

Which?

EMBARGOED UNTIL THURSDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2015 at 00:01 hrs

Higher education: a review of providers' rights to change courses

Which? Investigation

Summary

The Which? report into the higher education market '[A degree of value](#)', published in November 2014, found that in the context of much higher fees an increasing proportion of students think that their course is poor value.

Our research found that six in ten students (58%) had experienced a change of some kind to their course. Of these, 26% felt that at least one of the changes had a significant impact on them and a third (35%) felt that at least one of the changes was unfair¹.

Our report raised concerns that terms and conditions are often difficult to find, and that some providers grant themselves a lot of discretion to make changes to courses. Whilst universities sometimes do need to make changes to courses that are justified and fair, we are concerned that at times this is happening in a way that is detrimental to students. From an initial analysis we found that some universities were giving themselves free rein in their terms and conditions to change courses in ways that might be contrary to consumer law and leave students lacking the protections they are entitled to.

We have explored this further by requesting information from higher education providers² to find out how much discretion they grant themselves to make changes to courses after a student has enrolled and how accessible and fair their terms and conditions are. We sent Freedom of Information (FOI) requests to 142 providers requesting information about changes they make to courses once students have enrolled, and received 131 responses back.

From an analysis by a Which? consumer lawyer, based on the information provided by universities, we consider that over half (51%) of higher education providers currently use

¹ See the Annex for further evidence of the detriment that significant changes can have on students.

² All providers with degree-awarding powers that teach undergraduate students in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Which? is a consumer champion
We work to make things better for consumers. Our advice helps them make informed decisions. **Our campaigns make people's lives fairer, simpler and safer.**
Our services and products put consumers' needs first to bring them better value.

www.which.co.uk

Which?
2 Marylebone Road, London, NW1 4DF
t 020 7770 7000 f 0207 7770 7600
www.which.co.uk

contract terms or other policies that give them a wide discretion to change courses after enrolment.

We found that:

- One in five providers (20%) use terms that we consider to be unlawful and in contravention of the Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999 (UTCCRs).
- Three in ten (31%) use terms that we consider to be bad practice, and are likely to be unlawful in contravention of the UTCCRs.
- Nearly four in ten (37%) lacked enough information for us to analyse, making it difficult for students to know where they stand.
- 6% use terms that have some positive elements but we believe they need improvement.
- Just 5% of providers use terms or policies that we consider to be good practice.
- Only one university, the University of York, met our best practice criteria.

From these investigation findings and concerns raised in our survey of 4,500 students in October 2014, we believe that there is wide-scale use of unfair terms that allow institutions to vary courses, which we believe are bad practice and unlawful in many cases.

We also found a number of cases where providers' terms permitted them to prevent a student from graduating where they had outstanding non-tuition fee debt, including from the University of Sunderland and the University of Coventry. The Office of Fair Trading (OFT) published a report into this issue last year which specifically stated that these terms are unfair.

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) has published draft guidance on how consumer law applies to the sector, which includes measures to ensure that terms are both transparent and fair.

These findings give cause for concern and we want providers to take immediate action to bring their contract terms into line with guidance and the law.

We are calling for:

- The CMA to conduct a compliance check against their new guidance at the earliest possible opportunity, and ideally in time to ensure that the next cohort of students are not exposed to unfair terms and poor practice.
- Providers to address unfair terms as a matter of urgency to ensure that they are, at least, complying with the law. They should immediately ensure that they are not relying in practice on any unfair terms.
- The higher education sector to come together to consider the potential for a standard format for student contracts to help ensure that terms are provided in a consumer-friendly format.

We are submitting our findings to the CMA to aid in providing a baseline for the compliance check they will be conducting in due course to ensure that institutions are abiding by the law.

1. Investigation methodology

In November 2014, we issued requests under the under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) to 142 publicly-funded higher education institutions that have degree-awarding powers and teach undergraduate students in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

We asked for (among other things) documents that set out the institution's right to vary the courses it offers after students have enrolled.

We received 131 responses back and these were analysed by a Which? consumer lawyer against our own best practice assessment criteria, and to check whether they complied with the UTCCRs.

Where we could analyse their response, we allocated each provider into one of five categories: best practice, good practice, needs improvement, bad practice, unlawful practice.

2. Accessibility of information

The results of this investigation confirm our concerns that university terms and conditions are often difficult for students to access.

