

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Thursday 6 June 2019, 10.00 – 12.00

Location London Councils, 59½ Southwark Street, SE1 0AL, meeting room 5

Contact Officer Peter O'Brien

Telephone 020 7934 9743

Email Peter.obrien@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Declarations of interest
3. Notes of last meeting and matters arising - For decision
4. London Councils' Pledges to Londoners and Young People - For action
Paper – Yolande Burgess
5. Vision for Young People's Education and Skills 2023 - For decision
Paper – Peter O'Brien
6. Updates: - For information
 - Performance Update: Participation, Achievement and Progression
Paper - Peter O'Brien
 - Policy Update
Paper - Peter O'Brien
 - London Post-16 SEND Review - update
Verbal update - Yolande Burgess/GLA
 - London Post-16 Trajectories Review - update
Verbal update - Yolande Burgess/GLA
 - Apprenticeship Update
Verbal update – London Councils Policy and Public Affairs Division
7. Any other business

Date of next meeting: Thursday 17 October, 3-5pm, London Councils SE1 0AL

Blank Page

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Date	28 March 2019	Venue	London Councils
Meeting Chair	Gail Tolley, Vice Chair		
Contact Officer	Anna-Maria Volpicelli		
Telephone	020 7934 9779	Email	Anna-maria.volpicelli@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Present

Gail Tolley (Chair)	Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS)
Derek Harvey	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)
Dr Graeme Atherton	AccessHE
John Prior	Association of Colleges (AoC) /NATSPEC (for Dr Caroline Allen OBE)
Laraine Smith	AoC/Further Education College representative
Mary Vine-Morris	AoC London Region
Sarah Wilkins	Greater London Authority (GLA) (for Joanne McCartney)
Yolande Burgess	London Councils Young People's Education and Skills

Speakers

Phil Rossiter	MIME Consulting
---------------	-----------------

Officers

Anna-Maria Volpicelli	London Councils Young People's Education and Skills
Peter O'Brien	London Councils Young People's Education and Skills
Spike van der Vliet-Firth	London Councils Economic Development, Skills and Culture

Apologies

Arwel Jones	Association of School and College Leaders
Ben Anderson	London Economic Action Partnership
Dr Caroline Allen OBE	Association of Colleges/NATSPEC
David Jeffrey	Department for Education
Doniya Soni	Greater London Authority (London Economic Action Partnership)
Cllr Georgia Gould (Chair)	London Councils Shadow Executive member (Labour)
Jane Hickie	Association of Employment and Learning Providers
Cllr Nickie Aiken	London Councils Executive Member (Conservative)
Paul Wakeling	AoC/Sixth Form Colleges
Tim Shields	Chief Executives London Committee

1 Welcome, Introductions and apologies

- 1.1 Gail Tolley opened the meeting as Chair, apologies having been received from Cllr Georgia Gould. Gail requested that it was noted that the original date for this meeting had been pushed back for the results of the trajectories research to be discussed under item 4. Round table introductions were made with Spike van der Vliet-Firth joining the meeting for an update on apprenticeship activity. Apologies were noted.
- 1.2 Under actions from the last meeting the [London Post-16 Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Review](#) had been published.

2 Declarations of interest

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3 Minutes of previous meeting and actions arising

- 3.1 The notes of the previous meeting were agreed.

4 Post-16 Education Trajectories Review

- 4.1 Phil Rossiter, MIME Consulting, and Yolande Burgess presented the findings from the London Post 16 Education Trajectories Review, a project jointly commissioned by the GLA and London Councils, and undertaken by MIME Consulting and University College Institute of Education (UCL IoE). Yolande reminded the Board that progress on the project had been delayed until the Department for Education (DfE) agreed to release the relevant data. The Board was invited to discuss the findings and inform the specific trends upon which the final report should focus.
- 4.2 In the course of discussion, Board members raised several points:
- 4.2.1 The final report should help schools, colleges and providers pinpoint priorities for the development of T levels and, potentially, other vocational learning, including Apprenticeships.
 - 4.2.2 The data supported other research undertaken by UCL IoE that endorsed three-year programmes post-16.
 - 4.2.3 It was noted that, in some institutions, there had been a wide range in students' attainment and additional explanatory notes in the final report could help readers interpret the data more consistently.
 - 4.2.4 Comparisons based on geography had greater relevance for students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) than more generally, as this helped local authorities devise an appropriate 'local offer'.
 - 4.2.5 Presenting institutional data interactively would be explored but in pursuing this option the steering group needed to be mindful of the project's budget and not delay the production of the overall report - consideration of overlaying the results of Ofsted inspections could also be reviewed by the project steering group in this light.
 - 4.2.6 It was suggested that the final report should refer to the effect of the curriculum changes made in recent years. This could be drawn out from a glossary of policy drivers and key changes made since 2010.
 - 4.2.7 When the final report was published, the Board felt that an accompanying press release should focus on a few headline 'memorable' facts.
- 4.3 Both presenters thanked the Board for their comments, which would be referred to the project steering group and they hoped to bring the final report to the next Board meeting. The Chair thanked them for their presentation.

Actions: Yolande and Phil to take the key points of the discussion to the Project steering Group and bring the final report to the next Board meeting.

5 Updates

Performance Update: Participation, Achievement and Progression

- 5.1 The meeting noted a paper introduced by Peter O'Brien that provided an update on the levels of participation of young Londoners in education and training, the level of their achievement and progression at the end of the learning process.

Policy

- 5.2 Peter O'Brien presented a policy update, in which he said that a draft response to the DfE's consultation on Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications would be provided to the next Board meeting and added that the DfE had sent a grant determination letter to the GLA setting out the Adult Education Budget for 2019 to 2020.
- 5.3 In discussion, the meeting noted that there is some concern around the diminishing funding for apprenticeships and how this was changing colleges' and providers' practices.

Action: A draft response to the consultation on Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications to be considered at the next Board meeting.

London Ambitions (verbal update)

- 5.4 Yolande Burgess informed the Board that, further to discussion at the last meeting, the London Ambitions portal will be closed from 1st April and its users were being directed to a similar national system maintained centrally. Sarah Wilkins added that the Careers Clusters commissioned by the GLA continued to perform well and clusters specifically addressing the needs of students with SEND would feature in the next procurement round.

