from previous plans while maintaining the institution's overarching goals. They found the APP ambitious, considering the school's size and resources, though there is scope for further development. However, they felt their engagement in the design process was insufficient, advocating for a more open and inclusive approach to involve a broader section of the student body.

Confidence in the university's delivery and evaluation of the APP is mixed. While students are encouraged by the focus on targeted outcomes, they hope for greater involvement of the wider student community in monitoring progress. Students recommended more consistent communication of APP objectives and periodic evaluation sessions with student representatives to ensure accountability.

No significant negative outcomes were anticipated, though students noted that the plan does not fully account for the current learning space, which could affect its success. Finally, feedback on the submission process suggested that providing briefing materials in advance would help students better absorb information, and they appreciated being compensated for their time and effort.

In summary, students support the APP but call for improvements in communication, inclusivity, and the implementation of specific initiatives.

7. Evaluation of the plan

Working in partnership with the Specialist Evidence, Evaluation and Research (SEER) service, we will be engaged in an ongoing evaluation of our intervention strategies and will continuously respond to the evaluation findings to improve and develop our practices.

7.1 Strategic context for evaluation

Evaluation and research are part of our 'whole institution' approach to access and participation. Our academic, professional and leadership teams contribute to the monitoring and evaluation of Targets, Intervention Strategies and Activities in this Plan through supporting and inputting on the range of evaluation measures. Our data team have skills in ensuring data capture is appropriate for the required monitoring and evaluation outputs, including designing new reports and processes to capture, collate and extract data for various evaluation and research questions. We also draw on the skills of staff responsible for the delivery of the Activities in this Plan, and our student representatives, to effectively incorporate evaluation.

In our assessment of our current context for evaluation, using the OfS evaluation self-assessment tool, we are 'emerging' across all areas. We have some foundations in place, but need to develop our practices, including embedding evaluation into activity design and delivery and ensuring feedback cycles into improving practice. Therefore, as we are continuing to build our cross-institution capacities for effective evaluation and the application of findings to improve practice, staff and student representatives will be supported with relevant training in Theory of Change and evaluation methods, provided through our SEER membership.

Students are important in this work, and we will work in partnership with students on the design and implementation of evaluation and research, particularly where this pertains to current students.

SEER provides us with the evaluation and research expertise we need to deliver our commitments in these areas. We will actively participate in this network, which provides us with opportunities to be part of collaborative research and evaluation projects as well as learning and sharing practice with other members and external stakeholders. SEER host an annual Symposium and regular workshops, roundtables and 'learning lunches' throughout the year, as well as providing us with opportunities to showcase our practice and insights. We will also engage with TASO and other relevant organisations in calls for evidence, conferences and events, and training.

7.2 Activity design

As detailed in the Strategic Measures section of this Plan, evaluation has been established at the start. We have built effective evaluation practice into our Strategies by establishing a range of evaluation attached to the individual activities that contribute towards the overall objective of each Strategy. We can therefore build up an understanding of which activities are 'working' and which are not. We have taken a Theory of Change approach to the development of our Intervention Strategies, identifying clear intended outcomes (intermediate and end) and a supporting evidence base that has informed our activity development and challenged assumptions. With the help of SEER, we will continue to review, develop and strengthen our Theories of Change (ToC), adding to our evidence base as our evaluation findings emerge and developing enhanced activity-level ToCs where required.

7.3 Evaluation design

We have collaborated with SEER and drawn from OfS and TASO toolkits and guidance on effective evaluation approaches. We have considered how the outcomes of activities can be evaluated credibly, particularly as our context as a small and specialist provider means that we are likely to be dealing with small cohorts. Employing mixed method approaches is particularly important, as we will need to rely on qualitative data to support our understanding, or fill gaps, in quantitative data. We will triangulate findings where possible and seek to deepen our insights

through qualitative methods. Given the developmental stage of our evaluation practice, the majority of our evaluations are type 1 (narrative), and type 2 (empirical enquiry) of the OfS 'Standards of Evidence'. We have however noted that we will explore and consider where we type 3 evaluation could be implemented in future.

Our evaluation approach has also considered the context and scale of the activities and, as we have proposed working with strategic partners (schools, colleges, community groups, specialist service providers) in our Intervention Strategies, we wish to note that some flexibility and development may be required as our collaborations take shape, allowing for input and advice from partners.

We have also considered our creative arts context and, where appropriate, will trial more creative evaluation instruments (as methods in surveying, focus groups and interviews). This may help to mitigate the issue of survey fatigue, which is a significant issue for effective evaluation and is compounded in small cohorts where the same students are more likely to be subjects of multiple evaluation and research projects. We will continue to be cognisant of this in collection of feedback and have aligned our evaluation and measures across our activities to enable us to minimise the number of collection points, where possible and appropriate.

Our evaluation approach, data collection and analysis have been formulated on the intended outcomes and objectives of our activities. Where appropriate and possible, we will consider and employ validated scales to our evaluation practices. We have also considered evaluation that spans (a) process and (b) impact, to provide comprehensive understanding of how our activities are working. We will explore, with SEER, further research projects in relation to our activities and our ambition to better understand the experiences and challenges of target students and issues of equality of opportunity. For example, consultation with students as part of the development of this Plan supports the identification of risks relating to insufficient to personalised academic and non-academic support; however, we consider that there is further research, supported by our learning analytics activity, that would add insight to this area.

7.4 Implementing our evaluation plan

We will collaborate internally across our team and with our strategic partners to deliver our evaluation plan. We will be guided by our school, college and community partners, and our students in respect of effective implementation of the plan. Our evaluation process will comply with ACM policies and complies with all legal requirements relating to data protection, following ethical, safeguarding, legal and risk considerations.

As noted above, we have become members of the Specialist Evidence, Evaluation and Research (SEER) service, with whom we will work in partnership to deliver our evaluation plan. A Data Sharing Agreement has also been established. SEER provides us with opportunities to collaborate on various evaluation and research items, including for example the evaluation of the impact of financial support, using the OfS toolkit.

The design of our evaluation has also been heavily informed by intended and projected standardised outcomes being adopted by SEER across its membership base, which not only increases efficiencies but provides opportunities to increase the sample size and evaluation, helping to mitigate the issue of small datasets. SEER incorporate and draw on TASO guidance on best practices for evaluations with small cohorts (small n). Further, such collaborations may provide us access to tools that would otherwise be unaffordable. For example, in respect of our access activity, we have noted the possibility of implementing tracking, which will be explored

via SEER. As a practice network, we are also able to participate in peer review of practice and evaluation, and share practice and findings.

As a smaller provider we are also well placed to respond with agility to interim findings and emerging data. We are able to be responsive in flexing our activity accordingly to help to keep us on track to achieve our objectives and targets, and continuously improve our practice.

7.5 Learning from and disseminating findings

We are committed to sharing our learning and findings internally, with our partners, within our close networks and with the broader sector, to develop stronger and an increased volume of evidence about what works and what can be improved. We are pleased to help to grow the evidence base for equality of opportunity in higher education and we will submit evaluation outputs to OfS's repository of evidence as appropriate.

In Section 4 we have set out our publishing plan, which includes publishing findings on interim and longer-term outcomes through a range of channels. In developing the format of our communications, we will consider creative and visual methods, and different audiences / purposes. We will ensure that our findings are open access.

Our SEER membership provides us with access to academic experts in evaluation, including in the access and participation space and broader teaching and learning arena. These staff are involved in design, delivery and analysis.

Further details about how we will evaluate our intervention strategies is included in Section 4.