As well as 37% lacking enough information for us to include them in the analysis, 10 providers failed to respond to our request as required by FOIA, and 31 only responded after we sent out a reminder email when the statutory deadline for them to provide the information was approaching. Reading University said that it would take over 25 hours to find and compile the documents requested, which would exceed the time and cost limit under section 12(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 so they were therefore not obliged to provide the information.

This persuades us that it is unlikely that these universities are making the terms readily available to students.

We also found many of the terms were lengthy, contained a substantial amount of jargon and were therefore potentially difficult for a prospective student to easily digest.

While a few providers helpfully supplied a document, or student contract, in the majority of cases providers sent back multiple documents. Bournemouth University sent its response via four emails attaching a total of 23 documents. Cambridge University's statutes and ordinances is over 1000 pages long. Many also sent links to websites, which then required us to navigate an A-Z of policies to try and find the relevant information.

3. Detailed analysis and findings

We assessed the information provided against our own best practice framework, and the requirements in the UTCCRs.

Under the UTCCRs, a contract term will be unfair if it creates a significant imbalance between the parties; in this case, the student and the provider. Our previous work - as well as the CMA's draft guidance - has flagged the propensity for terms that give providers a wide

discretion to make changes to courses (including increasing fees) after a contract is formed to be unfair and unlawful.

Consumers need to understand and be able to foresee prior to signing a contract when the terms of that contract may change. Simply providing advance notice of changes will not guarantee the contract is fair, nor will a right to terminate a contract in the event of a change if that is not practical in the circumstances. Similarly, a term providing a remedy in the event of a variation is more likely to be fair where the remedy is sufficient to ameliorate the impact of the change.

Our investigation found that some providers retain absolute discretion to vary courses as they see fit, even after students have enrolled. Other providers retain discretion to make changes only in very limited circumstances, or sometimes only with the unanimous consent of the current student cohort. There is then a range of terms in between.

Universities also take different approaches to the assistance or compensation they offer to students who are affected by a change. In cases where a student can withdraw from their course when faced with a significant change, they might only be eligible to receive compensation for teaching that they have paid for but not received, rather than for previous semesters. This is unlikely to be enough to help affected students given that the value of a degree is (largely) the final outcome, not individual components. Similarly, offering alternative modules or course components in response to a change may not be enough to balance the impact on the degree as a whole.

A number of providers offer students the option to terminate their contract (withdraw from their course) if they are aggrieved by a significant change. The mere ability to terminate a contract in response to a change does not guarantee that students, as consumers, are adequately protected. In the market for higher education, opportunities for switching are extremely limited. Although students could in theory avoid a change to their course by terminating and switching, for most this will not be a practical reality. In these circumstances, allowing students to withdraw does little if anything to stop a contract term which allows for significant changes from being unfair.

It is against this background that the fairness of terms or policies that allow changes to courses must be assessed. Variations to degrees once students have enrolled pose a significant risk of detriment, and the circumstances in which changes can be made fairly will be limited. Providers need to recognise this and ensure the impact on their student body of any potential changes is at the centre of their policies.

In our view, variations to courses should only be allowed where the change is beneficial to students, or necessary in response to an event outside the provider's control that it could not plan for.

We think that a remedy (such as the right to withdraw or obtain compensation) should be available to students where a change is necessary due to circumstances beyond the provider's control; for some individuals, this may be the best of a number of unattractive choices.

We used these criteria to build on the UTCCRs requirements and the principles set out in the CMA's draft guidance - as a benchmark for identifying best and worst practice. We allocated each provider (where we could analyse their response) into one of five categories: best practice, good practice, needs improvement, bad practice, unlawful practice.

We emphasise that this analysis relates only to providers' terms concerning changes to courses (including changes to fees) after a contract is formed between the student and the institution. It is not indicative of the fairness of other provisions or policies that may be used by providers.

Category A: Best practice

We defined best practice as cases where:

- The provider's terms or policies allow changes only where:
 - o the changes are (i) non-material (ii) beneficial to students or (iii) necessary due to circumstances outside the provider's control that it could not plan for; or
 - o all affected students (including students who have already begun the course and will be affected in future years) give informed consent to the change.
- The provider also consults students in advance of making beneficial or non-material changes.
- The provider also offers a remedy to students affected by an unavoidable and unforeseeable change, such as compensation or support changing courses.

