

Equality Impact Assessment

**Changes to the Apprenticeship
Programme**

25 NOVEMBER 2011

Contents

Title	3
Introduction	3
Scope of this Equality Impact Assessment.....	3
Description of the policy	4
The evidence base	4
Prioritising the efforts of the National Apprenticeships Service where apprenticeships deliver greatest value.....	4
Rationale for focusing on:	4
Younger learners	4
Higher level qualifications	5
Percentage wage gain associated with apprenticeships, compared to previous literature	5
Particular sectors	5
Incentive Payments for small employers taking on apprentices for the first time.....	6
Rationale	6
Background Information on the Apprenticeship Programme	6
Involvement and Consultation	9
Key facts and findings	9
Prioritisation of efforts from intermediate towards advanced apprenticeships.....	9
Prioritisation of efforts from older to younger age groups	9
Prioritisation of efforts towards high-value sectors.....	10
Incentive payment for small employers to take on a young apprentice for the first time	11
Developing options.....	12
Current activity to promote equality and diversity	12
Monitoring and review	14
Responsibility	14
Confidentiality & Data Protection.....	14
Annex A.....	16

Title**Changes to the Apprenticeship Programme:**

1. Prioritising the efforts of the National Apprenticeship Service (NAS) where apprenticeships deliver the greatest value and benefits – including on younger adults, new employees, higher level qualifications and particular sectors.
2. An incentive payment for small employers to take on a young apprentice for the first time.

Introduction

This Equality Impact Assessment accompanies the announcements made on Apprenticeships on November 16 2011 and in the Education and Skills Growth Review, due to be published on 29 November 2011:

<http://nds.coi.gov.uk/content/detail.aspx?NewsAreaId=2&ReleaseID=422075&SubjectId=2>

http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/ukecon_growth_index.htm

Any queries about this EQIA should be addressed to:

Nick Grout, Department for Business Innovation and Skills, 1 Victoria Street, London.

The proposals contained within are likely to affect groups on the basis of age and gender. Initial screening suggests that the policies will not have any significant impact either in terms of numbers involved or scale of the impact on groups with other “protected characteristics”.

A list of the organisations and individuals involved in the Consultation process (On the Growth Review as a whole) is provided in Annex A.

Scope of this Equality Impact Assessment

On 5 April 2011 the new public sector Equality Duty came into force. The Equality Duty replaces the three previous duties on race, disability and gender, bringing them together into a single duty, and extends it to cover age, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity, and gender reassignment (as a whole these are called protected characteristics or protected groups). Based on a proportional analysis we will outline the impacts, both positive and negative, on these protected groups.

Equality Impact Assessments are an important framework for demonstrating due regard through considering evidence and analysis to help identify the likely positive and negative impacts that policy proposals may have on certain protected groups of consumers and to estimate whether such impacts disproportionately affect such groups. This Equality Impact Assessment takes a summary view of the equality impacts of the changes to the apprenticeship programme outlined in the box below.

Description of the policy

The policies under consideration in this Impact Assessment are part of a wider range of announcements around the apprenticeship programme, including:

1. New incentive payments for small employers to take on a young apprentice for the first time;
2. Measures to make it quicker and easier for employers to take on an apprentice - including reducing the time it takes an employer to advertise for an apprentice to one month, and stripping back any unnecessary health and safety requirements;
3. Requiring apprenticeship providers to offer training in English and Maths up to the standard of a good GCSE to all apprentices, and publishing their progress;
4. Launching a new employer-led review into the standards and quality of apprenticeships, to ensure every apprenticeship delivers professionally recognised qualifications which employers value;
5. Prioritising the efforts of the National Apprenticeship Service where apprenticeships deliver greatest value - including on younger adults, new employees, higher level qualifications and particular sectors, whilst maintaining a demand-led, all age programme open to all sectors across the economy where high quality Apprenticeships can be offered.

Initial screening suggests that changes 2, 3 and 4 above will not have a major impact upon minority groups in terms of the numbers affected nor the seriousness of the likely impact. Therefore, this impact assessment focuses on policies 1 and 5, which may impact differentially on learners according to their age, and potentially gender. The requirement on English and maths will be implemented in a manner that fully recognises the existing skills level of the learner and supports them to *work towards* a level 2 qualification where achievement may be some distance away. The responsibility will be on Providers to encourage English and maths study at the appropriate level for the learner's existing level and ability. The requirements on English and maths in order to complete a given Apprenticeship framework will not change through this enhanced offer to learners, and English and maths study can continue beyond successful Apprenticeship completion if needed.

