



**“OTHER” PROVISION:
definition, categorisation and funding**

Eddie Burch

July 2002

Edited by: Maggie Greenwood LSDA

Preface

The research project was funded by the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) in autumn 2001 as part of its core grant to the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA).

In April 2001, the LSC took over the funding of all post-16 provision and the Learning and Skills Act 2000 removed the schedule 2/ non-schedule 2 divide. The LSC now funds provision leading to qualifications which are included in the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and courses outside the NQF, currently identified as defined as “other provision”.

The “other provision” is further sub-divided by the LSC into:

- Externally certificated – including “pseudo” qualifications, enrichment activities and internally devised qualifications
- Internally certificated
- No certification

These courses do not and are not intended to, meet the criteria for approval into the NQF. They represent a large body of work carried out in Further Education (FE) colleges and Adult and Community providers; they include Access courses, enrichment activities, specialist SLDD programmes, and non-schedule 2 type activities.

The LSC needs to define this work in a more appropriate way and is looking for a refinement of the categories identified. It also needs to know the extent of this provision in FE colleges in particular. The aim of the research was to look at the how FE colleges, Sixth Form Colleges and specialist colleges understood the term “other provision”, delivered this provision and its importance in their portfolio of work. In addition, the research looked at issues related to funding “other provision” and how this might develop in the future.

The research highlights the importance of “other provision” in Widening Participation, Inclusiveness, and Lifelong Learning.

Acknowledgements:

The Learning and Skills Development Agency wishes to acknowledge the help given by College Principals and their Staff for providing information and advice to enable this survey to be completed. We would also like to thank staff at the Learning and Skills Council who have supported the research project, in particular Jon Gamble and Kully Jones.

CONTENTS

TOPIC	PARAGRAPH
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	A - E
INTRODUCTION	1 - 2
BACKGROUND	3 - 7
SCOPE OF THE PROJECT	8
PROJECT DEFINITIONS	9 – 10
METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH	11 – 15
ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY AND COMMENTS	
PART A	
How is “other provision” interpreted at the College?	16 – 38
PART B	
How is “other provision” delivered?	39 – 48
How is “other provision” managed?	49 – 55
How is “other provision” funded?	56 – 84
CONCLUSIONS	
Introduction	85 – 91
What are FECs delivering?	92 – 98
How should “other provision” be categorised?	99 – 107
What reasons are there for the LSC to fund “other provision ” when there is valid certification in the NQF?	108 - 112
RECOMMENDATIONS	113 – 120
APPENDICES	
Appendix I	The Interim Report
Appendix II	Pilot colleges
Appendix II	The composite completed questionnaire.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A “Other Provision” Project Purpose

The LSC established the project with three objectives:

- To investigate what Further Education Colleges are currently providing under the category of “other provision” in 2001/2002
- To develop a categorisation for “other provision”
- To assist the LSC to develop a clearer policy on funding “other provision”.

B Project Activity

A survey was undertaken of all 450 colleges in England by questionnaire.

The questionnaire was prepared after guidance had been sought on the format from a range of colleges.

It was then piloted with ten colleges which included FE, Tertiary And Sixth Form Colleges.

After changes suggested from the pilot, the questionnaire was distributed. 108 replies were received.

C Analysis of Survey Results

Analysis of the results of the survey contained in the body of the report has led to the following conclusions and recommendations. The recommendations fall into three categories:

Categorisation
Funding
Guidance.

D Conclusions

Introduction

- 1) Government vision for the learning age is clear and unequivocal.
- 2) Broad policies such as widening participation, inclusiveness, lifelong learning and key indicators of high quality learning; achievement, retention, attainment and progression, have been well trailed and incorporated into the learning culture of colleges.
- 3) Challenging targets have been set as performance indicators of effectiveness and efficiency in meeting them.

- 4) The quality of qualification and “other provision” is subject to inspection based on the C.I.F.
- 5) The introduction of the Learning and Skills Act and the concomitant changes in the funding and categorisation of courses have required significant re-writing of guidance. Evidence suggests that not all of this guidance appears to have been fully understood. Some colleges, for example, seem to continue to use schedule 2/non schedule 2 to categorise “other provision”.
- 6) While colleges seem to be completely clear about the big picture and their roles and responsibilities in securing the learning age, changes to funding arrangements, categorisation of courses and the transfer of strategic and operational policy from FEFC to LSC have without prejudice to any party, created some misconceptions and misunderstandings of “other provision”, its role and its funding.
- 7) That the links between widening participation, inclusiveness and “other provision” have been made is unquestionable. Equally the embedding of “other provision” within curriculum areas is a welcome and encouraging development offering, as it does, a safe starting point for many students returning to learning and providing them with easily recognisable pathways to progression. However what triggers funding for “other provision”, at what level and for how long, is less clear for some colleges.

What are FECs Delivering?

- 8) Colleges are using “other provision” as a means to meet their responsibilities for providing learning opportunities outside “qualifications” outlined in the Learning and Skills Act.
- 9) Most colleges (87%) were clear about how they interpret “other provision” given the guidance in the questionnaire.
- 10) The range of courses with no certification identified by colleges in the review is wide. This seems to represent the genuine attempts by colleges to respond to Government policy and initiatives by reaching and engaging an increasingly diverse clientele with equally diverse needs, aspirations and goals.
- 11) College returns in the survey indicate that “other provision”:
 - Is embedded in all 14 CIF curriculum areas
 - Is delivered through a variety of mechanisms but chiefly throughout the college structure in all or a number of sections, departments, schools or programme areas
 - Is managed mainly by managers within discrete departments, schools and programme areas but also by a designated manager in the case of thirty colleges
 - Is delivered in partnership with other providers, particularly with L.E.A.s and, in a few cases (15 colleges), it is franchised out to selected providers on a purchaser/provider basis
 - In most cases (79 colleges), “other provision” comprises between 1-10% of all college units of provision
 - “Other provision” is delivered on main college sites fully integrated into the college and off-site to pick up requirements to base learning opportunities in communities and in outreach locations

- Over 50% of learners in “other provision” are learners who are new to a programme in the year or are learners who have not accessed formal learning for two years.

12) Reference to non-schedule 2 in a small number of returns implies, for example, the continuation of non-schedule 2 pilot courses aimed at widening participation amongst disadvantaged and non-traditional learners. In another case “non-schedule 2 as was” was quoted as a working definition for “other provision”.

13) Overall, colleges are providing a wide range of “other provision” to meet agendas for:

- Widening participation
- Supporting neighbourhood regeneration
- Economic development
- Personal development.

It is significant provision which is seen by colleges to encourage and attract and engage new learners and provide enriching opportunities in and for, local communities by making good use of college facilities.

14) The description of uncertificated courses and the embedding of “other provision” in curriculum areas plus the emphasis on basic skills, whether discrete or embedded, IT. and introductory courses, ensures that “other provision” has learning and the achievement of learning goals at its heart. While it is not possible to say that there are no courses which are not built on an activities approach it would be wrong to equate “activity” with non-learning. The lists of learning opportunities, working definitions and priorities underpinning why colleges are delivering “other provision” all suggest that effective learning is the goal for both tutors and learners.

How should “other provision” be categorised?

15) Results from the survey of colleges show that 87% of those who responded interpreted “other provision” as in the provisional LSC categorisation:

- Courses Externally Certificated (outside the National Qualifications Framework) 86%
- Courses Internally Certificated (outside the National Qualifications Framework) 93%
- Courses with no Certification 81%.

16) Working definitions of “other provision” were confirmed by 53 respondents to question 4 as the LSC definition of “other provision” as follows:

- Courses not in Sections 96/97 (18% of respondents)
- Courses not in the NQF (13% of respondents)
- Broad definition as per LSC definition (9% of respondents)

in the funding document.

These results confirm that the LSC categorisations of “other provision” are seen as valid interpretations by a high proportion of colleges. Also almost 50% of respondents’ working definitions were in accord with LSC guidance.

- 17) 47% offered a wide range of other interpretations. These also may give some clues to, and influence the creation of a refined categorisation e.g. courses where outcomes are agreed with the learner.
- 18) Augmenting the answers to the main question was a number of interesting and pertinent comments about the definition “other provision” (Para 29). There was, for example, concern that the term “other provision” had “no stability”. Another college felt that by implication “other provision” was seen to be less important than Sections 96 and 97’s provision. While a third suggested that “other provision” might be replaced by “The title of Engagement Programmes to embrace those individuals and groups who have experienced disadvantage and exclusion and would require different approaches of support for them to feel confident enough to engage in formalised learning”.
- 19) The list of college priorities for providing “other provision” may also lead to the construction of a refined categorisation by embracing, for example:
 - Widening Participation (38 references)
 - Progression Opportunities (20 references)
 - First Step Learners, Stepping Stones (16 references)

the three priorities that received most references.

- 20) However, care is need when using these terms. Progression for example, implies a kind of “vertical” movement up a learning ladder, yet for some students, progress will be as one respondent put it “jagged”, progressing across a horizontal plane of learning also, acquiring new knowledge and skills in different locations and by various means.

While the body of the report gives much food for thought to those framing any new categorisation, the review, taken as a whole, provokes a number of parallel suggestions. Any future revised “other provision” categorisation should:

- Reflect those parts of the Remit Letter intended to underpin and secure non qualification learning, particularly those outlined in paragraph 26
- Have as its starting point, recognition of the diversity of groups and individual learners accessing “other provision”, their goals and aspirations
- Recognise the healthy breadth of organisations offering “other provision” both in colleges and in partnership with them and other partners
- Make clear the need to offer flexibility and easy access to learning to take account of the diversity of clients and the vulnerability that many of them can feel in formal learning locations particularly in “qualification” courses.