8. Provision of information to students

All information on fees and financial support available to prospective and current students can be found on our website.

At the London School of Architecture (LSA), we are deeply committed to ensuring that all prospective and current students, have easy access to clear and transparent information regarding our programme, support services, and financial resources. As part of our mission to make architecture education accessible to everyone, we prioritise ethical practice with our partners, inclusivity, equality, and transparency in all areas of our operations.

We understand that choosing where to pursue your architectural education is a significant decision, and we aim to provide all the necessary details to help you make an informed choice. Whether prospective students are considering applying or are already enrolled at the LSA, you will find extensive and up-to-date information on our website. This includes key details about our Programmes Part 0, Part 2 and Part 4, admissions process, tuition fees, and various financial support options.

The LSA offer an innovative and immersive Master of Architecture programme that blends rigorous academic study with real-world experience in leading architectural practices. Our programme is tailored for those passionate about design, sustainability, and urbanism and ready to engage with the challenges of contemporary architecture.

We provide detailed admission requirements and a step-by-step application process on our website, ensuring that potential students have all the necessary information to submit a successful application. In addition to the programme overview, students can also access resources such as our admissions guide and frequently asked questions to help them better understand our expectations and application criteria.

In our commitment to inclusivity of students from target groups in the plan, we provide information about our programmes, fees, and financial support through various channels. In addition to our website, you can access this information via Open Days, webinars, social media platforms, and our printed prospectus. Our admissions and programme teams are always available to provide further details through direct communication, whether by email, phone, or in-person meetings.

Understanding the costs associated with higher education is crucial, and we are committed to being transparent about all tuition fees and any additional costs related to our programmes. Our website provides detailed information on the LSA's fee structure, payment plans, and available financial aid. We also provide guidance on how to apply for loans, scholarships, and bursaries, ensuring that no one is discouraged from pursuing their passion for architecture due to financial barriers.

Our scholarships and bursaries are designed to support students from diverse backgrounds, with a particular focus on widening access to global majority heritage students who are the target group of this plan. We are proud of our efforts to increase inclusivity in the architectural profession and encourage student applications who may face financial challenges. We provide information about the financial support options on our website (Stephen Lawrence Day Foundation & Hardship Fund).

Financial Support Scheme	Purpose	Criteria for Eligibility	Number of Awards	Level of Support (£)	Level of Support in Subsequent Years of Study
Stephen Lawrence Day Foundation	Access to Education for Global Majority Students	Students must have received an offer from the LSA. Students from a Global Majority Heritage background	3	£9,000	Per Annum
Hardship Fund	For Students in Financial Hardship	Students must have received an offer from the LSA Students must have an UG/PG Loan Students must show financial evidence of hardship, (3 months of bank statements + Student Loan information) through student finance	10	£10,000	A pot of £10000 available per annum by application. Students can apply for £1000 per application and there is a max of £1000 per year
Bursary	Access for IMD students	Students must have received an offer from the LSA. Students residing in IMD quintile 1 postcodes at the point of application to Part 1, who have a household income of under £25,000	10	£10,000	Per Annum

Annex A: Assessment of Performance

We have conducted a thorough performance assessment based on the latest OfS APP data release (July 2023) which covers up to the 2021-22 monitoring year. We have supplemented this with internal data where relevant, to provide additional insights particularly where datasets are small. From this analysis, we have determined our key Indicators of Risk, which we have explored further using supplementary information, data and evidence from internal and local sources; and, from the wider sector and sector bodies (e.g. UCAS).

We considered performance across all APP measures, at each stage of the lifecycle:

- Access – enrolment
- Continuation – continuing students measured at 1 year and 15 days post initial enrolment
- Completion – students completing their course, up to 6 years after beginning their studies
- Attainment – achievement of a First or 2:1 degree outcome
- Progression – progression into highly skilled employment or further post-graduate study

This assessment presents the identified indicators of risk areas from our full analysis.

Summary of Indicators of Risk and Target Areas

The following table (1) highlights all the indicators of risk we have identified from the full initial data analysis.

Metric / Student Group	Access	Continuation	Completion	Attainment	Progression
IMD Quintile 1					
Global Majority					
Disabled					
FSM-eligible learners					
Female learners					

Table 1: Summary of Indicators of Risk and Priorities

Due to the nature of our cohort and their previous qualifications, our cohort are predominantly 21 and above, therefore the age and TUNDRA metrics have been omitted from the assessment. Additionally, when considering AdultHE, we felt that IMD is the most appropriate measure for socio-economic disadvantage and will be the primary measure.

We are focusing on areas where there are issues. While too small to report, we noted no gaps between completion, attainment and progression.

Priority Target Areas

We have determined that the following priority areas will be of concern under our APP, with associated targets and milestones.

Analysis - Access

- Increasing the percentage of learners from IMD quintile 1 to LSA
- Increasing the percentage of learner from a global majority heritage

Continuation

- Continuation rates between disabled and non-disabled learners

Areas for Continued Monitoring

The priority areas for continued monitoring are:

- Continuation for students with a global majority heritage
- Continuation for learners who were in receipt of free school measures at Level 4

Performance Analysis

Access

Access is defined as enrolment. This section provides LSA's performance in enrolling students from the OfS key target groups.

Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019

Due to the datasets being extremely small (latest year n=<65 enrolments), it is useful to use the 2- and 4-year aggregate data.

LSA enrolment of students from the most disadvantaged (IMD Quintile 1) backgrounds is below the sector in both 2- and 4-year aggregates. For the 2-year aggregate, the proportion of IMD Quintile 1 enrolments is 13.5% (this is in comparison to the sector average, at 23.2%), while the 4-year aggregate is 14.8% (sector average is 22.5%).

While specific data is too small to report, our analysis indicates that the percentage of students from IMD Quintile 1 backgrounds has generally decreased year-on-year.

The 4-year aggregate difference in LSA's enrolment between IMD Quintile 5 (least disadvantaged) and IMD Quintile 1 students is 10.3% percentage points, favouring the more affluent students by a wide margin. This is significantly larger than the sector average gap, which is -2.8% percentage points (favouring disadvantaged students).

Overall, the IMD measure is therefore **a concern** in the context of Access.

Students from the Global Majority

The LSA intake of students from global majority heritage is slightly below the sector, with 4-year aggregate data showing that 28.5% of entrants over the last 4 years came from Black, Asian,

Mixed, and other non-White backgrounds. This compared to the sector average of 34.4%. However, this performance falls further behind our local London population demographic of Hackney, at 46.9% Black, Asian, Mixed, and other non-White backgrounds.

Data for disaggregated ethnic groups is too small to report, however we note our largest intake is Asian background.

Overall, the Ethnicity measure is a potential **area of concern** in the context of Access, given our local population demographic and contextual ambitions to support diversification of the industry.

Disabled Students

LSA enrolled a similar proportion of disabled students in comparison to the sector average (17.5%, compared to 17.4%, respectively) over the last 4-year aggregate. The 2-year aggregate of the most recent data is also at 17.5%.

Overall, the Disability measure is **not of concern** in the context of Access.

Students Eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) at Key Stage 4

This measure explores outcomes for students who have been eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) at Key Stage 4.

The available FSM data is again extremely limited, and we are unable to draw any meaningful conclusions from this dataset. Given our student cohort is largely mature learners, this is expected.

The FSM measure is therefore **not of concern** in the context of Access.

Female Learners

Females are underrepresented within the Architecture sector, therefore we closely monitor the number of female learners entering LSA. Over the past 4 year aggregate, LSA's enrolling cohorts have consisted of 42% female.