The evidence base

Prioritising the efforts of the National Apprenticeships Service where apprenticeships deliver greatest value

Rationale for focusing on:

Younger learners

Evidence suggests that the economic returns to vocational qualifications are greater when taken at younger ages. Although there are no such estimates for apprenticeships specifically, the table below shows the wage returns for NVQs at Levels 2 and 3, according to the age at which they are acquired. Whilst wider benefits may accrue in supporting individuals to progress or change tack in their careers, it suggests that, on average, positive wage returns from Level 2 NVQs are dominated by those who achieve qualifications at a younger age. Although there are positive returns to L3 qualifications above the age of 25, these are lower than when taken below the age of 25.

Age of acquisition	NVQ L2	NVQ L3
15-16	1%	1%
17-18	4%*	9%*
19-20	4%*	11%*
21-25	7%*	11%*
26-30	0%	6%*
>30	-6%*	-1%

* Indicates that the estimate is statistically significant different from zero at the 95% confidence level.

Source: London Economics (2010) - BIS Research Paper Number 53, Returns to Intermediate and Low Level Vocational Qualifications, September 2011.

A further basis for targeting those aged 16-24 is that young people at the early stages of their working lives, in many cases entering the workforce for the first time, are likely to need greater support to acquire vocational and workplace skills, and for employers may be initially less productive as a result than older learners.

International comparisons also emphasise the importance of targeting this age range. The UK trails international competitors in advancing skills from the age of 19+. For example, in the UK at aged 19, 48% of people have a Level 3 qualification, compared to 47% in Germany; but by 25 the figures are 54% and 74% respectively. A similar pattern is seen at Level 2. The greater emphasis on vocational qualifications in Germany is believed to explain the difference.

Higher level qualifications

Evidence also suggests that there are greater wage returns to apprenticeships at Level 3 compared to Level 2, and a recent study indicates that the wage returns have diverged over time. This is summarised in the table below. A similar pattern is observed for employment returns, which are greater at Level 3 compared to Level 2. However, when considering these higher returns, it should also be borne in mind that the government funding costs for advanced apprenticeships are higher than those for intermediate apprenticeships.

Percentage wage gain associated with apprenticeships, compared to previous literature

Qualification Type	McIntosh (2007), based on data for 2004-05	London Economics (2011) - based on data for 2004-2009
Advanced Apprenticeship (L3)	18%	22%
Intermediate Apprenticeship (L2)	16%	12%

Source: London Economics (2010) - BIS Research Paper Number 53, Returns to Intermediate and Low Level Vocational Qualifications, September 2011.

Particular sectors

McIntosh (2007) also suggests that there are considerable differences in the returns by sector – the wage returns, net lifetime economic benefits (NPV) per apprenticeship achievement and per pound of government investment in the programme are shown in the table below. Combined with other evidence (such as

that outlined below), this provides a starting point for deciding the sectors towards which NAS efforts should be reprioritised.

	Wage Returns	NPV per achievement (£000s)*	NPV per government £
Construction	32%	157	£27
Engineering	10%	78	£12
Hospitality	13%	58	£15
Business Administration	7%	57	£15
Retail/Customer Service	0%	32	£9

Source: McIntosh (2007) 'A Cost-Benefit of Analysis of Apprenticeships and Other Vocational Qualifications'

Further work is underway to identify sectors which might be given greater focus in future marketing of the programme, in order to maximise the impact of public investment and wider benefits. This includes considerations of economic returns, projected growth, skills gaps and the extent to which the opportunities of the programme are currently recognised. Consideration to potential equality and diversity impacts will be given as part of the process of determining sectors for targeting.

Incentive Payments for small employers taking on apprentices for the first time

Rationale

There is significantly greater demand from learners for Apprenticeship places than is currently being met by the supply of places from employers. Illustrative evidence from the Apprenticeships Vacancies Online website suggests the number of applications outstrips the number of places by around ten to one. While there has recently been significant expansion in the number of places offered by employers to older learners, this has not been matched in the younger age bands. This suggests that employer demand is a particular barrier to taking on younger Apprentices. Furthermore, the analysis above suggests that returns to apprenticeships are greater when taken at younger ages.

Incentive payments are more likely to affect the decision making of small companies than large; evidence from the British Chamber of Commerce suggests that around 20% of businesses with fewer than 250 employees cite cost as a barrier, in comparison to 10% of businesses with over 250 employees.

Background Information on the Apprenticeship Programme

According to the October 2011 BIS Statistical First Release, there were 279,700 Apprenticeship starts in the full 2009/10 academic year. The breakdowns by level, age and sector are shown below:

Level

- 190,530 Intermediate Level (L2) Apprenticeship starts;
- 87,660 Advanced Level (L3) Apprenticeship starts;
- 1,490 Higher (L4) Apprenticeship starts.

Age

- 116,780 Apprenticeship starts by those aged under 19;
- 113,770 Apprenticeship starts by 19–24 year olds;
- 49,130 Apprenticeship starts by those aged 25 and over.