The University of York was the only institution to fall within this category, based on the documents provided to us.

It provided a detailed policy for approving changes, specifically acknowledging the institution's contractual obligations to students. Its policies provide that changes will only be allowed if they are proved to cause no disadvantage to students, or where affected students unanimously consent. For negative changes that are "unavoidable", there must be a plan to protect students' interests.

Category B: Good practice

We identified seven providers (5%) where the terms or policies reflected good practice. This includes cases where the provider was almost offering best practice, but was missing a few elements. We define good practice as cases where:

- The provider's terms or policies allow changes only where:
 - o the changes are (i) non-material (ii) beneficial to students or (iii) necessary due to circumstances outside the provider's control that it could not plan for; or
 - o students are consulted on the change with a positive outcome (e.g. consent of the majority of students).
- But the provider might not consult students in advance of making changes or might not offer students who are affected by unavoidable and unforeseeable changes a remedy.

Providers with terms reflecting good practice:

De Montfort University	University of Leeds
Imperial College London	University of Salford
London School of Economics and Political Science	University of Surrey
University of the Arts (London)	

Category C: Needs improvement

We identified eight providers (6%) where the terms or policies in relation to course changes needed improvement. This includes cases where the terms allow changes only in limited circumstances, but where we did not consider the limitations to be sufficient for good practice.

Some providers restrict the types of changes that can be made or the reasons why changes might be experienced. While this is a step in the right direction, students still cannot predict how or when such changes will apply to them and, in most cases, the changes will be within the control of the provider and/or could reasonably have been planned for. This includes discretion to, for example, remove or relocate modules due to a lack of demand, staff illness, or building works.

Providers with terms that need improvement:

Bournemouth University	Teesside University
Edinburgh Napier University	University College London
Manchester University	University of East Anglia
Queen Mary, University of London	University of Exeter

The view from campus³:

"I am a biomedical science student and when I started my course it was accredited by the institute of biomedical science, this meant I was able to get more jobs. However, then they removed the haematology module which is a requirement for working in labs owned by the NHS, so now I can't get a job in one of the largest areas biomedical science students go into without spending 7k on tuition for an accredited masters degree." (Edinburgh Napier University)

"I selected an SSU I was interested in, and, having no car, I wanted it partially because the description said it would all take place in the Wonford hospital. However, when I was

³ YouthSight, on behalf of Which?, surveyed 4519 students in second year and above, online between 9 and 29 October 2014. All student views in this section are drawn from that survey.

assigned this SSU, I found it was in Newton Abbot. Now I have no car and the university will not reimburse my full travel costs, so I feel a bit cheated and irritated. I would not have chosen the SSU if I had known it was so far away.” (University of Exeter)

Category D: Bad practice

We identified 40 providers (31%) where we considered the terms or policies in relation to course changes to be bad practice, based on the documents provided to us. We define bad practice as cases where:

- The provider’s terms or policies give the provider an unfettered discretion to make changes to courses. This applies even if the discretion is reserved to certain types of changes (e.g. course location or assessment structure) if those changes could be significant or material.
- But some kind of remedy is offered to students when a change is made, such as the right to withdraw from the course, assistance switching or compensation (but something more than merely notifying students of the change or minimising disruption), for at least some types of changes.

Given that the right to withdraw from the course or receive compensation for fees already paid will be of little assistance to students in many cases (due to the nature of higher education provision discussed above), we consider many of the terms in this category to be potentially unlawful in breach of the UTCCRs.

We also note that providers’ terms or policies may fall into this category even where they only allow “reasonable” or “reasonably necessary” changes, or changes that the provider “considers to be necessary”. As the CMA’s draft guidance makes clear, just because changes are limited in this way does not make a term fair, because students will still not be able to foresee the circumstances in which changes can be made.