- 21) In many respects the responses in the review depict “other provision” as a safety net of learning for adults which offers adult learners the opportunity to re-establish key links of their choice between:
- Learning and personal development
 - Learning and economic development
 - Learning and social cohesion/community regeneration and sustainability
 - Learning and health and fitness
 - Learning and citizenship.
- 22) It will then be important to retain at least the breadth of the current categorisation, ensure that learning is of a sufficiently high quality, valid and relevant to learner needs. “Other provision” will need to be provided by a provider with appropriate staffing facilities and resources which will be attractive to, and engage and sustain learner interests and be open to rigorous but sensitive quality assurance. This approach to quality assurance should recognise the difficulties that many “other provision” learners may encounter with approaches to monitoring, assessment and evaluation that they may consider to be over-structured, bureaucratic and even threatening.

What reasons are there for the LSC to fund “other provision when there is valid certification in the NQF?

- 23) Making learning opportunities available to all is a basic tenet of the Government’s policy in the Learning and Skills Act 2000. It is clarified in the Secretary of State’s Remit Letter in greater detail where key elements of the LSC’s role for the post 16 sectors are spelled out. “The Council’s remit ranging from basic skills to higher level skills, will enable it to bring a much sharper strategic perspective to arrangements for lifelong learning. It is also the first time that a public body has had a statutory duty placed upon it to encourage participation in learning.” (Paragraph 7). Clearly there is an expectation that resources will be made available to fund these learning goals.
- 24) Within the Remit Letter the Secretary of State also outlined a strategy for adult learning which does not always require a response through qualifications and is “other provision”.
- 25) Responses from colleges detailed in this report demonstrate just how much of “other provision” provided by them meets the Secretary of State’s requirement for post 16 learning and which therefore should draw down appropriate funding as the following examples suggest:

Examples of Government Requirement (Post 16) the Act 2002

Responses through “Other provision” Noted in College Responses

Basic skills training
 Filling the technology gap
 First rung provision
 Stepping stone work leading to qualification
 Widening Participation
 Lifelong Learning

Adult basic education (ESOL)
 IT. courses – Computers for the terrified
 Short taster, bite-sized courses
 Short steps before vocational course
 Women’s courses, supporting disabled people
 Adult Education

Draw new learners into learning

Family literacy

Small businesses skills' needs

Equal opportunities

Helping the disadvantaged

Exploring art, music. Literature

Negotiated learning, return to learn,
introductory courses

Family learning – parenting

Courses for businesses, welding, blacksmith etc

Sign language, assertiveness training

SEN, LD, information and research training

Self-development courses, art and crafts.

- 26) In framing a policy for funding “other provision” the following issues should be taken into account:
- That qualification courses cannot meet the learning needs of all people
 - That responses to many learning needs will only be met by courses that are outside the National Qualifications’ Framework
 - That in order to achieve widening participation and inclusion, learning will have to start at a point often decided by the student and that will require flexible, patient, sometimes 1-1 support
 - That reaching and connecting with learners and informing them about what opportunities exist will require novel, specialist publicity and marketing
 - That in costing funding for “other provision” account should be taken of:
 - The need to cover concessions – sometimes 100% for disadvantaged and low income learners
 - The need to keep learner/teacher ratios low for some Basic Skills, SEN, Courses for the Disabled
 - The need to provide crèche facilities where and when appropriate
 - The need to base courses in outreach locations away from main centres/colleges
 - The need to provide loaded funding allocations and learning support in addition to tutors, e.g. (signers) for some categories of provision ABE, Learning Difficulties and Disabilities and SLDD
 - That teaching staff working in “other provision” courses will need specific training and updating
 - That quality assurance and human resource support will be critical to monitor and report on the quality of provision and keep staff up to date
 - That providing “other provision” requires significant management support to secure at least an equivalent high quality to qualifications provision. The management may be within an established faculty, school or department or within a discrete section
 - That account should be taken that some “other provision” students may take longer than one course, one term or even one year to achieve progression onto a qualification course or onto a course offering more advanced work but without a qualification.
- 27) If “other provision” in whatever guise is to meet its vital role in helping to achieve a learning society, it should continue to be funded in recognition of the diverse responses it is required to make to meet the learning needs of a diverse population now becoming fully aware of what should be available for them.

E RECOMMENDATIONS

Categorisation

- 28) The importance of “other provision” in meeting Government learning, economic development, personal development, social stability, environment, health, citizenship and community regeneration targets should be reflected in how it is re-categorised, badged, funded and managed.
- 29) The refinement of the categorisation of “other provision” should retain at all costs, the flexibility inherent in the current title so that the diversity of learner needs and particularly those of new learners may continue to be met at, at least current levels.
- 30) Colleges should be involved through appropriate channels or on working groups established to discuss the future categorisation and funding of “other provision”. Representatives might be invited from colleges which responded fully and helpfully to the questionnaire.

Funding

- 31) Any future refined categorisation and funding policy for “other provision” should demonstrate conspicuously which elements of Government vision and strategic and operational policy objectives “other provision”, or its successor is intended to achieve. For example there is a “widening participation”.
- 32) Discussions aimed at developing a clearer policy for funding “other provision” should ensure that colleges continue to be enabled to meet the needs of disadvantaged and disabled learners fully and to satisfy equal opportunities, and access and progression pre-requisites for all learners. There is a need for rigorous monitoring and evaluation of provision to confirm that “other provision” achieves these objectives.
- 33) This research has shown that non-qualification courses, “other provision”, are an important aspect of colleges’ provision in meeting Government guidelines and in responding to the learning needs of many adults and therefore should continue to be funded. Courses which are internally certificated outside the NQF and those which are externally certificated outside the NQF should also continue to be funded. Care should be taken to ensure that no qualification is available for these courses within the NQF.
- 34) Funding “other provision” should take account of the need:
 - To manage and sustain practice of the highest quality
 - To fund concessions, keep learner/teacher ratios low and provide for learning support in certain areas e.g. basic skills
 - For specific teacher training and human resource development for staff
 - To ensure that widening participation objectives are met through high quality “other provision”.

Guidance

- 35) An early rationalisation of various current guidelines to colleges on which courses are eligible in the “qualifications” category and which in “other provision”, should be undertaken and colleges informed as an interim measure to help end the confusion which appears to exist, for example reference to “X codes” as “other provision” on the Qualification Aims Database (see Para 63). It is anticipated that this will be achieved through the Learning Aims Database.

LEARNING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

OTHER PROVISION PROJECT 2002

Introduction

1. The purpose of this paper is to report on the findings of the Other Provision Project.
2. The project was required to undertake three tasks:
 - To investigate what English Further Education Colleges are currently providing under “other provision” in 2001/2002
 - To develop a categorisation for other provision
 - To assist the LSC to develop a clearer policy on funding “other provision”.

Background

3. The FEFC formerly funded provision under Schedule 2 to the 1992 Act.
4. In 1999/2000 it funded forty pilot projects to deliver non-schedule 2 programmes. A further 34 projects were additionally funded in 2000/2001. Altogether, a total of £30 million was invested in this programme over the two years.
5. From April 2001 the LSC took over the funding of all post 16 provision. The Learning and Skills Act 2000 removed the divide between schedule 2 and non-schedule 2 provision.
6. The LSC now funds provision leading to qualifications which are included in the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). It also funds courses outside the NQF currently identified and defined as “other provision”. These programmes have been provisionally categorised by the LSC. However these categories need refining.
7. In order to plan for future funding the LSC needs robust evidence in which decisions can be made.

Scope of the Project

8. The scope of the Project includes:
 - a) To investigate what “other provision” Further Education Colleges (FECs) are delivering by reviewing:
 - How colleges are interpreting “other provision” outside the NQF?
 - Whether FECs are still delivering non-schedule 2 programmes?
 - Why they are still delivering non-schedule 2?
 - Whether colleges are delivering “learning” rather than “activities”?
 - b) How should “other provision” be categorised?
 - What types of category should there be?
 - What is the impact of the NQF?
 - What is the purpose and value of “other provision”?
 - What is the impact of certification?
 - c) What reasons are there for the LSC to fund other provision when there is valid certification in the NQF?
 - Why should the LSC wish to fund a particular programme?
 - What issues need to be taken into account when developing policy?

Project Definitions

9. In order to provide a defined baseline for colleges participating in the Project the LSC confirmed that there were two broad types of provision eligible for Council funding as follows:

Qualifications:

These are learning aims which lead to qualifications approved by the Secretary of State under Sections 96 and 97 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000

Other Provision:

Those as learning aims which do not lead to qualifications as defined above.

10. Other provision was then further clarified in an LSC Document which differentiated between courses and categorised them as follows:
 - To date “other provision” is available to all eligible learners over compulsory school age and may include:
 - Learning aims with external certificates of attainment (Validated Access to HE – Local OCN)
 - Learning aims with internal certificates of attainment (College Certificates)
 - Learning aims with attainment and no certification (A record of attendance only).

Methodology of the Research

11. The methodology for the research and analysis was based on the following principles:

- That colleges should be engaged at all stages of the research
- That the main instrument of research would be a questionnaire
- That the questionnaire would elicit both quantitative and qualitative information necessitating both open and closed questions
- That the questionnaire would seek to answer five questions in 2 parts:

PART A How is “other provision” interpreted at the college?