The Female measure is therefore **not of concern** in the context of Access.

Continuation

Continuation is measured as the proportion of Year 1 students continuing in their studies 1 year and 15 days post-enrolment.

Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019

Datasets for this measure are extremely low, at n= <20 IMD Quintile 1 students and n= <35 IMD Quintile 5 students over the last 4-year aggregate. Therefore, we apply caution in interpreting these data.

LSA's continuation rates for students from the most disadvantaged backgrounds (IMD Quintile 1) are higher than the sector average of 85.0%. When comparing this to the 100% continuation rate students from the least disadvantaged backgrounds (IMD Quintile 5), the continuation gap smaller than the sector average of 8.5 percentage points. However, these data pertain to very small numbers of students discontinuing.

Overall, the IMD measure is therefore **not a concern** in the context of Continuation.

Students from Global Majority

Data is again very small for all ethnic groups except White ($n = <90$ for all ethnic groups across last 4 years of data). LSA's gap in continuation rates is similar to that of the sector's average gap of 3 percentage points.

Given the extremely small cohorts underpinning these data, we do not propose to set a target at this time, although we will monitor performance closely and try to better understand the small number of discontinuations by ethnicity.

Disabled Students

Again, the data for students with disabilities ($n = 20$) is very small across the last four years. However, LSA's gap in continuation rates is larger than the sector's average of 0.5 percentage points, and the gap is increasing over time.

As a result, the **Disability measure is of concern** in the context of Continuation.

Students Eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) at Key Stage 4

Datasets for this measure are extremely low, at $n = < 5$ FSM students over the last 4-year aggregate. Therefore, we apply caution in interpreting these data.

The 4-year aggregate data indicates that fewer than the sector average of 87.3% of students continue at LSA. However, given the very small number of FSM students, any other meaningful conclusions are not possible, and we will continue to monitor this metric at this stage.

Female Learners

Data is again very small for female learners ($n = <45$ across last 4 years of data). LSA's gap in continuation rates is similar to that of the sector's average gap of 3 percentage points.

Given the extremely small cohorts underpinning these data, we do not propose to set a target at this time although we will monitor performance closely and look to better understand the small numbers of discontinuation by sex.

Risks to Equality of Opportunity

We have considered the identified indicators of risk against the national Equality of Opportunity Risk Register (EORR). This highlights 12 risks that are of national concern, and which are more likely to affect students with particular characteristics.

Access (Pre-Enrolment)

The first five (5) Risks on the EORR relate to the Access (pre-enrolment) area, and we note that all 5 risks are generally more likely to have an impact on outcomes for the target groups we have identified in relation to enrolment outcomes (disadvantaged students, measured by IMD and FSM; and, students from the Global Majority). We have therefore considered all 5 Risks in relation to our context at LSA, and in consultation with our community of staff and students.

The following information provides a summary of our context in relation to each risk, and considerations of whether it is occurring and potentially the cause of the indicators of risk (i.e. poor performance) we have identified. Further information can also be found in references in the main Access and Participation Plan and in Annex B.

Risk 1 – Knowledge and Skills

It has been observed that students from our focus groups may have had limited opportunities to foster the growth of their abilities and understanding needed to pursue higher education. Consequently, it is even more probable that they will lack the necessary competencies and expertise to begin a career in architecture. This conclusion is drawn from our work with educational institutions, existing research, and the systemic challenges in architectural education; students from global majority backgrounds face far fewer opportunities to engage with architecture before attending university than other students.

Risk 2 – Information and Guidance

Schools and colleges frequently lack resources and direction regarding entry into the architecture and built environment field or specialised providers. We recognise this challenge; however, through our Part 0 access work e.g. Extended Project Qualification aimed at ages 13-19, we proactively address the knowledge and accessibility gap in architecture. The application process for studying at an LSA differs from the usual UCAS procedure; students commonly apply directly to the LSA, which introduces additional factors, including an earlier submission deadline.

Risk 3 – Perceptions of Higher Education

There is a persistent belief that a qualification in an arts discipline is exclusive to the privileged and wealthy. Students from the global majority or economically disadvantaged backgrounds frequently face discouragement in their pursuit of a career and degree in architecture, often opting instead for programs seen as more likely to provide a reliable income and secure employment due to systemic obstacles. These views are further reinforced by findings from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) and Architectural Journal (AJ) (2024) when assessing the diversity within the workforce of our creative sectors.

Risk 4 – Application Success Rates

Given the characteristics of our offerings, we incorporate contextual admissions into our application process, acknowledging that interviews might pose a challenge for some candidates, whether due to self-esteem or insufficient interview experience. Discussions with LSA staff and students indicated that this concern is not as significant for our current students and prospective applicants.

Risk 5 – Limited Choice of Course Type and Delivery Mode

Since the LSA exclusively offers a single full-time program, we recognise this as a potential risk. However, we have no intention of altering our current delivery format.

On-Course (Student Success)

The remaining Risks on the EORR relate to the on-course and progression areas, and we note that all these risks (7) are generally more likely to have an impact on outcomes for the target groups we have identified in relation to continuation (disability). Again, we have therefore considered all 7 Risks in relation to our context at LSA, and in consultation with our community of staff and students.

The following information provides a summary of our context in relation to each risk, and considerations of whether it is occurring and potentially the cause of the indicators of risk (i.e. poor performance) we have identified. Further information can also be found in references in the main Access and Participation Plan, and in Annex B.

Risk 6 – Insufficient Academic Support and Risk 7 – Insufficient Personal Support

With our small class sizes and teaching approach, every student benefits from small group instruction, and many also receive individual tutoring. This fosters strong working relationships between students and staff, enabling quick resolution of academic concerns. As a result, Risk 6 was deemed irrelevant for the LSA. However, this may not apply to all students, so we will keep assessing this risk moving forward.

Risk 8 – Mental Health

Due to the cost of living in London, students who would typically not identify as having a mental health issue are facing elevated levels of stress and concern. The demands of our program, which emphasise both academic and practical excellence, set high expectations for many students, leading to frequent experiences of stress and anxiety, particularly related to managing their time. Additionally, there are specific points in our academic schedule where multiple assessments are clustered together, coinciding with students' project deadlines at their work placements, which can create difficulties for some.

Risk 9 – Ongoing Impacts of Coronavirus

Contextual admissions – students are likely to feel the lingering effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Those enrolling in the LSA in the coming years will have faced fragmented and interrupted learning experiences before joining. This will have influenced students in various ways; for instance, at the LSA, we have observed a diverse range of students opting to withdraw or pause their studies, with no consistent pattern related to their background. Therefore, a universal approach to addressing this is not appropriate. Teaching methods and support services may need adjustment to accommodate these challenges, but should still uphold high standards to ensure students are prepared for employment or further studies.

Risk 10 – Cost Pressures

Rising financial pressures could impact a student's capacity to finish their program or achieve strong academic results. Being located in London, combined with the growing expenses for living and housing, intensifies the financial burden on students. The LSA will maintain ongoing analysis to better understand this issue for our students and evaluate our financial assistance programs to ensure we provide the most effective support, focusing on gathering insights from students in IMD Quintile 1 or the Global Majority.

Risk 11 – Capacity Issues

A rise in student enrolment could restrict students' ability to engage with important aspects of their anticipated higher education journey. We are aware of this; however, capacity is not a concern for the LSA. We will regularly review our offerings each year to guarantee that the quality of the student experience remains high for everyone.