Apprenticeship Update (verbal update)

- 5.5 Yolande introduced Spike van der Vliet Firth, Policy Officer, Economic Development, Skills and Culture to the meeting.
- 5.6 Spike reported back from the Apprenticeship Sub-Group (ASG) meeting held on 14 March 2019:
- 5.6.1 The Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) has confirmed that there will be no substantial changes to funding for 2020.
- 5.6.2 London local authorities have explored the potential for collaboratively procuring Apprenticeship provision for roles where there is cross-borough demand. The first of these will be social worker and occupational health apprenticeships, the former of which Health Education England will procure on behalf of London Boroughs. It is hoped that there will be 150 social worker apprenticeships delivered in year one.
- 5.6.3 The Sub-Group also undertakes an annual data collection exercise for both numbers of apprenticeship deliveries in London and on pay scales. The report on local authority apprenticeship delivery goes to Leaders, Chief Executives, ALDCS, ASG members and respondents. The pay scales report is shared with ASG members and respondents only.
- 5.6.4 The Local Government Association (LGA) presented the findings for London from the LGA Apprenticeship Survey 2019. The survey shows that London is sixth out of nine regions, with a 21 per cent increase in local authority apprenticeships nationally as opposed to London with 10 per cent.
- 5.6.5 There is concern that September will see a lot of employers losing unspent levy funds. It is hoped that recent changes in levy funding regulations might help to alleviate the issue. The ESFA has announced it will be producing a league table for the top 100 employers and SMEs.
- 5.6.6 London Councils is organising the ninth Local Authority Apprenticeship Awards this September. London Councils is currently seeking a three year sponsorship for this annual event and to increase its profile.
- 5.7 Gail thanked Spike for his report and the meeting agreed that Spike should be asked to provide future meetings with an update on apprenticeships.

Action: Anna to invite Spike to future Board meetings to provide updates on apprenticeship activity.

6 Annual Statement of Priorities (ASoP)

- 6.1 The Chair invited the meeting to discuss the draft ASoP covered by a paper prepared by Peter O'Brien.
- 6.2 The meeting agreed with a proposal from Mary Vine-Morris that some of the context and actions from last year's ASoP should be carried forward into this year's statement.
- 6.3 Sarah asked if the wording for London Ambitions could include a reference to the Careers for Londoners action plan, along with highlighting the post-16 trajectory work being undertaken. She also asked if it would be possible to make a reference to supporting the most vulnerable pupils who are most at risk of going missing from school or being excluded.
- 6.4 The Board agreed that a framework for a three year vision to 2023 should be presented to its next meeting.

Action: Peter to make changes incorporating suggestions and re-circulate to Board for final sign off. Peter to present a framework for a three year vision to 2023 to the next Board meeting.

7 Revised Terms of Reference – Operational Sub-group

- 7.1 The meeting agreed to an amendment to the proposal submitted for its consideration to the effect that sub-regional representation by local authorities should be agreed with ALDCS. Subject to that change, the Board agreed revised terms of reference of the Operational Sub-Group.

Action: Peter to incorporate revisions to OSG Terms of Reference.

8 AOB

- 8.1 Mary said that the 'Love our Colleges Campaign' is continuing with a hundred and forty-six MPs signed up. The focus is now on ensuring increased funding for both delivery and pensions.
- 8.2 Derek Harvey advised that DWP is working closely with the Careers and Enterprise Company's Enterprise Advisors in its programme of engaging with schools on careers advice.

Date of the next meeting: Thursday 6 June 2019, 10am – 12noon, London Councils

Actions and Matters Arising from 28 March 2019 Young People's Education and Skills Board meeting

ACTION POINTS	ACTION OWNER	STATUS	UPDATE
Under Item 4. Post-16 Trajectories Review - Yolande Burgess and Phil Rossiter, MIME Consulting, to take forward the key points of the discussion to the Project Steering Group and bring the final report to the next Board meeting of 6 June	Yolande Burgess/Phil Rossiter	Open	An update on the draft report will be provided at the 6 June meeting
Under Item 5. Performance Update, a draft response to the consultation on Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications to be considered at the next Board meeting of 6 June	Yolande Burgess/Peter O'Brien	Open	
Under Item 5. Apprenticeship Update, Spike van der Vliet-Firth to be invited to future meetings to provide a regular policy update for this area of work	Anna-Maria Volpicelli	Closed	The new policy officer for this area to be invited on appointment
Under Item 6. Annual Statement of Priorities, Peter O'Brien to make changes incorporating member's suggestions and re-circulate to Board for final sign off. Peter to present a framework for a three-year vision to 2023 to the next Board meeting.	Peter O'Brien	Closed	Actioned and signed off
Under Item 7. Revised ToR for Operational Sub-group, Peter to incorporate revisions to OSG Terms of Reference	Peter O'Brien	Closed	Actioned and signed off
ACTION POINTS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING(S)			
OTHER MATTERS ARISING			
DECISIONS TAKEN BY CHAIR TO BE REPORTED			

Blank Page

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Pledges to Londoners - Young People

Item: 4

Report by Yolande Burgess **Job title** Strategy Director

Date 6 June 2019

Telephone 020 7934 9739 **Email** yolande.burgess@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This paper provides information about the [Pledges to Londoners](#) agreed by the Leaders of London's councils and shows the relationship with the annual statement of priorities and work plan agreed by the Young People's Education and Skills Board.

It also suggests how the *Pledges to Londoners* could be best communicated to young people.

Recommendation Board members are asked to:

- endorse a joint project between the Young People's Education and Skills team and Partnership for Young London to explore, with young people, the relevance of the pledges to young people in the capital and bring back to the Board any actions that may stem from this investigation.

1 Background

1.1 London Councils' Leaders' Committee has published a series of Pledges to Londoners¹, which the Leaders and Mayors of all 32 London boroughs and the City of London have jointly agreed to work together to deliver. Spread across seven policy areas, the Pledges represent a comprehensive set of plans for joint action that will improve life for Londoners by 2022. The themes and pledges are connected by the common thread of how local borough leadership integrates public services to deliver against the big challenges facing communities across London.

1.2 There are 46 specific pledges to *all* Londoners, across the seven key policy areas:

- housing
- better health and care
- supporting business growth and inclusive growth
- crime and public protection
- transport and the environment
- funding London
- new ways of working.

2 Relationship with Young People's Education and Skills Priorities

2.1 In respect of the work of the Young People's Education and Skills Board, some Pledges relate directly to the Board's Vision 2020, Annual Statement of Priorities and operational work plan:

¹ <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/who-we-are/pledges-londoners>

- addressing the increases in costs of supporting young people with Special educational needs and disabilities
- ensuring post-EU funding continues to provide as much support to Londoners as the current EU ESIF programme
- improving and increasing careers advice and work experience for all young people
- extending skills devolution to 14 to 19 provision
- working with London's businesses and government to reform the Apprenticeship levy.

3 Young People and the Pledges to Londoners

3.1 Partnership for Young London has approached the Young People's Education and Skills team with the idea of exploring the relevance of the pledges to young people in the capital through a series of activities, for example:

- a call out to youth councils and Children in Care Councils to source thoughts and ideas around each priority area
- a joint session with lead members and young people to discuss how the pledges can make a positive difference to young people
- a task and finish process, led by young people, to take forward actions that bring the pledges to life/demonstrate how the pledges are being honoured locally

3.2 Children and young people (those aged from 0 to 24) make up 31 per cent of London's population². Engaging young people to help local borough leadership integrate public services to deliver against the big challenges facing communities across London may offer some critical insights into how to maximise positive impact in our communities.

4 Recommendations

4.1 Board members are asked to:

- 4.1.1 endorse a joint project between the Young People's Education and Skills team and Partnership for Young London to explore, with young people, the relevance of the pledges to young people in the capital and bring back to the Board any actions that may stem from this investigation.

