

ELWa

Final Report

Auditing the Supply of Learning

Final Report

Auditing the Supply of Learning

Submitted to:

Julie Owens
Senior Research Analyst
ELWa
Unit 6, Richard Davies Street
St Asaph Business Park
ST ASAPH
Denbighshire LL17 OLJ

Submitted by:

CRG Research Ltd
25 Cathedral Road
CARDIFF
CF11 9TZ

In Partnership with Dateb and Miller Research (UK)

Tel: 029 20 343218
Fax: 029 20 667328
consult@crgresearch.co.uk
www.crgresearch.co.uk

1 February 2005

Contents

1.	BACKGROUND	4
	▪ Introduction	4
	▪ Aims and Objectives	5
	▪ Expected Value and Relevance	6
	▪ Agreed Scope and Assumptions Made	7
2.	RESEARCH METHOD	8
3.	FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE	12
	▪ Developments Outside Wales	12
	▪ Developments in Wales	20
	▪ Developments Within ELWa	22
4.	FINDINGS OF STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS	24
	▪ Introduction	24
	▪ Sources of Supply Side Information	24
	▪ Datasets and Data Management	25
	▪ Current Information Use	26
	▪ Developments Likely to Impact Upon the Use of Information	28
	▪ Perceived Purposes of Information	28
	▪ Perceived Future Information Needs	30
	▪ Constraints on the Effective Use of Supply Side Information	31
	▪ Conclusions About the Use of Supply Side Information	32
5.	PROPOSED MODEL AND PILOT EXERCISE	33
	▪ Use of the model (include partially populated model in appendices)	34
6.	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PILOT	52
	▪ Introduction	52
	▪ Internal Stakeholders' Perceptions	52
	▪ External Stakeholders' Perceptions	55
7.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	64
	APPENDIX 1: References and Bibliography	65
	APPENDIX 2: Partially populated model for Flintshire	68
	APPENDIX 3: Partially populated model for the Construction Sector	85
	APPENDIX 4: List of LLWR Fields	97

1. Background

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 In the Spring of 2004, CRG Research Ltd - in association with Miller Research UK Ltd and Dateb – was commissioned by ELWa to undertake a project designed to support ELWa in developing its thinking about the method of assessing the supply of learning.
- 1.1.2 Previous work undertaken by ELWa (particularly in relation to Mid Wales) had pointed to potential benefits from a much more structured and systematic approach to assembling supply-side data about learning.
- 1.1.3 Particular value was expected to come from an appropriate model in an era where considerable changes were already apparent, both within ELWa and amongst its partners. In particular, ELWa's single National Planning Framework and Funding System (NPFS), then under active development, was expected to lead to much more overt decision making and clarity in choosing the most appropriate and cost-effective learning routes. The emerging Sector Skills Councils (SSCs) are also expected to be leading to much more informed and strategic questioning of previous arrangements in relation to the supply of learning. For example, the emerging Sector Skills agreement between ELWa and pathfinder SSCs include an assessment of current provision of learning for their respective sectors. Many providers of learning (in particular Further Education colleges) had rapidly increased their capacity for structured planning and analysis of issues like competitive advantage and probable future demands for learning over recent years: again, an effective audit of supply framework was expected to support this activity, leading to overall quality and cost-effectiveness gains.
- 1.1.4 In relation to technical developments several specific changes were also envisaged at this stage, namely:
- The phased introduction of the LLWR database;
 - The longer term integration of LLWR and PLASC;
 - The longer term integration of ACE and informal learning data;
 - The development of the Welsh Learning Aims Database;
 - The developing credit and qualifications framework;
 - The ongoing national funding systems review;
 - The introduction of Company Learning Accounts and the reintroduction of Individual Learning Accounts.
 - The coincidental introduction of a Provider Performance Review system.

- 1.1.5 All of this pointed to potential benefits from a much more integrated and consistent approach to using data effectively, and requirements for the project to provide ‘a framework model for managing information about the supply of learning and enable informed decisions to be made’.
- 1.1.6 The rest of this report details:
- A summary of the research method adopted
 - Findings from the literature review, covering developments both within Wales and more widely
 - Results from stakeholder consultations
 - Description of the proposed model and the piloting exercise
 - Findings of the evaluation of the pilot
 - Conclusions and recommendations
- 1.1.7 It seems fair to say that the project has not always gone as anticipated: in the rapidly changing context outlined above, further technical developments (e.g. the introduction of the SuperSTAR system) have arisen which need to be given particular attention in taking forward the findings from this report.
- 1.1.8 Equally, of course, during the period of this project the announcement was made that ELWa (and various other Assembly-Sponsored Public Bodies) will become integrated within Welsh Assembly Government structures – leading to a range of additional questions which cannot be fully resolved at this point.
- 1.1.9 Nevertheless, by the end of the project period a workable model has been developed and piloted: the challenge posed to ELWa and its strategic partners is that – whilst the model itself may be both useful and technically usable for rolling out more widely – its full potential impact can only be achieved if a number of significant decisions and resources allocation choices are made to provide appropriate support and guidance.

1.2 Aims and Objectives

- 4.3.7 As we have pointed out already, the overall aim of the study was to support ELWa in its thinking about the role and remit of a Supply Audit, including developing and undertaking a pilot audit of the supply of learning in Further Education institutions and major work based learning providers across Wales, and to develop proposals and a project plan to undertake a full supplier audit in 2004 – 2005.

Five more detailed objectives centred on:

- To review existing approaches towards audits of supply in order to draw out good practice;
- To develop and agree with ELWa a Welsh model for auditing supply;
- To pilot the use of the agreed model to audit supply;
- To evaluate lessons learnt from the pilot study;
- To develop a project plan for the full audit of supply to be undertaken in 2004 or later.

4.3.8 These objectives have been followed closely throughout the project: as we pointed out in 1.1 a number of unforeseen developments have complicated aspects of the study, but extensive support from Julie Owens, the project manager, and her colleagues, has resolved issues as they have arisen. Whilst the aims and objectives remain fully valid, some changes in emphasis have emerged: in particular, a work plan has only been given in outline form until key decisions about, for example, technical links and resourcing have been made. On the other hand, many more lessons were learned during piloting than at one time seemed likely, so we are able to give much more detail about the kinds of practical, 'hands-on' issues which are likely to arise when the model goes 'live'.

1.3 Expected Value and Relevance

1.3.1 It has always been arguable that those wishing to consider questions about the Audit of Supply for particular locations or within particular sectors might simply wish to access existing information for themselves – perhaps via Estyn reports, public sector information, LLWR or additional information. Equally, it is essential to note that ELWa has high levels of expertise within the Data and Analysis Teams within IM&T (referred to subsequently as DAS) who have proved themselves well able to provide effective analyses and reports without an Audit of Supply tool as such. We are also well aware that, for example, Further Education colleges increasingly have access to expertise allowing them to assess both their own performance and that of other providers, overall patterns of supply, and look at, for example, competitor capabilities. CCETs too, although the position varies, have been able to conduct careful reviews of supply-side issues – either from within their own resources, commissioning external work or drawing on expertise held by, for example, relevant local authorities.

1.3.2 Yet considerable evidence pointed to a further need – first – for a more integrated and accessible system of assembling supply-side data in structured, consistent, commonly understood and rigorous ways; this was seen as being of potential benefit even to relatively 'sophisticated' users (for example, with amongst those responsible for ELWa's National Planning and Funding System). Perhaps even higher hopes rested with opportunities identified for helping those less familiar with statistical sources and techniques – perhaps within operational management parts of ELWa, CCETs, and providers. Given a framework model with reasonably 'easy to use' characteristics, again it was expected that more informed, coherent decision-making would emerge – boosting both the overall cost-effectiveness of learning supply but, also tending to drive up quality standards too.