Annex B – Evidence Based for Activities

Intervention Strategy	Activity	Evidence (reference / links)	Key points from evidence and reference to proposed activity
<p>IS1</p> <p>A whole lifecycle, personalised approach to supporting students from low socio-economic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Outreach at schools and in communities.</p> <p>Scope: Learners between 7-16 y.o. from select schools, colleges, and community organisations.</p> <p>Target: Students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and from global majority backgrounds, and disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <p>3 strands of outreach activity including:</p>	<p>¹ OFFA, 2018. Office for Fair Access annual report and accounts 2017-18. https://tinyurl.com/4rnfsand</p> <p>²Crawford, C. 2014. Socio-economic differences in university outcomes in the UK: drop-out, degree completion and degree class. London: IFS. Available at: https://ifs.org.uk/publications/socio-economic-differences-university-outcomes-uk-drop-out-degree-completion-and</p> <p>³TASO evidence toolkit on multi-intervention outreach: https://taso.org.uk/intervention/multi-intervention-outreach/</p> <p>⁴TASO evidence toolkit on pre-entry study and soft-skills support: https://taso.org.uk/intervention/study-and-soft-skills-support-pre-entry/</p>	<p>Evidence related to the effect of outreach activities generally, and programmes of activities like our age-targeted (Year 7 to Year 12) programmes and workshops, indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lower attainment rates of disadvantaged and underrepresented students are a key barrier to their access of HE; when disadvantaged students achieve the same attainment levels as their better off peers, they are almost equally likely to succeed in accessing HE^{1,2}. • programmatic (intensive) activities like workshops, taster sessions, summer schools, etc., have a small positive effect on prospective students' attitudes, aspirations, applications, confidence in the ability to achieve sufficient entry qualifications, and sense of belonging to HE^{3,4,5,6,7}. • such programmatic activities may be particularly effective for Global Majority

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After-school workshops for Years 7-9 ('Crafting Cities') aimed at developing design skills and knowledge. • Skills programme of workshops ('National Saturday Club') to engage 13-16 y.o. students with design to a brief and to develop their design awareness and knowledge. • An academic programme for Year 12 students ('Extended Project Qualification (EPQ)') providing 28 UCAS points and developing design skills and knowledge. 	<p>⁵Robinson, D. & V. Salvestrini. 2020. The impact of interventions for widening participation to higher education. A review of the evidence. Education Policy Institute. https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Widening_participation-review_EPI-TASO_2020-1.pdf</p> <p>⁶Austen, L., R. Hodgson, C. Heaton, N. Pickering & J. Dickinson. 2021. Access, retention, attainment and progression: an integrative review of demonstrable impact on student outcomes. Advance HE. http://shura.shu.ac.uk/29312/</p> <p>⁷TASO. 2023. School's in for the summer: interim findings on the impact of summer schools. https://cdn.taso.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TASO_Report_Schools-in-for-the-summer-interim-findings-on-impact-of-summer-schools.pdf</p> <p>⁸Hoare, T. & R. Mann. 2011. The impact of the Sutton Trust's Summer Schools on subsequent higher education participation: a report to the Sutton Trust. Sutton Trust.</p>	<p>students, students from deprived backgrounds, and disabled students^{5,8,9}, which are our target groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specifically for subjects like architecture and architectural engineering, outreach programmatic activities aimed at developing understanding and interest, and at raising attainment in the relevant subjects at school, appear to promote both applying to and succeeding in higher education (specifically, in terms of lower drop-out rates)¹⁰. • the format of activities (workshops and shorter projects working better than lectures or longer projects), their positioning to the curriculum (out-of-school producing better engagement), and the learning environment (project work with experts and classmates working better than being teamed up with pupils from other classes or schools), all appear to determine learner motivation and engagement with the activity, alongside its explicit alignment to personal relevance and interests, enhancing understanding, and real-life application¹¹.
--	---	--	---

		<p>https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/summer-school-summary-final-draft.pdf</p> <p>⁹McCabe, C., K. Keast & M.S. Kaya. 2022. Barriers and facilitators to university access in disadvantaged UK adolescents by ethnicity: a qualitative study. <i>Journal of Further and Higher Education</i>, 46(10), pp. 1434-1446. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2022.2086037</p> <p>¹⁰Ramming, C. H. & S.E. O'Hara. 2017. P-12 Outreach - Exploring a School of Architecture's Efforts to Engage the Early Education Community. 2017 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, Columbus, Ohio. https://peer.asee.org/28730</p> <p>¹¹Vennix, J., P. den Brok & R. Taconis. 2018. Do outreach activities in secondary STEM education motivate students and improve their attitudes towards STEM? <i>International Journal of Science Education</i>, 40(11), pp. 1263–1283.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for programmatic activities to be effective, judged by rate of applying to and enrolment in HE, they need to offer at least 8 contact hours (leading to 17% uplift on enrolment compared to learners who do not engage in such outreach activities)¹². <p>As part of this activity, we will work in partnership with schools, FE colleges, and community organisations to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extra-curricular opportunities for learners between the ages of 7-16 y.o. to gain experience, knowledge, and skills that relate to design (all three activity strands). • UCAS-point contribution of participating in our EPQ strand, towards applying to study architecture.
--	--	---	--

		https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1473659 ¹² HEAT. 2023. HE Provider HEAT-HESA Track Impact Report. https://heat.ac.uk/research-evidence/heat-track-impact-reports/he-provider-heat-hesa-track-impact-report/	
	<p>Supported Admissions</p> <p>Scope: Prospective applicants and those actively engaged at the application stage.</p> <p>Target: Students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and from global majority backgrounds, and disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p>	<p>¹Comunian, R., Dent, T., O'Brien, D., Read, T. & Wreyford, N. 2023. Making the Creative Majority: A report for the All-Party Parliamentary Group for Creative Diversity on 'What Works' to support diversity and inclusion in creative education and the talent pipeline, with a focus on the 16+ age category. KCL. https://www.kcl.ac.uk/cultural/projects/creative-majority-education</p> <p>²Hayton, A., P. Haste & A. Jones. 2015. Promoting diversity in creative art education: the case of Fine Art at Goldsmiths. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 36(8), pp. 1258-1276.</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prospective students from our target groups face social capital and cost-related challenges around preparing to apply to study creative subjects in HE¹. • supporting disadvantaged students with preparing for the application process (e.g., putting together application portfolios, attending interviews) benefits them both in terms of preparation and rate of success¹. • offering guaranteed interview to applicants from disadvantaged backgrounds and training staff on interview panels around biases has helped increase access for students

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> targeted personalised advice and support throughout the applicant journey based on applicant background. 	https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2014.899891 ³ Barkat, S. 2019. Evaluating the impact of the Academic Enrichment Programme on widening access to selective universities: Application of the Theory of Change framework. Br Educ Res J, 45: 1160-1185. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3556	<p>from our target groups at, e.g., Goldsmiths, University of London².</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> including advice and guidance on, preparation for, and financial support with the application process within a programme of targeted application support enhances the access of underrepresented students to HE, including to highly selective HE providers³.
	<p>Contextual Interview Access</p> <p>Scope: Active applicants.</p> <p>Target: Students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and from global majority backgrounds, and disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provision of portfolio advice, 	<p>⁴Boliver, V. & M. Powell. 2020. Fair admission to universities in England: improving policy and practice. Nuffield Foundation. https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Fair-admission-to-universities-in-England.pdf</p> <p>⁵OfS. 2019. Contextual admissions: Promoting fairness and rethinking merit. https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/bf84aeda-21c6-4b55-b9f8-3386b21b7b3b/insight-3-contextual-admissions.pdf</p> <p>⁶Boliver, V., C. Crawford, M. Powell & W. Craige. 2017. Admissions in Context: The use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contextual admissions mitigate applicant inequalities and selector biases as part of admissions in HE^{1,3} and are a recommended approach for enhancing the access to HE for our target groups^{4,5}. contextual admissions by definition factor the applicant's background into the admission decision^{6,7}. the effectiveness of contextual admissions in reducing inequality gaps for applicants from our target groups is enhanced by⁸: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> using indicators intersectionally. using composite indicators like TUNDRA and school ratings cautiously.