Sector

The largest sectors were:

- Business, Administration and Law with 76,590 Apprenticeship starts;
- Retail and Commercial Enterprise with 61,620 Apprenticeship starts;
- Health, Public Services and Care with 44,150 Apprenticeship starts.

The evidence on the extent to which returns differ by these factors is summarised in the previous box.

The current take up of Apprenticeships broken down by key characteristics is as shown below and includes figures for 2009/10 and provisional figures for 2010/11

Apprenticeship Programme Starts by Narrow Age Band, Gender, Learners with Learning Difficulties and/ or Disabilities and Ethnicity (2009/10 and 2010/11)

Dimension	Category	2009/10		2010/11	
		Full Year		Full Year (provisional)	
			% of Total		% of Total
Age Band	Under 16	400	-	300	-
	16-18	116,380	41.6%	128,010	28.9%
	19-24	113,770	40.7%	138,870	31.4%
	25-34	25,250	9.0%	70,540	15.9%
	35-44	13,680	4.9%	52,400	11.8%
	45-59	9,810	3.5%	48,650	11.0%
	60+	400	-	3,910	0.9%
	Not known	-	-	-	-
	Total	279,700	100.0%	442,700	100.0%
Gender	Female	138,640	49.6%	239,300	54.1%
	Male	141,030	50.4%	203,390	45.9%
	Total	279,700	100.0%	442,700	100.0%
Learners with Learning Difficulties and / or disabilities	Yes	26,390	9.4%	35,620	8.0%
	No	250,640	89.6%	403,690	91.2%
	Not Known	2,650	0.9%	3,380	0.8%
	Total	279,700	100.0%	442,700	100.0%
Ethnicity	Asian or Asian British	9,180	3.3%	18,440	4.2%
	Black or Black British	6,390	2.3%	14,230	3.2%
	Mixed	5,020	1.8%	8,120	1.8%
	White	254,780	91.1%	393,820	89.0%
	Chinese or other ethnic group				
	Chinese	210	-	430	-
	Any Other	1,430	0.5%	3,220	0.7%
	Total Other	1,640	0.6%	3,640	0.8%
	Not Known/Not Provided	2,660	1.0%	4,440	1.0%
	Total	279,700	100.0%	442,700	100.0%

Source: BIS (2011) Apprenticeships Supplementary table, SFR: 'Post-16 Education & Skills: Learner Participation, Outcomes and Level of Highest Qualification Held'

Involvement and Consultation

As noted earlier, consultations through the Growth Review have involved a wide range of stakeholders regarding future priorities for the programme, and have linked also to parallel discussions about inclusion being taken forward in the context of the Participation Strategy. A list of Growth Review consultees is attached at Annex.

Key facts and findings

We have considered the potential impact of the key policy proposals, as set out below, on the composition of the apprentice population by gender, age, ethnicity and disabilities and /or learning difficulties. These are the characteristics which are routinely collected and reported upon in the published data on Apprentices. Considering, for example, the prioritising of efforts away from intermediate towards advanced apprenticeships, the analysis below essentially assumes that the additional advanced apprenticeships will be typical of those already in that group; and that the reduced number of intermediate apprenticeships will also be typical of those in that group.

In all cases, it is not possible to predict the extent to which this prioritisation of NAS efforts will lead to changes in the number of apprenticeships at different levels, among different ages and within different sectors, given the demand-driven nature of the programme. For this reason, we do not attempt to estimate the total number of apprenticeships for whom this is the case; instead, we limit our analysis to looking at the characteristics of those who now do apprenticeships compared to those who they will effectively displace.

Prioritisation of efforts from intermediate towards advanced apprenticeships

- 50.0% of those starting intermediate apprenticeships in 2009/10 were female, compared to 48.4% of those starting advanced apprenticeships;
- 10.3% of those starting intermediate apprenticeships in 2009/10 had learning difficulties and / or disabilities, compared to 7.6% of those starting advanced apprenticeships;
- 90.8% of those starting intermediate apprenticeships in 2009/10 were white, compared to 91.7% of those starting advanced apprenticeships.

Therefore, although those doing advanced apprenticeships are currently less likely to be women, have a learning difficulties and / or disability and be from an ethnic minority group, the differences between the two groups are relatively small.

Prioritisation of efforts from older to younger age groups

Clearly, the biggest potential impact of this shift is on the age composition

of the apprentice population. In 2009/10, 41.6% of apprenticeship starts were aged 16-18, a further 40.7% were aged 19-24, with the remaining 17.6% aged 25 or over. However, provisional data for 2010/11 suggests that these figures changed to 28.9%, 31.4% and 39.6% respectively, which when set against a backdrop of rising apprentice numbers, suggests a particularly rapid increase in the 25+ age group. In addition, it is also worth noting the other characteristics of younger apprentices, relevant to this Impact Assessment:

- Younger apprenticeship starts are less likely to be female – 45.8% of 16-18 year-old starts, 48.6% of 19-24 year-old starts and 60.9% of 25+ year-old starts were female in 2009/10;
- Younger apprenticeship starts are slightly more likely to have learning difficulties and/ or disabilities – 11.0% of 16-18 year-old starts, 8.5% of 19-24 year-old starts and 8.0% of 25+ year-old starts had a learning difficulty and/ or disability in 2009/10;
- Younger apprenticeship starts are more likely to be white – 92.8% of 16-17 year-old starts, 91.6% of 19-24 year-old starts and 86.1% of 25+ year-old starts were white in 2009/10.