1.3.3 Whilst these characteristics have – broadly – been delivered through the project so far, we do have to repeat the point that the full potential of the model, particularly in relation to the needs of non-specialist users, is going to need considerable extra support and development work on the part of ELWa and relevant stakeholders.

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

1.4 Agreed Scope and Assumptions Made

- 1.4.1 The aims and objectives listed above define the primary scope for the project. Inevitably, this has led to a number of caveats: first, the model is based – as it must necessarily be – on ‘best available’ data. In some instances, this means there are gaps in the information available through the model – nothing relevant can currently be provided. Similarly, concerns have inevitably arisen when data presented in the model, is perhaps, two or more years old.
- 1.4.2 Further issues which have arisen from considering the scope of the model as currently configured come, first, from an emphasis on CCET/local authority geographical areas: whilst this has inevitably proved the most relevant and widely usable spatial analysis, it does not necessarily meet all requirements set by, for example, individual providers of learning who may well have ‘catchment areas’ by no means coterminous with CCET areas. Equally, an emphasis on sectoral analyses – whilst widely seen as the most appropriate level of analysis for employers and learning routes, does not necessarily align with all subject/sector area requirements, and also has had to address concerns that some SSCs have developed much further in their capabilities for analysing and handling data than others have, at least so far.
- 1.4.3 In terms of assumptions made, careful attention has had to be given to the different priorities of those with different levels of access to statistical information, varied access to know-how about how information may best be analysed, and those with different levels and characteristics of need for information. Technical constraints about, in particular, Data Protection Act restrictions on access to data have also needed to be borne in mind throughout. Assumptions have been made as transparent as possible, but clearly significant variability has been encountered.
- 1.4.4 For the pilot exercise, it is important to note that data was confined to Further Education and WBL provision, although the model could potentially be more widely applicable, subject to data being held on LLWR. Equally, the pilot focused on Flintshire and the construction sector, but the model queries presented are more widely applicable.
- 1.4.5 Inevitably, the model as piloted had to be constructed to take advantage of data already held by ELWa rather than data which might be desirable to access - accessibility being a key consideration, although provision has been made within the model for some information which we think is particularly important but is not available - or is only available at some spatial levels e.g. learner satisfaction data.
- 1.4.6 As one final point for this introduction, the research team are sincerely grateful for high levels of assistance from many individuals within ELWa and other stakeholder organisations. It is essential to note, however, that responsibility for any remaining errors or omissions rest firmly with the research team.

2. Research Method

2.1 In this section we set out the methodology used to undertake the study. It is presented in eight parts, as follows:

- Inception
- Review of Developments Outside and Within Wales
- Review of Existing Data
- Development and Agreement of a Welsh Framework Model
- Pilot Audit
- Evaluation of the Pilot Audit
- Presentation of the Findings of the Evaluation of the Pilot Audit
- Recommend Future Development

2.1.1 Items 2.2.3 to 2.2.10 below revisit the purpose of each element of the work and describe the activities which we undertook under each one. The overall work programme extended from February – November 2004.

2.1.2 Inception

Purpose

To clarify the scope of the evaluation and to agree the methodology for the work with the Project Manager and the Steering Group.

Activities

Initial meeting with the Project Manager and Steering Group to discuss our proposed approach and to receive project data;

Development of a draft work plan for discussion with the Project Manager;

Development of an outline questioning framework;

Preparation of final work plan and inception report.

2.1.3 Review of Developments Within and Outside Wales

Purpose

- To learn lessons from work already undertaken within and outside Wales;

Activities

Review of literature surrounding the ‘mapping’ of learning provision within and outside Wales. Details of the documents reviewed are given in Appendix 1.

Face to face discussion with members of the Mid Wales regional team to explore the processes and outcomes of the work already done to ‘map’ the Mid Wales learning network;

Face to face discussion with the DAS teams to explore the processes and outcomes of the work already done to ‘map’ the Mid Wales learning network;

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Telephone discussions with a range of organisations outside Wales to gain a clearer picture of developments elsewhere. The organisations contacted included:

- The Learning and Skills Council (LSC);
- Five Local Learning and Skills Councils (LLSCs);
- The Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA);
- The Scottish Parliament;
- The Scottish Further Education Funding Council (SFEFC).

The need to conduct this element of the work had not been foreseen at the inception phase of the study;

- Synthesis of the findings of the literature review and discussions, drawing out key lessons to emerge.
- Discussion of literature review with client Project Manager.

2.1.4 Review of Existing Data

Purpose

- To clarify data availability and data sources.

Activities

- Discussion with DAS to clarify the nature and accessibility of student and learner data currently held (ISR and trainee databases);
- Discussion with DAS to explore the nature and accessibility of data envisaged under the new LLWR database and other sources;
- Development of a list of potential data sources.

2.1.5 Development of a Welsh Model

Purpose

- To develop one or more practical and usable models for auditing the supply of learning;
- To secure the 'buy-in' of a range of stakeholders to the model(s) developed.

Activities

- Development of research instruments to guide structured interviews with stakeholders from ELWa and other organisations;
- Three Focus Group discussions with key informants from ELWa: it had been planned to host five Focus Groups, one in each of ELWa's regional offices and one at the Llanishen office. However, there was a disappointing response to our invitation to participate and one Focus Group meeting was cancelled;
- One to one interviews with selected ELWa staff: this element of the project had not been planned at the inception stage and was undertaken in light of people's inability to participate in Focus Group discussions;
- Face to face discussions with representatives from a minimum of two CCETs about their perceived information needs;
- Face to face and telephone discussions with representatives from ConstructionSkills (formerly CITB) and Skillset about their perceived information needs;

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- Face to face discussions with representatives from three training providers; these interviews involved staff at various levels to ensure coverage of different disciplines and perspectives within those organisations;
- Synthesis of the findings of stakeholder interviews;
- Research team meeting to brainstorm ideas and construct a framework model in light of the intelligence gathered during the Review of Other Audits, the Review of Existing Data and the various discussions with key stakeholders. We were anxious to ensure that the framework model would enable the supply of learning to be analysed by type as well as by sectoral and spatial variables;
- Presenting the draft model to the Project Manager and Steering Group and agreeing to undertake a spatial pilot focusing upon Flintshire and a thematic/sectoral pilot focusing upon Construction training/learning;
- Developing a detailed work-plan for the pilot audit phase of the project.

2.1.6 Pilot Audit

Purpose

- To test the practicality of populating the model developed with data held by ELWa;
- To identify gaps in the data currently held by ELWa;
- To explore providers' ability and preparedness to supply additional data not currently held by ELWa;
- To assess the feasibility of sourcing additional data from providers;
- To identify potential implications of rolling the model out across all Further Education and work based learning providers.

Activities

- Defining clearly the framework model's data needs;
- Designing queries which will enable relevant data to be accessed from sources such as LLWR and SIR with the minimum of difficulty;
- Working with DAS to access information and populate the framework model with data relating to Flintshire and to construction related training/learning in the South West Wales area. The workload of ELWa's Data and Analysis Teams meant that this element of the project took substantially longer to complete than we had anticipated;
- Reviewing the populated framework model to establish where data gaps lie;
- Accessing data from other sources, primarily Estyn reports and NOP's 2003 Learner Satisfaction Survey to fill in gaps as well as possible;
- Presenting the partially populated framework models to Flintshire CCET, ConstructionSkills and the Swansea Bay Construction Group and inviting their responses to the framework model;
- Following up the framework model's presentation with an e-mail posing key questions of learning providers about their supply side information needs and exploring their ability/willingness to provide additional data to fill gaps;
- Following up the e-mail questionnaire with four telephone calls to gauge providers' reactions and their ability/willingness to provide additional data;

- It had been intended that we would survey up to five providers to access data not held by ELWa. However, providers were not enthusiastic about providing additional data and this element of the work was not undertaken.