² GLA Population Projections - Custom Age Tables: [Housing-linked projection incorporating data from the 2016 SHLAA](#)

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Vision for Young People's Education and Skills in London to 2023 Item: 5

Report by	Peter O'Brien	Job title	Regional Commissioning Manager
Date	6 June 2019		
Telephone	020 7934 9743	Email	peter.obrien@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary	This paper provides the Board with a draft framework for the development of a new vision for young people's education and skills in London to 2023.
Recommendation	Board members are asked to discuss the proposals in this paper and agree the framework that the Young People's Education and Skills team can develop in conjunction with the Operational Sub-Group.

1 Background

- 1.1 The Young People's Education and Skills Board meeting of 28 March 2019 agreed to develop a vision for young people's education and skills in London in 2023 and asked that a framework of the vision statement should be provided for further consideration.
- 1.2 This paper sets out the steps taken to develop the framework and an outline of the further action to finalise the vision.

2 Developing the Vision

- 2.1 The diverse perspectives of its stakeholders are the major strength of the Young People's Education and Skills Board. We have at our disposal a considerable body of research, principally:
 - 2.1.1 Intelligent London, which provides local analysis of national data
 - 2.1.2 The London Datastore maintained by Greater London Authority (GLA) Economics;
 - 2.1.3 London Councils and partner research, for example the annual Higher Education Journey of Young Londoners, the recently published London Post-16 SEND Review and the forthcoming report on London Post-16 Trajectories
 - 2.1.4 Intelligence from organisations such as Partnership for Young London, which provides valuable insight into the opinions of young people.
- 2.2 The evidence supporting the development of the Mayor of London's strategies (for example City for All Londoners and Skills for Londoners and the related action plans) also provide a rich source of data to support the development of a vision for 16 to 19 education and skills.
- 2.3 The starting point of the vision is the analysis of this range of evidence and identifying the key issues for the 16 to 19 phase of education. It will be vital to ensure that the

Board's vision is placed in the context of other overarching strategies developed by the London Councils and Mayor and considers the viewpoints of other partners.

- 2.4 In parallel, engaging with the Operational Sub-Group (OSG) provides added assurance in the relevance of the issues at a local authority level, and in ensuring the practical implementation of our proposals.

3 Framework

- 3.1 Attached at Annex 1 is a broad framework for the Board's consideration.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 Following discussion by the Board, the Young People's Education and Skills team will continue discussions with partner organisations. We will modify the framework as necessary and work with OSG members to produce a draft vision statement for the next Board meeting, where we will seek additional input from Board members. Further refinement of the draft will enable the vision to be finalised by the end of March 2020 (before the 2020 election purdah period).

5 Recommendations

- 5.1 Board members are asked to discuss the proposals in this paper, highlighting any amendments, omissions etc., and agree the framework that the Young People's Education and Skills team can develop in conjunction with the OSG.

Framework for the Young People's Education and Skills Board Vision 2023

1. Introduction

- We are not proposing to provide a separate evidence base to the vision statement, but to reference out to the body of research through which we have defined the key issues for London (for example, Intelligent London, London Datastore/GLA Economics, Higher Education Journey of Young Londoners, Education Trajectories) and some key national research (for example Youth Employment UK).
- We propose to restate the importance of the 16 to 19 phase as a distinct transition point in the education and skills system in London, paying reference to the contribution Board members make to the formulation of policy and strategy through joint membership of other key forums.
- Although we do not want to move away from the emphasis on participation, achievement and progression, we propose to take a broader view of what 'success' means from a young Londoner's perspective:
 - Young people in London having purposeful, fulfilling and personalised outcomes that enable them to contribute to the economic, social, political and cultural life of an inclusive world-class city.
 - "A City for all Londoners - making sure Londoners, employers and businesses get the skills they need to succeed in a fair, inclusive society and thriving economy"
 - 16 to 19 education in London being recognised as a crucial phase in overcoming disadvantage, raising aspiration, providing opportunity for advancement, achieving personal growth and contributing to the development of London.

2. Acknowledgements

- We intend to place the Board's vision in the context of London Councils' *Pledges to Londoners*, the London Industrial Strategy (currently under development) and the Mayor's strategies (principally the *City for All Londoners* and *Skills for Londoners*)
- We should place 16 to 19 in the context of the whole system: pre-16 providing the inputs and raising aspiration; availability and accessibility of post-18 destinations shaping aspiration and endeavour.

3. The story of London

- We propose to restate and refresh the story of London, the Board's core beliefs and partnership principles
 - The Board's core beliefs, as expressed in the last vision, remain a valid expression of the long-term structural changes in the system that would work best in the interests of London – its young people, businesses and communities.
 - There are partnership goals that we propose to add, including: working towards a lifelong learning continuum that is not just a deficit reduction (second chance/reactive) model; integrating education, skills and employability support; devolution.
- We plan to highlight the main strengths of 16 to 19 in London
 - The range of the curriculum offer
 - The quality of learning opportunities
 - Extensive progression options to both employment and further study

- The main issues for London
 - Family background remains the biggest determinant of outcomes at Key Stages 4 and 5, progression to higher education (HE), careers destinations and working life income/benefit dependency
 - There is a link between family characteristics (income, employment history, family stability, educational attainment) and individual characteristics of young people – for example the health and well-being of young people and their ambitions in life. Young people (and adults) with special educational needs and disabilities experience specific barriers to advancement.
 - Access to top professions seems a privilege: work experience, internships and apprenticeships are often dependent on word-of-mouth. Pathways into some careers are opaque and only well-placed families can navigate them unaided.
 - Relatively large numbers of young people are insufficiently prepared for transition between Key Stages 4 and 5; and, following Key Stage 5, for transition either to employment, further study, or the challenges of independent adulthood.

4. Taking actions

- We intend to focus on those actions we can realistically take or influence over a three-year period that both take steps towards the longer-term goals and make a difference to the success of young people.
- We shall be guided by the OSG in proposing this set of actions and shall discuss the measures we intend to take with a range of partners to ensure synergy and complementarity.

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Performance Update: Participation, Achievement and Progression

Item: 6a

Report by: Peter O'Brien **Job Title** Regional Commissioning Manager

Date 6 June 2019

Telephone 020 7934 9743 **email:** peter.obrien@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary This paper provides the Board with an update on the levels of participation of young Londoners in education and training, their level of achievement and progression at the end of learning.

Recommendations Board members are asked to note the content of the report.

1 Background and introduction

- 1.1 This paper provides the Board with an update on the three core themes in Vision 2020 and the annual statement of priorities (participation, achievement and progression).

2 Participation

- 2.1 Recent Board meetings have discussed the level of participation in London and the proportion of young Londoners who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). The reports to the Board had been based on data that is now only published annually.
- 2.2 The latest annual participation figures are published by the Department for Education (DfE) "so that members of the public can make informed decisions about the performance of their own local authority" with regard to the duty "to encourage, enable or assist young people's participation in education and training" (§68, Education and Skills Act 2008). The headline data is in Table 1 below.

