



**MINISTER
EDUCATION
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

Private Bag X603, PRETORIA, 0001, South Africa, Sol Plaatje House, 123 Schoeman Street, PRETORIA, 0002, Tel.: +27 12 312 5601, Fax: +27 12 323 5909
Private Bag X9034, CAPE TOWN, 8000, South Africa, 120 Plain Street, Cape Town, 8001. Tel.: +27 21 465 7350, Fax: +27 21 461 4788, <http://www.education.gov.za>

Prof E M Tyobeka
Vice-Chancellor
Tshwane University of Technology
Private Bag X680
PRETORIA
0001

By fax: 012 382 5422

Dear Prof Tyobeka

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT ON STUDENT ENROLMENT PLANNING

I am attaching a copy of the new Ministerial Statement on Student Enrolment Planning. This is the second Ministerial Statement on Student Enrolment Planning. The first, which was published in September 2005, established a framework for the development of student enrolment planning in the South African public higher education system.

This October 2007 Ministerial Statement on Student Enrolment Planning consolidates the decisions which I took during 2007 on student enrolment and output targets. It takes account of the targets for 2010 set in my March 2007 letters, and of the subsequent variations to these targets which I approved at the request of institutional Councils.

This new Statement sets out also the second phase of the migration strategy for teaching input shares. I approved phase one of this migration strategy in the Ministerial Statement on Higher Education Funding: 2007/08 to 2009/10, which was released to you in September 2007. No changes to this first phase have been made in this new Statement on enrolment planning.

The second phase of the migration is set out in section 6.2 of this new Statement, and in Tables 12 and 13 of its Annexure. This moves institutional shares of the teaching input total from the 2010/11 financial year to the final shares institutions will have in the 2012/13 financial year. These final shares are based on the enrolment targets institutions have been set for the 2010 academic year.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT ON STUDENT ENROLMENT PLANNING

- | | |
|----------|---|
| <i>1</i> | <i>Introduction</i> |
| <i>2</i> | <i>National student enrolment planning targets</i> |
| <i>3</i> | <i>Institutional targets</i> |
| <i>4</i> | <i>Monitoring institutional performance</i> |
| <i>5</i> | <i>Teaching input units</i> |
| <i>6</i> | <i>Migration strategy for teaching input shares</i> |
| <i>7</i> | <i>Conclusion</i> |

<i>Annexure</i>	<i>Student enrolment and output targets by institution</i>
-----------------	--

OCTOBER 2007

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 First Ministerial Statement on Student Enrolment Planning

The first Ministerial Statement on Student Enrolment Planning was published in September 2005. This Statement established a framework for the development of student enrolment planning in the South African public higher education system.

The first part of the framework deals with the role which student enrolment planning plays in the national higher education governance system. The September 2005 Statement explains this role in this way:

“Planning, funding and quality assurance remain the three key steering instruments for achieving the transformation of the higher education system in support of the country’s social, political and economic development needs. --- Enrolment planning should therefore not be seen in isolation from broader planning processes or from funding and quality assurance imperatives. The Ministry also does not see enrolment planning as a panacea to address all system inefficiencies but recognises that quality improvement will require due attention to a range of key areas including support for academic development, student support and the promotion of inclusive institutional cultures, for example” (page 1).

The second part of the framework deals with the principles which must be applied in the development of student enrolment planning. The September 2005 Statement lays down four principles for enrolment planning, which are consistent with advice received from the Council on Higher Education (CHE) and Higher Education South Africa (HESA):

- (1) The higher education system must contribute to national human resource and research priorities.
- (2) Enrolments must be matched to available resources, to enable the higher education system to deliver its teaching and research mandate.
- (3) Institutions must, in their enrolment plans, focus on improving graduation and success rates.
- (4) A differentiated approach to enrolment planning must be adopted. The planning process must accept that uniform sets of planning goals and targets cannot be applied across all institutions in the public higher education system.

The third part of the framework outlines the essential features of the process of developing of student enrolment plans. It says that this process will involve:

“---bilateral discussions between the Ministry of Education and each university in order to arrive at agreed upon funded head count and FTE student totals for each university for the period (up to 2010), within the context of system parameters” (page 3).

1.2 The 2006/07 enrolment planning process

The enrolment planning process involved these phases during 2006 and 2007:

- (1) In early 2006, the Department of Education sent to each institution data profiles which had been extracted from the national Higher Education Management Information (HEMIS) system. The Department asked that these be checked as an important first phase in the planning process.
- (2) Institutions were invited to send to the Department a student enrolment plan setting out what they expected their student inputs and outputs to be during the period 2006 to 2010. These first phase plans were submitted to the Department in the first half of 2006.
- (3) These enrolment plans were discussed at meetings held with each institution during the period July to September 2006. At these meetings, the Department presented an overview of the national enrolment planning context for the period up to 2010, together with analyses of the planning proposals submitted by the institution concerned. This presentation formed the basis of the detailed discussions between the Department and each institution.
- (4) During the discussions, a number of institutions indicated that they might be able to increase their enrolments and graduates in targeted areas, if additional government resources were to be made available. At the end of the discussions, all institutions were invited to submit revised enrolment planning proposals to the Department. They were asked to base these on the initial discussions, and were asked further to indicate what additional government resources would be needed if they were given new input and output targets.
- (5) Institutions submitted revised enrolment plans to the Department during October and November 2006. The Department then analysed the revised institutional submissions, and submitted a report to the Minister.
- (6) The Department's proposed student enrolment and output targets for each institution were approved by the Minister. The Minister wrote to institutions in March 2007 setting out their approved student input and output targets for 2010. The Minister said this in introducing these targets:

"With due regard for racial and gender equity imperatives, I have approved --- enrolment plan and performance targets of your institution, which constitute your statement of intent in this regard" (Letter to Vice Chancellors, March 2010).
- (7) The Minister asked in this letter that the Council of each institution confirm acceptance of its specific student enrolment plan and performance targets. Responses were received from all Councils by the end of August 2007.
- (8) A large proportion of Councils asked the Minister to approve some variations to their March 2007 targets. These requests were considered by the Minister, and final institutional plans and targets for 2010 were approved in October 2007.