2.1.7 Evaluation of the Pilot Audit

Purpose

- To assess the practicality of populating the model developed with the data required;
- To assess the effectiveness of the data collection instruments and approaches developed;
- To identify potential implications of rolling the model out across all Further Education and work based learning providers.

Activities

- Identification of the gaps between data needs and data accessed;
- Documenting the sources of existing data;
- Reviewing the effectiveness of data extraction processes;
- Limited discussion with members of the Swansea Bay Construction Training Group to assess the usefulness of information produced by the framework model from their perspective;
- Discussion with 19 key stakeholders within ELWa to assess the utility of the model from their perspectives;
- Team meeting to discuss the pilot 'audit' and the findings of our evaluation and to brainstorm our emerging conclusions;
- Presentation of the findings of our evaluations of the pilot exercise and our emerging conclusions with the Steering Group.

2.1.8 Recommendations for Future Developments

Purpose

- To develop an outline plan for a full audit of supply in 2004/05.

Activities

- Draw together the findings of each of the earlier stages of the project;
- Agree an outline timetable for the full audit of supply with the Steering Group;
- Draw up an outline project plan, identifying key milestones for the full audit
- Production of draft and agreed final reports, including Executive Summary, with recommendations as given in Section 7.
- Presentations to the Project Manager and Steering Group.

3. Findings from the Literature

3.1 In this section we set out the findings of:

- Our review of relevant literature from outside Wales, including the documents identified in our Inception Report: details are given in Appendix 1`;
- Telephone discussions with a number of external agencies in England, Wales and Scotland;
- Our review of relevant ELWa documents: details are also given in Appendix1.

3.2 Our findings are presented in three parts:

- A review of developments outside Wales;
- A review of developments in Wales:
- A review of developments within ELWa.

3.3 Developments Outside Wales

3.3.1 In order to build a picture of developments outside Wales, we reviewed a number of documents and spoke to key contributors from a range of organisations including:

- The Learning and Skills Council (LSC);
- Five Local Learning and Skills Councils (LLSCs);
- The Scottish Executive;
- The Scottish Further Education Funding Council (SFEFC);
- The Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA).

3.3.2 In this section we present a synthesis of the findings of our literature review and discussions, looking at developments in England and Scotland separately. Paragraphs 3.3.3 to 3.3.16 deal with developments in England, whilst paragraphs 3.3.17 to 3.3.24 discuss developments in Scotland.

England

Strategic Area Reviews

- 3.3.3 In England, the Department for Employment and Skills (DfES) and the Learning and Skills Council have developed a joint strategy for reforming Further Education and training. Success for All (2002), as it is entitled, points to the role of Strategic Area Reviews (StARs) in providing “a comprehensive assessment of the pattern of provision in every part of the country”. It envisages that StARs will help to “drive up quality and success rates across the learning and skills sector” by examining how well existing provision meets the needs of various stakeholders and identifying the strengths and weaknesses of providers as the basis for improvement. The StARs process draws upon information compiled as part of twice annual Provider Performance Reviews. Responsibility for taking forward StARs has been delegated to the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) and thence to Local Learning and Skills Councils (LLSCs).
- 3.3.4 The LSC’s Circular 03/06 sets out arrangements for undertaking StARs of all LSC funded post-16 learning and skills provision. The StAR process comprises seven ‘activities’, which the guidance indicates may be carried out consecutively or concurrently:
- a. Preparatory planning work;
 - b. Information gathering and analysis;
 - c. Developing and appraising strategic options;
 - d. Appropriate local consultation;
 - e. Publishing outcomes;
 - f. Implementing outcomes; and
 - g. Evaluating the process and outcomes.
- 3.3.5 It is envisaged that the ‘information gathering and analysis’ stage of the process will consider the ‘long-term’ demand for provision in terms of learner, employer and community needs and examine the existing and planned supply of learning. Clearly, it is this second element which most closely relates to ELWa’s proposed Audit of Supply.
- 3.3.6 Although not explicit about the information to be used in analysing the supply of learning, it is clear that LLSCs are expected to make use of existing datasets such as Individualised Learner Record (ILR) and Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC). The guidance goes on to say that additional, often qualitative data should be used, including LSC performance review assessments, inspection findings and feedback upon the perceived quality and relevance of learning from sources such as Jobcentre Plus and Connexions (the English Careers Companies). The guidance also makes specific mention of assessing ‘value for money’, although no details are given as to how this should be addressed.

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- 3.3.7 It is expected that by spring 2005, each of the 47 LLSCs will have completed the process and will have incorporated the outcomes in their local strategic plans. In the meantime, however, the LSC has identified nine pioneer LLSCs to be involved in a formative evaluation of the StAR process.
- 3.3.8 The StARs guidance acknowledges that some LLSCs will have started to review provision prior to its publication and recognises that each will take a slightly different approach, reflecting local circumstances. Published StAR specifications or action plans would suggest that most LSCs are at the analysis stage of development, with an expectation that they will have generated strategic options by the autumn.
- 3.3.9 We spoke to a handful of LLSCs reported to have made most progress in developing StARs in order to build a picture of activity, to understand the issues which they had encountered during the process and to explore the use which had been made of supply side information, once analysed. Key issues to emerge from these discussions are summarised below.

Sources of Data

- 3.3.10 Data about the various strands of learning were not universally available or reliable and were, therefore, used to varying degrees by different LLSCs. Sources of supply side data used by one or more of the LLSCs which we consulted included:
- The LSC's centralised ILR database;
 - PLASC post-16 datasets;
 - Aggregated New Deal participation data from Jobcentre Plus;
 - Locally commissioned reviews of Adult Continuing Education;
 - OFSTED Inspection Reports, including Area Inspection Reports;
 - Adult Learning Inspectorate reports, including Area Inspection Reports;
 - DfES schools performance data;
 - DfES/NCER value added data, where subject based figures are supplied by LEAs;
 - Locally commissioned learner satisfaction surveys;
 - Other locally commissioned research.
- 3.3.11 The following elements of learning fall outside the scope of any reviews of supply undertaken:
- Students in private education;
 - Self funded learning e.g. driving lessons;
 - Training entirely funded by employers;
 - Training provided by charities and voluntary organisations (which does not receive LSC support).

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Individualised Learner Records

- 3.3.12 Circular 02/03 sets out the Learning and Skills Council's medium-term strategy for the collection of learner data and the introduction of the new Individualised Learner Record (ILR) format. The ILR format consists of 148 data fields and four related datasets:
- A learner dataset;
 - A learning aim dataset (with links to the learner dataset);
 - An ESF co-financing dataset (with links to the learner dataset);
 - An HE dataset.
- 3.3.13 In 2002/03 the ILR database was used to capture data on Further Education and Work Based Learning provision only. The 2003/04 ILR Specification sets out arrangements for extending the ILR's coverage to include LSC funded Adult Continuing Education provision.
- 3.3.14 All LLSCs have local access to ILR data, although it was clear that not all LLSCs are equipped to analyse data effectively; indeed, some had commissioned external bodies to analyse data for them. Generally, LLSCs envisaged that they would seek to develop the capacity to analyse and interpret data internally. It was generally recognised that ILR data are not perfect and some LLSCs had made a point of admitting this up-front in order to reduce the likelihood of discussions about the accuracy of data becoming distracting and hindering strategic debate.
- 3.3.15 Here, we present a series of 'mini case studies' emanating from our discussions with individual LLSCs.