Examples of terms included:

- *We reserve the right to alter the timetable, location, numbers of classes, method of delivery, content/syllabus and method of assessment of your programme, provided such alterations are reasonable. We have the right to withdraw your programme or combine it with others. In the unlikely event that the University discontinues or can no longer provide your programme, we will tell you at the earliest opportunity to enable you to withdraw or help you to make other suitable arrangements.*
- *The University will use all reasonable endeavours to deliver courses in accordance with the descriptions set out on this website and in those further documents. However, the University reserves the right to make variations to the contents and methods of delivery of courses, to discontinue courses, to merge or combine courses and to vary fees, if such action is reasonably considered to be necessary. If the University discontinues any course it will use its reasonable endeavours to find or provide a suitable alternative.*
- *The University may alter the timetable, location, number of classes, method of delivery, content, assessment and syllabus of your Course, provided such alterations are reasonable. The University may also withdraw Courses before they have started. If the University discontinues your Course, or combine it with others, the University shall use its reasonable endeavours to make arrangements to allow you*

to complete the Course. Exceptionally, this may include making arrangements for you to complete the Course at a different institution, but will not require the University pay tuition fees that are substantially more than the Fees you have been charged.

In the event of any discontinuance of or fundamental changes to your Course or these terms and conditions you will be given reasonable notice by the University and you will be entitled to withdraw your application or withdraw from your Course by telling the University in writing.

Providers with terms reflecting bad practice:

Birkbeck, University of London	University of Aberdeen
Brunel University	University of Bath
Coventry University	University of Brighton
Durham University	University of Bristol
Falmouth University	University of Cambridge
Glyndŵr University	University of Chester
Leeds Beckett University	University of Cumbria
Leeds Trinity University	University of East London
Liverpool Hope University	University of Edinburgh
London Metropolitan University	University of Gloucestershire
Manchester Metropolitan University	University of Lincoln
Northumbria University	University of Kent
Nottingham Trent University	University of Northampton
Oxford Brookes University	University of Nottingham
Queen's University Belfast	University of Oxford
Royal College of Art	University of Sheffield
Royal Holloway, University of London	University of St Mark & St John
Sheffield Hallam University	University of Sussex
SOAS, University of London	University of Ulster
University College Birmingham	University of the West of Scotland

The view from campus:

"It is frustrating that the University can change locations, sometimes on a weekly basis, without giving a minimum of 24 hours notice. Locations regularly change without giving 7 days notice, making it hard to arrange travel etc." (University of Edinburgh)

"We didn't realise the university planned to cut our department after our first year, meaning there would be less courses offered to us. As a result, there are very few courses offered to us, and to make up our credits we are offered courses from other departments." (Royal Holloway, University of London)

"I had no idea that they would be doing this as I thought that even if the fees did go up it would only affect new students coming in. The university also only drew attention to the price increase in an invoice that was sent about 2 weeks before payment was due (although the increased price was published on their website, no attention was drawn towards it - only someone who looked for it would have realised and even then might not have known that the price applied to returning students)." (University of Kent)

"The course changed from 100% coursework to 100% exam and I hate exams! We had no choice in the matter but as it was advertised as coursework I was really looking forward to it, only to get back from the summer to find the assessment had completely changed...not impressed!!" (Nottingham Trent University)

"Wanting to be a director after university, I needed a course that would allow me to expand my skills through both the acting and technical side of theatre. This was advertised on the course's page and I believe it still is today, however the technical module and others have been taken off the course and affect my entire experience needed for my career choice. I would have chosen a different university had I known this." (Liverpool Hope University)

Category E: Unlawful practice

We found 26 providers (20%) where we considered the terms or policies in relation to course changes to be in breach of the UTCCRs, based on the documents provided to us. These were cases where:

- The provider's terms or policies have the same characteristics as for the "bad practice" category.
- But no remedy is offered to students in cases where changes are made (other than merely notifying students of changes or trying to minimise disruption).

This category includes providers that give themselves an unfettered discretion to increase fees year-on-year, where no indication is given as to the likely size of the increase. (For these institutions, the table below indicates their practice in relation to other types of changes to courses).

Examples of terms included:

- *Fees are subject to annual increase. In enrolling at the Institute, students accept fees in second year and subsequent years of study will increase.*
- *The University reserves the right to amend any programme of study, or module, or to withdraw any module, or programme at any time. Where an amendment to a*

programme and/or module has an effect on currently registered students, those students are formally notified of the change.