	<p>contextual interview offer, and deferral offer to the next application cycle for applicants from our target groups.</p>	<p>of contextual information by leading universities. The Sutton Trust. https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Admissions-in-Context-Final_V2.pdf</p> <p>⁷Gorard, S., V. Boliver & N. Siddiqui. 2018. How Can Contextualised Admissions Widen Participation? In: Shah, M., McKay, J. (eds) Achieving Equity and Quality in Higher Education. Palgrave Studies in Excellence and Equity in Global Education. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78316-1_14</p> <p>⁸Boliver, V., S. Gorard & N. Siddiqui. 2021. Using contextual data to widen access to higher education, Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 25(1), pp.7-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2019.1678076</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ avoiding the attachment of conditions to the contextual offer of a place, lowering the entry tariff to e.g., BCC (which associates with students who entered via contextual admissions achieving 80% completion rate and 50% rate of attaining a good degree). ○ making eligibility criteria transparent. ○ covering eligibility criteria in pre-entry Careers, Information, Advice, and Guidance (CIAG) activities. ○ lowering or removing prior attainment thresholds for participation in outreach activities. ○ increasing the intake of disadvantaged students and students with lower prior attainment into a Foundation Year (FY), if it is in place, and considering introducing a FY if it is not already in place. <p>In our support provision with preparing to apply, and our contextual admissions process, we will:</p>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce a multiprong approach to delivering targeted support to our target student groups with preparing to apply and performing at interview. introduce a contextual admissions process to further improve direct access for students from our target groups.
	<p>Peer Support</p> <p>Scope: Year 1 students.</p> <p>Target: Students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and from global majority backgrounds, and disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alumni, horizontal (same-year peer), and vertical (near peer) support via, 	<p>¹TASO. 2024. Mentoring, counselling, coaching and role models (post-entry). https://taso.org.uk/intervention/mentoring-counselling-role-models-post-entry/</p> <p>²Dekker, I., M. Luberti & J. Stam. 2023. Effects of supplemental instruction on grades, mental well-being, and belonging: A field experiment. Learning and Instruction, 87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2023.101805</p> <p>³Black, F. M. & J. MacKenzie. 2008. Peer support in the first year. The QAA. https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/11603/1/peer-support-in-the-first-year-1.pdf</p>	<p>Evidence on the effect of peer support suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> peer support enhances continuation and completion rates¹; evidence of an effect on attainment is less strong, although see². other benefits of peer support include improved transition, making friends, developing learning skills for HE, better understanding of course content^{3,4}. Year 1 ethnically minoritised students and students from deprived backgrounds (e.g., IMD Quintiles 1 and 2, Free School Meal eligible students, care leaver/care experienced students) are among the most common target

	<p>e.g., a Buddy Scheme, matching Year 1 to Year 2 students based on similarities in lived experience, and our Alumni Human Library, matching students with to alumni with skills and experiences that support current students' needs.</p>	<p>⁴Paloyo, A. R., S. Rogan & P.M. Siminski. 2016. The effect of supplemental instruction on academic performance: An encouragement design experiment. <i>Economics of Education Review</i>, 55, pp. 57-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.08.005</p> <p>⁵Dawson, P., J. Van der Meer, J. Skalicky & K. Cowley. 2014. On the effectiveness of supplemental instruction: A systematic review of supplemental instruction and peer-assisted study sessions literature between 2001 and 2010. <i>Review of Educational Research</i>, 84, pp. 609–639. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314540007</p> <p>⁶Miller, V., E. Oldfield & M. Bulmer. 2012. Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS) in first year chemistry and statistics courses: insights and evaluations. Paper presented at the Proceedings of The Australian Conference on Science and Mathematics Education. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/229409498.pdf</p>	<p>groups of peer support on which such support has a positive impact¹.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • peer support can cover support with studies that can work well both in 1:1 and in small groups (6-12 peers)^{5,6}, as well as the provision of pastoral, social, and emotional support, career and professional development support, and role modelling⁷. • peer support can be very effective during transitioning, for increasing student belonging⁸, and for personal development, stress reduction, and increasing self-efficacy and agency^{9,10,11}. • opt-out¹², structured¹³, synchronous (in-person or online), more frequent contact with a tutor or a mentor¹⁴, matching of tutees and mentees to tutors and mentors by sociodemographic characteristics¹⁵, and training tutors and mentees in teaching methods¹⁶, are all recommended for higher effectiveness of peer support. <p>As part of this activity, we will:</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>⁷Jacobi, M. 1991. Mentoring and Undergraduate Academic Success: A Literature Review. Review of Educational Research. 61(4), pp. 503-532. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543061004505</p> <p>⁸Teshera-Levy, J. & H.D. Vance-Chalcraft. 2024. Peer mentorship and academic supports build sense of community and improve outcomes for transfer students. J Microbiol Biol Educ. 25:e00163-23. https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.00163-23</p> <p>⁹Budge, S. 2006. Peer Mentoring in Postsecondary Education: Implications for Research and Practice. Journal of College Reading and Learning, 37(1), pp. 71–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2006.10850194</p> <p>¹⁰Hall, R. & Z. Jaugietis. 2011. Developing Peer Mentoring through Evaluation. Innov High Educ 36, pp. 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9156-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduce peer support schemes that aim to match students with peers of similar lived experience.
--	--	---	---

		<p>¹¹Akinla, O., P. Hagan & W. Atiomo. 2018. A systematic review of the literature describing the outcomes of near-peer mentoring programs for first year medical students. BMC Med Educ 18, 98. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1195-1</p> <p>¹²Andrews, J. & R. Clarke. 2011. Peer Mentoring Works! How Peer Mentoring Enhances Student Success in Higher Education. Engineering Education Research Group, Aston University, Birmingham. https://research.aston.ac.uk/files/2875614/Peer_mentoring_works.pdf</p> <p>¹³TASO. 2023. Understanding online mentoring delivered as part of multi-intervention outreach programmes. https://s33320.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/TASO-Report-%E2%80%93-Understanding-online-mentoring-delivered-as-part-of-multi-intervention-outreach-programmes.pdf</p> <p>¹⁴Garcia-Melgar, A., J. East & N. Meyers. 2015. Hiding in plain sight: The ‘relationship’ in peerassisted learning in higher education.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education, Special Edition Academic Peer Learning. https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i0.361</p> <p>¹⁵Reddick, R.J. & K.O. Pritchett, K.O. 2015. 'I don't want to work in a world of Whiteness:' White faculty and their mentoring relationships with Black students. The Journal of the Professoriate, 54–84. https://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/8-1_Reddick_p54.pdf</p> <p>¹⁶Lewis, M. & L. Ritchie. 2010. Evaluation of the South Yorkshire Aimhigher Associates programme 2009–2010. Sheffield: Aimhigher South Yorkshire. https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/13175/1/11_35.pdf</p>	
	<p>LSA financial bursaries</p> <p>Scope: Year 1 students.</p>	<p>¹ TASO. 2023. Financial support (post-entry). https://taso.org.uk/intervention/financial-support-post-entry/</p>	<p>Evidence on the effect of financial support on disadvantaged student groups suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • receipt of financial support (grants, bursaries, scholarships, and fee-waivers) increases continuation and completion¹ and can help close