LLSC A

LLSC A had undertaken an 'area survey' of LSC-funded provision in anticipation of the StARs process. The review involved collating and 'mapping' data from a number of existing sources including the then ISR database, a work based learning database and some PLASC data. External consultants had been engaged to undertake the work, although it was expected that a follow-on exercise would be undertaken by the LSC's internal Management Information Team.

Little use had been made of the 'mapped' data thus far; however, plans were in place to analyse them *"in order to find out what it all means"*. The expectation was that the data, once analysed, would help the LSC to identify areas of duplication and gaps in provision, but it was clear that the *"jury is still out as to whether it's useful ... whether we're able to use it"*. The LSC seemed to be more convinced, at this stage, of the value of research into specific topics - employer perceptions of certain providers, the causes of high drop-out rates etc. - rather than 'mapping' provision.

The LLSC claimed not to have *"done anything publishable yet"*.

LLSC B

LLSC B had invested heavily in software to enable the analysis of ISR/ILR and, in time, PLASC data to a fairly fine level of detail. The LLSC had also sought to build a picture of Adult Continuing Education (ACE) provision in terms of learning 'outlets', recruitment, retention and achievement, that is, to gather ACE data in a form comparable with that held for other strands of provision.

Data on ACE had revealed significant variations in the levels of provision available across different parts of the LLSC area, but had not led to any actions as yet.

The software was perceived to have helped the LLSC to 'negotiate' with FEIs – *"we can analyse provision down to course level"*. It was claimed that over the last five years robust supply side information had been used to 'persuade' colleges to tailor provision, to develop specialisms, to put on provision at level 3 and above and to work up CoVE proposals. It was also claimed that information generated by the system had helped the LLSC to make the case for 'merging' a weak college with a stronger one.

More recently, it was claimed that data generated by the system had been used to *"drive up the quality of work based learning"*, which had meant reducing the number of work based learning providers and, in the process, *"driving down volumes"*.

Although information generated by the system had been used to predicate or to justify some significant changes, the LLSC was eager to stress that it was generally used to support 'local area' planning, to inform 'local learning networks' and to develop 'collegiate arrangements' – *"it's not about being radical ... it enables us to provide better leadership"*. LLSC B had not published information generated by the system.

LLSC C

LLSC C had set out to *"map learners to colleges"* in the first instance, concentrating on the area of provision for which data is most readily available – *"we wanted to understand travel to learn patterns"*. It was clear that the LLSC had some concerns about the perceived quality of provision at one particular college and it had sought to 'map' travel to learn patterns as a means of confirming anecdotal evidence that local people were travelling to colleges further afield to avoid that particular institution.

The LLSC had found learner level data on other strands of provision *"very patchy"* and more difficult to capture and understand: data on 6th form provision was not well understood, data on work based learning often proved to be incomplete and unreliable and data on ACL was almost non-existent. The LLSC looked forward to the adoption of a consistent *"national standard"* for reviewing learning provision. It was also thought that the Further Education sector within the

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

learning community would be better placed to make use of StAR data – *“most WBL providers simply aren’t geared up to doing things with data”*.

The LLSC perceived ‘quantifiable’ supply side data as one component of a system of intelligence which would help to shape and improve the supply of learning – *“you still need a local presence to capture local intelligence”*. The LLSC StAR Action Plan identified a number of other potential sources of information about the supply of learning, including:

- The Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action (FRESA);
- Jobcentre Plus
- Ufi
- Property Review, including surveys of premises;
- Review of Special Needs Provision (LEA);
- Survey of Neighbourhood Learning in Deprived Communities (LEA);
- Research into the Views of Young People (Connexions);
- Research into Learners with Learning Difficulties and/or disabilities (Connexions);

In the longer term, it was envisaged that a better informed LLSC would be in a stronger position to *“buy provision rather than just giving money to providers”*. Thus far, however, only limited use had been made of information – *“the data is being shared with Vice Principals ... but it’s up to them what they do with it”*.

LLSC D

LLSC D had produced a learning and skills assessment focused on young people in two of its districts. The document contained an overview of learning provision for young people which set out:

Provider Related Information

- A list of learning providers in the area;
- The relative sizes of providers in terms of learner numbers;
- Enrolments by LSC ‘Areas of Learning’ (which are akin to ELWa Subject/sector areas);
- A broad outline of A Level courses provided;
- Discussion of composite performance against the new success rate measure for FEIs (which combines retention and achievement rates);
- FE retention and achievement data;
- WBL achievement data;
- School pre 16 ‘Value Added’ data (between Key Stage 3 and GCSE);
- School post-16 GCE/VCE points scores;
- Discussion of recent schools, Further Education and WBL inspection reports;
- Identification of existing or planned specialisms among schools;
- Identification of existing collaborative arrangements between providers (primarily between schools or between schools and colleges).

Learner Related Information

- Facets of the learner population in comparison to the population as a whole;
- School leavers destinations;

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- Levels of participation in learning by residents of individual wards;
- Sketchy details of New Deal participation;
- Level of learning being undertaken.

The document focused more closely upon supply side information than any previous LLSC publication – *“we were reasonably good at understanding the demand for skills and learning, but had not got to grips with the supply side in the past”*. Of course, this owed much to the LLSC having access to a wider range of supply side data than any of its predecessor organisations.

Despite more comprehensive supply side data, however, the assessment failed to identify clear mismatches in demand and supply, principally because of difficulties in *“translating demand language into supply language”*. This meant that the ‘opportunities for action’ (or ‘strategic options’ in StARS parlance) identified in the document were very general in nature and did not point to clear action.

Despite the document’s failings, it had been well received by stakeholders (partly because *“there was nothing else available”*) and it had started a series of debates among these stakeholders. It was felt that it would help to ‘kick-start’ a process of *“joint strategic planning”* and help to focus stakeholders upon problems which they are capable of addressing individually or jointly – *“getting us to focus on what we can do”*. The document certainly did not provide a platform for the LLSC to adopt a directive, top-down approach to planning or purchasing learning provision.

Review of Funding

3.3.16 The StARs process is running in parallel with moves to change the way in which Further Education is funded in England. LSC Circular 03/15 sets out proposals for the introduction of a funding system based on the agreement between colleges and the LSC of three year development plans, which address agreed skills needs and priorities. The document heralds a *“fundamental shift in the relationship between funding and planning”* in that existing retrospective adjustment arrangements will be discontinued (thus severing the direct link between data and funding) and reflects the expectation of ‘closer trust relationships’ between colleges and local LSCs.

3.3.17 Whilst it might have been expected that these ‘closer trust relationships’ would reduce the need for fine level data, the document emphasises the importance of accurate and timely ILR data to underpin effective planning and monitoring. Thus, the review of the Further Education funding system would seem to increase the pressure to develop and maintain an effective ILR system.

Scotland

- 3.3.18 The 'Mapping Lifelong Learning Provision in Scotland' (2001) report was commissioned shortly after the formation of the Scottish Parliament to inform the Lifelong Learning Enquiry in Scotland. It provided brief profiles of a range of learning provider 'sectors', and set out, in broad terms, the means by which provision of various kinds was funded. The report did not 'map' provision per se.
- 3.3.19 The report was heralded as the start of a process of systematic data gathering, although there is no evidence that the process was taken any further. Responding to our question surrounding the use made of the report, an officer of the Scottish Executive explained that "*it became ridiculously over-complicated ... there were so many players involved ... the risk of double counting was very high*" and, in the event, the final Lifelong Learning Enquiry report made no reference to the report. It was felt that the report had no operational value, but did help to demonstrate "*how uncoordinated it all was*". It was argued that the agenda had moved on in Scotland and any mapping undertaken now is tied into planning at a local level.