PART B How is “other provision” delivered?
How is “other provision” managed?
How is “other provision” funded?
How much “other provision” is being delivered?
Why is your college delivering “other provision”?

12. All types of incorporated colleges in the post 16 sector (450) were contacted in the sample surveyed including FE, 6th Form, Tertiary, Agricultural and External Institutions. In all, 108 questionnaires were returned completed (24%), six were returned as a nil return and two returns were too late to be included in the analysis.

13. The research was undertaken in a number of phases as follows:

Phase 1 (Jan – April 2002)

- Initial consultations with LSC, LSDA and 2 colleges about the Project and Pilot Study to gauge the extent to which they were sound and would be received positively
- Discussions with two colleges – 1FE and 1 tertiary, regarding the content and framework of the draft questionnaire
- Discussions of the draft questionnaire and letter with LSC and LSDA officers
- Revised letter and draft questionnaire “field tested” with 2 FE College Principals (FE)
- Colleges for the “Pilot” survey selected to represent a geographical spread and variety of type in England i.e. 5FE, 1 FE/HE, 2 Tertiary and 2 Sixth Form Colleges (Total 10) – Two wished to withdraw.

Phase 2 (April/May 2002)

- Visits made to 8 colleges to counsel their views
- Pilot Survey of eight colleges by visit
- Suggested amendments discussed
- Questionnaire amended.

Phase 3 (May/June 2002)

- Survey sent to all 450 colleges in England
- Replies received from 108 completed and 6 nil returns.

Phase 4 (July)

- Analysis of completed questionnaires and draft report writing.
14. The number of respondents (106) is disappointing, particularly as every effort was made to counsel colleges about the survey, its format and the questions.
 15. The interim report, written before the questionnaires were despatched is attached as appendix I. The final questionnaire is attached – Appendix II. The comments made in this report are therefore based on evidence from less than 25% of colleges. This fact must be taken into account when considering the conclusions and recommendations.

Analysis of the Survey and Comments

Part A

16. This section was aimed at determining what colleges understand and categorise as “other provision”. They were asked to indicate how they interpret “other provision” by answering six questions including:

- Providing examples of courses with no certification
- Providing their own working definition of “other provision”.

How is “other provision” interpreted at the college?

Question 1. Do you interpret “other provision” as courses externally certificated (Outside the National Qualification Framework NQF)?

17. 86% (91) respondents interpreted “other provision” as Courses externally certificated (Outside the National Qualifications Framework).

Question 2. Do you interpret “other provision” as courses internally certificated (Outside the NQF)?

93% (99) respondents interpreted “other provision” as Courses Internally Certificated (outside the NQF).

Question 3. Do you interpret “other provision” as courses with no certification?

81% (86) respondents interpreted “other provision” as Courses with no Certification.

Comment

18. An average of 92 colleges (87%) who responded interpreted “other provision using the definition: for “other provision” produced by the LSC. This high level of unanimity should be considered when seeking to refine categories of “other provision”.

Examples of courses with no certification.

19. 79% (84) of respondents provided examples of courses with no certification. While colleges were not asked to place them in categories they are listed here in broad bands to provide some coherence to the return:

Provision Type: () References made

- Adult Education (1)
- Enrichment (6th Form Colleges) Sports, Arts, Tutorial Programme, Religious Education (6)
- Widening Participation (4)
- Short Taster – Bite Sized (14)

- Introductory Courses “Welding, Photography, Watercolours, Gardening” onto City and Guilds Accreditation (Agricultural College) (1)
- Short Steps before vocational courses (4) (6-30 hours)
- Summer School (1)
- Pre- Access/Access to HE (1)
- Full range of OCN (1)
- Duke of Edinburgh’s Award (2)
- Return to Learn (1)
- Part Time Prospectus (1)
- Non-Schedule 2 (1)
- Non- Schedule 2 Pilots. Continuing Non-Schedule 2. All former Non-Schedule 2 (2, J, E, F, G) (4)

Curriculum Type

- Adult Basic Education (5)
- Adult Basic Introductory and “Very Low Level” Courses (5)
- ESOL (2)
- SEN/LD – Self Development, Information and Research Training, Negotiated Learning (3)
- ITC – Computers for the Terrified. Computers for the over 50s. Specialist I.T. Course. Short RSA I.T. (10)
- Individual Learning Plans – negotiated Courses, LEAP to Section 96/97 Courses. ILP Negotiated Learning. (3)
- Rural Skills (Agricultural Colleges) Examples quoted include: Shotgun Training (1), Blacksmith, Agricultural machinery, Beginners Shearing (2)
- Arts and Crafts (3)
- Self Development, Interest, Leisure (1). Examples include: Carpentry, Cookery, Languages, Keep Fit, Line Dancing, Motor Cycle maintenance, Painting, Singing, Wine Tasting, Yoga
- EFL (Overseas Students) (1)

Community Type

- Community Education – Learner Driver, Risk Assessment, African Dance (1)
- Family Learning – Parenting, Pram to Playgroup, Helping Children with SATS, Family Learning (1)
- Supporting Disabled People – I.T. for the Disabled, (Hearing Loss), Sign Language (1)
- Women’s Courses – Examples quoted include: Assertiveness, Range of Women’s Courses (1)
- Community Sports Leaders (1)

Miscellaneous

- College attendance certificate (1).

Comment

20. The range of responses to identifying courses with no certification and the emphasis within the broad classification suggests a clear reflection, in most colleges who responded, of the Government's vision outlined in both "The Learning Age – A Renaissance for a new Britain (1998)" and in the Secretary of State's Remit Letter to the Chairman of LSC 2000. In the Forward to the Learning Age the Secretary of State says, "*As well as securing our economic future, learning has a wider contribution. It helps make ours a civilized society, develop the spiritual side of our lives and promotes active citizenship. Learning enables people to play a full part in their community. It strengthens the family, the neighbourhood and consequently the nation. It helps us fulfil our potential and opens doors to a love of music, art and literature.*"

To realise our ambition, we must all develop and sustain a regard for learning at whatever age. For many people this will mean overcoming past experienced which have put them off learning. For others it will mean taking the opportunity, perhaps for the first time to recognise their own talent, to discover new ways of learning and to see new opportunities opening up. What was previously available only to the few can, in the century ahead, be something which is enjoyed and taken advantage of by many." While in the text of The Remit Letter the Secretary of State (Paragraph 26) outlines a vision not only for learning which leads to qualification but for that which does not. "*In developing the range of provision, you will need to manage carefully the balance between learning which leads to qualifications and learning which does not, but which still offers value and progression. In achieving this balance the Council will need to ensure proper account is taken of what people want and need; that qualification routes are available to adults as well as to young people; and that more first rung provision is made available to help the more disadvantaged.*"

21. Courses in the "Provision Type" category mirror the ideals of widening participation in learning. Emphasis on short taster, bite sized and introductory courses, pre access and return to learn opportunities suggest a positive, thoughtful approach by colleges to encouraging adults back into learning through the "non certificated" course route. These courses also demonstrate the "first rung" on a progression route for students' principle. The language used in the course descriptions confirms this: "taster courses, enrichment, short steps to vocational courses, introductory". In the majority of responses, courses with no certification seem to aim to offer a sensitive re-entrance into learning with the eventual offer of access to a wider range of further opportunities available to students' requirements. Four respondents gave a link to "non – schedule 2" as a description of non- certificated courses.
22. The "Curriculum Type Category" of non-certificated courses submitted in the survey is wide. It focuses on the particular importance of these courses in developing a broad canvas of key skills which provide a passport for people to reach their full potential at home, at work and in the community. It also confirms that colleges are offering equality of opportunity to those who have not been successful at school and who need help to achieve basic skills, self-development and a widening of cultural and creative enrichment.
23. The broad band of non-certificated courses listed under the "community type category" is the smallest, but as colleges were only asked to give examples this, should not be viewed as the least prevalent type of provision. It can simply be taken to indicate that within the family of colleges, the very important courses aimed at supporting community and family development

and those geared at equipping vulnerable groups can be, and are, delivered through the non-certificated route.

Question 4. Please let us know your own working definition of “other provision”. Is there a different generic title you would prefer to use?

24. 76% of colleges (81) who responded to the questionnaire offered a working definition of “other provision”. The responses are contained in the list below:

WORKING DEFINITION	NO OF RESPONDENTS
a. Courses not in Sections 96/97	19
b. Courses not in the NQF	14
c. Broad definition as per LSC Definition in the funding document	10
d. Courses synonymous with NS2	5
e. Courses aimed at widening participation	4
f. Courses offering progression to vocational qualifications	3
g. Continue with NS2 definition	3
h. Adult Community Learning (No qualifications funded via LEA)	3
i. Provision other than mainstream qualifications	2
j. Short courses with very specific vocational qualifications	2
k. Responses to local demands from industry, employers and community groups	2
l. Provision contributing to employability	1
m. Provision designed to attract learners back in a non-threatening manner	1
n. Low level introductory courses often in outreach locations for those who have not participated in post 16 Education	1
o. Enrichment	1
p. Full cost or corporate provision	1
q. College devised provision for ABE/ESOL/LDLL	1
r. Access to HE	1
s. Access and Pathway Courses	1
t. Courses where outcomes are agreed with the learner	1
u. Courses with no formal assessment	1
v. Courses not funded, no units attached	1
w. Courses not funded directly by the LSC	1
x. Courses with no qualifications attached but which attract funding	1
y. College certificated courses	1.

