

Higher Education Funding Scrutiny Panel

1 Introduction

The Scrutiny Panel was established in June 2007 with the following terms of reference:

"To examine the impact of the forthcoming government review of higher education funding on the city's economic development."

The Panel was chaired by Councillor Nick Small, the Opposition Spokesperson for Regeneration, and comprised:

Councillors John Coyne, Phil Moffat, Stuart Monkcom, Bob Ousby and Ben Williams, the Chair of the Regeneration and Economic Development Select Committee Councillor Eddie Clein and the Executive Member for Economic Development and Europe Councillor Flo Clucas.

The Panel was serviced by Mark Kitts, the Interim Assistant Executive Director for Regeneration and Joan Leonard from Committee Services.

The Panel met on five occasions and interviewed a wide range of parties from universities, student organisations, the voluntary sector, Liverpool City Council and its regeneration partners.

All meetings were open to the public. A list of those interviewed is detailed in Annex 1 and minutes of each meeting held are attached in Annex 2.

2 Recommendations

The Scrutiny Panel makes the following recommendations:

2.1 The current cap on tuition fees should not be substantially raised.

Liverpool's higher education institutions complement each other. Collectively they are crucial drivers of economic prosperity and growth. Evidence from the city's higher education institutions strongly indicates that lifting the cap on tuition fees from the current £3,070 level and the resultant inevitable marketisation of higher education, which some commentators have called for, would impinge on the complementary model of Liverpool's higher education offering and would impact negatively on the city's future economic prospects.

2.2 Maintenance grants should be improved and maintenance loans targeted at students from lower income families.

Maintenance grants for lower income students should be increased and taxpayer support for maintenance loans in the form of interest subsidies and write-offs should be targeted at lower income students.

As an illustration of this, means-tested maintenance grants could be increased from £2,875 a year to £3,750 a year for students with parental incomes lower than £25,000. Grants could be tapered for students with parental incomes between £25,001 and £60,000, as in the current system. In a reversal from the current system students with the lowest parental incomes should be given access to the biggest loans. The maximum annual maintenance loan could be set at £3,750 (reduced from the current level of £4,330 to take account of increased grants), with 75% of the loan means-tested, so every student would be guaranteed a minimum loan of £937 a year, regardless of parental income.

2.3 Education Maintenance Allowances (“EMA”) should be extended and take-up rates encouraged.

EMA has been shown to increase staying-on rates in post-compulsory education and many of those benefiting from EMA subsequently enter higher education. Government should increase EMA payments and widen eligibility to increase further opportunities for young people from lower income backgrounds. The City Council should also look at ways it can encourage wider take-up of EMA.

2.4 Regulation of the widening participation agenda should be strengthened and periodically reviewed.

Government should continue to regulate the widening participation agenda, but the current arrangements for financing and regulating higher education are complex and do not give enough weight to increasing the access to and retention in higher education of those from lower income and other excluded backgrounds.

Government should consider establishing in legislation the minimum amount of additional fee income higher education institutions should spend on means tested bursaries and outreach work to widen participation. This should be around a third of additional fee income.

The roles and responsibilities of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (“HEFCE”), which is the primary channel of public funding to universities, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (“QAAHE”), which safeguards academic standards and the Office for Fair Access (“OFFA”), which regulates access agreements should be merged so that widening participation is at the heart of the financing and regulation of higher education in England.

Government should also give the new regulator additional powers to sanction those higher education institutions failing to meet statutory minimum targets for widening participation and additional targets set out in access agreements.

The regulator should require all higher education institutions to align their entitlement thresholds for means tested bursaries with the thresholds for maintenance grants to simplify the system.

Arrangements for funding higher education and regulating widening participation should be periodically reviewed by government.

2.5 Widening participation data should be more prominently disclosed by the city’s higher education institutions.

Liverpool’s higher education institutions have a strong record in supporting and improving widening participation. This is demonstrated by the fact that all higher education institutions in the city (with the exception of Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts (“LIPA”)) spend more of their additional fee income on financial support for lower income students than the national average for 2006/07 of 21.37%. (It should be noted that the Panel did not interview a representative from LIPA.)

In 2006/07 only Liverpool John Moores University (“LJMU”) of the city’s four higher education institutions met its target for the level of additional fee income spent on financial support for lower income students.

The institutions themselves should communicate better the nature of the widening participation work they undertake and intend to undertake in the future and its outcomes more prominently.

2.6 The City Council should do more to co-ordinate, promote and support the widening participation agenda.

There is an unmet need across the city for promoting access to and retention in higher education on an cross-institutional basis.