	<p>Target: Students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and from global majority backgrounds, and disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSA bursary in every year of study for students who meet set eligibility criteria. • rebranding our 'hardship fund' and opening it up to all students to apply for when they find themselves in an unforeseen financial need. 	<p>²OfS. 2020. Understanding the impact of the financial support evaluation toolkit: Analysis and findings. https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/474c9580-e99a-4d24-a490-3474e85ae199/financial-support-evaluation-report-2016-17-2017-18.pdf</p> <p>³Harrison , N., S. Davies, R. Harris & R. Waller. 2018. Access, participation and capabilities: theorising the contribution of university bursaries to students' wellbeing, flourishing and success. Cambridge Journal of Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1401586</p> <p>⁴Hordosy, R., T. Clark & D. Vickers. 2018. Lower income students and the 'double deficit' of part-time work: Undergraduate experiences of finance, studying, and employability. Journal of Education and Work 31(4), pp. 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2018.1498068</p>	<p>continuation gaps for disadvantaged students².</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positive effect of financial support on attainment (good degree outcome) is less evident¹. • receipt of financial support also: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ increases recipient capacity to focus on their studies³. ○ Improves social life³. ○ helps build a social network³. ○ Increases recipient's self-esteem³. ○ reduces the need for working in term time⁴. ○ increases sense of belonging and mattering^{5,6}. • means-based financial support is more effective than merit-based support, particularly for disadvantaged students⁷. • bursaries especially help increase continuation of disadvantaged students⁸. • students eligible for means-based support may not receive it because
--	---	---	--

		<p>⁵Thomas, L. 2012. Building student engagement and belonging in Higher Education at a time of change: a summary of findings and recommendations from the What Works? Student Retention & Success programme Summary Report. Paul Hamlyn Foundation. https://www.phf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/What-Works-Summary-report.pdf</p> <p>⁶Clark, T., & R. Hordósy, 2019. Social Identification, Widening Participation and Higher Education: Experiencing Similarity and Difference in an English Red Brick University. Sociological Research Online, 24(3), 353–369. https://doi.org/10.1177/1360780418811971</p> <p>⁷Herbaut , E. & K. M. Geven. 2019. What Works to Reduce Inequalities in Higher Education? A Systematic Review of the (Quasi)Experimental Literature on Outreach and Financial Aid Policy Research Working Papers. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-8802</p>	<p>their household income has not been officially assessed (meaning they miss out also on a maintenance grant) and/or because they find navigating the bursary application process difficult to navigate; that increases their risk of dropping out^{9,10}.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adopting an effective method for identifying students at a greater risk and therefore in greater need of financial support is necessary for the overall effectiveness of the financial support provision¹¹. <p>As part of this activity, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide annual bursary throughout our courses. • open up and streamline the application for hardship funds.
--	--	--	---

		<p>⁸Murphy, R. & G. Wyness. 2015. Testing Means-Tested Aid. CEP Discussion Paper No 1396, Centre for Economic Performance. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35438856.pdf</p> <p>⁹Harrison, N. & R. Waller. 2017. Success and Impact in Widening Participation Policy: What Works and How Do We Know? Higher Education Policy 30(2), pp. 141-160. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1057/s41307-016-0020-x.pdf</p> <p>¹⁰Moore, E. & A P. Burgess. 2023. Financial support differentially aids retention of students from households with lower incomes: a UK case study, Studies in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2125950</p> <p>¹¹Kaye, N. 2021. Evaluating the role of bursaries in widening participation in higher education: a review of the literature and evidence, Educational Review, 73:6. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1787954</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Coaching Skills for Industry Success (Group work module)</p> <p>Scope: All students.</p> <p>Target: Students from deprived socio-economic backgrounds and from global majority backgrounds, and disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pre-module, day-long workshops on developing skills for group work, forming a group ethos, and networking with industry leads. 	<p>¹Ramaiah, B. & D. Robinson. 2022. What works to reduce equality gaps in employment and employability? TASO. https://taso.org.uk/news-item/what-works-to-reduce-equality-gaps-in-employment-and-employability/</p> <p>²Percy, C. & K. Emms. 2020. Drivers of early career success for UK undergraduates: an analysis of graduate destinations surveys. Edge Foundation. https://www.edge.co.uk/sites/default/files/documents/edge_hesa_analysis_report_web-1.pdf</p> <p>³ Scott, F. J. & D. Willison. 2021. Students' reflections on an employability skills provision, Journal of Further and Higher Education, 45:8, pp. 1118-1133. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1928025</p> <p>⁴Moore, J., J. Sanders & L. Higham. 2013. Literature review of research into widening participation to higher education. Bristol: HEFCE.</p>	<p>Evidence related to developing employability skills and support career readiness suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disadvantaged students have less positive employment outcomes than their better off peers¹. • the most important factor for career success and satisfaction appears to be whether graduates were confident they could function / perform effectively across a range of relevant skills². • features of higher education that associate positively with high graduate career satisfaction and earning potential include²: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ focus on skills development. ○ relevance of the curriculum to graduate jobs. ○ relevance of the degree, degree classification (grade), and the qualification for graduate jobs. ○ relevant work experience during the degree. ○ whether the graduate job was obtained through the university.
--	---	---	---

		<p>http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/year/2013/wplitreview/</p> <p>⁵ Pegg, A., J. Waldock, S.Hendy-Isaac & R. Lawton. 2012. Pedagogy for employability. The Higher Education Academy. https://documents.advances.he.ac.uk/download/file/document/3983</p> <p>⁶¹ Lunsford, L., G. Crisp, E. Dolan & B. Wuetherick. 2017. Mentoring in Higher Education. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://tinyurl.com/4ne83h72</p> <p>⁷Capstick, M.K., L.M. Harrell-Williams, C.D. Cockrum & S. West. 2019. Exploring the Effectiveness of Academic Coaching for Academically At-Risk College Students. Innov High Educ, 44, pp.219–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-019-9459-1</p> <p>⁸Alzen, J.L., A. Burkhardt, E. Diaz-Bilello, E. Elder, A. Sepulveda, A. Blankenheim & L. Board. 2021. Academic Coaching and its Relationship to Student Performance, Retention, and Credit Completion. Innov High</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cohort tailored, needs based support with the development of employability skills works best, according to alumni feedback^{3,4} and good practice from the UK HE sector⁵. • role-modelling and coaching by industry practitioners in the context of learning for career readiness affects positively student transition, belonging, continuation, motivation, and self-efficacy⁶. • staff-student or peer-coaching in academic skills enhances achievement and retention of at-risk students^{7,8}. <p>As part of this activity, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introduce workshops on teamwork and links to career skills and employability.
--	--	---	--