Comment

25. There is clearly a wide range of working definitions of “other provision” in use.
26. 27% (29) - (a + c), of respondents submitted a definition almost identical to that of the LSC (Courses not in Sections 96/97). It was also referred to as: “Broad definition as per LSC definition”.
27. 7.5% (8) – (d + g) were still using non-schedule 2 or synonymous with NS2 as a guideline.

28. The plethora and diversity of other working definitions suggests that the need for a revised clarified working definition which takes account of the current definition but reflects the vision “other provision” as expressed in the Remit Letter to the LSC from the former Secretary of State “*Not all learning should lead to awards. Encouraging adults back into learning and helping the disadvantaged through relevant provision will also be important.*” Paragraph 26 The Learning and Skills Council Strategic Priorities. November 2000.

29. A number of colleges made suggestions for a preferred definition as follows:

- One college felt that the term “other provision” had no stability
- Another college felt that the title “other provision” implied that “other provision” was less important than Section 96/97 work
- A third suggested that “The title of ‘Engagement Programmes’ would be more useful”. The working definition would embrace those individuals and groups who have experienced disadvantage and exclusion and would require different approaches of support for them to feel confident enough to engage in more formalised learning
- A fourth suggested that “provision outside the NQF” as a title.

Question 5. Is “other provision” described as a discrete area in your:

College Strategic Plan?

SAR?

Development Plan?

30. Responses to the question revealed that “other provision” was described as a discrete provision in:

- College Strategic Plans by 17% of respondents (18 colleges)
- SAR by 13% of respondents (14 colleges)
- Development Plan by 15% of respondents (16 colleges).

Comment

31. The low number of colleges featuring “other provision” as a discrete area in college Strategic Plans, SAR and Development Plans can be interpreted in two ways. Where “other provision” is included as a discrete area, colleges may wish to adjust the focus more clearly on this area of work as a more important part of the overall provision. Conversely it is not surprising that “other provision” is not treated as a discrete and different area in 90 colleges. Evidence in the responses to other questions may also have a bearing on this question. For example answers to question 6 suggest that much “other provision” is “embedded” in the work of department and curriculum areas across the college and would therefore feature as an integral part of their contributions to SAR and development plans.

Question 6. Using the Common Inspection Framework (CIF) fourteen categories, please indicate those curriculum areas in which “other provision” is delivered in the College and indicate, if possible, what approximate percentage of units in each curriculum area your would regard as “other provision”.

32. Overall 93% (99 colleges) completed this exercise. Responses to individual curriculum areas varied according to provision offered at the college. The full response is contained in the completed questionnaire synopsis (Appendix II).

33. Responses to question 6 bear a similarity with those to question 4 concerning working definitions and the examples of courses with no certification. Both provide a much clearer picture of what Further Education Colleges are delivering under the “other provision” banner.

34. While there was some anxiety in a few colleges that not all “other provision” was convertible into units and that only approximate figures were called for, the analysis provided a further insight into how “other provision” is being interpreted as follows:

51% of respondents (54 colleges) indicated that they had “other provision” distributed in at least 7 to 14 different curriculum areas

49% of respondents (52 colleges) indicated that they had “other provision” distributed from 0 – 6 different curriculum areas

8% of respondents (8 colleges) did not indicate provision in any of the CIF categories

22% of respondents (23 colleges) indicated that they had provision distributed in all 14 categories.

35. The distribution of “other provision” based on the percentage of units regarded as “other provision” was variable. The table overleaf details the distribution.

Curriculum Areas in which colleges consider they deliver “other provision” (OP).

<u>Curriculum Area</u>	<u>No of Colleges who have OP in the curriculum area</u>	<u>Approximate % of Units in each area which is regarded as OP</u>			
		<u>25% or less</u>	<u>26-50%</u>	<u>51-75%</u>	<u>75+%</u>
1) Science and Maths	51	46	2	2	1
2) Land Based Provision	43	41	0	1	1
3) Construction	45	41	3	0	1
4) Engineering, Technology & Manufacturing	51	47	3	0	1
5) Business Administration Management and Professional	58	51	5	1	1
6) Information and C.T.	82	70	10	1	1
7) Retailing, Customer Service and Transportation	38	37	1	0	0
8) Hospitality, Sports, Leisure and Travel	60	54	5	0	1
9) Hairdressing & Beauty Therapy	47	46	1	0	0
10) Health, Social Care, Public Services	58	48	7	1	2
11) Visual & Performing Arts & Media	67	59	5	0	3
12) Humanities	61	52	7	1	1
13) English, Languages & Communication	63	55	5	1	2
14) Foundation Programmes	77	51	7	9	10

36. The table below provides evidence of the five curriculum areas in which the most responding colleges are delivering “other provision” as follows:

<u>Curriculum Area</u>	<u>Number of Colleges delivering in the Area</u>
1) Information and Technology	82
2) Foundation Programmes	77
3) Visual and Performing Arts and Media	67
4) English, Languages and Communication	63
5) Humanities	61.

37. There is a slight change in the order when the table below shows the curriculum area with the highest approximate percentage of units regarded as “other provision”.

<u>Curriculum Area</u>	<u>Approximate % of units in each area which is “other provision”</u>			
	<u>25% or less</u>	<u>26-50%</u>	<u>51-75%</u>	<u>75+%</u>
1) Foundation Programmes	51	7	9	10
2) Information and Communication Technology	71	9	1	1
3) Visual and Performing Arts and Media	59	5	0	3
4) English, Languages and Communication	55	5	1	2
5) Humanities	52	7	1	1.

Comment

38. Analysis of both tables suggests that colleges are at least making particularly sound use of “other provision”, to attract new learners onto foundation courses, to fill the information technology skills’ gap, to provide stepping stones to future learning and to respond to communication, cultural, arts and music learning needs. At best “other provision” has an important, if not prolific place in all cases, across all fourteen curriculum areas.

Part B

How is “other provision” delivered?

39. Part B aimed to determine how and why colleges delivered, managed and funded “other provision”. They were asked to answer 19 questions and in particular, to provide their three main priorities for choosing to provide “other provision”.
40. This question was addressed through a number of sub-questions as follows:

Question 7. Is “other provision” led by a discrete section, department, school, programme area?

Question 8. Is “other provision” distributed throughout the college’s structure within all or a number of sections, departments, schools, programme areas?

Question 9. Is “other provision” delivered solely through a range of separately managed projects?

Question 10. Is “other provision” franchised out to selected providers?

Question 11. Is “other provision” delivered in partnership with other providers?

41. Responses to questions 7-11 produced the following profile of delivery of “other provision”:

- Q7. 20% of respondents (21 colleges) claimed to deliver “other provision” through a discrete section, department, school or programme area.
- Q8. 88% of respondents (93 colleges) claimed to deliver “other provision” within all or in a number of sections, departments, schools programme areas.
- Q9. 7% of respondents (7 colleges) claimed to deliver “other provision” solely through a range of separately managed projects.
- Q10. 14% of respondents (15 colleges) claimed to deliver “other provision” through a franchise arrangement with selected providers.
- Q11. 28% of respondents (30 colleges) claimed to deliver “other provision” in partnership with other providers.

42. The discrete departments quoted by colleges (20%), fall into five categories:

- Those which focussed on an adult education theme and had titles such as:
 - Adult Education Division
 - Adult Studies
 - Adult and Community Education
 - Adult Provision

- Adult Continuing Education
- Those that focussed on a community theme such as:
 - Community Education
 - Community Division
 - Community Studies
 - Department of Community Learning
 - Outreach and Community Provision
 - Community Education and Humanities
- Those that had a business theme such as:
 - Business Development
 - Business Unit
- Those that had Lifelong Learning as a theme such as:
 - The Lifelong Learning Centre
 - Lifelong learning for adults
 - The Lifelong Learning Team
- Those that had continuing education as a theme such as:
 - School of Continuing Education
 - Continuing Education
- The miscellaneous group with six specific titles:
 - Short Course Unit
 - Downlands Centre
 - UFI
 - Learn Direct
 - Foundation Programme
 - ESF.

Comment

43. There is a close correlation between the spread of “other provision” throughout 14 curriculum areas and the fact that 88% of respondents (93 colleges) claim to be delivering “other provision” throughout all or some of the college’s departments, schools etc and not through discrete sections.
44. The variety of titles given to the discrete departments may be no more than a reflection of the freedom experienced by colleges when responding to the wide definition of “other provision” given in the guidance to colleges for the changes in funding arrangements for 2000-2001 in the eligible provision section. Alternatively and/or equally it may be an individual college’s idiosyncratic response to the influences of; “The Learning Age” 1998, The Secretary of State’s Remit Letter 2000, the widening participation and inclusion agendas, the obvious responses to Ufi/Learn Direct or a local historical precedent within a college.