The City Council should look at ways of augmenting work already done by organisations such as Merseyside Network for Change, Aimhigher and Partnerships for Progression.

This could take the form of non-institution based bursaries targeted at specific areas with low levels of higher education participation in return for supporting the city's community infrastructure, along the lines of the Kensington Community Bursary Project.

This could also take the form of supporting non-institution based, area focused outreach for financial advice to students and potential students from lower income backgrounds in the city to remove barriers to access and improve retention.

Government funding from the new Working Neighbourhoods Fund, which is a dedicated fund for community-led regeneration in the most deprived parts of England, could be used to pay for such projects.

The City Council should examine how it could use its existing resources to make students, potential students and their parents aware of financial support available.

The City Council should look at ways it can work with higher education institutions and others to facilitate the better promotion of financial help available to students from lower income households before students apply to university.

2.7 The City Council should work more closely with the city's higher education institutions to make areas students live, work and study more liveable.

It is crucial that the City Council does more to improve the physical regeneration, community safety and public realm of those parts of the city in which higher education institutions are located and in which students live and work. This principle should be enshrined in the City Council's Local Development Framework, which will outline how planning is managed in local areas and in Neighbourhood Area Agreements, which will set out local priorities at neighbourhood level.

The City Council should look at the community-forum model adopted in Marybone and supported by City and North Neighbourhood Management Services to micro-manage the interaction between students, higher education institutions, accommodation providers and the wider community and to promote the integration of students within the communities in which they live, work and study.

2.8 The City Council should make a formal submission to the 2009 funding review based on the findings of this report.

The City Council should make a submission to the forthcoming funding review, given the potential negative impacts on the city's economy that may result. The City Council's submission should be based on the findings of the Panel and made on a cross-party basis.

3 Relevant background information

3.1 The context of higher education funding in the UK

The UK higher education system has gradually evolved over a generation from a system characterised by low participation levels principally funded by the taxpayer to the current cost-sharing, higher participation model.

In 1990 the then Conservative Government partially replaced student grants with government-guaranteed low interest student loans administered by the Student Loans Company. Two years later the Higher Education Act 1992 rapidly expanded student numbers by giving 48 polytechnics university status.

In 1998 the Labour Government introduced tuition fees for the first time and fully replaced student grants with maintenance loans following the Dearing Report. Tuition fees were at a level of £1,000 a year and were payable by all full-time undergraduate students, although students from low income households were given fee remissions.

The following year the government announced the aspiration that half of 18–30 year olds should have the opportunity to benefit from higher education by 2010.

Further radical change came about with the Higher Education Act 2004, which replaced up-front fixed fees with deferred variable fees at a level capped by the government, reintroduced grants and extended maintenance loans. Tuition fees are capped at a maximum of £3,070 a year for 2007/08 and have been payable by students starting their degree in 2006/07 and subsequent years. Repayment of fees under the current system is deferred until a student is earning £15,000 a year.

Although tuition fees can be set at a variable level, subject to the £3,070 cap, all higher education institutions in England, with only two exceptions (Thames Valley University and Leeds Metropolitan University), charge fees at the maximum level. Therefore, no market based on the level of tuition fees exists in practice.

In 2007/08 the maximum maintenance grant is £2,700 and is available to students from households earning £17,500 or less. Partial grants are available at a tapered rate until parental income reaches £38,330.

From 2008/09 maintenance grants of a maximum of £2,825 a year will be available to students from lower income households from 2008/09 (now defined as those with parental incomes of £25,000 or less). Grants will then reduced proportionately until parental income reaches £60,000.

Government-guaranteed low interest maintenance loans are also available. Such loans are at their minimum for those students qualifying for maximum grants, with loans increased pound for pound with the corresponding reduction in grants until parental incomes of £60,000 where the loan reaches its maximum of £4,330.

The National Union of Students calculates the total cost to the UK taxpayer of the current funding arrangements to be £1,962m a year. This amount consists of fee loan subsidies (in low interest and projected write-offs) of £600m a year, maintenance loan subsidies of £451m (assuming a take-up rate of 80%) and maintenance grants of £911m.

The 2004 Act also required higher education institutions to enter into binding access agreements with a newly established body OFFA. These agreements stipulated targets for levels of fee income institutions were required to set aside for targeted bursaries and measures institutions were required to undertake to widen participation.