SFEFC Geographical Information Mapping System

- 3.3.20 Although the Mapping Lifelong Learning Provision project was not taken forward, considerable progress has been made in 'mapping' Further Education provision in Scotland with the launch of a new Geographical Information Mapping System (FEGIS) by the Scottish Further Education Funding Council in February 2004. The system uses Further Education data on participation and activity at colleges across Scotland and presents it on a map interface. Colleges have access to their own information about students and can also gain access to aggregated information about activity at other colleges. It was envisaged that the system will assist with strategic planning, curriculum planning and marketing at college level as well as assisting strategic collaboration between colleges at area and national levels.
- 3.3.21 The purpose of FEGIS is to provide users with a tool to analyse statistical information about Further Education in a geographical context. The student information that is presented is based on the Further Education statistics (FES) that are returned to SFEFC by all the colleges that it funds. The system superimposes the FES data onto an Ordnance Survey digital map. Users can explore and analyse specific data within the geographic area/s of their choice. The site also has census data which provides statistics on population, age, gender profiles and so on.
- 3.3.22 There are two methods of presenting FES information on the system ('aggregated' and 'point-based') which are described below. The two-level approach is partly to comply with data protection requirements, but it also allows users to carry out different levels of analysis appropriate to their requirements. All information on the site is derived from the post code for each student which is collected by colleges and sent to the SFEFC as part of the FES return.

3.3.23 Data Protection Act (DPA) requirements restrict access to information about individual students, so a grid-based system, which anonymises individual records, has been developed to enable different levels of access to the information on the system, as follows:

- Individual colleges have access to point-based information about students from their own college;
- SFEFC has access to point-based information about students for all colleges;
- The public at large has access to the grid-based information.

3.3.24 The 'Demand and Supply of Further Education in Scotland' report (2002) made use of Further Education data to provide an overview of the supply of Further Education in defined 'areas' which, although slightly larger, are akin to CCET areas in Wales. Key indicators were used to benchmark individual Further Education Institutions against the sector norm and variances interpreted in the context of 'demand' side intelligence. The 'supply side' indicators used are described below

- Participation Rates – enrolments expressed as a proportion of the population in defined areas. It is argued that participation rates are *“key indicators of activity and powerful measures pointing to the extent to which supply may not be meeting demand and need”*;
- Market Share and Competition – in terms of provider enrolments from particular areas. This indicator is expected to help delineate provider catchments, indicate the strength of competition, expose duplication and opportunities for collaboration;
- Patterns of Provision – enrolments in terms of variables such as subject/sector areas, mode of learning, level of learning etc. This indicator is expected to provide clues as to gaps in provision;
- Estate Adequacy and Needs – assessment of capital expenditure needs and plans to determine whether facilities are fit for purpose;
- Financial Health – in order to determine providers' capacity to offer a diversity of provision, to respond to changes in the market and to invest for the future;
- Collaboration – assessment of the degree to which providers collaborate and the strategic intent driving such collaboration.

3.4 Developments in Wales

3.4.1 The report by Miller Research (2001) outlines the processes involved in developing a database to 'map' publicly funded post-16 provision leading to an accredited qualification in Swansea. The database provided a 'snapshot' of provision on a particular census date (1 November 2000) in terms of:

- Participation in Further Education – using Individualised Student Record (ISR) data;
- Participation in schools – using pupil level data compiled especially for the exercise from schools' Student Information Management Systems (SIMS). The report points to substantial difficulties in compiling this data;

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- Participation in work based learning – using ‘trainee/apprentice’ data held by ELWa, augmented by additional information gathered from providers. The report points to significant differences in the sophistication of provider data returns, although their quality did not seem to be an issue;
- Participation in community education – using data provided by the Local Authority and the Workers Education Authority. The report notes that the bulk of this kind of provision was unaccredited;
- Participation in learning delivered by the voluntary sector. The report highlights the weakness of a census based approach in capturing information about short courses, often one day, which represent a significant element of learning delivered by the voluntary sector.

3.4.2 The report presents headline information about local provision, but emphasises that the database is capable of providing more detailed analyses of particular aspects of learning, depending upon users’ needs. It describes the database as a “*powerful tool in helping to target and improve the delivery*” of learning, not least by placing learner data in the wider context of datasets such as the National Assembly’s Index of Multiple Deprivation, data on health, on unemployment or on youth crime etc. In essence, the report illustrates the types of analysis which could be generated using supply side data.

3.4.3 The report also points to a number of issues which need to be addressed in ‘mapping’ learning provision, including:

- Mismatches between definitions and datasets relating to the different elements of learning;
- The additional burden which providing consistent data would place upon some providers;
- Difficulties in capturing data about non-accredited learning;
- Stakeholders’ ability to understand and use the data.

3.4.4 Estyn’s new Common Inspection Framework will provide information on a consistent basis on all post-16 providers (albeit over a six-year cycle) in respect of seven key areas:

- How well learners achieve;
- The effectiveness of training, teaching and assessment;
- The degree to which learning experiences meet the needs and interests of the wider community;
- The quality of guidance and support provided to learners;
- The effectiveness of leadership and strategic management within organisations providing learning;
- The effectiveness of leaders and managers within provider organisations in evaluating and improving quality standards;
- The efficiency with which managers within provider organisations use resources.

3.4.5 Also, introduction of area inspections which will typically (though not always) be coterminous with CCET areas and which will provide grades and findings across a geographical area.

3.5 Developments within ELWa

- 3.5.1 The Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning's 2001 Remit Letter charged ELWa with reviewing planning and funding systems for post-16 learning (except Higher Education). ELWa plans to introduce a single National Planning Framework and Funding System (NPFS) from August 2005.
- 3.5.2 ELWa Circular 04/04NPF points to the development of national and regional assessments of needs, demand and supply, based on information drawn from a number of sources, including Sector Skills Councils (SSCs), ELWa's Learner Satisfaction Survey, CCETs, other stakeholders and "the networking and intelligence gathering activities of ELWa's regional staff". Interestingly, no mention is made in the circular of ELWa's ILR or LLWR databases.
- 3.5.3 The circular states that Regional Statements of Needs and Priorities (RSNPs) will "outline current post-16 education and training provision" and goes on to say that "over time", RSNPs will identify areas of "under- and over-supply or poor quality provision". It does not elaborate on how this will be done.
- 3.5.4 Allied and parallel work being undertaken by ELWa is the development of a quality framework which will include arrangements for assessing provider performance. 'Aiming for Excellence: Quality Framework' (2003) sets out proposals for a system of Provider Performance Reviews (PPRs), which will be based upon 14 performance measures, currently in development. The circular identifies potential sources of evidence to be used in compiling performance measures: they are likely to include:
- Provider strategic and operational plans (including recovery plans);
 - Aggregated learner data (from the LLWR database) e.g. recruitment, attainment, completion, retention, destinations, programme/occupational areas etc;
 - Provider contract/funding agreements;
 - Financial health assessments;
 - Provider Self Assessment Reports (SARs) and Quality Development Plans (QDPs);
 - Estyn inspection reports;
 - ELWa's Customer Satisfaction Survey;
 - Provider learner surveys;
 - Feedback from Careers Wales and Job Centre Plus on their clients' perspectives;
 - ELWa audit reports;
 - Health and safety risk assessment reports;
 - Records of complaints received by ELWa;
 - Quality marks/standards held by providers e.g. EFQM, IIP etc.