	Proportion of 16 and 17 year olds recorded as participating in:							Participation rate change in year (ppts)	Current activity not known to LA
	Full-time education and training	Apprenticeship	Work-based learning	Part-time education	Employment combined with study	Other	Total		
England	84.8%	5.5%	1.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	92.5%	+0.5	2.3%
London	91.1%	2.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	94.9%	+0.5	2.2%

Table 1: Type of activity

- 2.3 The supporting spreadsheets that make up the DfE's publication confirm the position previously reported to the Board:
- 2.3.1 participation is higher among young females than young males (96.8 per cent compared with 93 per cent)
- 2.3.2 the participation of white young Londoners is the lowest of the major ethnic groups covered in the report
- 2.3.3 the participation of young people with an Education, Health and Care Plan (or statement of Special Educational Needs) is 2.5 percentage points lower than

those without (92.8 per cent compared with 95.3 per cent). London's participation rate of young people with SEN or disabilities is the highest of all regions;

2.3.4 Participation rates vary in boroughs from 90 per cent to 98.4 per cent. Figures for young people who are NEET or whose status is not known to their local authority are calculated slightly differently (and based on three-month averages) and range from 0.9 per cent to 3.1 per cent for NEET and 0.4 per cent to 13.5 per cent for activity not known.

2.4 The latest monthly statistics from the National Client Caseload Information System (NCCIS) are shown below in Table 2. The figures for both NEET and activity not known are lower in London than the national average. The overall position in London is largely unchanged from the same period last year.

	Academic age 16-17						
	NEET	NEET %	Not known	% not known	NEET and NK	% NEET and NK	Quintile
ENGLAND	31,804	2.8%	27,132	2.4%	58,936	5.3%	
LONDON	3,337	1.9%	3,868	2.2%	7,205	4.2%	
Barking and Dagenham	189	3.2%	26	0.4%	215	3.7%	1
Barnet	98	1.3%	49	0.6%	147	1.9%	1
Bexley	102	1.8%	68	1.2%	170	3.0%	1
Brent	101	1.4%	83	1.1%	184	2.5%	1
Bromley	127	1.9%	48	0.7%	175	2.6%	1
Camden	84	2.7%	31	1.0%	115	3.7%	2
City of London	-	0.0%	1	1.9%	1	1.9%	
Croydon	246	2.8%	181	2.0%	427	4.8%	3
Ealing	94	1.3%	124	1.7%	218	2.9%	1
Enfield	115	1.4%	304	3.7%	419	5.1%	3
Greenwich	125	2.1%	173	2.9%	298	5.0%	3
Hackney	107	2.1%	105	2.1%	212	4.2%	2
Hammersmith and Fulham	18	0.8%	19	0.8%	37	1.6%	1
Haringey	107	2.0%	409	7.7%	516	9.7%	5
Harrow	60	1.2%	39	0.8%	99	1.9%	1
Havering	109	1.9%	50	0.9%	159	2.8%	1
Hillingdon	155	2.4%	139	2.1%	294	4.5%	3
Hounslow	109	1.9%	106	1.8%	215	3.7%	1
Islington	59	1.8%	94	2.9%	153	4.8%	3
Kensington and Chelsea	33	2.5%	27	2.0%	60	4.5%	3
Kingston upon Thames	56	1.8%	57	1.8%	113	3.7%	1
Lambeth	131	2.4%	329	6.1%	460	8.5%	5
Lewisham	115	1.9%	164	2.7%	279	4.6%	3
Merton	78	2.0%	44	1.1%	122	3.1%	1
Newham	175	2.1%	192	2.3%	367	4.3%	2
Redbridge	147	1.9%	83	1.1%	230	3.0%	1
Richmond upon Thames	52	1.8%	35	1.2%	87	3.1%	1
Southwark	120	2.3%	218	4.2%	338	6.5%	4
Sutton	55	1.3%	93	2.1%	148	3.4%	1
Tower Hamlets	183	3.1%	218	3.7%	401	6.8%	5
Waltham Forest	86	1.5%	122	2.1%	208	3.6%	1
Wandsworth	75	1.9%	218	5.5%	293	7.5%	5
Westminster	26	1.1%	19	0.8%	45	1.8%	1

Table 2: NEET and 'not known', NCCIS (April 2019)

3 Achievement

3.1 No further significant updates have been produced to the data previously reported to the Board. The position in London was discussed at the last Operational Sub-Group (OSG) meeting. The OSG is continuing to investigate local variations in performance and actions that are supporting young people's attainment.

3.2 The next major update on achievements will be the provisional analysis of 2018/19 academic year, which is expected in the autumn term.

3.3 Detailed data on achievements - at borough and provider level - is available through Intelligent London (<http://www.intelligentlondon.org.uk/>).

4 Progression

- 4.1 The destinations data given at the November Board meeting was final. Interim figures for 2017/18 are expected before the end of the start of the next academic year.

5 Recommendation

- 5.1 Board members are asked to note the content of the report.

Blank Page

Young People's Education and Skills Board

Policy Update

Item: 6b

Date: 6 June 2019

Contact: Peter O'Brien

Telephone: 020 7934 9743

Email: peter.obrien@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary	This paper outlines the key changes affecting 14 to 19 policy since the last Young People's Education and Skills Board meeting.
Recommendation	Board members are asked to note the information in this paper and decide any actions necessary.

1 Consultation on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and Alternative Provision Funding Arrangements

- 1.1 The Department for Education (DfE) has issued a call for evidence on *Provision for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities, and for those who need alternative provision: how the financial arrangements work*. The call does not address concerns over the amount available for high needs, which it says will be "carefully considered in the forthcoming spending review", but seeks information about how funding is distributed, whether there are aspects of the current funding system that are driving up costs without improving outcomes, and what changes might be made in the future.
- 1.2 Through the Operational Sub-Group (OSG), the Young People's Education and Skills team has asked boroughs to share with us their responses to the call for evidence. London Councils will submit a response and will circulate a draft to the Board for comment before the closing date of 31 July 2019.

2 Consultation on Children Not in School

- 2.1 The DfE published the results of its consultation on elective home education on 2 April 2019 and has concluded that there is good reason to consult further on possible legislation relating to support for families that educate their children at home.
- 2.2 In this latest consultation, the government is proposing to create a duty on every local authority in England with responsibility for education to maintain a register of all children under compulsory school age in its area who are not a registered pupil at a school maintained by a local authority, a non-maintained school, an alternative provision academy, or a registered independent school¹. Introducing this proposal requires a change in primary legislation, though its implementation is intended to be through regulations.
- 2.3 The consultation also covers two subsidiary issues concerning children who would otherwise be in scope of the proposed register but whose education is already known to

¹ Academies and free schools are in legal terms registered independent schools

the local authority and those who are flexi-schooled (i.e. registered at a school but educated at home for a large part of the week).

- 2.4 As this is primarily an issue affecting pre-16, London Councils' response is being led by colleagues in the Policy and Public Affairs team, though there is an opportunity for any Board member who wishes to provide comments on the proposals to do so via the Young People's Education and Skills team.