Under the 2004 Act OFFA has the power to prevent higher education institutions from charging fees of more than £1,200 a year, if an institution's access arrangements are insufficient. OFFA is also able to impose financial sanctions of up to £500,000 on higher education institutions which do not meet agreed requirements on bursaries and outreach work.

During the passage of the 2004 Act through parliament, the government announced that a review of the 2004 funding arrangements would take place during 2009 with any changes resulting from the review likely to be implemented in 2010/11.

3.2 The regulation of higher education by government

Since last year the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills ("DIUS") has been responsible for post-19 education policy (including higher education) at a ministerial level. Together with OFFA, the role and responsibilities of which are discussed in 3.1, various independent bodies are responsible for funding, regulating and promoting higher education and the government's higher education policy priorities in England. The roles of the principal bodies are dealt with below.

3.2.1 HEFCE

HEFCE distributes public money for teaching and research to higher education institutions in England. It also has the remit to promote high quality education and research within a financially healthy sector.

3.2.2 QAAHE

QAAHE safeguards and helps improve academic standards and the quality of higher education in the UK.

3.2.3 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education ("OIAHE")

OIAHE is responsible for resolving complaints from students about higher education institutions. OIAHE also publishes recommendations to higher education institutions about good practice in handling complaints.

3.3 The context of higher education in Liverpool

Liverpool's student population has grown rapidly throughout the 1990s and 2000s. In 1986/87 Liverpool's student population was approximately 19,000. Today the number of higher education students living in Liverpool is approximately 50,000, which equates to 11% of the city's population. The majority of higher education students living in the city are studying at University of Liverpool ("UoL"), LJMU, Liverpool Hope University ("Hope") and LIPA, although a small number are studying at other nearby higher education institutions (such as Edge Hill University, University of Chester, University of Salford and University of Manchester).

It is estimated that around half of the city's student population are from the Greater Liverpool area and half are from outside the city. The direct contribution made by students to Liverpool's economy in non-course related expenditure is £252m per year. As well as this, students living in Liverpool spend an average of 41% of their time in paid work, further contributing to the local economy.

Figures from UoL's Careers and Employability Service show that almost one third of students remain working in Greater Liverpool six months after graduation.

There are four higher education institutions in Liverpool.

3.3.1 UoL

UoL, founded in 1881 as one of the country's first civic universities, is a member of the Russell Group, an association of twenty leading research-intensive UK universities, with a world class reputation in biological sciences, veterinary sciences, engineering and medicine.

UoL charges the maximum tuition fees permitted to UK and EU students (£3,070 in 2007/08).

UoL provides those students from households with incomes of £17,910 or less a bursary of £1,300 a year and those from households with incomes of between £17,911 and £38,330 a bursary of £1,000 a year. UoL do not plan to raise these income thresholds to align them with the new thresholds for maintenance grants.

UoL provides non-means tested attainment scholarships of £1,500 a year to students attaining outstanding entry qualifications in specified degree programmes. Further scholarships offered are Alumni Awards (£2,000 per year based on academic excellence), John Lennon Memorial Scholarships (£1,200 a year based on financial need and merit with priority given to Merseyside residents) and Hillsborough Trust Memorial Bursaries (£600 a year based on financial need, merit and career intentions with priority given to Merseyside residents). The Access to Learning Fund provides up to £3,000 a year based on financial hardship.

In 2006/07 UoL projected that 30.00% of additional fee income would be spent on financial support for lower income students. The actual percentage spent was 26.80%.

A copy of UoL's Access Agreement with the Office For Fair Access ("OFFA") is enclosed in Annex 3.

3.3.2 LJMU

LJMU is a post-1992 institution with strong links to the business community and a focus on real-world experience. LJMU has a world class reputation for space science research, is the UK's top university for teaching and research in sports and exercise sciences and for teaching in applied social work, health studies, hospitality, leisure, recreation, sport and tourism, physics and astronomy.

LJMU charges the maximum tuition fees permitted to UK and EU students (£3,070 in 2007/08).

LJMU provides those students from households with incomes of £17,910 or less a bursary of £1,025 a year and those from households with incomes of between £17,911 and £38,330 a bursary of £410 a year. From 2008/09 those students from households with incomes of £25,000 or less will be entitled to bursaries of £1,050 a year, while those from households with incomes between £25,001 and £50,000 will be entitled to bursaries of £420 a year. This is to align the LJMU bursary scheme with the same income levels as the new maintenance grant scheme.