45. Very few colleges (7) indicated they delivered “other provision” solely through a range of separately managed projects although these projects may well have been part of the delivery ranged throughout the college structure. This is also corroborated by the comment from a few colleges that they had a problem with the word “solely”. Examples quoted were UFI, contractual arrangements with a L.E.A., off site provision and non-schedule 2 pilots.
46. 15 colleges franchised “other provision” to selective providers, for example, on a purchaser/provider basis.
47. However 30 colleges delivered “other provision” in partnership with other providers. Partnerships described included:
- With the L.E.A.
 - Lifelong Learning Projects
 - A range of outreach and community centre projects
 - ESF, L.E.A. and S.E.E.D.A.
48. The diversity of modes of delivery of “other provision” suggests the close and healthy interrelationship and overlap between “other provision” and “adult community learning”. The Government’s vision, policies and guidelines which currently underpin the roles and provision of the two titles, make no such discrimination. Neither does the public. On the contrary, Government policies would seem to point to the need for even greater coherence between the two, also learners attend opportunities based on their needs, the quality and the value of the provision – not on its bureaucratic name or title. Both “other provision” and adult community learning are critically important in maintaining the balance between opportunities for adults offered through the qualifications led approach and the non-qualifications led approach, to achieving learning goals. These facts seem to point to closer relationships between the two to provide a single curriculum map offering progression which is understood by the providers and, most importantly, by the public.

How is “other provision” managed?

49. The response to this question which complements the previous question on delivery, was answered by 34% (36 colleges). It is answered through the following sub questions.

Is “other provision” managed?

Question 12	by a designated manager
Question 13	by a designated team
Question 14	by a number of managers with discrete departments, schools, programme areas
Question 15	by franchisees
Question 16	by an external manager
Question 17	by another?

50. The responses to these questions did not entirely mirror the returns for the section on delivery. There was however, some correlation for example between “other provision” delivery being led as a discrete department, 20% (21 colleges) and “other provision” being managed by a single manager 28% (30 colleges).

51. Overall the statistics suggested the following profile:

- In 20% of colleges (21) “other provision” was managed by a designated manager. Examples of their titles included; Adult Education Manager, Continuing Education Manager, Widening Participation Manager, Head of School of ICT, Environment Co-ordinator
- In 13% of colleges (14) “other provision” was managed by a designated team: Adult Programme Team, Outreach Team
- In 69% of colleges (73), “other provision” was managed by a number of managers within discrete departments or schools etc. For example by a range of Heads of Department
- In only 12% (13 colleges) was “other provision” managed by franchisees, 3% (3 colleges) by an external manager, community centre manager and 6% (6 colleges) by a selection or by other means. For example Continuing Education, Services to Business.

52. Descriptors of the management of “other provision” fell into a number of categories. The number of categories plus the significant miscellaneous group reflects again the diverse approach to providing “other provision” selected by colleges. The categories included:

Lifelong Learning

Lifelong Learning Manager x 2
Cross River Lifelong Learning Provision

Adult Education

Adult Programme Manager
Adult Education Manager
Adult Programme Team.

Widening Participation

Widening Participation Co-ordinator
Widening Participation Manager

Continuing Education

Head of Continuing Education
Managers + Ace Team
Head of Adult Continuing Learning
Continuing Education Services to
Business Lifelong Learning Centres

Community

Community Centre Manager
Community Studies Management Team
Community Education Manager

Miscellaneous

SMT/Relevant Heads
Short Course Manager
Outreach Team
Centre (Specific) Manager
{ Director of MIS
{ Senior Director
{ Curriculum
{ OCN Leader/Tutor
Head of School of ICT
Enrichment Co-ordinator
Senior Manager External Services
Head of Individual Curriculum Areas
Normal admin as all we do is “other provision”.

Comment

53. The 69% of colleges in which “other provision” was managed by a range of curriculum managers is unsurprising. It mirrors the trend to embed “other provision” in a wide range of curriculum areas and to deliver it in a number of departments, schools, across colleges.
54. These arrangements demonstrate not only a horizontal distribution across colleges in various departments but as the descriptions of courses without qualifications suggest, a vertical distribution within departments at various levels from introductory courses: pre access, first steps, short steps and first rung leading through progression onto qualification led opportunities.
55. The analysis of management types for providing “other provision” also points to a further structural dimension for the work in colleges. For example, there is clearly sufficient outreach work in some colleges to warrant the appointment of an outreach team. Equally the responsibility for “other provision” being given to The Head of the School of ICT in one college reinforces the evidence of I.T. as a curriculum area that provides significant levels of “other provision”. Similar conclusions can be drawn from the importance that some colleges place on using “other provision” to deliver enrichment, short courses and links with external agencies by the fact that they have appointed managers to oversee work in each of these areas.

How is “other provision” funded?

56. This question was covered by four sub-questions as follows:

Question 18. Is “other provision” funded by the LSC through your main allocation funding? LSC via LEA?

Question 19. Is “other provision” funded from specific project funding e.g. LIF, ESL or other?

Question 20. Is “other provision” funded on a “full cost” basis (i.e. is not funded by resources which are drawn down from the LSC to fund tuition and tuition on-costs?)

Question 21. Is “other provision” funded from other funding mechanisms?

57. An analysis of responses showed that:

92% of respondents (98 colleges) fund “other provision” through their main LSC allocation. 40% of respondents (42 colleges) fund “other provision through the LSC via an L.E.A. There is clearly some overlap – mainly where L.E.A.s have a well-structured purchaser/provider type structure for the delivery of adult education.

58. 27% of respondents (29 colleges) fund “other provision” from specific project funding. Examples quoted included SRB, ESF, Excellence in Cities, Yorkshire Fund and Advantage West Midlands.

59. 34% of respondents (36 colleges) fund some “other provision” on a full cost basis which can include fees from students. Examples quoted included; “arrangements with businesses through a centre which provides bespoke services to business (SMEs)”, “some ‘so called’ leisure courses”, “full cost I.T.” and “short courses of less than nine hours except I.T. courses”.

60. 14% of respondents (15 colleges) indicated that “other provision” was funded by other funding mechanisms although replies to this question could easily have been a response to “full cost”, specific projects or L.E.A. funding. Examples included:

- Excellence in Cities DfES
- Learn Direct/Ufi
- Hourly paid contract through the L.E.A.
- Cross subsidy from funded courses (6th Form College)
- LLSC approve “other provision” therefore funded from within the existing central allocation.

Comment

61. Responses to how “other provision” is funded indicated a clear understanding that the LSC is the main funding agent, either direct or via the L.E.A. However there were signs that colleges were unclear about what could and could not be funded and about the interrelationship of special project funding, the L.E.A. funding arrangements and LSC funding. There was also a range of replies and nuances confirming how full cost funding were applied to “other provision”.
62. It is likely that confusion over funding is directly related to the extent to which colleges are clear about what constitutes “other provision” and how this term/category has emerged since incorporation.
63. Evidence from conversations with staff in colleges during the pilot phase, from those who have responded and from letters received both before and after the completion of this questionnaire point to some measure of confusion and misunderstanding. These have arisen from changes that have taken place since the incorporation of colleges in the evaluation of what constitutes “other provision” and how its various manifestations can be funded. Examples include:
 - The changes to eligibility and funding in schedule 2 (d) and 2j between 1995-1999
 - The arrangements for schedule 2 and non-schedule 2
 - The enactment of the Learning and Skills Act 2000
 - The repeal of the schedule 2/non-schedule 2 divide
 - The guarantees of funding during the interregnum Between the FEFC and LSC in the circular “Changes to Funding Arrangements for 2000-2001”
 - The guidance regarding “other provision”
 - The introduction of sections 96 and 97 as criteria for funding
 - The very recent implementation of section 97
 - Reference to “X” codes as “other provision” on the Qualification Aims Database using FEFC programme Areas (10 Areas)
 - Data regarding funding on the Qualification Aims Database being incomplete and incorrect
 - The introduction of the CIF 14 curriculum area codes.
64. The need to clarify funding arrangements concurrently with an unequivocal definition of “other provision” against Government vision, aims, target and aspiration is the strong message emanating from this section of the questionnaire.
65. Colleges who replied to the questionnaire are obviously attempting to respond to Government policy by using “other provision” to meet business and it seems in particular, small to medium enterprise (SMEs) requirements. They are also using “other provision” to attract new learners, widen participation in learning, secure achievement and attainment at an appropriate level and provide progression routes to qualifications, jobs and personal growth for new learners.
66. The case for funding is therefore well made. The funding structure, it seems, is yet to be finalised and disseminated. It will need to be flexible, effective, efficient, sustainable, clear, robust and useable.

How much “other provision” is being delivered at your college?

67. In order to quantify the amount of “other provision” being made, colleges were asked to express what percentages of all college’ provision was “other provision”. Questions included:

Question 22. What % of units of all college provision is “other provision”?

Question 23. What % of units of all college provision delivered on sites owned by the college is “other provision”?

Question 24. What % of units of all college provision delivered on sites not owned by the college is “other provision”?

68. Completion rates for these three questions (22, 23 and 24) were good - 96% (101 colleges), 93% (99 colleges) and 85% (90 colleges) respectively.

69. Percentage of units of all college provision which is “other provision”

% of units	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
No of Colleges	69	11	8	5	3	2	0	2	0	1 *

70. Percentage of units of all college units delivered on sites owned by the college which is “other provision”

% of units	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
No of Colleges	73	10	5	6	1	1	0	2	0	1 *

71. Percentage of units of all college provision delivered on sites not owned by the college is “other provision”

% of units	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
No of Colleges	79	4	0	3	3	0	0	3	3	3

* Northern College for Residential Adult Education.

Comment

72. From the data available it is possible to extrapolate that while in most colleges “other provision” accounts for between 0-10% of units delivered, in 27 colleges it accounts for between 11% and 50% of units and in 5 colleges it contributes the majority of over 51% of provision.