3 Timpson Review

- 3.1 Edward Timpson published his report into school exclusions² on 7 May 2019. Mr Timpson was commissioned in March 2018 to review exclusion practice, explore how head teachers used exclusion and establish why some groups of pupils are more likely to be excluded than others. The report comments on several examples of good practice but found too much variation in exclusion practice and concludes there is more that can be done to ensure that every exclusion is lawful, reasonable and fair; and that permanent exclusion is always a last resort.
- 3.2 It makes 30 recommendations, built on four key pillars: a system that delivers ambitious **leadership** for every child at all levels; better **equipped** schools able to meet those expectations; the right **incentives** so that schools are clearly recognised for inclusive practice and using exclusion appropriately; and stronger **safeguards** to ensure that no child is being inappropriately pushed out of school or education altogether. Most of the recommendations are aimed at government, and include:
- 3.2.1. schools should be made responsible for the children they exclude and accountable for their educational outcomes
 - 3.2.2. there should be limits on fixed-term exclusions (though the report does not provide any further detail on what this might mean in practice)
 - 3.2.3. new measures should be put in place to tackle off-rolling
 - 3.2.4. there should be a stronger role for local authorities
 - 3.2.5. a Practice Improvement Fund should be set up to help: councils and schools deliver good interventions for children; investment in buildings and facilities; and enough funding for schools to support pupils and so avoid exclusions
 - 3.2.6. there should be accessible, meaningful and substantive training on positive behaviour cultures
 - 3.2.7. schools should submit information about pupils who are in off-site Alternative Provision and social workers notified when a child-in-need is moved into such provision
 - 3.2.8. guidance on in-school units should be strengthened
- 3.3 The government, in its response to the review (published the same day), acknowledged the importance of the issues highlighted in the review; accepted many of the review's recommendations (which it has translated into revised guidance); reinforced the right of head teachers to exclude pupils as a last resort; and committed to review outstanding areas in the summer with a view to further consultation in the autumn – this would cover how to make schools accountable for the outcomes of permanently excluded pupils and extending support for Alternative Provision.

² https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/799979/Timpson_review_of_school_exclusion.pdf

4 Careers Guidance

- 4.1 We are planning to refresh London Ambitions into a succinct statement of how London's local authorities and their partners, building on current practice, can best contribute to the Mayor of London's Careers for Londoners Action Plan. We will provide the next Board meeting with a detailed update.

5 T Levels

- 5.1 Following a procurement exercise, the DfE has appointed the Association of Colleges (AoC) to run its T Level transition framework support programme. Working with its partner, The Challenge Network, the AoC will support volunteer T Level providers who get involved in phased implementation of the T Level transition framework up to the first delivery in 2020 and 2021. They will
- 5.1.1 support advisory panels to contribute to developing the content of the transition framework
 - 5.1.2 provide support for participating providers to develop, package and deliver their local transition programme
 - 5.1.3 encourage and facilitate these providers to explore different approaches to implementing certain elements of the transition programme.
- 5.2 On 19 May 2019 the Secretary of State announced a new package of support to employers offering work placements in T Levels³. This included several changes in the arrangements, such as allowing placements to take place with more than one employer.

6 Post-16 Funding

- 6.1 The AoC has continued the Love Our Colleges campaign, with a week of activities from 13 to 19 May 2019. In addition to the debate in the Commons in March, questions were again raised with Ministers on 29 April and by the Education Committee the following day.
- 6.2 During the week of activity, the AoC published a report on *Skills Shortages and the Funding Gap*⁴. The report continues to press the case for increased funding and other changes in the funding system, with a strapline that the economic impact of the funding gap could amount to £3.3 billion in lost output over the next five years.
- 6.3 Other organisations have also published reports on funding and the effects of cuts in spending. The reports below have greatest relevance to our work and have been cited by other leaders in the sector:
- 6.3.1 *16-19 Education Funding (Trends and implications)* by the Education Policy Institute⁵. This report comments on funding trends, the impact on teaching and provision, teacher pay and Ofsted ratings. It recommends reviewing the adequacy of 16 to 19 funding and the impact on the curriculum and on disadvantaged students.
 - 6.3.2 *Resolution Foundation: Growing Pains: the impact of leaving education during a recession on earnings and employment*⁶. This report looks back at the financial crisis, which led to the biggest recession in living memory: output fell by almost five per cent, a bigger drop than in the downturns of the early 1990s or early

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/more-support-to-help-employers-offer-t-level-industry-placements>

⁴ <https://www.aoc.co.uk/sites/default/files/AoC%20skills%20shortages%20and%20funding%20gaps%20may%202019%20-%20Final.pdf>

⁵ https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/16-19-Funding_EPI-2019.pdf

⁶ <https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/app/uploads/2019/05/Growing-pains-final-report.pdf>

1980s. The report points out that, as in previous recessions, younger people bore the brunt of this: the unemployment rate for those aged 18 to 29 rose by four percentage points and average real earnings for this group fell by nine per cent. This report looks at the specific fortunes of the “crisis cohort”, those who left education between 2008 and 2011. By analysing outcomes for those who entered the labour market in the aftermath of the 2008-09 recession, this paper estimates how severe an impact the downturn had on people who left education in its midst, and how long-lasting these effects were. It says that it is also the first attempt to compare this recession with previous ones, shedding light on how the effects differ and what this can tell policy-makers about how to prepare for future downturns.

7 FE Skills Index

- 7.1 The government published the Further Education Skills Index⁷ on 29 April 2019. The Index shows how the aggregate value of skills supplied by the Further Education (FE) system each year has changed over time. The Index makes an estimate of the value added to all adult learners and apprentices in England who have successfully completed their courses.
- 7.2 The report finds:
 - 7.2.1 The overall Skills Index, covering both apprenticeships and classroom-based learning, has decreased each year since 2012/13, before flattening out in 2017/18.
 - 7.2.2 The value-added for classroom-based training has decreased during this period, due to a large decrease in the number of achievements at Full Level 2 and Full Level 3. In 2017/18 the value-added for classroom-based training decreased by two per cent on the previous year.
 - 7.2.3 However, the picture for apprenticeships is markedly different to that of adult classroom-based qualifications. The value-added for apprenticeships has increased year-on-year since 2012/13. In 2017/18 it increased by two per cent on the previous year due to an increase in the volume of achievements of advanced and higher apprenticeships, as well as a small shift towards sectors with higher wage returns.
 - 7.2.4 For apprenticeships, the Skills Index does not estimate the added-value of the switch from frameworks to standards. As full outcome data for apprentices achieving apprenticeship standards is not yet available, the two per cent increase is likely to be a conservative estimate. In 2017/18 achievements on standards made up one per cent of all apprenticeship achievements.

8 Review of Post-16 Qualifications at level 3 and below in England

- 8.1 As discussed at the last Board meeting, the Young People's Education and Skills team has, in conjunction with the Operational Sub-Group, prepared a draft response to the consultation and this is attached as an annex to this paper. The Board is asked to make any necessary amendments and agree the response.