2 NATIONAL STUDENT ENROLMENT PLANNING TARGETS

Table A collates the October 2007 institutional targets into sets of national student enrolment targets.

Table A

National student enrolment planning targets: 2010			
	Actual 2005	Target 2010	Average annual Increase
Head count student enrolments by qualification type (thousands)			
Undergraduate diplomas	251	277	2.0%
Undergraduate degrees	376	400	1.2%
Postgraduate qualifications below masters	59	73	4.5%
Masters and doctors	52	65	4.8%
Total	738	816	2.0%
Head count student enrolments by major (thousands)			
Science and technology	214	245	2.7%
Business and management	214	269	4.7%
Humanities and education	310	302	-0.5%
Total	738	816	2.0%
Enrolment shape by qualification type			
Undergraduate diplomas	34%	34%	
Undergraduate degrees	51%	49%	
Postgraduate qualifications below masters	8%	9%	
Masters and doctors	7%	8%	
Enrolment shape by major field			
Science and technology	29%	30%	
Business and management	29%	33%	
Humanities and education	42%	37%	
Full-time equivalent enrolments (thousands)			
Total	508	566	2.2%
Student output rates			
Average success rate by course	71%	73%	
Graduation rate: total graduates divided by total head count enrolments	16%	17%	
Graduates (thousands)			
Total	120	142	3.4%

The main features to note about this summary in Table A are these

2.1 Head count totals

In a head count enrolment total, each student is counted as a unit, regardless of the course load she/he is carrying. The aggregated 2010 head count enrolment target for the public higher education system is 816 000 students. This target total is 78 000 higher than the actual 2005 enrolment total of 738 000. If it is to be achieved, then the public higher education system will have to grow at an average annual rate of 2.0% between 2005 and 2010.

2.2 Shape of the system

The aggregated targets show also that growth in head count enrolments should be accompanied by changes in the shape of the system:

2.2.1 Enrolments in postgraduate qualifications should grow at faster rates than those in undergraduate qualifications. The share which postgraduate qualifications have of total enrolments should increase from 15% in 2005 to 17% in 2010. Masters plus doctoral enrolments should increase from 52 000 in 2005 to 65 000 in 2010, giving them an 8% share of total enrolments in 2010.

2.2.2 The share which undergraduate diploma enrolments have of the total enrolment should remain constant at 34% over the period up to 2010. This will require undergraduate diploma enrolments to increase by 26 000 (or 10%) and undergraduate degree enrolments by 24 000 (or 6%) in 2010 compared to 2005.

2.2.3 The share which science and technology (including health sciences) majors have of the total enrolment should change from 29% in 2005 to 30% in 2010, and the share of business and management majors should increase from 29% in 2005 to 33% by 2010. These changes imply that the share which education plus other humanities majors have of the total should drop from 42% in 2005 to 37% in 2010.

2.3 Full-time equivalent student enrolments

In a full-time equivalent student enrolment total, account is taken of the course load carried by students. For example, a student carrying a normal full-time load would = 1 FTE student, and one carrying a 50% load would = 0.5 FTE enrolled students. The total of FTE enrolled students should grow, between 2005 and 2010, at the same average annual rate as the head count enrolled total. This implies that the average course loads carried by students are not expected to increase over this period.

2.4 Student outputs

Output levels should improve during the period of student growth. The average success rate for all undergraduate plus postgraduate courses in the system should improve from the 2005 average of 71% to at least 73% by 2010. The total of graduates produced by the system should increase from the 2005 total of 120 000 to 142 000 by 2010, implying that dropout rates must fall and graduation rates must improve substantially.

3 INSTITUTIONAL TARGETS

Tables 1 to 7 in Sections A and B of the Annexure list the final 2010 targets which the Minister has approved for each public higher education institution. These targets deal with:

- head count enrolment totals;
- head count enrolment shape by qualification type and field of study;
- full-time equivalent student enrolment totals;
- success rates by course;
- graduate totals and graduation rates.

In keeping with the principle of differentiation in enrolment planning (see paragraph 1.2 above), institutions have been set different enrolment and output targets. Tables B and C below illustrate some of these differences in targets:

Table B

Head count enrolment growth targets: 2005-2010	
Average annual growth	Number of institutions
-1.5% to 0%	5
0.2% to 1.9%	10
2.0% to 2.9%	4
3.1% to 4.1%	4

Table C

Success rate targets: 2010	
Courses passed divided by enrolled courses	Number of institutions
80% and above	7
75% to 79%	11
Below 75%	5

4 MONITORING INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE

The Department of Education will monitor, on an annual basis, the performance of institutions relative to their input and output targets. If an institution's performance in any given year indicates that it will not meet all of its 2010 targets, then the Minister may ask its Council to submit a formal report on why this has occurred, and on what remedial steps will be introduced.

5 TEACHING INPUT UNITS

Tables 8 and 9 in Section C of the Annexure set out the teaching input units generated by actual 2005 enrolments and the 2010 targets approved by the Minister.

A teaching input unit is a weighted FTE enrolled student, with the weightings being those prescribed in the government funding framework (see Tables 2 and 3 in subsection 7.1 of the Ministerial Statement on Higher Education Funding: 2007/08 to 2009/10, July 2007). These units are used to distribute teaching input grants to public higher education institutions. In the 2007/08 financial year the total available for teaching input grants was R6 772 million, which was 63.3% of the total allocated to block grant subsidies.

It is important to note that the calculation of teaching input units for a financial year N is always based on the FTE enrolled student totals for year N-2. For example, the teaching input units for the 2007/08 financial year were based on the FTE enrolments for 2005, and for 2009/10 will be based on the FTE enrolments for 2007. Two tables in the Annexure show what the effect is of these teaching input weightings. As can be seen, the FTE enrolled total for 2005 was 508 000 (see column 1 of Table 4), and the weighted teaching input unit total generated for the 2007/08 financial year was 981 000 (see column 2 of Table 8). The average ratio in 2005 of teaching input units to FTE enrolments for the system was, therefore, 1.94:1.