This suggests that in addition to the impact on older apprentices, the increased prioritisation of younger apprentices could reduce the proportion who are female, and the same is true of ethnic minority groups which are a greater proportion of the older apprentices. Again though, this assumes that the additional young apprentices, and the older apprentices whom they effectively displace, are typical of the two groups currently. The figures above however also demonstrate that the younger apprentices are proportionately more likely to have learning difficulties or disabilities, so the move towards younger apprentices may have a proportionately positive impact in terms of learning difficulties and / or disabilities.

It is also worth noting that England is unusual internationally in extending eligibility for Apprenticeships to those aged 25+, following a decision in 2006 to do so, linked to supporting those upskilling within a changing economy.

Prioritisation of efforts towards high-value sectors

The prioritisation of particular sectors could potentially have a significant impact on protected groups, particularly females. This therefore needs to be considered when choosing the sectors which will be prioritised, and how high-level the sectors to be targeted are.

To take an example, if we prioritised efforts towards construction (a relatively high-value sector, according to the analysis presented previously) instead of retail (a relatively low-value sector), we may expect a particularly adverse impact on females:

- In retail, 61.3% of apprenticeship starts were female in 2009/10, compared to only 1.6% in construction;
- In retail, 10.6% of apprenticeship starts had a disability and/or learning difficulty in 2009/10, compared to 7.6% in construction;

- In retail, 93.1% of apprenticeship starts were white in 2009/10,, compared to 96.0% in construction.

A similar effect would be observed if we prioritised efforts towards engineering instead of Business Administration:

- In Business Administration, 67.3% of apprenticeship starts were female in 2009/10, compared to only 4.0% in engineering;
- in Business Administration, 7.7% of apprenticeship starts had a disability and/or learning difficulty in 2009/10, compared to 8.6% in engineering;
- In Business Administration, 88.9% of apprenticeship starts were white in 2009/10, compared to 94.2% in engineering.

It will be relevant to consider both the impact of targeting individual sectors and the net effect of an increased focus on a range of sectors. It may be for example that the overall impact on protected groups at programme level could be limited, even if targeting certain sectors would have a significant impact considered in isolation.

Incentive payment for small employers to take on a young apprentice for the first time

We lack information on the extent to which protected groups are more or less likely to be employed as apprentices by the small firms who are the potential recipients of these incentive payments. No data is routinely collected on the equality and diversity of the workforce. However, we have no reason to believe that any of these groups would be adversely affected by this proposal. Although, given that the incentive is being targeted at the recruitment of young apprentices, then clearly this will impact on the number of older apprentices going forward.

In summary therefore, the reprioritisation of NAS efforts considered in this paper, as well as the incentive payment for small firms to take on young apprentices for the first time, are likely to lead to a reduction in the proportion of apprentices aged 25+, and a corresponding increase in the proportion aged under 25. Prioritisation of different sectors may also impact on protected groups, particularly females, but clearly this depends on which sectors are targeted, and at the 'expense' of which others. Further work will be needed on this as potential sectors for targeting are identified. There may be impacts on other groups, as outlined above, but the numbers affected are not likely to be significant compared to the numbers engaged in the programme overall.

Given the demand-driven nature of the apprenticeship programme, it is not possible to estimate with any accuracy, the number of apprentices who may be affected by the prioritisation of efforts, therefore this analysis has focussed on the *nature* of any change in the characteristics of the learner population..

Developing options

We believe that the increased focus on younger employees is supported by strong evidence of higher benefits, and that additional steps to mitigate potential impacts on older learners are not necessary. As noted earlier, the programme will remain demand led, and opportunities for older learners will continue to be supported.

In addition, other broader measures to improve quality and standards, reduce burdens and speed up recruitment processes will bring benefits across the board.

The net effect of an increased focus on particular sectors, and potential mitigating measures, is difficult to assess before further work is completed. As noted in the previous section, a range of measures already exist to provide additional help to protected groups. The scope for further mitigation measures will be considered once it is established what, if any, specific impacts (and net impacts) are likely.

Current activity to promote equality and diversity

Providers can draw on Additional Learner Support funding to meet the additional needs of disadvantaged apprentices while on off-the-job training. Employers of disabled apprentices can also draw on the Access to Work scheme as they would for any other disabled member of staff. On a discretionary basis providers can also claim 100% funding for training disabled apprentices aged 19-24 (while the usual 19-24 rate is 50%).