⁷ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/797902/FE_Skills_Index.pdf

9 Oversight Policies

- 9.1 The DfE published an updated policy on “College Oversight: Support and Intervention” on 1 April 2019⁸: The policy sets out a strengthened approach to supporting and intervening in colleges, including:
- 9.1.1 a preventative function to identify problems sooner
 - 9.1.2 extended triggers for early and formal intervention
 - 9.1.3 a strengthened role for the FE Commissioner to review provision in a local area
 - 9.1.4 use of independent business reviews to support effective decision making
 - 9.1.5 introduction of the statutory college insolvency regime.
- 9.2 At the same time as the College policy was published, the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) published new guidance on its oversight of Independent Training Providers (ITPs)⁹. The guidance says that the ESFA will be taking a revised approach to assessing the risks associated with ITPs and that it will cease taking intervention action based on the 16 to 19 and 19+ education minimum standards of performance under the current policy after the application of 2017 to 2018 data. The guidance, however, acknowledges the need for a different way of dealing with apprenticeships as the system moves from frameworks to standards. A more fundamental review of apprenticeship measures is therefore envisaged and, in the meantime, the ESFA will apply the current minimum standards policy to apprenticeship provision (all ages) in 2020 (academic year 2019 to 2020), based on 2018 to 2019 data, for one final year.

10 Ofsted Framework – results of the consultation

- 10.1 Following a consultation, Ofsted has now published a final version of the new Education Inspection Framework¹⁰ that will come into operation from autumn 2019. The new Framework focuses on the curriculum offer and reduces some of the data requirements. In the FE and Skills sector, high needs and special educational needs and disabilities provision will be inspected as a ‘type’ of provision (along with education programmes for young people, apprenticeships and adult learning programmes).
- 10.2 The changes have been made to ensure that inspections focus on what students actually learn, ahead of results, and so discourage the culture of “teaching to the test”. It includes a new judgement (“Behaviour”) to give parents reassurance on protection from bullying.

11 Review of Post-18 Education and Funding

- 11.1 The report of the independent panel chaired by Dr Philip Augar¹¹ was published on 30 May 2019. A report on the benefits of post-18 education for individuals and society¹² and two linked reports on attitudes towards the student finance system¹³ were published alongside the main report. Changes in post-18 provision affect the prospects of 16 to 19-year-olds progression into further study and will be of interest to the Board.
- 11.2 Whilst the report has attracted media attention with regard to its narrative about student loans and higher education (HE) - the review recommended reducing university tuition

⁸ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/790991/College_Oversight_Support_and_Intervention.pdf

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/how-esfa-maintains-oversight-of-independent-training-providers-itps/esfa-oversight-of-independent-training-providers-operational-guidance>

¹⁰ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/801429/Education_inspection_framework.pdf

¹¹ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/805127/Review_of_post_18_education_and_funding.pdf

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/benefits-of-post-18-education-for-individuals-and-society>

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/attitudes-towards-the-student-finance-system>

fees to £7,500 and reintroducing maintenance grants for some students - the report makes clear that the panel examined the whole of post-18 provision, whether in FE or HE.

- 11.3 The Review established some basic principles that are covered in the report:
 - 11.3.1 post-18 education benefits society, the economy, and individuals
 - 11.3.2 everyone should have the opportunity to be educated after the age of 18
 - 11.3.3 the decline in numbers of those getting post-18 education needs to be reversed
 - 11.3.4 the cost of post-18 education should be shared between taxpayers, employers and learners
 - 11.3.5 organisations providing education and training must be accountable for the public subsidy they receive
 - 11.3.6 government has a responsibility to ensure that its investment in tertiary education is appropriately spent and directed
 - 11.3.7 post-18 education cannot be left entirely to market forces
 - 11.3.8 post-18 education needs to be forward looking.
- 11.4 The full report is 217 pages and makes over 50 recommendations that are captured within these top-level proposals:
 - 11.4.1 strengthening technical education
 - 11.4.2 increasing opportunities for everyone
 - 11.4.3 reforming and refunding the FE college network
 - 11.4.4 bearing down on low value HE
 - 11.4.5 addressing HE funding
 - 11.4.6 increasing flexibility and lifetime learning
 - 11.4.7 supporting disadvantaged students
 - 11.4.8 ensuring those who benefit from higher education contribute fairly
 - 11.4.9 improving the apprenticeship offer.
- 11.5 The recommendation that the reduction in the core funding rate for full time 18-year-olds should be reversed is consistent with the Young People's Education and Skills Board's goals.
- 11.6 The Prime Minister welcomed the report but cautioned that it would be for her successor to determine how to implement its recommendations through the forthcoming spending review.
- 11.7 Although most of the sector response to the report has been positive, some in HE have voiced concern over the effect of changes in HE funding.

12 London Industrial Strategy and use of Adult Education Budget

- 12.1 London Councils has been working closely with the Greater London Authority (GLA) in its consultations on London's Industrial Strategy and proposed use of the Adult Education Budget from 2020 (the second year of its devolution to the Mayor of London).
- 12.2 The Industrial Strategy is one of the documents that the Mayor of London is mandated to produce and must be based on principles established by central government. The aims around which the consultation is taking place are:

- 12.2.1 ensuring access to good work in all London communities
- 12.2.2 supporting inclusive innovation in London
- 12.2.3 maximising London's contribution to its local economies, its neighbouring regions and ultimately to nationwide prosperity.
- 12.3 PAPA is co-authoring the section on the skills and employment vision for London around the themes of access and participation; meeting the needs of the economy and employers, and; delivery of a strategic city-wide offer. The vision is for a more integrated skills and employment offer for London. The Young People's Education and Skills team will add a distinct 16 to 19 element into the development of the vision.
- 12.4 The GLA is also consulting about possible changes to the devolved Adult Education Budget in its second year of operation.

13 Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee report on Children's Services

- 13.1 The Commons Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee published the report of its inquiry into the funding of local authorities' children services¹⁴. The inquiry sought to establish whether funding of statutory and non-statutory services was sufficient and secure the long-term sustainability of local authorities' children's services.
- 13.2 The report makes a series of recommendations under two broad headings: Central government funding and systemic change. It concludes that funding is insufficient and calls for an increase of £3.1 billion in un-ringfenced core grant funding until 2025. It wants this to be included in the Spending Review. The Committee commented that "we heard about a system at breaking point, increasingly reliant on the goodwill of social care professionals; the children supported by the care of councils are some of the most vulnerable in society and deserve better. We hope that our recommendations for change will act as a catalyst for the Government to co-operate with local authorities to secure the short and long-term sustainability of these services."
- 13.3 The latest *London Intelligence Briefing*¹⁵ from the Centre for London think-tank also expresses concern over the level of funding cuts experienced by the capital's local authorities.

14 Social Mobility Commission – State of the Nation 2018 to 2019

- 14.1 The Social Mobility Commission's sixth State of the Nation report¹⁶, published on 30 April 2019, highlighted entrenched inequality in Britain from birth to work. The report was based on extensive analysis of data and showed that "the wide gap in school attainment and in the income of the rich and the poor has barely shifted". It cites the statistics to show that "being born privileged still means you usually remain privileged". The Commission therefore makes a wide-ranging set of recommendations, including a call "for a significant increase in funding for all 16 to 19 year olds and a special student premium for the disadvantaged".