73. Regarding the location of “other provision” of 106 replies 24 colleges have more other provision on site that off-site while 16 colleges have more provision off-site than on.

Why is your college delivering “other provision”?

74. The final section of the survey questionnaire aimed to determine why colleges choose to provide “other provision” and what priorities underpinned that decision. Colleges were asked two questions:

Question 25. What are your three main priorities for offering other provision?

Question 26. What % (approximately) of “other provision” learners are new learners? Please estimate the number of new learner enrolments. The definitions of a new learner for the questionnaire are:

**Learners who are new to the programme in the year, or
Learners who have not accessed formal learning for two years.**

75. There was a good response to these questions - 92% (97 colleges) to question 25 and 89% (94 colleges) to question 26.
76. In response to the questions the priorities listed by the colleges for providing “other learning” produced a list which not unsurprisingly matches those operational priorities set out in the Secretary of State’s Remit Letter to the Learning and skills Council – November 2000. Paragraph 26.

“Not all learning should lead to awards.

Encouraging adults back into learning and helping those more disadvantaged through relevant provision will also be important. Such first rung provision should, where practical, act as a stepping stone into further learning leading to qualifications or units of qualifications but many adults, including large numbers of older and retired learners will want to pursue high quality rigorous study for its own sake, and I expect provision to be made available to meet their needs.”

77. The responses also reflect the very diversity of “other provision” as it aims to tackle the very important aspects of learning that are not met by accredited courses.
78. The responses are set out in a tabular form detailing the references made to responses from providing “other provision” by colleges.

<u>College Priorities for “other provision”</u>	Number of References
1) Widening Participation (“Kennedy Agenda”)	38
2) Progression Opportunities (to funded provision qualifications) (to Sections 96/97, to I.T.)	20
3) First Step Learners, Stepping Stones, First Rung Provision. For students lacking in confidence Pathways to accreditation for those who otherwise would not attend	16
4) Responses to employers’ needs, short courses for industry, Tailor made for SME, Special interest short vocational courses	12

5) Local learner needs. Courses designed for this. Entry route back into learning (Safe entry point).	12
6) Where there is no appropriate qualification or where qualification has been withdrawn or does not appear in Section 96/97. Qualifications withdrawn essential for specialist provision.	10
7) Inappropriateness of qualifications, approved qualifications do not meet the needs of adult learners.	8
8) Disadvantaged, vulnerable learners enabling. Independent living skills. Social inclusion. Learning Difficulties. Mental Health	7
9) Attracts new learners who would not participate (pathways)	7
10) Flexible courses designed for learners	7
11) Attractive “bite sized” courses	6
12) Based in local communities (Links to communities)	5
13) Provides lifelong learning opportunities	5
14) Non threatening tasters	5
15) Access to HE	5
16) Provide Basic Skills’ tasters	4
17) Broadening the offer for all	4
18) Up-skilling, re-skilling, workforce development	3
19) Neighbourhood renewal, wider re-generation, economic development	2
20) Outreach into the community	2
21) Local older ethnic minorities groups	1
22) Addressing strategic needs in rural settings	1
23) Targeting specific groups	1

79. In addition to these collective and transparent priorities a number of illuminating responses were also received concerning priorities and reasons for offering “other provision”. They included some which are widely recognisable and others which are clearly idiosyncratic to particular colleges:

- Allows us to meet needs
- Sections 96/97 provide a limited range of programmes for a diverse range of learners
- Personal development to extend existing skills
- Recreational courses
- To teach/provide our students with Religious Education
- First contact with hard to reach groups
- New ventures in ESF funding enables us to explore new markets
- OCN Foundation Level
- Develop additional income
- Jagged Progress (across a curriculum map)
- To meet local LSC needs
- Supporting students from overseas.

Comment

80. The similarities and diversities of this catalogue of colleges’ priorities for providing “other provision” exhibit the lengths to which colleges are going to respond to the seemingly “ever

varied” cohorts of adults who wish or need to return to learn in some form. But it is not simply the question of responding to who the students are but also to why they want to be there. The “who” is manifest in the following descriptions of students; ‘adult’, ‘community’, ‘disadvantaged’, ‘vulnerable learners’, ‘learning difficulties’, ‘employees’, ‘students lacking confidence’. The “why” in examples such as ‘entry route back’, ‘stepping stones’, ‘first rung’, ‘access to HE’, ‘basic skills’ tasters’, ‘employers’ needs’.

- 81. The Government has set the vision and spelled out the operational priorities. Public interest has been awakened. Evidence from this survey suggests that colleges who replied have sound ideas for making “other provision” but some remain confused about how it can be funded and whether although eligible it is as highly regarded as “qualification”. There therefore seems to be uncertainty about how robust the response to “other provision” should be in some colleges.
- 82. The colleges’ replies to question 26 elicited the approximate percentage of learners, others which were “new” learners.
- 83. The completion rate for this question was 89% (94 colleges).

% of new learners	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Number of Colleges	16	4	12	3	6	9	12	14	14	4

- 85. These statistics are quite encouraging. 56% (53 colleges) indicate they have over 50% new learners on “other provision” courses. However the question asked for approximate percentages. It is also notoriously difficult to calculate with certainty whether a learner is a new learner given the range of options open to learners and the interpretation of “formal” in formal learning. Is for example, learning on the “internet” formal or informal?

Conclusions

Introduction

86. Government vision for the learning age is clear and unequivocal.
87. Broad policies such as widening participation, inclusiveness, lifelong learning and key indicators of high quality learning; achievement, retention, attainment and progression, have been well trailed and incorporated into the learning culture of colleges.
88. Challenging targets have been set as performance indicators of effectiveness and efficiency in meeting them.
89. The quality of qualification and “other provision” is subject to inspection based on the C.I.F.
90. The introduction of the Learning and Skills Act and the concomitant changes in the funding and categorisation of courses have required significant re-writing of guidance. Evidence suggests that not all of this guidance appears to have been fully understood. Some colleges, for example, seem to continue to use schedule 2/non schedule 2 to categorise “other provision”.
91. While colleges seem to be completely clear about the big picture and their roles and responsibilities in securing the learning age, changes to funding arrangements, categorisation of courses and the transfer of strategic and operational policy from FEFC to LSC have without prejudice to any party, created some misconceptions and misunderstandings of “other provision”, its role and its funding.
92. That the links between widening participation, inclusiveness and “other provision” have been made is unquestionable. Equally the embedding of “other provision” within curriculum areas is a welcome and encouraging development offering, as it does, a safe starting point for many students returning to learning and providing them with easily recognisable pathways to progression. However what triggers funding for “other provision”, at what level and for how long, is less clear for some colleges.

What are FECs Delivering?

93. Colleges are using “other provision” as a means to meet their responsibilities for providing learning opportunities outside “qualifications” outlined in the Learning and Skills Act.
94. Most colleges (87%) were clear about how they interpret “other provision” given the guidance in the questionnaire.
95. The range of courses with no certification identified by colleges in the review is wide. This seems to represent the genuine attempts by colleges to respond to Government policy and initiatives by reaching and engaging an increasingly diverse clientele with equally diverse needs, aspirations and goals.

96. College returns in the survey indicate that “other provision”:

- Is embedded in all 14 CIF curriculum areas
- Is delivered through a variety of mechanisms but chiefly throughout the college structure in all or a number of sections, departments, schools or programme areas
- Is managed mainly by managers within discrete departments, schools and programme areas but also by a designated manager in the case of thirty colleges
- Is delivered in partnership with other providers, particularly with L.E.A.s and, in a few cases (15 colleges), it is franchised out to selected providers on a purchaser/provider basis
- In most cases (79 colleges), “other provision” comprises between 1-10% of all college units of provision
- “Other provision” is delivered on main college sites fully integrated into the college and off-site to pick up requirements to base learning opportunities in communities and in outreach locations
- Over 50% of learners in “other provision” are learners who are new to a programme in the year or are learners who have not accessed formal learning for two years.

96. Reference to non-schedule 2 in a small number of returns implies, for example, the continuation of non-schedule 2 pilot courses aimed at widening participation amongst disadvantaged and non-traditional learners. In another case “non-schedule 2 as was” was quoted as a working definition for “other provision”.

97. Overall, colleges are providing a wide range of “other provision” to meet agendas for:

Widening participation
Supporting neighbourhood regeneration
Economic development
Personal development.

It is significant provision which is seen by colleges to encourage and attract and engage new learners and provide enriching opportunities in and for, local communities by making good use of college facilities.

99. The description of uncertificated courses and the embedding of “other provision” in curriculum areas plus the emphasis on basic skills, whether discrete or embedded, I.T. and introductory courses, ensures that “other provision” has learning and the achievement of learning goals at its heart. While it is not possible to say that there are no courses which are not built on an activities approach it would be wrong to equate “activity” with non-learning. The lists of learning opportunities, working definitions and priorities underpinning why colleges are delivering “other provision” all suggest that effective learning is the goal for both tutors and learners.

How should “other provision” be categorised?

100. Results from the survey of colleges show that 87% of those who responded interpreted “other provision” as in the provisional LSC categorisation:

Courses Externally Certificated (outside the National Qualifications Framework) 86%
Courses Internally Certificated (outside the National Qualifications Framework) 93%
Courses with no Certification 81%.