Under the Education Act 2011 we will prioritise funding for Apprenticeship training for young people with disabilities and care leavers when they have secured a place. The SFA/NAS will be under a duty to make reasonable efforts to secure employers' participation in Apprenticeship training for these groups, subject to guidance from the Secretary of State.

We are working on implementation of the flexibility that will allow people with disabilities to submit alternative evidence to demonstrate their suitability for, and capacity to complete, an Apprenticeship.

We convene a disability reference group of external stakeholders to advise us on ways to improve the programme for disabled people and have commissioned independent research to produce cost-neutral recommendations on this too.

We are also working with dyslexia organisations and other relevant stakeholders in FE, HE and awarding organisations to identify and spread effective practice in supporting apprentices with dyslexia.

The new Access to Apprenticeships pathway within the Apprenticeships programme helps young people who have the potential to succeed as apprentices but who need a little extra boost of training, and an opportunity to prove themselves as keen, reliable workers, in order to convince an employer to take them on as a paid apprentice. Access is open to young people aged

16-24 who have been NEET for 13 weeks or more or who have Additional Learning or Social Needs (as defined in SFA guidance).

Increasing the diversity of the backgrounds of people applying for Apprenticeships is a priority for the National Apprenticeships Service (NAS). NAS is supporting 16 'Diversity in Apprenticeships' pilots which are trying out new approaches to attracting under-represented groups and supporting them to complete Apprenticeships successfully. We expect approximately 3,500 apprentices to be involved, and an external evaluation will collect and disseminate effective practice developed.

Illustrations of the type of activities being undertaken by those pilots aiming to break down gender stereotyping are – creating publicity materials with gender positive images; using new media channels (the web, you tube, DVDs); providing taster sessions and events; using role models and ambassadors to promote apprenticeships and lead information, advice and guidance (IAG); offering equalities training and an assessment of organisational culture to businesses; providing gender-congruent mentors and actions to positively influence parental views of apprenticeships and gender-stereotyped occupations. Examples are:

- **Bradford College/UKRC** is a national level pilot, prioritising action to increase female representation in the energy sector and has a secondary focus on access among BME groups. It has engaged a partnership of energy sector employers and representative bodies and is undertaking work on the 'supply' side to ensure organisations are welcoming of women. It is also supporting activities on the demand side – to increase applications from women.
- **Essex County Council**, based in the South East, is focused on women into engineering. It is acting as the prime contractor for a regional provider network and is integrating sources of funding to support the expansion of apprenticeship places (including providing wage subsidies to employers) and increase the representation of women in engineering and the energy sector.
- **West Nottinghamshire College** is situated in the East Midlands and is focusing on increasing female representation in engineering. Its model involves awareness raising and providing both young people and employers with IAG about work roles and workplace cultures.
- **Zodiac Training Ltd** is based in the North East and is focused on increasing male representation in social care. Its model involves providing pre-employment training and work trials, funding Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks, and brokering with employers. Its work mainly focuses on people aged over 19 since many employers' policies preclude the employment of younger age groups.

The on-line vacancy matching service enables NAS to identify occasions when some groups are disproportionately unsuccessful in their applications and thus in need of further support.

Monitoring and review

The impact of the measures set out will be monitored and evaluated through a range of mechanisms, including:

- Periodic and detailed operational data reports
- Regular operational review meetings with the National Apprenticeships Service (NAS), up to Ministerial level
- Specific reports on key issues or initiatives commissioned from NAS
- Other specific research commissioned by BIS as may be needed, e.g. on employer and/or learner views and impacts
- Both NAS and the Departments (BIS/DfE) have regular meetings with wider stakeholders, including business groups, FE sector bodies, a Disability Reference Group to invite views and promote discussion on key policy and operational issues, as well as wider links with the DWP sponsored Ethnic Minority Advisory Group.

In these ways, and through more regular day to day discussions, the Department will work closely with NAS to understand the impact that individual measures are having.

Responsibility

For the record, but not for publication, give:

Your name and today's date: Nick Grout

Name of SRO and date endorsed by SRO: Gila Sacks / Mike Keoghan

Whether the duty of "due regard" has been met for a particular policy is the responsibility of the relevant policy lead. We would expect it to be endorsed or signed off by the senior responsible officer (which within BIS will normally be the Grade 5 for the particular area).

This Equality Impact Assessment is available electronically at.....

Where possible, we will make other versions of this document in Braille, other languages, or audio-cassette available on request.