¹⁴ <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/1638/1638.pdf>

¹⁵ <https://www.centreforlondon.org/publication/the-london-intelligence-issue-8/>

¹⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-mobility-in-great-britain-state-of-the-nation-2018-to-2019>

15 IFS-Deaton Review

- 15.1 Continuing on the theme of inequality, the Nuffield Foundation is funding a *Review into Inequalities in the Twenty-First Century*¹⁷ to be carried out over a five-year period by the Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) and headed by Sir Angus Deaton. The report introducing the review states that “inequalities in different dimensions – income, work, mental and physical health, families and relationships – are likely to reinforce one another. They may result in, and stem from, other inequalities in wealth, cultural capital, social networks and political voice. Inequality cannot be reduced to any one dimension: it is the culmination of myriad forms of privilege and disadvantage”.

16 Youth Jobs Gap

- 16.1 A report from National Institute of Economic and Social Research and Impetus (*Youth Jobs Gap: Establishing the Employment Gap*¹⁸) is the first in a series that the organisations plan to produce. Using data of approximately 3.5 million young people (nearly everyone leaving state secondary schools between 2007 and 2012), the report confirms that early disadvantage impacts youth employment outcomes and that the position has not changed over time. Local differences in this ‘employment gap’ indicate that some areas are tackling the negative effects of disadvantage on young people’s school-to-work transition more successfully than others, but this is often unrelated to education success.
- 16.2 The report concludes that “improving education outcomes is a necessary, but not sufficient condition to lower the disproportionately higher NEET rates of disadvantaged young people. Better local support for them and investment in e.g. youth employability services and careers advice are also very relevant”.
- 16.3 The Young People’s Education and Skills team and other colleagues at London Councils are investigating the possibility of Impetus providing a London-specific report.

17 Overeducation

- 17.1 The Office for National Statistics published an article on *Overeducation and hourly wages in the UK labour market; 2006 to 2017*¹⁹ that examines overeducation in the UK labour market using Annual Population Survey (APS), for 2006 to 2017 including analysis on the relationship between overeducation and wages. It found that:
- 17.1.1 In 2017, around 16 per cent of all those in employment aged 16 to 64 years were overeducated (had more education than required for their job); the corresponding figure for graduates (with first degree or equivalent) was around 31 per cent.
- 17.1.2 In 2017, 21.7 per cent of those who graduated before 1992 were overeducated, whereas the corresponding figure for those who graduated in 2007 or later was 34.2 per cent.
- 17.1.3 There is a wage penalty associated with overeducation, although overeducated employees earn positive return on wages, this is significantly lower compared with those who are matched to their jobs.

¹⁷ <https://www.ifs.org.uk/inequality/>

¹⁸ <https://impetus.org.uk/assets/publications/Report/Youth-Jobs-Gap-Establishing-the-Employment-Gap-report.pdf>

¹⁹ https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/nationalaccounts/uksectoraccounts/compendium/economicreview/april2019/overeducationandhourlywagesintheuklabourmarket2006to2017?utm_source=govdelivery&utm_medium=email

- 17.1.4 In 2017, the overeducation rate was similar for women and for men, however the wage penalty for overeducation was somewhat higher for men than for women; this suggests that overeducation does not contribute to gender pay gap.
- 17.1.5 Recent graduates experience lower pay penalty on overeducation compared with non-recent graduates.

18 The Independent Commission on the College of the Future

- 18.1 The Independent Commission on the College of the Future has been established under the auspices of the AoC and brings in a panel of experts representing different aspects of education and skills provision throughout the UK, although none of the Commissioners represent local government (from any of the home nations). The Commission aims to establish what is wanted and needed from our colleges in ten years' time.
- 18.2 The Commissioners will be holding round-table and workshop events with a broad range of individuals and organisations across the UK and will be meeting as a Commission five times throughout the year. They will be supported by an expert panel, who will be feeding in throughout the process. A final report will be published in Spring 2020.
- 18.3 The Young People's Education and Skills team has drawn the Commission's attention to the body of research we have commissioned over the past few years and research that is in progress.

19 Youth Voices Census

- 19.1 Youth Employment UK launched the results from the 2019 Youth Voice Census, a survey capturing the experiences of more than 3,000 14 to 24 year-olds as they transition between education and employment. The survey found that:
- 19.1.1 Young people are benefitting from developments in careers education policy and knowledge is on the rise, but still has some way to go before there is real parity with higher education.
- 19.1.2 There is a gender divide in careers education: females are more likely to have theoretical/academic pathways discussed with them, whereas males are more likely to have support to pursue vocational routes.
- 19.1.3 Young people fear that their mental health, where they live, experience of work and a 'lack of jobs' will prevent them from finding work.
- 19.2 The key recommendation from young people is that they would benefit from personalised services that enable them to talk to someone who will help them make sense of their options and early career journey.

Proposed Response from London Councils Young People's Education and Skills**Principles – Purpose and necessity**

How could we extend this clarity of purpose to all qualifications at level 3 and below so that the intended outcome for the student is clearer? Please give reasons for your answer, including any examples of how this may be achieved.

In principle, there is great merit in every qualification having clarity of purpose; but there are some practicalities that need to be addressed:

- The reform of qualifications and the introduction of T Levels is still very much work-in-progress and the T Level framework is still under development. For example, Transition Programmes are only now being designed and tested and there has been very little additional work on the Bridging provision between A Levels and T Levels that was envisaged by the Sainsbury Review.
- We do not recommend taking firm action now that may close options when these key aspects of the reform programme have not yet been finalised.
- Care should also be taken not to exclude preferences of individual students and employers.
- Over the past 10 years, options for people pursuing courses of study other than A Levels have narrowed, in particular, pathways for those who have not achieved the benchmark at Key Stage 4 have eroded considerably, for example, in 2017/18 there were 24,300 fewer intermediate level apprenticeship starts for under 19-year olds compared to 2015/16.
- The new Ofsted inspection framework provides the basis for ensuring that careers education programmes communicate post-16 pathways clearly to pupils, for example by implementing the requirement to explain vocational and technical education on a par with theoretical and academic learning. Unless T Levels and Apprenticeships are proposed to young people at years 9 to 11, for example through taster days, there is likely to be limited take-up.
- The measure of any curriculum or qualification should be how effectively they provide progression pathways, irrespective of age.

Are standalone qualifications in personal, social and employability skills necessary? Please give reasons for your answer and tell us if there are other changes we should explore to support these skills being delivered in other ways. Please make clear if your answer varies in relation to different student groups, such as adults or those with SEND.

No. Personal, social and employability skills should be embedded into qualifications.

Recognition of skills acquisition is possible without a qualification, for example, through processes to measure the progress and achievement of learners on non-accredited learning programmes, such as Recognising and Recording Progress and Achievement (RARPA).

These principles hold true, irrespective of the student's age.

Principles - Progression

What additional evidence or data could we use to determine whether current qualifications or types of qualifications, including Applied General qualifications, are delivering successful outcomes?

In addition to the published reports on destinations after key stages 4 and 5 (we note that key stage 5 data does not cover all qualifications) the government should make use of the Longitudinal Education Outcomes data.

At present, there is no consistent data on progression/destinations of year 14 students. This is making it difficult for local authorities to have meaningful dialogue with schools and colleges in their area.

How could we better use data about student outcomes to monitor and assess the success of future qualifications?