The first column of Table 8 of the Annexure shows that teaching input grants for 2007/08 were not distributed on the basis of the 981 000 teaching input units generated by the actual 2005 FTE enrolled student total of 508 000. In the current funding framework, teaching input grants are based on input unit totals approved by the Minister for funding purposes, and these approved-for-funding totals are not necessarily those generated by actual enrolments. The teaching input unit total approved for funding for the 2007/08 financial year, as can be seen in the first column of Table 8, was 876 000. This, as can be seen in the second column of the table, was 105 000 (or 11%) less than the total of 981 000 units generated for 2007/08 by 2005 FTE enrolments. This difference implies that about 10% of student enrolments in the system in 2005 were not included in government funding calculations.

The third column of Table 8 of the Annexure sets out the teaching input units generated by each institution's head count and FTE enrolments targets for 2010. These totals have been approved by the Minister for funding for the 2012/13 financial year. The fourth column of the table shows that a total of 1 071 000 teaching input units will be funded in 2012/13 compared to the 2007/08 funded total of 876 000. This represents a increase of 195 000 (or 22%) across the 6 funding years.

This increase in funded teaching input units reflects the decision of the Minister that there must not, by the end of this 6-year period, be any "unfunded" students in the public higher education system. The implementation of this decision will be based on the understanding that institutions will restrict their student enrolments to their approved targets, and that they will, as a consequence, be funded for all the students which they enrol.

Table 9 of the Annexure shows how the shares which institutions have of the funded teaching input unit totals will change in 2012/13 compared to 2007/08. The shares of some institutions will increase substantially, and the shares of others will fall. Because these changes in shares could affect the financial stability of institutions, a migration strategy is needed, to move institutions slowly from the shares which they had for the 2007/08 financial year to those which they would have in 2012/13.

6 MIGRATION STRATEGY FOR TEACHING INPUT UNITS

Tables 10 to 14 of Section D of the Annexure deal with the migration of 2007/08 shares of the teaching input unit total to those of 2012/13. This migration strategy is divided into two phases.

6.1 Phase one of the migration strategy

Phase one of the strategy was approved by the Minister in the Ministerial Statement on Higher Education Funding: 2007/08 to 2009/10 (July 2007). Subsection 7.2 of the Statement on Higher Education Funding says this about the migration strategy:

"The Minister's determinations of enrolment targets for 2010 were based on these principles:

- ◆ Higher education institutions cannot carry 'unfunded' students, other than in circumstances approved by the Minister. By 2010, all student head counts and all the teaching input units which they generate must, other than in the cases approved by the Minister, be included in teaching input calculations.

- ♦ Approved enrolment growth rates could differ, depending on institutional capacity and past performance.
- ♦ The funding of those institutions which cannot grow because of capacity constraints must be protected, but new funding must be directed to those permitted to grow at rates above the national average. This implies that a new migration strategy will be have to implemented for teaching input funding grants" (paragraph 7.2.2).

Table 9 of the Annexure to this Statement on enrolment planning gives the totals of teaching input units which have been approved for funding for the 2007/08 to 2009/10 financial years. The table shows that the funded total will increase from 876 000 in 2007/08, to 905 000 in 2008/09, and to 940 000 in 2009/10. The shares which institutions will receive of the teaching input allocation across this period are recorded in the first three columns of Table 12 of the Annexure.

6.2 Phase two of the migration strategy

Table 11 of the Annexure sets out the approved totals for the final three years of the migration strategy. The funded teaching input unit total moves from 940 000 in 2009/10, to 984 000 in 2010/11, 1 027 000 in 2011/12, and finally to 1 071 000 in 2012/13.

The final three columns of Table 12 show what institutional shares will be of these changing totals. The table also summarises the full changes which will occur in institutional shares of the teaching input unit total across all 6 years of the migration strategy. Since teaching input grants are distributed in accordance with the shares which institutions have of the total of funded units, this table can be used in conjunction with the three-year rolling national higher education budget, to determine what an institution's teaching input grant is likely to be.

6.3 Financial implications of the migration strategy

Tables 13 and 14 of the Annexure show what effect the migration strategy will have on the teaching input funding of each institution.

Table 13 uses the 2007/08 total of R6 772 million for teaching input grants and the shares in Table 12 to show how institutional allocations will change in real terms between 2007/08 and 2012/13. The data show that the grants of 8 institutions are likely to fall in real terms in 2012/13 compared to 2007/08. The grants of 6 would increase in real terms at an average annual rate of less than 1%, and the remaining 9 at an annual average rate of more than 1%.

Table 14 shows in Rands of 2007/08 what effect these changes in shares will have on the teaching input grants of institutions. Institutions whose teaching input grants will fall in 2008/09 and 2009/10 (columns 2 and 3 of Table 14) were informed by the Minister in March 2007 that they would receive ad hoc grants to help cover these shortfalls.

If further institutional efficiency funds are allocated to higher education by the National Treasury, the Minister will consider assisting institutions whose teaching input grants will fall in real terms during the second phase of the migration.

7 CONCLUSION

This Ministerial Statement on Student Enrolment Planning consolidates decisions taken by the Minister during 2007 on student enrolment and output targets. The Minister informed institutions in March 2007 on what targets they had been set for 2010. Those Councils which requested some variation to these targets were given the Minister's final decisions in October 2007.

Phase one of the teaching input unit migration strategy was approved by the Minister in the July 2007 Ministerial Statement on Higher Education Funding: 2007/08 to 2009/10. No changes to this first phase have been made in this Statement on enrolment planning.

The second phase of the migration is set out in section 6.2 of this new Statement, and in Tables 12 and 13 of its Annexure.

Institutions are asked to note two specific issues raised in this Statement:

- (1) The performance of institutions relative to their input and output targets will be monitored annually. If an institution's performance falls below the targets, then the Minister may ask its Council to submit a formal report on why this has occurred, and on what remedial steps will be introduced.
- (2) If the National Treasury allocates institutional efficiency funds to higher education during phase two of the migration strategy, the Minister will consider providing ad hoc funds to those institutions whose teaching input grants are likely to fall in real terms.