Confidentiality & Data Protection [You only need to include the data protection paragraphs if we are asking questions]

Information provided in response to the questions included in this equality impact assessment, including personal information, may be subject to publication or released to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004). If you want information, including personal data that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public

authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

Annex A

List of organisations consulted on Education and Skills Growth Review

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
Kwik Fit	Paul Binks	Employer Reference Group
National Employer Service (NES)	Hilary Chadwick	Employer Reference Group
Construction Skills	Steve Geary	Employer Reference Group
CBI	Simon Nathan	Employer Reference Group
Business in the Community (BITC)	Sarah Gibb	Employer Reference Group
Superdrug	Gail Gittins	Employer Reference Group
Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA)	Gareth Griffiths	Employer Reference Group
Sainsbury's	Christine Jackson	Employer Reference Group
Sainsbury's	Matthew Marlow	Employer Reference Group
National Employer Service (NES)	Jenny Herdman	Employer Reference Group
McDonald's	Sue Husband	Employer Reference Group
Federation of Small Businesses (FSB)	Matthew Jaffa	Employer Reference Group
Interserve	Helen Jeffery	Employer Reference Group
UK Commission for Employment and Skills (UKCES)	Ian Kinder	Employer Reference Group
Ministry of Defence (MoD)	Erwin Moore	Employer Reference Group

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
BT	Andy Palmer	Employer Reference Group
Carillion	Dean Smith	Employer Reference Group
TUI Travel	Andy Smyth	Employer Reference Group
British Chambers of Commerce (BCC)	Ann Tipple	Employer Reference Group
Barchester Healthcare	Terry Tucker	Employer Reference Group
Fitness Industry Association (FIA)	Fred Turok	Employer Reference Group
CIPD	Katerine Rudiger	Employer Reference Group
Chair Marches LEP Alamo Group Europe	Dr Geoffrey Davies MBE	Roundtable
Chair Shropshire Business Board, Marches Care Limited	Mrs Mandy Thorn	Roundtable
General Manager, Caterpillar Remanufacturing	Mr Daniel Shockley	Roundtable
Managing Director, Stadco Ltd	Mr Dermot Sterne	Roundtable
Managing Director, Pork Farms Ltd, Palethorpes	Mr Lewis McCloud	Roundtable
Managing Director, Grocontinental Ltc	Mr David Grocott	Roundtable
Director of Morris Care, Morris & Co	Mr Timothy Morris	Roundtable
General Manager, ABP Ellesmere	Mr Steve Thompson	Roundtable
Supply Operation Manager, Premier Medical	Mr David Speakman	Roundtable
Managing Director, Bridgnorth Aluminium	Mr Simon MacVicar	Roundtable
Principal, Harper Adams University	Dr David Llewellyn	Roundtable
Principal, Shrewsbury College of Art and Technology	Mr Greg Molan	Roundtable
Principal, Walford and North Shropshire College	Mr Andrew Tyley	Roundtable

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
Head Teacher, Shropshire Head Teachers	Mr Philip Poulton	Roundtable
Regional Director for the West Midlands, NFU	Mr David Collier	Roundtable
Partner, Dyke Yaxley	Mr Mark Bramall	Roundtable
Director, Husk Consulting	Mrs Ann Johnson	Roundtable
Managing Director, Heart of England Fine Foods	Mrs Karen Davies MBE	Roundtable
Managing Director, e4Environment	Ms Mandy Stoker	Roundtable
Managing Director, Starfish Advertising & Marketing Ltd	Mrs Alison Bukhari	Roundtable
Managing Director, Purecom	Mr Matt Sandford	Roundtable
Service Manager Business & Enterprise, Service Manager Business & Enterprise	Mr Mark Pembleton	Roundtable
Council Leader, Shropshire Council	Cllr Keith Barrow	Roundtable
Leader Liberal Democrats, Shropshire Council	Cllr Peter Philips	Roundtable
Chief Executive, Shropshire Council	Mr Kim Ryley	Roundtable
Corporate Director- Places, Shropshire Council	Mr Tom McCabe	Roundtable
Managing Director, BAE SystemsGroup	Nigel Whitehead	Business Breakfast
Education Manager, McDonald's	Sue Husband	Business Breakfast
Non-executive director DfE	Theodore Agnew	Business Breakfast
National Grid and keen supporter of UTC projects	Richard Earp	Business Breakfast
Talent and Resource Director, Cross Rail Ltd	Valerie Todd	Business Breakfast
Accredited Programmes Manager, TUI Travel	Andy Smyth	Business Breakfast
McKinsey	Hugh Harper	Business Breakfast
CBI	Lucy Armstrong	Small Business Economic Forum
Institute of Credit Management	Philip King	Small Business Economic Forum
Forum of Private Business	Phil Orford	Small Business Economic