		Educ 46, pp. 539–563. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09554-w	
IS2 Support for students with disabilities/mental health needs to stay on programme and continue to graduation.	<p>Student Buddy Scheme and Human Library (both are flexible and can be used to match students to meet specific needs)</p> <p>Scope: Disabled students.</p> <p>Target: Disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diverse counselling and coaching offer, as per our Intervention Strategy 2. 	<p>¹Campbell, A. 2015. Introducing a buddying scheme for first year pre-registration students. British Journal of Nursing, 24(20), pp. 992-996. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2015.24.20.992</p> <p>²Thalluri, J., J.A. O’Flaherty & P.L. Shepherd. 2014. Classmate peer coaching: A Study Buddy Support scheme, Journal of Peer Learning, 7. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1059984.pdf</p> <p>³Thomas, L. 2011. Do Pre-entry Interventions such as ‘Aimhigher’ Impact on Student Retention and Success? A Review of the Literature. Higher Education Quarterly, 65: 230-250. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2010.00481.x</p> <p>⁴Furrer, C. J., E.A., Skinner & J.R., Pitzer. 2014. The Influence of Teacher and Peer Relationships on Students’ Classroom</p>	<p>Evidence indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘buddy schemes’ normally pair participants for mutual safety and assistance, to provide them a ‘helpful listening ear’, and to direct and support them to an appropriate source of advice¹. ‘buddy schemes’ enhance participant sense of belonging and self-advocacy (help seeking)². positive peer relationships contribute to belonging³ and engagement with learning⁴ and represent an additional layer of support over the signposting and engaging students with what they can access, and how, and the personalisation of that to meet diverse needs. embedding mental health and wellbeing into curricular and co-curricular activities achieve a wide range of impacts, from improved mental

		Engagement and Everyday Motivational Resilience. Teachers College Record, 116(13), 101–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811411601319	<p>health, general wellbeing literacy, and the development of coping mechanisms and awareness of available support and how to access it, to increased self-reporting and seeking support by student groups that generally are less likely to report and seek help⁵.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sector-wide frameworks, e.g., the Mental Wellbeing Embeddedness Framework⁶, and established toolkits for reviewing and embedding wellbeing into curricula⁷ and the wider student experience help guide the development of a whole-institution approach⁸. • partnering with students and enabling their leadership of curricular reform in the context of support provision, raising awareness, and self-advocacy, is very effective and can help destigmatise help seeking and reporting of mental health and other kinds of challenges by
	<p>Culture of Care wellbeing events.</p> <p>Scope: All students.</p> <p>Target: Disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a programme of events, e.g., yoga, crafting, and meditation, that are designed in collaboration with students to promote wellbeing. 	<p>⁵Wavehill. 2022. What Works in Supporting Student Mental Health. Final Report to the Office for Students. https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/7584/evaluation-of-the-mhcc-what-works.pdf</p> <p>⁶ Lister, K. & Z. Allman. 2024. Embedding mental wellbeing in the curriculum: a collaborative definition and suite of examples in practice. Front. Educ. 8:1157614. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1157614</p> <p>⁷Thomson, LJ. & H.J. Chatterjee. 2013. UCL Creative Wellbeing Measures. UCL. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/biosciences/culture-</p>	

	<p>Review of learning & teaching adjustments and embedding into the curriculum.</p> <p>Scope: All students.</p> <p>Target: Disabled students.</p> <p>What is it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> incorporation of reasonable adjustments as a matter of design into curricular teaching and assessment. 	<p>nature-health-research/ucl-creative-wellbeing-measures</p> <p>⁸Allman, Z. 2022. What good looks like in embedding mental health support across HE. WonkHE. https://wonkhe.com/blogs/what-good-looks-like-in-embedding-mental-health-support-across-he/</p> <p>¹⁰OFS. 2023. Meeting the mental health needs of students. Insight 20. https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/8812/insight-brief-20-meeting-the-mental-health-needs-of-students.pdf</p> <p>¹¹Advance HE. 2020. Equality impact assessment. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/governance-and-policies/equality-impact-assessment</p> <p>¹²TASO. 2023. Summary report: What works to reduce equality gaps for disabled students. https://taso.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TASO-report-what-works-to-</p>	<p>certain student groups⁵, many of which (e.g., mature students, students from lower economic background, Global Majority students) are likely to experience higher attrition due to lower rates of presenting to and engagement with available support, e.g., mental health support¹⁰.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> equality impact assessment is an established approach to modelling the effect of higher education policies and processes on protected characteristics, e.g., disability, under equality law¹¹; inclusivity impact assessment (SEER) is a novel approach that combines the modelling of effects of curricular and support provision designs and practices on both equality and inclusivity for target student characteristics in the equality law and EORR. disabled students are negatively affected by the lack of accessibility, digital and physical, in the learning environment¹², and by insufficient reasonable adjustments for their type of disability¹³. the support provided to students with disability can have profound effect on
--	---	---	---

		<p>reduce-equality-gaps-for-disabled-students.pdf</p> <p>¹³Disability UK. 2022. Adjustments for disabled students and apprentices. https://www.disabilityrightsuk.org/resources/adjustments-disabled-students-and-apprentices</p> <p>¹⁴Safer, A., L. Farmer & B. Song. 2020. Quantifying Difficulties of University Students with Disabilities. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, v33, n1, pp. 5-21. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1273641.pdf</p> <p>¹⁵Hubble, S. & P. Bolton. 2021. Support for disabled students in higher education in England. Briefing Paper. House of Commons. https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8716/CBP-8716.pdf</p> <p>¹⁶Beard, L.M., K. Schilt & P. Jagoda. 2023, Divergent Pathways: How Pre-Orientation Programs Can Shape the Transition to College for First-Generation, Low-Income Students¹.</p>	<p>their continuation and attainment¹⁴, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ provision of support as early as in the first semester/term of study affects positively the continuation of disabled students. ○ hearing impairment students, regardless of provision of interpretative support, as well as students with ASD, tend to have lower attainment. ○ STEM students with disability have lower attainment and continuation rates (although, that seems to apply generally to STEM students, so may not be related to disability). ○ ethnically minoritised students with disability may be less likely to do as well (and/or take up available support) as their white comparator group, so culturally responsive support and teaching may be necessary. ○ male students with disability are also less likely to take up support and may need more encouragement to do so.
--	--	---	---

		<p>Sociol Forum. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12923</p> <p>¹⁷Sanger, C.S. 2020. Inclusive Pedagogy and Universal Design Approaches for Diverse Learning Environments. In: Sanger, C., Gleason, N. (eds) Diversity and Inclusion in Global Higher Education. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1628-3_2</p> <p>¹⁸TASO. 2023. What Works to Reduce Equality Gaps for Disabled Students? https://s33320.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/TASO-report-what-works-to-reduce-equality-gaps-for-disabled-students.pdf</p> <p>¹⁹Felsinger, A. & K. Byford. 2010. Managing reasonable adjustments in higher education. Equality Challenge Unit. https://documents.advance-he.ac.uk/download/file/document/7822</p> <p>²⁰Borkin, H., A. Rowan, N. Stoll, N. Codioli, A. Aldercotte, E. Pugh & H. Lawson. 2024.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • receipt of DSA combined with effective support during HE studies enhances the disabled student experience and confidence in their ability to complete and pass a degree course¹⁵. • pre-enrolment support can boost generation of self-advocacy skills and peer capital¹⁶. • tailoring reasonable adjustments to disability type is effective in addressing challenges and supporting outcomes, e.g., continuation¹³. • for neurodiverse learners specifically, effective approaches to transitioning and overall student experience include^{17,18}: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ using Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to underpin curricula and teaching and learning. ○ embedding opportunities to learn about and discuss neurodiversity for both staff and students. ○ engaging students with a screening tool that can identify undiagnosed conditions.
--	--	--	--