3.5.5 'Guidance on Piloting Provider Performance Review' (2003)¹ acknowledges that all the evidence required is not yet available or not available in a consistent format for all providers, but identifies a handful of measures for which data are available and which were to be used during the autumn 2003 pilot exercise. An evaluation of the pilot exercise has been undertaken and reported to the Quality Assurance Expert Committee.

¹ This is an internal document

4. Findings of Stakeholder Consultations

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section of the report is informed by a series of focus groups and face to face interviews with:

- Key practitioners in ELWa, acting in strategic, operational and specialist functions;
- A selection of external stakeholders representing CCETs, SSCs and training providers.

4.1.2 In this section we present:

- 4.2 An outline of the available sources of information about the supply of learning;
- 4.3 A brief description of the Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) database;
- 4.4 Our findings in respect of the ways in which information is currently used to plan and manage learning provision;
- 4.5 An outline of developments which are expected to impact upon the availability and use of supply side information in the future;
- 4.6 Stakeholders' perceptions of the purposes for which information will be needed in future;
- 4.7 Stakeholders' perceptions of their future information needs;
- 4.8 A discussion of possible hindrances to the effective use of supply side information in the future;
- 4.9 Stakeholders' overall assessments about the use of supply side information.

4.1.3 It is worth emphasising that Further Education and WBL provision was the focus of our discussions, although issues relating to other strands of provision were also touched upon.

4.2 Sources of Supply Side Information

4.2.1 The main sources of supply-side data available to contribute to the planning process are:

- The LLWR² database;
- The Further Education Provider staff record database (SIR/SAR³);
- ELWa and individual providers' Customer Satisfaction Surveys;
- Estyn Reports;
- ELWa ESF database;
- Primary research for target customer groupings.

4.2.2 The first Post-16 Pupil Level Annual Schools Census (PLASC) was submitted by secondary schools with sixth forms in September 2003. Detailed pupil and learning activity data for sixth

² Lifelong Learner Wales Record – replaces the former measure, the ISR or Individualised Student Record from 2003/04.

³ Staff Individualised Record / Staff Aggregate Record

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

forms is collected twice a year, in September and January. It is expected that Post-16 (PLASC) data will be made available in due course, in a format comparable with outputs from the LLWR database. The PLASC data will increasingly be used to provide information on provision in school sixth forms and to inform the development of the 14-19 pathways.

4.2.3 Post-16 PLASC differs from the all-school PLASC data collection, in that it collects data at a learning activity or course level, as opposed to pupil level data alone. In addition, the post-16 census is based on September and January data, rather than just the January return of the all-school PLASC.

4.2.4 Post-16 PLASC data collected is divided into two information sets :

- Individual Pupil Data, including a unique identifier, basic demographic data, information on special needs, Welsh language issues, enrolment date and status and home postcode.
- Learning Activity Data, including learning activity reference (by level and subject), LLDD needs, Welsh Medium education and provider code.

4.3 Datasets and Data Management

4.3.1 Development of the LLWR offers a significant step forward in the information gathering and monitoring system for learners in Wales. Essentially, the LLWR database contains four key datasets:

- The Learner Dataset – including learner identification and demographic data;
- The Learning Programme Dataset – which details learning currently being undertaken by the individual and information on destination/ progression on completion;
- The Learning Activity Dataset – which details the activities undertaken within the programme of learning, such as the learning aim, location of learning and method of delivery;
- The Award Dataset – which provides details of the awards for which the learner is entered, or has achieved.

4.3.2 These are complemented by an HE Dataset, which includes data on learners studying at HE level within Further Education institutions.

4.3.3. For any given individual, the Learner Dataset provides an unchanging set of key identification information, whereas the data from the other datasets will change according to the learning in which the individual is currently engaged. This will allow the tracking of individual learning over time and will integrate with credit framework, once this is in place.

4.3.4. The Data and Analytical Services (DAS) teams form part of the IM&T department, which sits within the Corporate Services Directorate of ELWa and has responsibility for managing data returns from providers and carrying out analysis for practitioners – for example the existing Learning Network Analysis.

- 4.3.5. In this role, DAS is the primary source of supply-side data for all learning supported by mainstream ELWa funding i.e. Further Education, Work-Based Learning, Adult Community Learning and sixth forms in Wales.
- 4.3.6. DAS is responsible for making information and analysis on LLWR and PLASC returns available to users, within the constraints of analytical resources and data access agreements.

4.4 Current Information Use

- 4.4.1 It was apparent from our discussions with stakeholders that supply side information often makes little sense without some demand side context and clear priorities for planning – *“supply side data is pretty meaningless without some demand side context ... rational decision making is always contextual”*. In the absence of clear context, practitioners struggle to define the **questions** which supply side information need to answer – *“one question generates another”*. It was argued that ELWa has yet to articulate its priorities in sufficiently detailed terms to enable the right questions to be posed – *“we (ELWa) don’t properly understand what we want to buy”*.
- 4.4.2 In the absence of clearly defined priorities, planners tend to use supply side data in two primary ways:
- Drawing upon past activity to inform future plans: a ‘last year plus or minus x%’ approach; and
 - In a fairly ad-hoc fashion to inform decisions on specific issues, although information is not always combined in a structured manner, to provide a sustainable rationale for one option rather than another.
- 4.4.3 For example, in one region, ‘travel to learn’ patterns had been mapped (using learner residencies and provider sites data) and the information produced had helped to improve stakeholders’ understanding of the supply network in terms of the array of providers operating in the region and the extent of ‘leakage’ into neighbouring regions. Yet to date, the information had not been used to shape policy and contributors were not altogether clear about how such macro level information might be used.
- 4.4.4 To some extent, difficulty in defining how data might be used is a facet of the sheer breadth and complexity of possible data variables and combinations. Furthermore, practitioners’ awareness of potential data sources varies, militating against a uniform approach or shared understanding.
- 4.4.5 At an operational level within ELWa regional offices, the following supply side data sources were used:
- ISR records (now being replaced by LLWR) of learner activity;

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- Learning mapping (mainly from DAS) is felt to be a useful representational tool for understanding provision – and issues such as travel to learn;
- Some schools based data provided by Local Education Authorities;
- PLASC Database for school sixth form provision;
- Estyn Reports as a headline quality measure;
- Assembly statistics on learning – which are perceived to have been significantly developed as a data source. Of course, most post-16 learning data stems from ELWa;
- IM&T data analysis publications.

4.4.6 Supply side data were often augmented by qualitative information from partners such as Jobcentre Plus and Careers Wales, although mechanisms for drawing such information into the planning process may not always be clear – *“Careers Wales were saying that there’s insufficient provision for the care and retail sectors in XXX ... that there’s a risk of falling foul of the guarantee because of the absence of provision ... but I’m not sure what we’ve done about that”*.

4.4.7 On the whole, ELWa tend to use data at fairly high levels of aggregation, although some provider-specific data was used for performance management purposes. As might be expected, providers used rather more detailed information to plan provision, including:

- Projections of achievements by existing learners;
- Historical data about learners’ average length of stay on WBL programmes, travel and support costs etc;
- Qualitative information about current provision;
- Assumptions about the numbers of learners that will be recruited onto programmes, informed by school cohort data;
- Advice received from Estyn following inspections.

4.4.8 FE colleges tend to undertake a good deal more analysis than do WBL providers for a number of reasons:

- ELWa adopts a more hands off approach to the management of Further Education provision, affording colleges greater freedom in determining local strategies, thus rendering ‘planning information’ more important;
- Colleges are generally larger and better placed to employ specialist staff in information management functions;
- The annual contracting system means that WBL providers tend to be more reactive and opportunistic in their approach to planning and data analysis has not become part of many providers planning mechanisms.