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
		Forum
Federation of Small Businesses	John Walker	Small Business Economic Forum
Entrepreneur	Sara Murray	Small Business Economic Forum
Entrepreneur	David Irwin	Small Business Economic Forum
ICAEW	Michael Izza	Small Business Economic Forum
ACCA	Helen Brand	Small Business Economic Forum
EEF – The Manufacturers' Organisation	Terry Scuoler	Small Business Economic Forum
Tesco Plc		Bilateral
UKTI	Susan Haird	Business Breakfast
HMT	Dan Micklethwaite	Business Breakfast
CBI	Katja Hall	Business Breakfast
CBI	Emma Wild	Business Breakfast
Ultra Furniture	Glenn Aston	Business Breakfast
What More UK Ltd	Tony Grimshaw	Business Breakfast
Cambridge ESOL	Susan Randall	Business Breakfast
United Corporation	Karim Fatehi	Business Breakfast
Wolf Review	Alison Wolf	Education & Skills Summit
Academic, Cardiff University	Ewart Keep	Education & Skills Summit
Institute for Fiscal Studies	Lorraine Dearden/ Steve Machin	Education & Skills Summit
Head of Skills, Institute of Directors	Mike Harris	Education & Skills Summit
Basic Skills Expert, London School of Economics	Anna Vignoles	Education & Skills Summit
Policy Exchange	Ralph Hartley/ Anna Fazackerley	Education & Skills Summit

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
Academic – SME and high performance working specialist, University of Durham	Ian Stone	Education & Skills Summit
Chief Executive, ACAS	John Taylor	Education & Skills Summit
Albatross Group	Sean Taggart	Education & Skills Summit
Astra Zeneca	Jackie Wilbraham	Education & Skills Summit
BAE systems and UKCES commissioner	Nigel Whitehead	Education & Skills Summit
Director of People, BBC	Lucy Adams	Education & Skills Summit
Director General, British Chambers of Commerce	David Frost	Education & Skills Summit
Director of learning, BT	Peter Butler	Education & Skills Summit
CEO, Business in the Community	Stephen Howard	Education & Skills Summit
Director General, CBI	John Cridland	Education & Skills Summit
CE of the Council for Industry and Higher Education	David Docherty	Education & Skills Summit
Chief Executive, Chartered Management Institute	Ruth Spellman,	Education & Skills Summit
Chief Executive, Chartered Institute of Personal development	Jackie Orme	Education & Skills Summit
CEO, Chartered Insurance Institute	Sandy Scott	Education & Skills Summit
Crossrail and UKCES commissioner	Valerie Todd	Education & Skills Summit
Chief Economist, Engineering Employers Federation (EEF)	Lee Hopley	Education & Skills Summit
Chair of education and skills, Federation of Small Businesses	Colin Wilman	Education & Skills Summit
Chair, Ford of Britain	Joe Greenwell	Education & Skills Summit
Government Relations, GE Aviation	Jonathan Walton	Education & Skills Summit
GlaxoSmithKline	Hannah Jones	Education & Skills Summit
CEO Img Tec and member of National Microelectronics Institute	Hossein Yassaie	Education & Skills Summit
Institute of Leadership and Management	David Pardey	Education & Skills Summit

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
Head of leadership and development, Interserve	Carl Johnson	Education & Skills Summit
KPMG and UK Commissioner	Jeremy Anderson	Education & Skills Summit
Head of Training, Kwik Fit	Paul Binks	Education & Skills Summit
HR Director, Mitie	Joanne Bacon	Education & Skills Summit
Pyronix Ltd and UKCES commissioner	Julie Kenny	Education & Skills Summit
Serco and UKCES commissioner	Chris Hyman	Education & Skills Summit
Apprenticeships programme director, Superdrug	Gail Gittins	Education & Skills Summit
Deputy Chairman, Wates Construction Limited	James Wates	Education & Skills Summit
Chief Executive, e-Skills	Karen Price	Education & Skills Summit
Chair, People1st	David Fairhurst (MacDonalds)	Education & Skills Summit
Chair, SEMTA	Allan Cook	Education & Skills Summit
TUC and UKCES commissioner	Brendan Barber	Education & Skills Summit
Unison and UKCES commissioner	Dave Prentis	Education & Skills Summit
Academic	Anna Vignoles (LSE)	Programme of consultations with Academics and Think Tanks
Academic	Lorna Unwin (University of London and NIESR)	Programme of consultations with Academics and Think Tanks
Academic	Ewart Keep	Programme of consultations with Academics and Think Tanks
Think Tank	ResPublica	Programme of consultations with Academics and Think Tanks
Business Representative Body	CBI	Programme of consultations with Academics and Think Tanks
Business Representative Body	IoD	Programme of consultations