- The establishment, delivery and continuation of a course or programme of study is subject to the availability of viable numbers of students and their continuing attendance. Where the circumstances are reasonable, the University reserves the right to discontinue courses, to divide, discontinue or combine units or classes and to vary the time or place of classes and to alter programmes of study as circumstances may require.*

Providers with terms reflecting unlawful practice:

Unfair terms in relation to the right to make changes to courses	
Aston University	Norwich University of the Arts
Bath Spa University	University of Bedfordshire
Cardiff Metropolitan University	University of Bolton
Cranfield University	University of Leicester
Liverpool John Moores University	University of Wolverhampton
Loughborough University	University of Worcester
King's College London	York St John University
Unfair terms in relation to varying fees and inadequate information to assess the right to make other changes to courses	
Cardiff University	University of Stirling
Guildhall School of Music & Drama	University of Westminster
University for the Creative Arts	
Unfair terms in relation to varying fees and bad practice in relation to the right to make other changes to course	
Glasgow Caledonian University	University of Central Lancashire
London South Bank University	University of St Andrews
Queen Margaret University (Edinburgh)	University of Sunderland
UCL Institute of Education	

The view from campus:

"Once I have accepted the offer from the university, I have found out that first year will be in the Runshaw campus rather than university main campus. I felt very upset because it meant I had to travel every day from the halls of residence, which meant additional costs. The university gave me no support and I had to pay the commute fees myself." (University of Central Lancashire)

"When they changed the name of our programme, they changed all the modules and their content. They put more of one aspect than others and completely eradicated other aspects. If I had known that I was going to be doing all this, I would've gone to another university as this wasn't what I signed up to do initially. I could've gotten the education that I wanted elsewhere" (University of St Andrews)

"The biology unit was launched and 4 weeks into the module, it all changed - the exam was brought forward which significantly reduced our teaching time and there were new assignments introduced." (University of Worcester)

"My fees increased by £1200 in my second year. I thought this was extremely unfair. I thought my fees were going to be the same for the rest of my course ... I still think that while the university has the right to increase international fees every year, current students should not be paying more and more every year - they should be paying the same amount they paid their first year." (King's College London)

Category F: Inadequate information

In addition to the above, there were 49 providers (37%) where we were not able to assess their terms because we were lacking adequate information. There were a variety of reasons for this, including that:

- The documents provided did not set out the rights of the provider to vary courses.
- Information was not provided in relation to the period after students sign-up (i.e. post-enrolment).
- Inconsistent or contradictory information was provided.
- We could not access the documents referred to (e.g. because a password was needed or hyperlinks were broken) or there was a lack of clarity as to which document was being referred to.

While we cannot tell whether or not those providers unfairly reserve the right to make changes to courses, this lack of transparency makes it difficult for students to know where they stand.

Providers that were lacking adequate information:

Abertay University (Dundee)	Royal Veterinary College
Aberystwyth University	Southampton Solent University
Anglia Ruskin University	Staffordshire University

Arts University Bournemouth	Swansea University
Bangor University	The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London
Birmingham City University	University of Birmingham
Bishop Grosseteste University	University of Chichester
Canterbury Christ Church University	University of Derby
City University	University of Dundee
Goldsmiths, University of London	University of Essex
Harper Adams University	University of Glasgow
Heriot-Watt University	University of Greenwich
Keele University	University of Hertfordshire
Kingston University	University of the Highlands and Islands
Lancaster University	University of Huddersfield
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	University of Hull
Middlesex University	University of Liverpool
Newcastle University	University of Plymouth
Newman University	University of Portsmouth
Open University	University of South Wales
Robert Gordon University (Aberdeen)	University of Strathclyde
Royal Academy of Music	University of Wales
Royal Agricultural University	University of Warwick
Royal College of Music	University of Winchester
Royal Northern College of Music	

The view from campus:

“My course is split between two locations which are about an hour’s drive away from each other which was something we were warned about but not told how often we’d be in the

location an hour away, it's split 50/50 and it is very inconvenient and expensive and also impacts the amount of money we can claim back for travel.” (Anglia Ruskin University)

“As I am doing creative and professional writing I thought that the module choices would be at least vaguely relevant however when it came to choosing my second year modules I was faced with either taking English literature modules, which I was okay with, or irrelevant ones such as Game Design and Animation as well as Japanese Cinema. I had checked previously in the year the modules that the second years at the time had the option to take and those including adapting for film and transitional writing, all relevant things, but when our choices came out they weren't there. Also once I chose one of the only modules I was actually interested in, they didn't have enough interest supposedly to carry it on and I had to pick a module I really didn't want to do. Had I known this would be the case, there would be no way I would've taken this course at this institution.” (Bangor University)

No response:

The following institutions did not formally respond to our request as required by FOIA: University of the West of England; University of Bradford; Edge Hill University; Roehampton University; St George's, University of London; St Mary's University College; University of Southampton; University of West London; Heythrop College and Buckinghamshire New University.