We recommend moving towards sustained outcomes (i.e. for at least six months after entry), following the example of the Longitudinal Education Outcomes data.

The absence of regular and reliable data means that local authorities' interaction with schools and colleges is presently limited to reviewing early-leavers and the flow into NEET.

Principles – Quality

Are the quality features listed under paragraph 55 the right starting point for framing future quality requirements for publicly funded qualifications? Please give reasons for your answer.

We agree that the features listed in paragraph 55 are a useful starting point (see also below) for developing quality-based criteria for qualifications.

Are there certain quality features, such as size (that is, number of guided learning hours) or assessment processes that should be given particular priority? Please give reasons for your answer and if yes, please state which features should be a priority.

The robustness of the assessment process is a priority for the quality of any qualification; whereas the number of funded guided learning hours and the quality of teaching are priorities in the valuation of the qualifications. Improving the value of qualifications at or below level 3 therefore depends on increasing the number of guided learning hours required for their completion; compared to England other countries have significantly larger programmes of study post-16 (Hodgson & Spours (2016) Tuition time in upper secondary education (16-19): Comparing six national education systems, University College London Institute of Education).

Are there particular quality principles that we should consider for adults? Please give reasons for your answer.

Employment is not the only aim of adult learning provision below level 3. Learners often have aims related to social inclusion that need a separate set of quality criteria. As adults often pay for their courses, they are well-placed to make their own judgements about the quality of their provision.

Applying our principles – Our broader ambitions

At level 3, what purposes should qualifications other than T Levels or A Levels serve:

a) for 16 to 19-year olds? Please give reasons for your answer.

b) for adults? Please give reasons for your answer.

Making T Levels and A Levels the “qualifications of choice” pre-supposes that students can exercise choice effectively and that high-quality supply is readily available in sufficient quantity and well-delivered throughout England.

Some specialist awards for arts/dance/music may not feature as either T Levels or A levels. This could affect progression into careers in the creative sector.

There is a significant proportion of young people following mixed, or blended, models of provision, combining A Levels and applied general qualifications. A range of opportunities need to remain open to young people.

We urge some care in moving forward too rapidly in developing two mutually exclusive learning pathways without first having the ability to bridge between them, as set out in both the Wolf and Sainsbury Reports.

There is a significant risk that policy is cherry-picking from Wolf and Sainsbury and deviating from their concepts. It may no longer be possible to use these reviews to justify the government’s intended actions.

How should we determine “overlap” in relation to:

a) overlaps with T Levels? Please give reasons for your answer.

b) overlaps with A Levels? Please give reasons for your answer.

The statistics provided with the consultation suggest that there is a significant number of students following both applied general qualifications and A Levels. We recommend that the government undertakes more forensic research into the curriculum pathways these students follow and their outcomes.

How could post-16 qualification reform and broader study best support more people to progress directly to level 3 after key stage 4?

We advocate that, where the student and their learning institution agree, provision should be made for fully funded three-year post-16 programmes. Whether A Level, T Level or other routes are being pursued, the system should have the capacity for greater individualisation based on prior attainment at key stage 4 and students’ personal circumstances.

Whilst the average point score for Level 3 students has improved steadily over recent years, this is in the context of a substantial reduction in the number of students accessing Level 3. In 2017, Department statistics state that the number of Level 3 students (in England) entered for a Level 3 qualification was 429,364. In 2018 it was 326,897 students - 102,467 fewer students, a 24 per cent reduction in the cohort size. This suggests that recent qualification reform is hindering progress directly to level 3 after key stage 4.

How could post-16 qualification reform and broader study best support more people to achieve at level 3?

Although we are unable to add insight from the perspective of delivery, we would be happy to work with the Department to showcase best practice in London.

If level 2 qualifications are intended to lead directly to employment, what quality principles should apply? Please give reasons for your answer including any examples of good practice.

Although we should rely on Ofsted as the primary national authority on the quality of education, we should also be able to consider sustained outcomes, when the goal of a programme of study is to secure employment.

What are the key roles that qualifications at level 1 and below need to play?

In our experience, qualifications at Level 1 and below play two distinct roles.

First, for students who have not attained at least level 1 at key stage 4, achieving level 1 post-16 - possibly in a different educational setting - should lead to achieving personal, social and employability skills and an ability to progress into level 2. For students whose achievement and progression may be dependent on their individual ability, or personal circumstances, achievement and progression may not be possible in the timeframes proposed in this consultation.

Secondly, for students who have not had access to a broad curriculum offer at Key Stage 4, it can provide the basic underpinning that helps students either in a distinct career pathway or to progress onto level 2 (for example, through a Traineeship or an Apprenticeship).

Are there additional principles we should apply to level 1 and below? Please give reasons for your answer, indicating clearly where it refers to the qualifications themselves or broader study.

No answer

Securing early progress

Are there any additional equality impacts of withdrawing approval for funding for pre-existing qualifications that are not included in the equality impact assessment published alongside this consultation? Please give reasons and any supporting evidence for your answer.

Applied general qualifications have not been reviewed and reformed at the same pace as have other qualifications and this should be upper-most in the Department's plans.

While many of the principles are rational, far more attention should be paid to the consequences of withdrawing funding from qualifications that are in use.

In general, it would be better to wait until T Levels are firmly established before withdrawing funding from existing technical qualifications. We are especially concerned that moving too quickly on withdrawing funding from existing qualifications will severely limit study options, for example, the option to study a combination of A Levels and applied generals on a blended timetable.

Do you agree with the proposed criteria for identifying qualifications with no enrolments? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes. It does not seem appropriate to have approved qualifications if there have been no enrolments; the criteria proposed appear to be fair.

Are there specific reasons that a qualification with no enrolments should remain approved for funding? Please give reasons for your answer.

No, we do not think that there are reasons why a qualification with no enrolments should remain approved for funding.

Do you agree we should consider removing approval for funding from qualifications with low enrolments? Please give reasons for your answer.

In our experience, some niche provision can result in qualifications having relatively low take-up. Funding for these qualifications should only be withdrawn:

- after separate consultation with the providers delivering them and relevant sector skills bodies, and
- if an agreed alternative is in place.

Are there specific reasons that a qualification with low enrolments should remain approved for funding? Please give reasons for your answer.

No answer

Shaping the next stages of the review

Do you have any comments regarding the potential impact the principles and other features outlined in this consultation may have on students from disadvantaged backgrounds, those with SEND or others with a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010? Please give reasons for your answer.

The statistics provided with the consultation show that there is a large proportion of students studying below level 3 post-16 who have SEND, and there is an over-representation of students in receipt of Free School Meals and Looked-After Children.

Fully funded three-year programmes will offer students the opportunity to continue to progress and/or take advantage of study programmes that support achievement and progression that is not qualification based.

Are there any additional impacts that you think should be included in the general impact assessment in our second stage consultation? Please give details of any additional impacts below.

We support moving towards sustained outcomes as an evaluative measure. The measure could include:

- employment in an occupation relevant to the qualification attained
- improvements in standards of living over time (e.g. salary levels, career advancement)

These have been features of employment initiatives funded by local authorities in London, for example the Skills Escalator in west London.