		<p>Supporting disabled students: Mapping reasonable adjustments and transition support. TASO. https://cdn.taso.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TASO_Report-Supporting-disabled-students-APR-2024-.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Encouraging disclosure of diagnosed conditions at the point of entry. • taking an anticipatory approach to matching to and providing students with appropriate adjustments is an effective approach¹⁹ predicated on early engagement of disabled students in considerations of appropriate reasonable adjustments and embedding of adjustments into curricula to enhance inclusivity for disabled students²⁰. <p>As part of these activities, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop targeted a buddy scheme for disabled students that matches them to vertically to senior year students or to alumni of similar lived experience. • take on a curriculum approach to embedding mental health and wellbeing that involves staff-student partnership and student leadership. • Explore the incorporation of reasonable adjustments into our curricula and take an anticipatory approach to the allocation of such adjustments.
--	--	---	--

Fees, investments and targets

2025-26 to 2028-29

Provider name: The London School of Architecture

Provider UKPRN: 10062810

Summary of 2025-26 entrant course fees

*course type not listed

Inflation statement:

We will not raise fees annually for new entrants

We will comply with defined fee levels for an approved fee cap provider

Table 3b - Full-time course fee levels for 2025-26 entrants

Full-time course type:	Additional information:	Sub-contractual UKPRN:	Course fee:
First degree	*	N/A	*
Foundation degree	*	N/A	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (classroom based)	*	N/A	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (non-classroom based)	*	N/A	*
HNC/HND	*	N/A	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	N/A	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	N/A	*
Accelerated degree	*	N/A	*
Sandwich year	*	N/A	*
Turing Scheme and overseas study years	*	N/A	*
Other	Part 2 Architecture Students from 2025-26 (Approved fee cap). Course Type is classed as other because, for the purposes of student finance, the Part 2 Architecture is classified as an undergraduate degree, as per the five qualifying years required to become an architect; however the course is not technically a first degree. Therefore we have designated the course type as other, as in previous years.	N/A	9000

Table 3b - Sub-contractual full-time course fee levels for 2025-26

Sub-contractual full-time course type:	Sub-contractual provider name and additional information:	Sub-contractual UKPRN:	Course fee:
First degree	*	*	*
Foundation degree	*	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (classroom based)	*	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (non-classroom based)	*	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*	*
Sandwich year	*	*	*
Turing Scheme and overseas study years	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*

Table 4b - Part-time course fee levels for 2025-26 entrants

Part-time course type:	Additional information:	Sub-contractual UKPRN:	Course fee:
First degree	*	N/A	*
Foundation degree	*	N/A	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (classroom based)	*	N/A	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (non-classroom based)	*	N/A	*
HNC/HND	*	N/A	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	N/A	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	N/A	*
Accelerated degree	*	N/A	*
Sandwich year	*	N/A	*
Turing Scheme and overseas study years	*	N/A	*
Other	Part 2 Architecture Students from 2025-26 (Approved fee cap). Course Type is classed as other because, for the purposes of student finance, the Part 2 Architecture is classified as an undergraduate degree, as per the five qualifying years required to become an architect; however the course is not technically a first degree. Therefore we have designated the course type as other, as in previous years.	N/A	6955

Table 4b - Sub-contractual part-time course fee levels for 2025-26

Sub-contractual part-time course type:	Sub-contractual provider name and additional information:	Sub-contractual UKPRN:	Course fee:
First degree	*	*	*
Foundation degree	*	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (classroom based)	*	*	*
Foundation year/Year 0 (non-classroom based)	*	*	*
HNC/HND	*	*	*
CertHE/DipHE	*	*	*
Postgraduate ITT	*	*	*
Accelerated degree	*	*	*
Sandwich year	*	*	*
Turing Scheme and overseas study years	*	*	*
Other	*	*	*

Fees, investments and targets

2025-26 to 2028-29

Provider name: The London School of Architecture

Provider UKPRN: 10062810

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	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Access activity investment (£)	NA	£34,000	£34,000	£34,000	£34,000
Financial support (£)	NA	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000
Research and evaluation (£)	NA	£19,000	£19,000	£19,000	£20,000

Table 6d - Investment estimates

Investment estimate (to the nearest £1,000)	Breakdown	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Access activity investment	Pre-16 access activities (£)	£4,000	£4,000	£4,000	£4,000
Access activity investment	Post-16 access activities (£)	£23,000	£23,000	£23,000	£23,000
Access activity investment	Other access activities (£)	£7,000	£7,000	£7,000	£7,000
Access activity investment	Total access investment (£)	£34,000	£34,000	£34,000	£34,000
Access activity investment	Total access investment (as % of HFI)	10.2%	10.2%	10.2%	10.2%
Access activity investment	Total access investment funded from HFI (£)	£14,000	£14,000	£14,000	£14,000
Access activity investment	Total access investment from other funding (as specified) (£)	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000
Financial support investment	Bursaries and scholarships (£)	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000
Financial support investment	Fee waivers (£)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Financial support investment	Hardship funds (£)	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000
Financial support investment	Total financial support investment (£)	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000
Financial support investment	Total financial support investment (as % of HFI)	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%
Research and evaluation investment	Research and evaluation investment (£)	£19,000	£19,000	£19,000	£20,000
Research and evaluation investment	Research and evaluation investment (as % of HFI)	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%	6.0%

Fees, investments and targets

2025-26 to 2028-29

Provider name: The London School of Architecture

Provider UKPRN: 10062810

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	2025-26 milestone	2026-27 milestone	2027-28 milestone	2028-29 milestone
To reduce the gap in access for students from low socio-economic backgrounds, as measured by IMD Quintile 1 compared to their counterparts, measured by IMD quintile 5 to a 5pp gap by 2032-33	PTA_1	Access	Deprivation (Index of Multiple Deprivations (IMD))	IMD quintile 1	IMD quintile 5	Our baseline and annual milestones are 4-year aggregates, from the baseline years 2017-18 to 2020-21. The smaller incremental changes across our milestones recognise the effect of historical data in use of 4-yr aggregates, whilst being ambitious in our context. Milestones continue as the rolling 4-year aggregate data.	No	Other data source (please include details in commentary)	Other (please include details in commentary)	Percentage points	10.3	10	9.5	9	8.5
To increase the proportion of entrants from global majority heritage backgrounds on the MArch programme, to 33% by 2032-33.	PTA_2	Access	Ethnicity	Not specified (please give detail in description)		Our baseline and annual milestones are 4-year aggregates, from the baseline years 2017-18 to 2020-21. The smaller incremental changes across our milestones recognise the effect of historical data in use of 4-yr aggregates, whilst being ambitious in our context. Milestones continue as the rolling 4-year aggregate data.	No	Other data source (please include details in commentary)	Other (please include details in commentary)	Percentage	28.5	29.5	30.5	31.5	33
	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	2025-26 milestone	2026-27 milestone	2027-28 milestone	2028-29 milestone
To reduce the continuation gap between disabled students and non-disabled students, 5pp by 2032-33.	PTS_1	Continuation	Reported disability	Disability reported	No disability reported	Our baseline and annual milestones are 4-year aggregates, from the baseline years 2017-18 to 2020-21. The smaller incremental changes across our milestones recognise the effect of historical data in use of 4-yr aggregates, whilst being ambitious in our context. Milestones continue as the rolling 4-year aggregate data.	No	Other data source (please include details in commentary)	Other (please include details in commentary)	Percentage points	10	9	8	7	6
	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	2025-26 milestone	2026-27 milestone	2027-28 milestone	2028-29 milestone
------------------------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------	--------------	------------------	---	-------------------------------	-------------	---------------	-------	---------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

[illegible]