LJMU provides various non-means tested scholarships – DPAs Scholarships (£1,000 a year for students achieving 3 A-Levels at grade "A"), Achievers Scholarships (£1,000 a year for students demonstrating an area of excellence above their peers) and Vice Chancellor's Award (a maximum of six scholarships of up to £10,000 a year to outstanding, academically gifted students). LJMU also provides Childcare Bursaries of up to £2,000 a year per child. The Access to Learning Fund provides up to £3,000 a year based on financial hardship.

In 2006/07 LJMU projected that 28.50% of additional fee income would be spent on financial support for lower income students. The actual percentage spent was 29.10%.

A copy of LJMU's Access Agreement with OFFA is enclosed in Annex 4.

3.3.3 Hope

Hope is one of the country's newest universities, but its history goes back over a century and a half. During the 1980s the original three constituent teacher training colleges (two Roman Catholic and one Church of England) were joined together in an ecumenical federation. Hope gained degree awarding powers in 2002 and became a university in 2005. Hope offers degree subjects in arts and humanities, education, business and computing and social sciences.

Hope charges the maximum tuition fees permitted to UK and EU students (£3,070 in 2007/08).

Hope provides bursaries of £1,000 a year to students from households with income of £17,500 or less, of £700 to students from households with income £17,501-£37,425 and £400 to students from households with income of more than £37,425. Hope does not plan to raise these income thresholds to align them with the new thresholds for maintenance grants.

Hope provides the following non-means tested scholarships: Excellence Scholarships (£2,000 per year based on academic excellence), Achievement Scholarships (£1,000 per year based on academic excellence), Foundation Scholarships (£600 per year to students from partnership schools on Merseyside) and variable Dean's List Scholarships (based on academic excellence and leadership potential). The Access to Learning Fund provides up to £3,000 a year based on financial hardship.

In 2006/07 Hope projected that 34.40% of additional fee income would be spent on financial support for lower income students. The actual percentage spent was 22.90%.

A copy of Hope's Access Agreement with OFFA is enclosed in Annex 5.

3.3.4 LIPA

LIPA was founded in 1996 and is the only higher education institution in the UK devoted to providing higher education programmes across the performing arts skills. LIPA offers nine undergraduate degree programmes for those wanting to pursue a career in arts and entertainment economy. LIPA is a small higher education institution with around 600 registered students.

LIPA charges the maximum tuition fees permitted to UK and EU students (£3,070 in 2007/08).

LIPA provides those students eligible for full government maintenance grants a bursary of £500 a year and those eligible for a partial maintenance grant a bursary of £250 a year.

In 2006/07 LIPA projected that 10.40% of additional fee income would be spent on financial support for lower income students. The actual percentage spent was 7.70%.

A copy of LIPA's Access Agreement with OFFA is enclosed in Annex 6.

3.4 The widening participation agenda in Liverpool

3.4.1 Outreach programmes undertaken by higher education institutions in Liverpool

Liverpool's higher education institutions have a good record on widening participation, with targeted outreach work to raise aspiration levels and to recruit from underrepresented groups, summer schools, mentoring, campus visits and revision classes.

Hope has entered into agreements with 25 local schools to identify individuals meeting Hope's widening participation criteria. These individuals benefit from study support and a guaranteed interview and conditional offer at Hope.

3.4.2 Kensington Community Bursary Project

The Kensington Community Bursary Project is a groundbreaking community-led project funded by Kensington Regeneration, the New Deal for Communities scheme in Liverpool 6 and Liverpool 7.

The project provides bursaries of £1,250 a year to students who have been resident in the Kensington Regeneration area for a minimum of two years prior to entry to higher education. In return participating students are required to undertake 40 hours of voluntary work per year. Awards are approved and compliance monitored by a community-led board. The project is administered by Merseyside Network for Change, a voluntary organisation.

Since the project was set up in October 2003, bursaries have been awarded to 122 students who have undertaken voluntary placements with 26 community groups. There have been high retention and completion rates, with only two bursary recipients completely dropping out of higher education and only three bursaries offers being withdrawn for failure to comply with the voluntary placement requirement.

The project has been successful in increasing retention rates for students from a non-traditional background in a defined area of Liverpool and in supporting local community infrastructure.

3.4.3 Money Matters booklet

Merseyside Network for Change has produced a booklet advising current and prospective students of financial support available aimed at students from backgrounds underrepresented in higher education.

A copy of the booklet is attached in Annex 7.

3.4.4 National and regional outreach programmes in Liverpool

Aimhigher aims to widen participation in higher education by raising the awareness, aspirations and attainment of young people from disadvantaged social and economic backgrounds, some minority ethnic groups and people with disabilities. Aimhigher is funded jointly by HEFCE and DIUS. UoL, LJMU and Hope all play an active role in the Aimhigher Greater Merseyside Partnership.