ANNEXURE

STUDENT ENROLMENT AND OUTPUT TARGETS

SECTION A: STUDENT ENROLMENT TARGETS

- Table 1 HEAD COUNT ENROLMENT TOTALS
- Table 2 ENROLMENT SHAPE BY MAJOR FIELD OF STUDIES
- Table 3 ENROLMENT SHAPE BY QUALIFICATION TYPE
- Table 4 FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLMENTS: UNWEIGHTED

SECTION B: STUDENT OUTPUT TARGETS

- Table 5 SUCCESS RATES: RATIO OF FTE DEGREE CREDITS TO FTE ENROLMENTS
- Table 6 RATIOS OF HEAD COUNT GRADUATES TO HEAD COUNT ENROLMENTS
- Table 7 GRADUATE OUTPUT TARGETS

SECTION C: TEACHING INPUT UNIT TARGETS

- Table 8 TEACHING INPUT UNITS
- Table 9 INSTITUTIONAL SHARES OF TEACHING INPUT UNIT TOTALS

SECTION D: MIGRATION STRATEGY FOR TEACHING INPUT UNIT TARGETS

- TABLE 10 PHASE ONE OF MIGRATION STRATEGY
- TABLE 11 PHASE TWO TARGETS OF TEACHING INPUT UNITS
- TABLE 12 MIGRATION FROM FUNDING YEAR 2007/08 TO 2012/13 TARGET SHARES
- TABLE 13 EFFECT OF MIGRATION SHARES ON TEACHING INPUT FUNDS
- TABLE 14 ANNUAL CHANGES IN TEACHING INPUT FUNDS ON MIGRATION PROCESS

9 OCTOBER 2005

SECTION A: STUDENT ENROLMENT TARGETS

TABLE 1
HEAD COUNT ENROLMENT TOTALS: THOUSANDS

	Actual 2005	2010 target: approved October 2007	Change: 2010 target compared to actual 2005	Average annual increase: 2005 to 2010
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	29.0	32.0	3.0	2.0%
University of Cape Town	21.8	24.0	2.2	1.9%
Central University of Technology	10.3	11.4	1.1	2.1%
Durban University of Technology	22.8	22.5	-0.3	-0.3%
University of Fort Hare	8.8	9.5	0.7	1.5%
University of Free State	24.7	27.0	2.3	1.8%
University of Johannesburg	45.5	44.3	-1.2	-0.5%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	40.7	44.5	3.8	1.8%
University of Limpopo	17.6	18.0	0.4	0.5%
Mangosuthu Technikon	9.9	10.0	0.1	0.2%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	24.2	27.0	2.8	2.2%
North West University	38.6	42.3	3.7	1.8%
University of Pretoria	46.4	54.0	7.6	3.1%
Rhodes University	6.3	6.5	0.2	0.6%
University of South Africa	207.9	254.0	46.1	4.1%
University of Stellenbosch	21.7	22.9	1.2	1.1%
Tshwane University of Technology	60.4	56.0	-4.4	-1.5%
Vaal University of Technology	17.4	18.5	1.1	1.2%
University of Venda	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0%
Walter Sisulu University	24.5	24.0	-0.5	-0.4%
University of the Western Cape	14.6	17.5	2.9	3.7%
University of the Witwatersrand	23.6	28.0	4.4	3.5%
University of Zululand	10.4	12.0	1.6	2.9%
TOTAL	737.6	816.4	78.8	2.1%

NOTES TO TABLE 1:

- [1] The first column gives the final head count total for 2005. This is 738 000, which is 6 000 less than the 2004 enrolment total of 744 000. The 2006 head count enrolled total was 740 000.
- [2] The second column reflects the final decisions of the Minister on institutional targets.
- [3] The final two columns show that the 2010 targets require an increase of 78 600 heads on the 2005 actual total. This would be an annual average increase for the system of 2.0% between 2005 and 2010.

TABLE 2

TARGETS FOR ENROLMENT SHAPE BY MAJOR FIELD OF STUDIES

	Actual 2005			2010 target: approved in October 2007		
	Science & technology	Business & management	Humanities & education	Science & technology	Business & management	Humanities & education
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	47%	33%	20%	50%	30%	20%
University of Cape Town	41%	25%	34%	41%	25%	34%
Central University of Technology	44%	35%	21%	45%	35%	20%
Durban University of Technology	49%	34%	16%	50%	35%	15%
University of Port Hare	16%	15%	69%	20%	25%	55%
University of Free State	29%	13%	58%	30%	20%	50%
University of Johannesburg	30%	33%	37%	33%	34%	33%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	30%	26%	44%	34%	22%	44%
University of Limpopo	43%	14%	43%	50%	15%	35%
Mangosuthu Technikon	57%	31%	12%	58%	32%	10%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	30%	24%	46%	30%	24%	46%
North West University	21%	17%	62%	22%	15%	63%
University of Pretoria	37%	14%	49%	37%	15%	48%
Rhodes University	21%	15%	64%	23%	15%	62%
University of South Africa	12%	42%	46%	13%	50%	37%
University of Stellenbosch	40%	14%	46%	41%	14%	45%
Ishwane University of Technology	36%	29%	35%	40%	35%	25%
Vaal University of Technology	44%	50%	6%	50%	45%	5%
University of Venda	28%	22%	50%	34%	22%	44%
Walter Sisulu University	27%	33%	40%	30%	35%	35%
University of the Western Cape	30%	15%	55%	35%	15%	50%
University of the Witwatersrand	50%	17%	33%	50%	17%	33%
University of Zululand	17%	12%	71%	18%	22%	60%
TOTAL	29%	29%	42%	30%	33%	37%

NOTE TO TABLE 2:

This table shows (a) what the actual shape of the system was in 2005, in terms of the broad fields of study for which students were actually registered, and (b) what shape targets have been approved for the 2010 head enrolment targets in Table 1.