4.5 Developments Likely to Impact upon the Use of Information

4.5.1 Stakeholders generally perceived that a number of wider developments could impact upon the use and availability of information in the future. Specifically:

- The creation of the Planning Framework and its influence on Regional Statements of Need and Priorities (RSNPs) and ELWa's Learning Network development plans;
- The development of the Credit and Qualifications Framework;
- The 14 – 19 Learning Pathways agenda in Wales, which could allow credits at school level;
- The creation of a Learning and Skills Observatory;
- Plans for on-line booking through Learndirect, which could clarify the distinctions between provision offered and provision delivered;
- Zero net growth in provider budgets mean that providers see little reason to develop new courses if they need to be balanced by a reduction in numbers of learners in other areas;
- Current work by SSDA to assess the effectiveness of current provision in meeting the needs of sectoral workforces.

4.5.2 More specifically, it was clear that developments relating to the capture and management of supply side information will have a profound effect upon stakeholders' ability to access and use data in the near future. These centre on:

- Rolling out LLWR to all learning providers, although it is recognised that this will not be without its difficulties;
- The extension of PLASC to capture data which meets the information needs of ELWa (in line with LLWR);
- The development of the SuperSTAR database – a web-based data dissemination system which will allow pre-determined reports and customised queries to be drawn off datasets such as LLWR, SIR and PLASC. (Subject to Data Protection and user-access considerations).

4.6 Perceived Purposes of Information

4.6.1 Supply side information currently serves different purposes at different levels of aggregation and in the future is expected to be more or less relevant to particular categories of stakeholders at each level of aggregation. For example, Wales-wide data will be more important to the National Assembly, ELWa senior managers and Sector Skills Councils; whilst local data will be of greater interest to ELWa's Regional Committees, regional managers, CCETs and individual providers. Equally, thematic data will be of more interest to some stakeholders than others, though generally at the national and regional levels: Sector Skills Councils, for example, will be particularly interested in data relating to the sectors which they serve and the National Assembly will be interested in data relating to young people, for example. This has particular implications for the design of our 'model' which will need to be able to reflect the varied information needs of different stakeholder groups.

4.6.2 Our discussions with stakeholders revealed a number of **themes** which they believe supply side data should address, including:

- Informing the RSNP;
- The identification of duplication and gaps in provision;
- Assessing the extent of choice available to learners;
- Understanding travel to learn patterns, including cross boundary issues (both between regions in Wales and between Wales and England) – it was perceived that at present “*the world stops at the boundary*”;
- Painting a picture of the numbers and characteristics of learners;
- Painting a picture of the learning being undertaken;
- Assessing levels of retention and attrition (in order to better target policies);
- Assessing the quality of provision;
- Assessing the appropriateness of provision to target groups (with the implication that some groups are repeatedly targeted with few positive results);
- Identifying provider strengths and weaknesses as a means of underpinning Networks of Excellence and Learning Network developments;
- Assessing the intensity of competition (with the implication that competition need not be healthy and may undermine the viability of provision);
- Stimulating debate about the nature of provision, particularly at a regional level and among CCET members;
- Informing bilateral discussions between ELWa and providers or between providers;
- Assessing the relative costs of different types of provision.

4.6.3 Several stakeholders pointed out that the information used in planning the supply of learning needed to be “*fit for purpose*” and warned against “*failing to see the wood for the trees*” and “*getting too bogged down in detail*”. It was recognised that the level of detail required is, to some extent, a function of the way in which ELWa intends to ‘purchase’ learning: the more learner rather than system focused ELWa’s planning becomes, the more detail will be required. Some stakeholders had an expectation that ELWa would migrate towards attaching more conditions to the allocation of funding as the organisation matures and its policies become better developed: its data needs will, therefore, increase.

4.6.4 It was recognised that there will always be imperfections in the information available about the supply of learning: one contributor argued that the key was to use information to enable

“planning by consensus ... it doesn’t matter if it’s wrong ... the point is to bring about consensus ... we’ll never have perfect information anyway”. Another argued that ELWa cannot afford for the planning system to become too formulaic – *“there will be judgement and flaws in the process”.*

4.6.5 Whilst stakeholders were generally keen to access information about the broad gamut of learning, most thought that the initial focus of attention should be upon ‘mainstream’ activities, that is, FE, WBL and sixth form learning. Stakeholders were also unanimous in the view that ELWa should avoid the temptation to *“micro-manage”* provision.

4.6.6 One stakeholder contended that ELWa staff generally understood little about the way in which providers operate in practice, which made it more difficult for them to contextualise planning decisions. It was argued that ELWa staff would benefit from being exposed to every-day provider practices.

4.7 Perceived Future Information Needs

4.7.1 Stakeholders identified a number of supply side data elements which they believed would be necessary to plan and manage provision effectively. These included:

- Learners’ personal details e.g. age, residence, preferred language for learning, special needs etc.;
- Details of learning pursued e.g. course, location etc.;
- Details of qualification aims;
- Details of learners stage of progression.

4.7.2 Most of these data feature on the LLWR database (a schedule of LLWR fields is given at appendix 4) and could be used to generate benchmarks, which some stakeholders thought would be of particular value.

4.7.3 Some of the information needs identified by providers would not be satisfied by LLWR, however. These included:

- Distance travelled in terms of learning (although LLWR data is capable of indicating learning activities undertaken and credits achievements);
- Learners’ motives for learning;
- Progression opportunities open to existing learners;

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- Learner experiences/customer satisfaction ratings;
- Employer/Further/Higher Education providers' ratings of former learners' skills and attitudes;
- The level of partnership/collaboration between providers (although LLWR data is capable of indicating sub contracting arrangements);
- Opportunities for reciprocal arrangements;
- Teacher qualification levels;
- Quality of teaching;
- The costs of provision;
- The viability of provision.

4.7.4 Estyn reports provide some of the information required, although it was argued that the *“richness is in the text ... there aren't many quantitative statements or tables”* and reports were generally thought to be too carefully drafted to yield particularly useful information in a planning context.

4.8 Constraints on the Effective Use of Supply Side Information

4.8.1 Several stakeholders were exercised by the difficulty in relating demand side, and sometimes economic information to the supply of learning: there is no clear relationship between Standard Industrial Classifications (SICs), Standard Occupational Classifications (SOCs), subject/sector areas and qualifications. Most interviewees saw this as a long-standing, probably insoluble problem.

4.8.2 It was also felt that the aged nature of some data prevented it from being as useful in planning and managing provision as 'real time' data might. CCETs in particular lamented the fact that data releases did not tie in with their 'planning' cycles.

4.8.3 In terms of sharing data, Data Protection Act (DPA) restrictions were also seen as a potential hindrance to developing and sharing a sound understanding – although perceptions of the level of potential concern and how they might best be resolved varied.

4.8.4 A key issue for several stakeholders was the lack of capacity within ELWa to⁴:

- Formulate questions in such a way as to yield useful information from the analysis of data;
- To extract data from databases such as LLWR;
- To interpret quantitative data derived from sources such as LLWR;
- To interpret Estyn reports and other qualitative information.