101. Working definitions of “other provision” were confirmed by 53 respondents to question 4 as the LSC definition of “other provision” as follows:

Courses not in Sections 96/97	(18% of respondents)
Courses not in the NQF	(13% of respondents)
Broad definition as per LSC definition	(9% of respondents)

in the funding document.

These results confirm that the LSC categorisations of “other provision” are seen as valid interpretations by a high proportion of colleges. Also almost 50% of respondents’ working definitions were in accord with LSC guidance.

102. 47% offered a wide range of other interpretations. These also may give some clues to, and influence the creation of a refined categorisation e.g. courses where outcomes are agreed with the learner.

103. Augmenting the answers to the main question was a number of interesting and pertinent comments about the definition “other provision” (Para 29). There was, for example, concern that the term “other provision” had “no stability”. Another college felt that by implication “other provision” was seen to be less important than Sections 96 and 97’s provision. While a third suggested that “other provision” might be replaced by “The title of Engagement Programmes to embrace those individuals and groups who have experienced disadvantage and exclusion and would require different approaches of support for them to feel confident enough to engage in formalised learning”.

104. The list of college priorities for providing “other provision” may also lead to the construction of a refined categorisation by embracing, for example:

- Widening Participation (38 references)
- Progression Opportunities (20 references)
- First Step Learners, Stepping Stones (16 references)

the three priorities that received most references.

105. However, care is need when using these terms. Progression for example, implies a kind of “vertical” movement up a learning ladder, yet for some students, progress will be as one respondent put it “jagged”, progressing across a horizontal plane of learning also, acquiring new knowledge and skills in different locations and by various means.

106. While the body of the report gives much food for thought to those framing any new categorisation, the review, taken as a whole, provokes a number of parallel suggestions. Any future revised “other provision” categorisation should:

- Reflect those parts of the Remit Letter intended to underpin and secure non qualification learning, particularly those outlined in paragraph 26
- Have as its starting point, recognition of the diversity of groups and individual learners accessing “other provision”, their goals and aspirations
- Recognise the healthy breadth of organisations offering “other provision” both in colleges and in partnership with them and other partners
- Make clear the need to offer flexibility and easy access to learning to take account of the diversity of clients and the vulnerability that many of them can feel in formal learning locations particularly in “qualification” courses.

107. In many respects the responses in the review depict “other provision” as a safety net of learning for adults which offers adult learners the opportunity to re-establish key links of their choice between:

- Learning and personal development
- Learning and economic development
- Learning and social cohesion/community regeneration and sustainability
- Learning and health and fitness
- Learning and citizenship.

107. It will then be important to retain at least the breadth of the current categorisation, ensure that learning is of a sufficiently high quality, valid and relevant to learner needs. “Other provision” will need to be provided by a provider with appropriate staffing facilities and resources which will be attractive to, and engage and sustain learner interests and be open to rigorous but sensitive quality assurance. This approach to quality assurance should recognise the difficulties that many “other provision” learners may encounter with approaches to monitoring, assessment and evaluation that they may consider to be over-structured, bureaucratic and even threatening.

What reasons are there for the LSC to fund “other provision when there is valid certification in the NQF?”

108. Making learning opportunities available to all is a basic tenet of the Government’s policy in the Learning and Skills Act 2000. It is clarified in the Secretary of State’s Remit Letter in greater detail where key elements of the LSC’s role for the post 16 sector are spelled out. “The Council’s remit ranging from basic skills to higher level skills, will enable it to bring a much sharper strategic perspective to arrangements for lifelong learning. It is also the first time that a public body has had a statutory duty placed upon it to encourage participation in learning.” (Paragraph 7). Clearly there is an expectation that resources will be made available to fund these learning goals.

109. Within the Remit Letter the Secretary of State also outlined a strategy for adult learning which does not always require a response through qualifications and is “other provision”.

110. Responses from colleges detailed in this report demonstrate just how much of “other provision” provided by them meets the Secretary of State’s requirement for post 16 learning and which therefore should draw down appropriate funding as the following examples suggest:

<u>Examples of Government Requirement (Post 16) the Act 2002</u>	<u>Responses through “Other provision” Noted in College Responses</u>
Basic skills training	Adult basic education (ESOL)
Filling the technology gap	I.T. courses – Computers for the terrified
First rung provision	Short taster, bite-sized courses
Stepping stone work leading to qualification	Short steps before vocational course
Widening Participation	Women’s courses, supporting disabled people
Lifelong Learning	Adult Education
Draw new learners into learning	Negotiated learning, return to learn, introductory courses
Family literacy	Family learning – parenting
Small businesses skills’ needs	Courses for businesses, welding, blacksmith etc
Equal opportunities	Sign language, assertiveness training
Helping the disadvantaged	SEN, LD, information and research training
Exploring art, music. Literature	Self-development courses, art and crafts.

112. In framing a policy for funding “other provision” the following issues should be taken into account:

- That qualification courses cannot meet the learning needs of all people
- That responses to many learning needs will only be met by courses that are outside the National Qualifications’ Framework
- That in order to achieve widening participation and inclusion, learning will have to start at a point often decided by the student and that will require flexible, patient, sometimes 1-1 support

- That reaching and connecting with learners and informing them about what opportunities exist will require novel, specialist publicity and marketing
- That in costing funding for “other provision” account should be taken of:
 - The need to cover concessions – sometimes 100% for disadvantaged and low income learners
 - The need to keep learner/teacher ratios low for some Basic Skills, SEN, Courses for the Disabled
 - The need to provide crèche facilities where and when appropriate
 - The need to base courses in outreach locations away from main centres/colleges
 - The need to provide loaded funding allocations and learning support in addition to tutors, e.g. (signers) for some categories of provision ABE, Learning Difficulties and Disabilities and SLDD
- That teaching staff working in “other provision” courses will need specific training and updating
- That quality assurance and human resource support will be critical to monitor and report on the quality of provision and keep staff up to date
- That providing “other provision” requires significant management support to secure at least an equivalent high quality to qualifications provision. The management may be within an established faculty, school or department or within a discrete section
- That account should be taken that some “other provision” students may take longer than one course, one term or even one year to achieve progression onto a qualification course or onto a course offering more advanced work but without a qualification.

112. If “other provision” in whatever guise is to meet its vital role in helping to achieve a learning society, it should continue to be funded in recognition of the diverse responses it is required to make to meet the learning needs of a diverse population now becoming fully aware of what should be available for them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Categorisation

113. The importance of “other provision” in meeting Government learning, economic development, personal development, social stability, environment, health, citizenship and community regeneration targets should be reflected in how it is re-categorised, badged, funded and managed.
114. The refinement of the categorisation of “other provision” should retain at all costs, the flexibility inherent in the current title so that the diversity of learner needs and particularly those of new learners may continue to be met at, at least, current levels.
115. Colleges should be involved through appropriate channels or on working groups established to discuss the future categorisation and funding of “other provision”. Representatives might be invited from colleges which responded fully and helpfully to the questionnaire.

Funding

116. Any future refined categorisation and funding policy for “other provision” should demonstrate conspicuously which elements of Government vision and strategic and operational policy objectives “other provision”, or its successor is intended to achieve. For example there is a close correlation between courses in the “other provision” category and those aimed at “widening participation”.
117. Discussions aimed at developing a clearer policy for funding “other provision” should ensure that colleges continue to be enabled to meet the needs of disadvantaged and disabled learners fully and to satisfy equal opportunities, and access and progression pre-requisites for all learners. There is a need for rigorous monitoring and evaluation of provision to confirm that “other provision” achieves these objectives.
118. This research has shown that non-qualification courses, “other provision”, are an important aspect of colleges’ provision in meeting Government guidelines and in responding to the learning needs of many adults and therefore should continue to be funded. Courses which are internally certificated outside the NQF and those which are externally certificated outside the NQF should also continue to be funded. Care should be taken to ensure that no qualification is available for these courses within the NQF.
119. Funding “other provision” should take account of the need:
- To manage and sustain practice of the highest quality
 - To fund concessions, keep learner/teacher ratios low and provide for learning support in certain areas e.g. basic skills
 - For specific teacher training and human resource development for staff
 - To ensure that widening participation objectives are met through high quality “other provision”.

Guidance

120. An early rationalisation of various current guidelines to colleges on which courses are eligible in the “qualifications” category and which in “other provision”, should be undertaken and colleges informed as an interim measure to help end the confusion which appears to exist, for example reference to “X codes” as “other provision” on the Qualification Aims Database (see Para 63). It is anticipated that this will be achieved through the Learning Aims Database.

LSDA
July 2002

OTHER PROVISION PROJECT: Interim Report

Report to 31 March 2002

The Learning and Skills Development Agency wishes to define more clearly what does or does not constitute “other provision”.

The project objectives are:

- To investigate what Further Education Colleges are currently providing under “other provision” in 2001/2002
- To develop a categorisation for “other provision”
- To assist the LSC to develop a clearer policy on funding “other provision”.

The approach to the project is through questionnaire and follow-up visits to a range of colleges. A pilot questionnaire will be available in ten colleges.

To date the following activities to achieve the objectives have been completed:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| – Initial confidential consultations with LSDA and two colleges about the project and the extent to which it would be received and understood | January/February |
| – Discussions with colleges (one FE, one Tertiary) regarding the content and framework of the draft questionnaire | February |
| – Draft questionnaire and letter discussed with LSC and LSDA officers | February |
| – Revised letter and draft questionnaire “field tested” with two College Principals (FE) | March |
| – Colleges for the “Pilot” survey selected to represent a geographical spread and a variety of Colleges in England i.e. FE, FE/HE, Tertiary, Sixth Form Colleges (Total 8) | March |
| – Contact made with 8 Pilot colleges and dates arranged for visits and letters and questionnaires set. | 1 st week in April |

To date there have been no negative comments made about the project or its aims from college representatives. College principals and staff involved to date have been very helpful in suggesting how best to frame the questionnaire.