TABLE 3

TARGETS FOR ENROLMENT SHAPE BY QUALIFICATION TYPE

	Actual 2005					2010 target: approved in October 2007			
	Undergraduate diplomas	Undergraduate degrees	Postgraduate qualifications below masters	Masters & doctors		Undergraduate diplomas	Undergraduate degrees	Postgraduate qualifications below masters	Masters & doctors
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	77%	19%	2%	2%		74%	19%	3%	4%
University of Cape Town	1%	70%	10%	19%		0%	69%	13%	18%
Central University of Technology	70%	24%	3%	3%		76%	18%	3%	3%
Durban University of Technology	84%	15%	0%	1%		80%	18%	0%	2%
University of Port Hare	11%	77%	7%	5%		5%	73%	14%	8%
University of Free State	12%	57%	19%	12%		6%	56%	25%	13%
University of Johannesburg	42%	42%	11%	5%		39%	43%	12%	6%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	10%	62%	15%	13%		10%	62%	14%	14%
University of Limpopo	13%	69%	7%	11%		10%	70%	8%	12%
Mangosuthu Technikon	98%	2%	0%	0%		94%	6%	0%	0%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	44%	45%	4%	7%		47%	42%	4%	7%
North West University	27%	48%	16%	9%		28%	50%	13%	9%
University of Pretoria	14%	58%	12%	16%		15%	56%	12%	17%
Rhodes University	12%	67%	8%	13%		5%	70%	10%	15%
University of South Africa	28%	62%	7%	3%		28%	61%	8%	3%
University of Stellenbosch	0%	65%	13%	22%		0%	62%	14%	24%
Tshwane University of Technology	77%	16%	3%	4%		76%	18%	0%	6%
Vaal University of Technology	92%	7%	0%	1%		87%	10%	0%	3%
University of Venda	15%	77%	5%	3%		15%	77%	5%	3%
Walter Sisulu University	71%	27%	2%	0%		73%	24%	2%	1%
University of the Western Cape	6%	74%	10%	10%		5%	73%	11%	11%
University of the Witwatersrand	1%	66%	10%	23%		1%	66%	9%	24%
University of Zululand	5%	70%	20%	5%		14%	66%	16%	4%
TOTAL	34%	51%	8%	7%		34%	48%	9%	8%

NOTE TO TABLE 3:

This table shows (a) what the actual shape of the system was in terms of the qualification types for which students were actually registered in 2005, and (b) what qualification-type targets are set for the 2010 head enrolments totals in Table 1 above.

TABLE 4

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT ENROLMENTS: UNWEIGHTED THOUSANDS

	Actual 2005	2010 target: approved October 2007	Change: 2010 target compared to actual 2005	annual increase: 2005 to 2010
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	22.2	24.6	2.4	2.1%
University of Cape Town	17.9	20.3	2.4	2.5%
Central University of Technology	8.0	8.8	0.8	1.9%
Durban University of Technology	17.1	17.2	0.1	0.1%
University of Port Har	6.8	8.3	1.5	4.0%
University of Free State	18.2	20.4	2.2	2.3%
University of Johannesburg	34.3	33.2	-1.1	-0.6%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	32.2	34.8	2.6	1.6%
University of Limpopo	14.1	14.1	0.0	0.0%
Mangosuthu Technikon	7.6	8.1	0.5	1.3%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	17.0	19.9	2.9	3.2%
North West University	27.1	29.5	2.4	1.7%
University of Pretoria	33.0	39.2	6.2	3.5%
Rhodes University	5.4	5.4	0.0	0.0%
University of South Africa	100.4	128.8	28.4	5.1%
University of Stellenbosch	17.8	18.9	1.1	1.2%
Tshwane University of Technology	47.4	45.0	-2.4	-1.0%
Vaal University of Technology	13.6	15.2	1.6	2.2%
University of Venda	8.2	8.2	0.0	0.0%
Walter Sisulu University	21.5	20.9	-0.6	-0.6%
University of the Western Cape	11.5	14.3	2.8	4.5%
University of the Witwatersrand	17.9	21.2	3.3	3.5%
University of Zululand	8.7	9.4	0.7	1.7%
TOTAL	507.9	565.6	57.7	2.2%

NOTE TO TABLE 4:

This table sets out the totals of unweighted FTE students generated by the head count totals in Table 1. In an FTE total account has to be taken of the load carried by a student. So someone with a 10% load = 0.1 FTE students, and another student carrying a load 20% above the standard curriculum = 1.20 FTE students.

SECTION B: STUDENT OUTPUT TARGETS

TABLE 5
SUCCESS RATES: RATIO OF FTE DEGREE CREDITS TO FTE ENROLMENTS

	Actual 2005	2010 target: approved October 2007	Change: 2010 target less actual 2005
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	75%	77%	2%
University of Cape Town	85%	85%	0%
Central University of Technology	74%	76%	2%
Durban University of Technology	74%	76%	2%
University of Port Hare	76%	79%	3%
University of Free State	70%	74%	4%
University of Johannesburg	75%	78%	3%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	73%	78%	5%
University of Limpopo	75%	78%	3%
Mangosuthu Technikon	79%	80%	1%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	73%	75%	2%
North West University	74%	78%	4%
University of Pretoria	82%	84%	2%
Rhodes University	87%	87%	0%
University of South Africa	54%	56%	2%
University of Stellenbosch	76%	80%	4%
Tshwane University of Technology	67%	70%	3%
Vaal University of Technology	70%	72%	2%
University of Venda	77%	78%	1%
Walter Sisulu University	69%	72%	3%
University of the Western Cape	79%	80%	1%
University of the Witwatersrand	80%	84%	4%
University of Zululand	71%	75%	4%
TOTAL	71%	73%	2%

NOTES TO TABLE 5

- [1] The percentages in this table represent average success rates for undergraduate plus postgraduate courses. The calculations are made by dividing the FTE enrolled total for an institution into an FTE total derived from courses actually passed.
- [2] The first column in the table sets out the actual success rate averages for 2005.
- [3] The second column contains the targets which the Minister has approved for 2010.
- [2] An average of 80% is the the Department of Education's benchmark target.

TABLE 6

RATIOS OF HEAD COUNT GRADUATES TO HEAD COUNT ENROLMENTS

	Actual 2005	2010 target: approved October 2007	Change: 2010 target less actual 2005
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	20%	22%	2%
University of Cape Town	28%	28%	-2%
Central University of Technology	20%	22%	2%
Durban University of Technology	19%	21%	2%
University of Fort Hare	20%	22%	2%
University of Free State	21%	23%	2%
University of Johannesburg	22%	23%	1%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	20%	22%	2%
University of Limpopo	17%	20%	3%
Mangosuthu Technikon	12%	16%	4%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	22%	22%	0%
North West University	20%	24%	2%
University of Pretoria	25%	22%	-3%
Rhodes University	33%	33%	0%
University of South Africa	7%	8%	1%
University of Stellenbosch	25%	27%	2%
Tshwane University of Technology	16%	18%	2%
Vaal University of Technology	13%	16%	3%
University of Venda	15%	18%	3%
Walter Sisulu University	11%	15%	4%
University of the Western Cape	21%	23%	2%
University of the Witwatersrand	21%	23%	2%
University of Zululand	20%	22%	2%
TOTAL	16%	17%	1%

NOTES TO TABLE 8:

- [1] This table offers proxies for graduate throughput rates (undergraduate + postgraduate qualifications) in the HE system. The percentages were calculated by dividing graduate totals by the head count enrolment totals in Table 1.
- [2] An average of 25% for contact institutions is the benchmark set in the 2001 National Plan. :
- [3] The 2010 target for the HE system increases the average by 1 percentage point from 16% to 18%.