Reading University said that it would take over 25 hours to find and compile the documents requested, which would exceed the time and cost limit under section 12(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 so they were therefore not obliged to provide the information. They reported that they were about to start a project to ensure that the information is published in a more accessible way, for completion in 2015.

For more information
Contact Darren Shirley on 020 7770 7858
darren.shirley@which.co.uk
5 February 2015

Annex: Evidence of detriment caused by significant changes

A Which? survey of over 4,500 students in October 2014⁴ revealed that providers do make significant changes to courses in practice, and those changes have the capacity to cause serious detriment. 58% of survey respondents experienced a change of some kind to their course. In particular:

- 24% of respondents experienced a change to the location of their course or a module, with 7% reporting that this had a significant impact on them. We identified some cases where this could have a very significant impact, including having to travel to another city to receive teaching. Similarly a BBC Radio 4 File on Four documentary found a case where a change to teaching location resulted in students having to travel 40 miles from campus.

"They should have mentioned a possible move even if they weren't sure, so that I could take into consideration whether or not I wanted to move to an area of London I might previously have avoided at university selection. I wasn't given a choice ... Consequently the move has been chaotic. The campus we've been moved to is too small and does not have the social resources for all the students attending. If I'd known this is where I would be going I would not have chosen this university". (University of East London)

"The University decided to move many courses to a different campus citing "better facilities for students" as an excuse. Neither I nor anyone else I know asked for better facilities, we all feel that the facilities we have are more than excellent and that the facilities in the Campus we are moving to are far inferior and are extremely cramped, forcing too many students into one place. We were not asked about our opinion on the move before it was decided, and this is very likely to prevent me from being able to progress onto my third year as I paid to go to Newport City campus for a reason, I am unable to go to Cardiff without significant help." (Newport University)

"I signed up to study English on a small campus called St Matthias with listed buildings and a wonderful vibrancy and sense of community. Both the architecture, the location and the status of this campus as intimate and friendly is what led me to study at UWE. However in second year we were moved to the main campus at Frenchay which is busy and uncomfortably large with little sense of belonging. Had I of known this I would have probably chosen to study elsewhere." (University of the West of England)

- 20% of respondents experienced an advertised module not being available anymore or the content of their course otherwise changing significantly. Almost half (47%) of those who experienced an advertised module being withdrawn thought the change to their course was unfair.

⁴ YouthSight, on behalf of Which?, surveyed 4519 students in second year and above, online between 9 and 29 October 2014.

"The module content was advertised when I applied to university, upon choosing [this university], my decision was largely based on course content, so as you can imagine it was a kick in the shins to find that the content of some modules had been changed without notice. There should be more accountability and a structure in place for change of module content to ensure that students get what they thought they were applying for. The £9000 a year tuition fees seem ludicrous when there is no fairness in the system." (Cardiff University)

- 12% of students experienced an increase in fees either part way through a year or between years. 4 in 10 students who said they experienced fees increasing part way through a year said that it affected them significantly.

I'm an international student and I based my student loans on the set price I was given at the start of my time here. Thankfully I've been able to live under budget but it still hurt me financially. (Heriot-Watt University)

Started at £8500, then £8750 and finally £9000. There was no indication this was going to happen when I signed up. Maybe the uni can claim it's inflation but the student maintenance grant does not increase with it. I wouldn't change course for this but it is annoying when they didn't tell us until we'd completed the 1st year and are essentially already "locked in" to the course and uni. (Kingston University)

"The University did not make me aware of the increase and it had serious consequences on my financial planning." (University of Southampton)

The increase in fees seems a little random. Previously, it was done every 2 years. But this year, it increased without warning. I am now unable to calculate the total expenses as I do not know if the fees will increase again. (University College London)

- 4% of students reported an advertised work experience placement that was not then available on the course.

"It was suggested in the course details prior to starting that work placements would be organised enabling us to work with organisations such as English Heritage or the National Trust. It has been up to the students, however, to organise their own placements and seemingly there are absolutely no working partnerships between my university and any NT or EH properties (or any heritage sites) ... This has been incredibly disappointing for me ... I foolishly thought that having a work placement similar to those aforementioned would strengthen my pathway into work after graduation." (Bishop Grosseteste University)