The Pilot will hopefully provide further indications of the effectiveness of the questionnaire and suggestions for any further amendments.

While this exciting project is both challenging and thought provoking, it provides an excellent opportunity for colleges to input their practical experience and knowledge of delivering “other provision” and the reasons for doing so. The results should provide a much clearer picture of “other provision” learning and its links to social coherence, economic development, personal development and health and fitness enhancement.

PRE-PILOT PHASE

Colleges initially consulted:

North-West Kent College
Canterbury College
Fareham Tertiary College.

PILOT SURVEY OF 8 COLLEGES

The colleges included in the Pilot Survey were:

City of Norwich College
Enfield College
Fareham Tertiary College
Harrogate College
Preston College
Solihull College
Tresham Institute of FE and HE
Worcester Sixth Form College



17th May 2002

Dear

“Other Provision” – To achieve a clearer definition

INTRODUCTION

In order to help the LSC to understand how colleges interpret “other provision” and to ensure that it is adequately funded, the LSC in partnership with LSDA, wishes to consult with all colleges in England in two ways:

- by completing the attached questionnaire
- by follow-up face to face consultation with a sample of colleges from the various regions in England.

We hope you will want to assist us in this important task and in so doing, contribute your experience and ideas so that clearer guidelines can be developed.

The Learning and Skills Act 2000 removed the divide between Schedule 2 and Non-Schedule 2 provision.

The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) now has responsibility for funding all post-16 provision, and has powers to fund a wide range of provision. It will use its powers as flexibly as possible to enable institutions to meet targets set out in corporate and local plans.

However, Ministers emphasised in “Learning to Succeed” (in paragraph 5.28) the expectation that the Council will

“Give priority to courses that lead to nationally recognised qualifications, and more generally, to encourage learning towards recognised qualifications.”

The LSC has identified two broad types of provision eligible for Council funding:

1. **Qualifications – these are learning aims which lead to qualifications approved by the Secretary of State under sections 96 and 97 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000 and**

2. **Other provision – these are learning aims which do not lead to qualifications as defined above.**

OTHER PROVISION

A broad definition of what constitutes “other provision” suggests that:

To date “other provision” is available to all eligible learners over compulsory school age and may include:

- Learning aims with external certificates of attainment (e.g. QAA – validated Access to HE; local OCN)
- Learning aims with internal certificates of attainment (e.g. college certified)
- Learning aims with attainment and no certification (e.g. a record of attendance only).

We would like completed questionnaires returned by **17th June 2002**.

Should you wish to add a qualifying statement on any aspect of the questionnaire this would be welcomed.

If you have any queries please contact me on 0207 297 9103 or my PA, Kim, on 0207 297 9110

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours sincerely

Maggie Greenwood (Dr.)
Research Manager

Eddie Burch
Project consultant



Questionnaire.pdf

OTHER PROVISION QUESTIONNAIRE 2002



COLLEGE

Name:

Address:

RESPONDANT

Name:

Title:

Tel:

E-mail:

Please use current year 2001/02 as the basis for your answers

PART A

HOW IS OTHER PROVISION INTERPRETED AT THE COLLEGE?

The LSC is keen to know more about what you understand and categorise as **OTHER PROVISION**. Could you therefore please indicate how you interpret **OTHER PROVISION** at your college? Is it, for example:

- Q1 Courses Externally Certificated (Outside the National Qualifications Framework - NQF)?
Types could include: Royal Yachting Association, OCN, Awarding Body Consortium, College self initiated OCN certification, Former FEFC Category 2D Yes No
- Q2 Courses Internally Certificated (Outside the NQF)? Yes No
- Q3 Courses with no certification? Yes No

Can you give examples of courses with no certification please?



Q4 Please let us know your own working definition of "other provision". Is there a different generic title you would prefer to use?

Q5 Is "other provision" described as a discrete area in your:

	Yes	No
College Strategic Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SAR?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q6 Using the Common Inspection Framework's fourteen categories, please indicate those curriculum areas in which "other provision" is delivered in the College and indicate, if possible, what approximate percentage of **units** in each curriculum area you would regard as "other provision".

Percentage of units of each curriculum area which is "other provision".
(Please tick the best column)

	25% or less	26-50%	51%-75%	75%+
1 - Sciences and Mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 - Land Based Provision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 - Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 - Engineering, Technology and Manufacturing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 - Business Administration, Management and Professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 - Information and Communication Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 - Retailing, Customer Service and Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 - Hospitality, Sports, Leisure and Travel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 - Hairdressing and Beauty Therapy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 - Health, Social Care and Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 - Visual and Performing Arts and Media	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 - Humanities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13 - English, Languages and Communication	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14 - Foundation Programmes <i>(e.g. Basic Skills, Entry Qualification, Pre Foundation, Other)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



PART B

HOW IS OTHER PROVISION DELIVERED / MANAGED / FUNDED IN THE COLLEGE?

The LSC has identified two broad types of provision eligible for Council funding:

- **Qualifications** - these are learning aims which lead to qualifications approved by the Secretary of State under Sections 96 and 97 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000.
- **Other provision** - these are learning aims which do not lead to qualifications as defined above.

Other provision:

A broad definition of what constitutes "**other provision**" suggests that to date "**other provision**" is available to all eligible learners over compulsory school age and may include:

- Learning aims with external certificates of attainment
(e.g. QAA - validated Access to HE - local OCN)
- Learning aims with internal certificates of attainment (e.g. College Certificated)
- Learning aims with attainment and no certification (e.g. A Record of Attendance only)

WOULD YOU KINDLY ANSWER THE REMAINDER OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE ABOVE DEFINITION AND TYPES OF "OTHER PROVISION" AS A GUIDE.

HOW IS OTHER PROVISION DELIVERED?

Q7 Is "**other provision**" led by a discrete section, department, school, programme area? Yes No

If Yes, please provide the name:

Q8 Distributed throughout the Colleges structure within all or a number of sections, departments, schools, programme areas? Yes No

Q9 Solely through a range of separately managed projects? Yes No

If Yes, please quote a number of examples e.g. SRB, ESF



Q10 Franchised out to selected providers (i.e. on a purchaser/provider basis)?

Yes No

Q11 In partnership with other providers (e.g. Learning Partnership)?

Yes No

If **Not as above**, please describe

HOW IS OTHER PROVISION MANAGED?

Q12 By a designated manager?

Yes No

If **Yes**, please provide the manager's title:

Q13 By a designated team?

Yes No

If **Yes**, please provide the name of the team:

Q14 By a number of managers within discrete Departments, Schools, Programme Areas?

Yes No

Q15 By franchisees?

Yes No

Q16 By an external manager (e.g. Learning Partnership co-ordinator)?

Yes No

If **Yes**, please provide the title of the external manager:

Q17 Other?

Yes No

If **Yes**, please state the arrangement:



HOW IS OTHER PROVISION FUNDED?

Q18 Is "other provision" funded by the:

LSC through your main funding allocation?
LSC via an LEA?

Yes No
Yes No

Q19 Is "other provision" funded from specific project funding (e.g. LIF, ESF or other)?

Yes No

If other please state:

Q20 Is "other provision" funded on a "full-cost" basis (i.e. Is not funded by resources which are drawn down from the LSC to fund tuition and tuition on-costs)?

Yes No

Please describe

Q21 Other funding mechanisms?

Yes No

Please describe

HOW MUCH OTHER PROVISION IS BEING DELIVERED AT YOUR COLLEGE?

Q22 What % of units of all college provision is "other provision"? (Please tick)

0 - 10 11 - 20 21 - 30 31 - 40 41 - 50
 51 - 60 61 - 70 71 - 80 81 - 90 91 - 100

Q23 What % of units of all college provision delivered on sites owned by the college is "other provision"? (Please tick)

0 - 10 11 - 20 21 - 30 31 - 40 41 - 50
 51 - 60 61 - 70 71 - 80 81 - 90 91 - 100



Q24 What % of units of all college provision delivered on sites not owned by the college is "other provision"? (Please tick)

- 0 - 10 11 - 20 21 - 30 31 - 40 41 - 50
 51 - 60 61 - 70 71 - 80 81 - 90 91 - 100

WHY IS YOUR COLLEGE DELIVERING OTHER PROVISION?

It would be extremely helpful to know why you choose to provide "other provision" at your college and particularly what priorities underpin your decision to make this provision

Q25 What are your three main priorities for offering "other provision"?

Q26 What percentage (approximately) of "other provision" learners are new learners? Please estimate the number of new learner enrolments. The definitions of a new learner for this questionnaire are:

- **Learners who are new to the programme in the year, or**
 - **Learners who have not accessed formal learning for 2 years**
- (Please tick)

- 0 - 10 11 - 20 21 - 30 31 - 40 41 - 50
 51 - 60 61 - 70 71 - 80 81 - 90 91 - 100

Thank you for completing this questionnaire, please return it (no stamp needed) by 17th June 2002 to:

Maggie Greenwood, LSDA, FREEPOST (25 LON 20500), LONDON, W1E 7LT