TABLE 7

GRADUATE OUTPUT TARGETS

	Actual 2005	2010 target: approved October 2007	Change: 2010 target less actual 2005
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	5.7	7.0	1.3
University of Cape Town	6.1	6.2	0.1
Central University of Technology	2.1	2.4	0.3
Durban University of Technology	4.3	4.7	0.4
University of Fort Hare	1.8	2.1	0.3
University of Free State	5.2	6.2	1.0
University of Johannesburg	10.1	10.2	0.1
University of KwaZulu-Natal	8.3	9.8	1.5
University of Limpopo	3.0	3.6	0.6
Mangosuthu Technikon	1.2	1.6	0.4
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	5.4	5.9	0.5
North West University	7.7	10.1	2.4
University of Pretoria	11.6	11.9	0.3
Rhodes University	2.1	2.1	0.0
University of South Africa	14.1	20.3	6.2
University of Stellenbosch	5.5	6.2	0.7
Tshwane University of Technology	9.4	10.1	0.7
Vaal University of Technology	2.3	3.0	0.7
University of Venda	1.6	1.9	0.3
Walter Sisulu University	2.7	3.6	0.9
University of the Western Cape	3.0	4.0	1.0
University of the Witwatersrand	5.0	6.4	1.4
University of Zululand	2.1	2.6	0.5
TOTAL	120.3	141.9	21.6
			18.0%

NOTES TO TABLE 7:

[1] The 1st column in this table gives the final graduate data for 2005.

[2] The second column sets graduate targets for 2010 on the basis of the head count targets in Table 1 and the approved graduation rate targets in Table 6

SECTION C: TEACHING INPUT UNIT TARGETS

TABLE 8
TEACHING INPUT UNITS : THOUSANDS

	2005 teaching input units approved for funding year 2007/08	Teaching inputs generated by actual 2005 enrolments	2010 teaching input units: approved for funding for 2012/13	Change: 2012/13 target compared to 2007/08	Average annual increase: funded 2007/08 to funded 2012/13
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	39.6	47.1	52.0	12.4	5.6%
University of Cape Town	47.0	50.9	56.0	9.0	3.6%
Central University of Technology	13.8	16.1	17.2	3.4	4.6%
Durban University of Technology	34.4	36.4	35.9	1.5	0.8%
University of Port Hare	10.9	12.1	13.1	2.2	3.7%
University of Free State	38.9	43.7	47.8	8.9	4.2%
University of Johannesburg	59.5	70.0	71.3	11.8	3.7%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	69.1	79.9	87.1	18.0	4.8%
University of Limpopo	29.5	37.6	38.5	9.0	5.5%
Mangosuthu Technikon	10.4	14.9	15.1	4.7	7.7%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	32.1	34.1	39.3	7.2	4.1%
North West University	45.6	53.5	60.0	14.4	5.6%
University of Pretoria	80.3	83.3	99.0	18.7	4.3%
Rhodes University	10.6	12.2	13.2	2.6	4.6%
University of South Africa	79.4	83.6	102.1	22.7	5.2%
University of Stellenbosch	45.7	51.0	54.0	8.3	3.4%
Tshwane University of Technology	75.1	77.8	75.1	0.0	0.0%
Vaal University of Technology	21.9	26.8	26.3	4.4	3.7%
University of Venda	12.0	15.6	16.2	4.2	6.2%
Walter Sisulu University	27.5	37.0	36.3	8.8	5.7%
University of the Western Cape	25.9	27.7	33.2	7.3	5.1%
University of the Witwatersrand	54.7	53.7	63.7	9.1	3.1%
University of Zululand	12.5	16.1	18.6	6.1	8.2%
TOTAL	876.3	981.2	1071.0	194.7	4.1%

NOTES TO TABLE 8

- [1] The teaching input units generated by student enrolments in year N are used for funding in year N+2. So the 2005 units were used for funding in the 2007/08 financial year, and 2010 units will be used in the 2012/13 financial year.
- [2] The first column sets out the teaching input totals approved for the 2007/08 funding year in the 2005 Ministerial Statement on Higher Education Funding. This 2007/08 total was based on the 2005 enrolments that had been approved for funding.
- [3] The second column sets out the teaching input unit totals generated by the actual 2005 enrolments of each institution.
- [4] The third column gives the 2010 units approved for funding in 2012/13.. These are generated by the various enrolment targets in earlier tables.
- [5] The fourth column compares the approved target total for 2012/13 to the approved total for 2007/08. The final column expresses this difference as an average annual change for the period 2005 to 2010.

TABLE 9
INSTITUTIONAL SHARES OF TEACHING INPUT UNIT TOTALS

	% share of 2007/08 funded teaching inputs	% share of 2012/13 target teaching inputs	Target 2012/13 target share less 2007/08 funded share
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	4.52%	4.86%	0.34%
University of Cape Town	5.36%	5.23%	-0.14%
Central University of Technology	1.57%	1.61%	0.04%
Durban University of Technology	3.93%	3.35%	-0.58%
University of Fort Hare	1.24%	1.22%	-0.02%
University of Free State	4.44%	4.46%	0.03%
University of Johannesburg	6.79%	6.66%	-0.13%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	7.88%	8.13%	0.25%
University of Limpopo	3.38%	3.59%	0.23%
Mangosuthu Technikon	1.19%	1.41%	0.22%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	3.65%	3.67%	0.01%
North West University	5.20%	5.60%	0.40%
University of Pretoria	9.17%	9.24%	0.08%
Rhodes University	1.20%	1.23%	0.03%
University of South Africa	9.05%	9.53%	0.48%
University of Stellenbosch	5.22%	5.04%	-0.17%
Tshwane University of Technology	8.57%	7.01%	-1.56%
Vaal University of Technology	2.50%	2.46%	-0.05%
University of Venda	1.37%	1.51%	0.14%
Walter Sisulu University	3.14%	3.39%	0.25%
University of the Western Cape	2.95%	3.10%	0.15%
University of the Witwatersrand	6.24%	5.95%	-0.29%
University of Zululand	1.43%	1.73%	0.31%
TOTAL	100%	100%	0.00%