Partnerships for Progression is an organisation which undertakes national and regional outreach programmes and is jointly funded by the Learning and Skills Council and HEFCE.

3.4.5 EMA

EMA is administered by the Department for Children, Schools and Families and provides cash payments to students aged 16, 17 and 18 undertaking a full-time further education course at school or college, an Entry to Employment programme or a course leading to an apprenticeship. Payments of £30 a week are awarded to those with household annual incomes of up to £20,817; £20 a week to those with household annual incomes between

£20,818 and £25,521; and £10 a week to those with household incomes between £25,522 and £30,817. In addition, bonus payments of up to £500 are awarded at various milestones.

EMA has had a positive impact on higher education participation rates by encouraging those from low income backgrounds to stay on in education after the age of 16 by providing a cash incentive and reducing barriers to post-compulsory education.

3.5 Socio-economic participation in higher education in the UK

The impact of the various changes to the UK higher education system cannot be judged against household income levels as historic evidence does not exist. UCAS, the central admissions body for UK higher education institutions and its predecessor bodies have, however, maintained details of the parental occupation of students. The table in Annex 8 details the socio-economic profile of UK students in 1980, 2000 and 2007.

The table suggests that the introduction of student loans in 1990, the Higher Education Act 1992 and the 1998 Dearing changes had a marginal effect on the socio-economic profile of the UK student population. Fewer students were from professional/managerial households in 2000 than in 1980 and more students were from a skilled non-manual/intermediate background, but the level of students from skilled manual/own account worker, lower supervisory/technical and semi-routine/routine households remained constant.

The effect of the 2004 reforms is perhaps more significant – a continued decrease in the proportion of students from professional/managerial households and a marked increase in students from semi-routine/routine households. However, there also appears to be a decrease in the proportion of students from both skilled manual/own account worker and lower supervisory/technical backgrounds.

The conclusions drawn from the table in Annex 8 are as follows:

- There has been a marked relative decrease in the number of students from professional/managerial households, although the number of students from such backgrounds in actual terms has continued to increase.
- There has been a marked increase both actually and relatively in the number of students from semi-routine/routine households.
- Despite the above welcome developments, there remains too large a disparity between the proportion of students from professional/managerial backgrounds and from semi-routine/routine backgrounds.
- There has been a decrease certainly in relative terms of the proportion of students from both skilled manual/own account worker and lower supervisory/technical backgrounds. While this can partly be explained by the changing demographic profile of the UK working population between 1980 and 2004 which has seen a dramatic reduction in the number of jobs in manufacturing, it would also appear that the widening participation agenda has not delivered to the same extent in relation to those from "intermediate" socio-economic backgrounds as it has to those from more deprived socio-economic backgrounds.

4 Key questions considered by the Panel

4.1 What benefits do Liverpool's higher education institutions bring to the city?

Liverpool's higher education institutions are crucial to Liverpool's economic well-being. Liverpool's universities are amongst the city's largest employers, directly and indirectly creating and sustaining jobs and prosperity.

Liverpool's large student population makes a significant contribution to the city's economy directly by spending money on local goods and services and indirectly by student workers contributing to the city's growth.

Liverpool graduates remaining in the city create a critical mass of highly skilled, highly motivated workers, allowing the city to benefit economically from inward investment and new business starts-ups.

4.2 What are the characteristics of Liverpool's economy?

Liverpool's economy was in turmoil between the 1960s and late 1990s with a dramatically falling population (from a high of 855,688 in 1931 to 439,476 in 2001) and poor economic performance following the rapid decline of the docks and industry.

Since the late 1990s Liverpool's economy has been improving. The city has had a strong record on increasing employment, albeit from a very low level, with a 19.40% increase in employment between 1995 and 2004. This makes Liverpool the 14th strongest performer in increasing employment of England's 56 largest cities. Despite this, Liverpool still faces massive challenges, with the highest unemployment rate and the lowest employment rate of the 56 largest cities; high levels of the working age population claiming work related benefits; and high numbers of adults with no qualifications.

Within this context Liverpool's universities are highly important in terms of improving the future economic performance of the city and maintaining its population base. Ongoing collaborative initiatives sponsored by the city's universities, its public sector regeneration partners like the North West Development Agency and Liverpool Vision and the private sector, such as the LJMU Design Academy, Liverpool Science Park, Hope Street Quarter and the University District Action Area, are especially important.