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
		with Academics and Think Tanks
Academic	Steve Mackintosh	Programme of consultations with Academics and Think Tanks
Oracle		Meeting
Hewlett-Packard (HP)		Meeting
Blitz Games		Meeting
Metropolitan Police		Meeting
e-skills UK		Meeting
RBS Insurance		Meeting
E-Skills		Roundtable
Cogent		Meeting
HEFCE		Teleconference
Society of Biology		Meeting
Skills Funding Agency		Workshop
City & Guilds		Meeting
UK Commission for Employment and Skills		Meeting
University Alliance		Meeting
Skills for Logistics		Roundtable
Engineering Council		Meeting
Ofqual		Meeting
Skills Funding Agency		Meeting
National Skills Academy for Nuclear		Teleconference
Fitness Industry Providers Forum		Meeting
British Chamber of Commerce		Meeting
British Retail Consortium		Meeting
Lifetime – Training provider		Meeting
Leeds LEP		Meeting
BITC		Meeting
FSB		Meeting
CIPD		Meeting
CBI		Meeting
NSA for Railway Engineering		Meeting
Kirklees Council		Meeting
Institution of Engineering and Technology		Meeting
Coventry Focus Group – 8 SME employers		Meeting
Somers Forge Focus Group – 8 SME employers		Meeting

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
West of England Partnership		Meeting
Association of Goldsmiths		Meeting
London Chamber of Commerce Focus Group – 7 SME employers		Meeting
First Steps to Employment		Meeting
Association of Employment and Learning Providers		Meeting
SEMTA - SSC		Meeting
London Focus Group – 4 SME employers		Meeting
The Trees Group – social enterprise		Meeting
Manchester Focus Group – 10 SME employers		Meeting
PM Training – training provider		Meeting
Doncaster Focus Group – 7 SME employers and 2 training providers		Meeting
Knutsford focus group – 3 SME employers		Meeting
Alison Brown – Creative Media consultant		Meeting
Skills Funding Agency	Ann Jones	Meeting
DWP	Debbie Ralph	Meeting
HM Treasury	Ruth Hannat	Meeting
HM Treasury	Nick McManus	Meeting
Department for Education	Cynthia Davies	Meeting
Department for Education	Tessa Griffiths	Meeting
Ofsted	Karen Adriaanse	Meeting
Ofqual	Sarah Rudge	Meeting
Federation of Awarding Bodies	Jill Lanning	Meeting
Learning & Skills Improvement Service	Rob Pheasant	Meeting
NIACE	Carol Taylor	Meeting
Assetskills	Chris James	Meeting
Institute for Learning	Michelle Jennings	Meeting
TUC	Judith Swift	Meeting
Association of Colleges	Joy Mercer	Meeting
Institute of Education	Helen Casey	Meeting
National Employer Service	Hilary Chadwick	Meeting
National Employer Service	Jennifer Herdman	Meeting
McDonald's	Louise Ellis	Meeting
Derbyshire L&D Consortium	Lisa Vernon	Meeting

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
CBI	Simon Nathan	Meeting
FSB	Nina Reeve	Meeting
Joint Council for Qualifications	Judith Norrington	Meeting
Ufi	Dereth Wood	Meeting
UK Commission for Employment and Skills	Judith Compton	Meeting
Small Business Economic Forum		Meeting
EEF		Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Dr Mike Short, President of the IET	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Stephen Uden, Head of Skills & Economic Affairs, Microsoft	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Prof. Calie Pistorious, VC Hull	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Paul Broadhurst, CEO of Technetix designs	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Stephen Burgin, UK President, Alstom	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Richard Earp, Education and Skills Manager, The National Grid	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Nigel Fine, Chief Executive and Secretary of the IET	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Dr Paul Golby, CEO EON; Chairman, EngineeringUK	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Richard Hamer, Education Director BAE systems	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Prof. Quintin McKellar, VC Hertfordshire	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Professor Jim Macdonald, VC Strathclyde	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Sir Keith O'Nions, VC Imperial	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Sir Jim (John) O'Reilly, VC Cranfield	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Professor Wendy Purcell, VC Plymouth	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Professor Chris Snowden, VC Surrey University	Roundtable
Institute of Engineering and Technology (IET)	Professor William Webb, CEO Neul	Roundtable
Business Schools		Roundtable
Whitehall Industry Group event	BAE Systems	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	Sainsburys	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	BP	Meeting

Stakeholder	Individual	Engagement Type
Whitehall Industry Group event	M&S	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	John Lewis	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	PWC	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	Rolls Royce	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	CBI	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	IoD	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	FSB	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	EADS	Meeting
Whitehall Industry Group event	Tesco	Meeting
Kitemarking Roundtables	CBI	Roundtable
Kitemarking Roundtables	UUK	Roundtable
Kitemarking Roundtables	HEFCE	Roundtable
Kitemarking Roundtables	SEMTA	Roundtable
Kitemarking Roundtables	COGENT	Roundtable
Kitemarking Roundtables	E-SKILLS	Roundtable

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. Visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is also available on our website at www.bis.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET
Tel: 020 7215 5000

If you require this publication in an alternative format, email enquiries@bis.gsi.gov.uk, or call 020 7215 5000.

URN 12/577