NOTE TO TABLE 9

These percentage shares were derived from the first and the third columns of Table 8

SECTION D: MIGRATION STRATEGY FOR TEACHING INPUT UNIT TARGETS

TABLE 10
PHASE ONE OF MIGRATION STRATEGY

	ACTUAL TEACHING INPUTS		FUNDED TEACHING INPUT UNITS: PHASE ONE			
	Generated by 2005 enrolments	Generated by 2006 enrolments	Funded : 2007/08	Migration total: 2008/09	Migration total: 2009/10	
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	47.1	47.5	39.6	41.5	43.8	
University of Cape Town	50.9	48.4	47.0	48.3	50.0	
Central University of Technology	16.1	16.1	13.8	14.3	14.9	
Durban University of Technology	36.4	36.2	34.4	34.6	34.9	
University of Fort Hare	12.1	11.1	10.9	11.2	11.7	
University of Free State	43.7	43.2	38.9	40.3	41.9	
University of Johannesburg	70.0	66.6	59.5	61.5	64.1	
University of KwaZulu-Natal	79.9	72.6	69.1	71.2	73.9	
University of Limpopo	37.6	34.1	29.5	30.9	32.5	
Mangosuthu Technikon	14.9	14.9	10.4	11.1	11.9	
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	34.1	34.1	32.1	32.9	34.0	
North West University	53.5	54.6	45.6	48.2	51.4	
University of Pretoria	83.3	86.5	80.3	82.9	85.9	
Rhodes University	12.2	12.1	10.6	11.0	11.5	
University of South Africa	83.6	90.8	79.4	82.9	87.0	
University of Stellenbosch	51.0	51.5	45.7	46.8	48.0	
Tshwane University of Technology	77.8	70.7	75.1	74.3	73.8	
Vaal University of Technology	26.8	25.4	21.9	22.9	24.1	
University of Venda	15.6	18.2	12.0	12.6	13.3	
Walter Sisulu University	37.0	36.5	27.5	29.0	30.6	
University of the Western Cape	27.7	28.1	25.9	27.0	28.3	
University of the Witwatersrand	53.7	55.5	54.7	56.1	57.8	
University of Zululand	16.1	15.2	12.5	13.5	14.6	
TOTAL	981.2	969.9	876.3	905.0	940.0	

NOTE TO TABLE 10

The totals in the table are drawn from the Ministerial Statement on Higher Education Funding: 2007/08 to 2009/2010, which was published in August 2007.

TABLE 11

PHASE TWO TARGETS OF TEACHING INPUT UNITS

	Migration total: 2010/11	Migration total: 2011/12	Migration total: 2012/13
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	46.5	49.3	52.0
University of Cape Town	52.0	54.0	56.0
Central University of Technology	15.7	16.4	17.2
Durban University of Technology	35.2	35.6	35.9
University of Fort Hare	12.1	12.6	13.1
University of Free State	43.9	45.8	47.8
University of Johannesburg	66.5	68.9	71.3
University of KwaZulu-Natal	78.3	82.7	87.1
University of Limpopo	34.5	36.5	38.5
Mangosuthu Technikon	13.0	14.0	15.1
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	35.8	37.5	39.3
North West University	54.3	57.1	60.0
University of Pretoria	90.3	94.6	99.0
Rhodes University	12.0	12.6	13.2
University of South Africa	92.1	97.1	102.1
University of Stellenbosch	50.0	52.0	54.0
Tshwane University of Technology	74.2	74.7	75.1
Vaal University of Technology	24.8	25.6	26.3
University of Venda	14.2	15.2	16.2
Walter Sisulu University	32.5	34.4	36.3
University of the Western Cape	29.9	31.6	33.2
University of the Witwatersrand	59.8	61.7	63.7
University of Zululand	15.9	17.2	18.6
TOTAL	983.7	1027.3	1071.0

NOTE TO TABLE 10

The totals in the table move the 2009/07 total to the final target 2012/13 target for each institution. August 2007.

TABLE 12

MIGRATION FROM SHARES FOR FUNDING YEAR 2007/08 TO TARGET SHARES FOR FUNDING YEAR 2012/13

	Funding year 2007/08	Funding year 2008/09	Funding year 2009/10	Funding year 2010/11	Funding year 2011/12	Funding year 2012/13
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	4.52%	4.59%	4.66%	4.73%	4.80%	4.86%
University of Cape Town	5.36%	5.34%	5.32%	5.29%	5.26%	5.23%
Central University of Technology	1.57%	1.58%	1.59%	1.60%	1.60%	1.61%
Durban University of Technology	3.93%	3.82%	3.71%	3.58%	3.46%	3.35%
University of Fort Hare	1.24%	1.24%	1.24%	1.23%	1.23%	1.22%
University of Free State	4.44%	4.45%	4.46%	4.46%	4.46%	4.46%
University of Johannesburg	6.79%	6.80%	6.82%	6.76%	6.71%	6.66%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	7.88%	7.87%	7.86%	7.96%	8.05%	8.13%
University of Limpopo	3.36%	3.41%	3.46%	3.51%	3.55%	3.58%
Mangosuthu Technikon	1.19%	1.23%	1.27%	1.32%	1.37%	1.41%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	3.66%	3.64%	3.62%	3.64%	3.65%	3.67%
North West University	5.20%	5.33%	5.47%	5.52%	5.56%	5.60%
University of Pretoria	9.17%	9.16%	9.14%	9.18%	9.21%	9.24%
Rhodes University	1.20%	1.21%	1.22%	1.22%	1.23%	1.23%
University of South Africa	9.06%	9.16%	9.26%	9.36%	9.45%	9.53%
University of Stellenbosch	5.22%	5.17%	5.11%	5.09%	5.06%	5.04%
Tshwane University of Technology	8.57%	8.21%	7.85%	7.55%	7.27%	7.01%
Vaal University of Technology	2.50%	2.53%	2.56%	2.52%	2.49%	2.46%
University of Venda	1.37%	1.39%	1.41%	1.45%	1.48%	1.51%
Walter Sisulu University	3.14%	3.20%	3.26%	3.31%	3.35%	3.39%
University of the Western Cape	2.95%	2.98%	3.01%	3.04%	3.07%	3.10%
University of the Witwatersrand	6.24%	6.20%	6.15%	6.08%	6.01%	5.95%
University of Zululand	1.43%	1.49%	1.55%	1.62%	1.68%	1.73%
TOTAL	876.3	905.0	940.0	983.7	1027.3	1071.0