4.3 What are the likely issues on the agenda of the 2009 funding review?

When the 2004 funding arrangements were put in place, they were vociferously opposed by the National Union of Students, student unions and many others. Although the question of whether tuition fees should continue to be charged or whether tuition costs should met directly by the taxpayer is something that will be discussed during the review, there is an emerging, if perhaps, in some quarters, reluctant, consensus that tuition costs cannot be met fully and directly by the taxpayer if current levels of participation in higher education are to be increased in the future. The annual cost to the taxpayer of the current system is £1,962m (see 3.1 for a detailed breakdown). The annual net cost of abolishing fees would be £1,650m, which is arrived at as university fee income received of £2,250m less the cost to the taxpayer of interest subsidies and projected write-offs of £600m. Therefore, the total cost of abolishing fees, but retaining means-tested grants and loans at their current level would be £3,012m compared with a cost of £1,962m for the current system – an increase of 53.52%. These costs would increase disproportionately with any significant increase in participation in higher education. Moreover, there is widespread and legitimate concern that the university sector would be unable to compete adequately with other education spending demands, most notably primary and secondary education, which was a historic inadequacy of the pre-2004 funding arrangements.

Many within the higher education community have called for the cap on tuition fees to be significantly lifted or even removed completely, thereby creating a market in higher education based on the level of tuition fees charged. It is highly unlikely that government, whatever its political colours, would remove the cap on tuition fees completely, as the cap is currently the principal mechanism by which central government is able to control the mix of public and private funding in universities. However, the lifting of the cap to a level of around £10,000 a year remains firmly on the agenda of many within the higher education community. The

impact of this would be to do something the Higher Education Act 2004 did not do in practice – to create a market between higher education institutions based on the level of tuition fees.

A third which is likely to be discussed during the 2009 review is the future role of OFFA. At the time the Higher Education Act 2004 was being debated, there was significant political opposition to the widening participation agenda being regulated by government. Since then there has been increased criticism of the principle and practice of government regulation of widening participation from certain elements of the media and other. The future role of OFFA will be, for these reasons, something discussed during the 2009 review.

5 Documents attached

- Annex 1 Schedule of meetings and attendees
- Annex 2 Minutes from each Scrutiny Panel meeting
- Annex 3 University of Liverpool Access Agreement
- Annex 4 Liverpool John Moores University Access Agreement
- Annex 5 Liverpool Hope University Access Agreement
- Annex 6 Liverpool Institute for the Performing Arts Access Agreement
- Annex 7 Money Matter booklet
- Annex 8 Table illustrating socio-economic profile of UK student population
- Annex 9 Slides from presentation by Mark Kitts, Interim Assistant Executive Director Regeneration, Liverpool City Council, at meeting on 1st October 2007
- Annex 10 Joint written submission from Liverpool Guild of Students, Liverpool Students' Union & Liverpool Hope Students' Union
- Annex 11 Slides from presentation by Edward Murphy of Merseyside Network for Change and Keith Black and Paul Harris of Kensington Community Bursary Project at meeting on 14th January 2008
- Annex 12 Slides from presentation by Professor Michael Brown, Vice Chancellor of Liverpool John Moores University, at meeting on 28th January 2008

Annex 1 Schedule of meetings and attendees

Monday 1st October 2007, 10am

- Mark Kitts, Interim Assistant Executive Director Regeneration, Liverpool City Council
- Louise Ellman MP, Labour and Co-operative MP for Liverpool Riverside

Monday 19th November 2007, 3.30pm

- Darran Martin, Liverpool Guild of Students (jointly with Liverpool Students' Union & Liverpool Hope Students' Union)
- Dan Sumners, Liverpool Guild of Students (jointly with Liverpool Students' Union & Liverpool Hope Students' Union)

Thursday 13th December 2007, 4.30pm

- Professor John Belcham, Pro Vice Chancellor, University of Liverpool

Monday 14th January 2008, 4.30pm

- Edward Murphy, Director, Merseyside Network for Change
- Keith Black, Bursary Officer, Kensington Community Bursary Project
- Paul Harris, Bursary Assistant, Kensington Community Bursary Project
- Professor Gerard Pillay, Vice Chancellor, Liverpool Hope University

Monday 28th January 2008, 4.30pm

- Professor Michael Brown, Vice Chancellor, Liverpool John Moores University
- John Kelly, Executive Director Regeneration, Liverpool City Council
- Jim Gill, Chief Executive, Liverpool Vision