NOTES TO TABLE 12

[1] Because enrolments for a year N affect funding for year N+2, the dates in these tables represent funding rather than academic years. So the data for 2005 is transposed into that for 2007/08, and that for 2010 into funding year 2012/13.

[2] The final column contains the approved teaching input targets contained in the third column of Table 7

TABLE 13

EFFECT OF MIGRATION SHARES ON TEACHING INPUT FUNDS: RANDS OF 2007/08

	Funding year 2007/08	Funding year 2008/09	Funding year 2009/10	Funding year 2010/11	Funding year 2011/12	Funding year 2012/13	Average annual change: 2007/08 to 2012/13
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	366	311	316	320	325	329	1.5%
University of Cape Town	363	362	360	358	356	354	-0.5%
Central University of Technology	106	107	108	108	108	109	0.5%
Durban University of Technology	266	259	251	242	234	227	-3.1%
University of Fort Hare	84	84	84	84	83	83	-0.3%
University of Free State	300	301	302	302	302	302	0.1%
University of Johannesburg	460	460	462	458	454	451	-0.4%
University of KwaZulu-Natal	534	533	532	539	545	551	0.6%
University of Limpopo	228	231	234	238	241	243	1.3%
Mangosuthu Technikon	81	83	86	89	93	95	3.4%
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	248	247	245	246	247	248	0.1%
North West University	352	361	370	374	377	379	1.5%
University of Pretoria	621	620	619	622	624	626	0.2%
Rhodes University	82	82	83	83	83	83	0.5%
University of South Africa	613	620	627	634	640	646	1.0%
University of Stellenbosch	363	350	346	344	343	341	-0.7%
Tshwane University of Technology	580	556	532	511	492	475	-3.9%
Vaal University of Technology	169	171	173	171	168	166	-0.4%
University of Venda	93	94	95	98	100	102	2.0%
Walter Sisulu University	212	217	221	224	227	230	1.6%
University of the Western Cape	200	202	204	206	208	210	1.0%
University of the Witwatersrand	422	420	416	412	407	403	-0.9%
University of Zululand	97	101	105	110	114	117	4.0%
TOTAL	5772	5772	5772	5772	5772	5772	0.0%

NOTES TO TABLE 13:

[1] This table shows what the teaching input grant for each institution would be (a) on the shares set out in Table 8, and (b) on the assumption that the 2007/08 total of R6 772 million for teaching inputs was kept constant.

[2] The final column shows what the average annual change in teaching allocations would be in real Rands between 2007/08 and 2012/13

TABLE 14

ANNUAL CHANGES IN TEACHING INPUT FUNDS ON MIGRATION PROCESS: RANDS (MILLIONS) OF 2007

	Base year: 2007/08	2008/09 compared to previous year	2009/10 compared to previous year	2010/11 compared to previous year	2011/12 compared to previous year	2012/13 compared to previous year	Total change: 2007/08 to 2012/13
Cape Peninsula University of Technology	0.0	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.0	22.9
University of Cape Town	0.0	-1.7	-1.4	-2.2	-2.1	-1.9	-9.2
Central University of Technology	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.3	2.5
Durban University of Technology	0.0	-7.4	-7.4	-8.8	-8.0	-7.4	-39.1
University of Port Harcourt	0.0	-0.3	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	-1.4
University of Free State	0.0	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.8
University of Johannesburg	0.0	0.7	1.4	-4.0	-3.7	-3.4	-8.9
University of KwaZulu-Natal	0.0	-0.7	-0.7	6.7	6.1	5.6	17.0
University of Limpopo	0.0	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.0	2.8	15.8
Mangosuthu Technikon	0.0	2.7	2.7	3.4	3.1	2.9	14.9
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	0.0	-1.4	-1.4	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.6
North West University	0.0	8.6	9.5	3.3	3.0	2.7	27.0
University of Pretoria	0.0	-0.5	-1.4	2.6	2.3	2.1	5.1
Rhodes University	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.9
University of South Africa	0.0	7.0	6.8	6.7	6.1	5.6	32.3
University of Stellenbosch	0.0	-3.1	-4.1	-1.7	-1.5	-1.4	-11.7
Tshwane University of Technology	0.0	-24.4	-24.4	-20.6	-18.8	-17.3	-105.6
Vaal University of Technology	0.0	1.9	2.0	-2.6	-2.3	-2.2	-3.2
University of Venda	0.0	1.4	1.4	2.5	2.3	2.1	9.7
Walter Sisulu University	0.0	4.4	4.1	3.2	2.9	2.7	17.2
University of the Western Cape	0.0	1.8	2.0	2.2	2.0	1.9	9.9
University of the Witwatersrand	0.0	-2.5	-3.4	-4.9	-4.5	-4.2	-19.5
University of Zululand	0.0	4.2	4.1	4.5	4.2	3.8	20.7
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

NOTES TO TABLE 14:

- [1] This table summarises, in Rands of 2007/08, the annual changes in teaching input funding which would result from the changes in shares set out in Table 8 above. The changes involve a redistribution of the teaching input total. Those institutions with increased enrolment targets get additional funds, which are in effect removed from the totals of those whose enrolment targets reflect below average increases.
- [2] The migration process approved in Table 8 implies (a) that institutions will retain the increases set out above, but (b) that special funds should be made available to those whose input allocations will decline as a result of the growth targets allocated to them.