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

4.9 Conclusions about the Use of Supply Side Information

- 4.9.1 The interviews conducted with data users highlight a range of current approaches to planning and managing provision, along with a diverse range of data sources employed.
- 4.9.2 To some extent it will always be both necessary and desirable to use customised information according to locality or sector of interest. Notwithstanding continuing needs for some ad hoc planning, however, strong evidence indicates a need for greater guidance in delivering a common approach to the planning process. Whilst the emerging Planning Framework for Wales will aim to provide this guidance, this project aims to identify the supply-side data and other information sources that will be used to populate the Framework.
- 4.9.3 In the absence of a framework, there is an issue of planning being driven by the availability of data – making the question fit the data, rather than identifying an information need and securing the data or qualitative information to fulfil this need.
- 4.9.4 Hence, one of the fundamental issues in defining supply side data requirements is to tightly define the purposes for which the data is required. Having said that, it was recognised by most stakeholders that, no matter how well defined data requirements are, supply side information is unlikely to answer users' every question. Equally, some level of 'open-ended' enquiry – *“getting a feel for what information is out there; allowing yourself scope for saying: ‘that’s interesting; I didn’t know that’”* ought not to be ruled out. It was also recognised that developing a model for 'auditing' the supply of learning would be an iterative process, which would evolve as stakeholders' understanding of data and the learning network increased and as information management systems developed: this Audit of Supply was generally seen as the start of a longer term process.

⁴ We understand that ELWa has embarked upon a staff development programme linked to the Quality Framework, which addresses several, though not all of the issues identified.

5. Proposed Model and Pilot Exercise

- 5.1 In this section we present our framework model or for 'auditing' the supply of learning. We have sought to create a practical, standard reporting tool which will provide different groups of users with information most appropriate to their needs. However, whilst acknowledging the importance of standard reporting mechanisms for planning and management purposes, we recognise that the framework model needs to be sufficiently flexible to provide non-standard information, as circumstances dictate, and also to be capable of evolving as ELWa's strategic priorities and information management systems develop.
- 5.2 We anticipate that different groups of users will require slightly different information about the supply of learning to fulfil different purposes. At an all-Wales level, information will be required to:
- Paint a broad brush picture of the supply of learning for the National Council and ELWa Senior Managers;
 - Enable ELWa to monitor and report upon progress against key targets within its Corporate and Operational Plans;
 - To provide benchmarks against which more localised/specific data can be compared.
- 5.3 At a regional level, information will be required to:
- Paint a broad brush picture of the regional supply of learning for the National Council, Regional Committees, ELWa Senior Managers and Regional Management Teams;
 - Enable ELWa to compile more comprehensive Regional Statements of Needs and Priorities;
 - Enable ELWa to monitor progress against regional objectives/targets;
 - Enable ELWa to benchmark regional characteristics/performance against national norms.
- 5.4 At a local level, information will be required to:
- Paint a picture of the local supply of learning for Regional Committees, Regional Management Teams, CCETs, individual learning providers and other stakeholders, including Careers Wales and Job Centre Plus;
 - Inform the 14-19 agenda within Learning Pathway development plans;
 - Enable ELWa and CCETs to monitor progress against agreed CCET plans;
 - Enable ELWa and stakeholders to benchmark localities, including target areas such as Communities First wards, against national norms.
- 5.5 Provider level information will be required to:
- Enable ELWa to monitor provider performance against agreed plans and standards set in ELWa's Quality Framework;
 - Enable ELWa and individual providers to benchmark their characteristics/performance against national norms.

Use of the Model

- 5.6 Ideally the model should be presented in such a way that a user with average IT skills and a working knowledge of factors affecting provision, can, subject to access permissions being granted:
- Readily access pre-determined data queries
 - Construct customised queries based on cross tabulations of data held within the model.
 - Analyse datasets by geography (Wales, Regional and CCET level)
 - Analyse datasets by sector / learning area
 - Obtain data at provider level
- 5.7 The extent to which this is achievable will depend on the interface available to users – the more user-friendly and flexible the interface, the greater the benefit to the average user.
- 5.8 The model can be used in two main ways – users can browse queries to get a comparative overview of provision, by area or sector, or possibly more usefully, can approach the model with a specific question relating to provision for a given area or sector.
- 5.9 For example, a user interested in examining construction provision in South West Wales might begin by looking at participation in South West Wales, compared with average rates for Wales, or by comparing against participation rates for other sectors.
- 5.10 In the example below, the user will note that North Wales and Flintshire have a lower than average percentage of residents learning in their home area and a higher than average percentage of funded distance or e-learning.

MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshire
Number of residents in funded FE/WBL	168380	33393	5804
Residents learning in home UA area	96909	17261	2979
% of residents learning in home UA area	58%	52%	51%
Residents learning in other UA area	61913	12057	2036
% of residents learning in other UA area	37%	36%	35%
Residents undertaking funded e/distance learning	9558	4075	789
% of residents undertaking funded e/distance learning	6%	12%	14%

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

- 5.11 This might lead the user to pose questions about the reasons for this. Does it relate to a lack of supply in the region? Or perhaps the quality of provision locally? These questions might be answered by looking at participation by provider, or customer satisfaction or Estyn quality ratings.
- 5.12 Each subsequent piece of information will allow the user to iteratively develop a fuller picture of learning supply for the sector and/or area of interest and hence provide the basis for a planning model that can be offered up for consultation with partners.
- 5.13 The model sets out a series of two dimensional data queries which will help to paint a picture of existing provision, as described above, but a better understanding of provision may be gained by cross tabulating certain queries. For example, a Flintshire CCET member thought that it might be useful to use cross tabulation to explore whether any relationship exists between the distance travelled to learn and learners' likelihood of completing or dropping out of courses.
- 5.14 The queries proposed in the model generally provide proxies rather than definitive dimensions of the supply of learning and it will still be necessary to interpret the dimensions presented in context. In presenting the framework model, we seek to identify issues which particular queries might highlight: we do, though, have to stress the need for careful and informed interpretation of data.
- 5.15 The model will not necessarily provide all the information needed to 'check-out' anecdotal evidence, and it may sometimes be necessary to supplement the data provided with non-standard reports. Nevertheless, the framework model does provide a suite of 'off the peg' reports, accessible in a consistent format to users who lack the expertise or time to compile them for themselves.
- 5.16 We recognise that it may not be possible to derive information to satisfy all the queries set out in the model in the immediate term, but we envisage that data will become increasingly available as LLWR datasets become more fully populated. In terms of those data derived from sources other than LLWR and SIR, we perceive that the framework model should introduce a degree of consistency and rigour into provider management practices across Wales.
- 5.17 Initially, the model will provide ELW and its stakeholders with 'snapshot' data, but over time, it will be possible to build a picture of trends, subject, of course to monitoring data over time.
- 5.18 Whilst it might be desirable to share reports generated under the framework model as widely as possible within the learning community, careful thought needs to be given to Data Protection and commercial confidentiality considerations.

- 5.19 The framework model is presented in six parts as follows:
- Participation;
 - Progression;
 - Attainment;
 - Learner Satisfaction;
 - Business Commitment to Funded Learning;
 - The Learning Infrastructure.

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Description of Key Processes Employed

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPATION

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other ⁵		
1	To monitor learner numbers	Number of residents in funded FE/WBL	Size of the resident learner population	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data
2	To monitor proportion of population in learning	Proportion of residents in learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ residents' propensity to learn ○ differences in people's propensity and ability to learn at different spatial levels ○ success or otherwise of campaigns to engage people in learning 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR Population Census Data (ONS)	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data
3	To monitor learner participation within specified areas	Proportion of resident learners learning in areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ travel to learn patterns ○ strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps local provision 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR Population Census Data (ONS)	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓	✓		
4	To monitor learner leakage from	Proportion of resident learners learning in other areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ travel to learn patterns ○ strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps local provision 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR Population Census Data	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓	✓		

⁵ It may be useful to analyse some data at different geographies, for instance by CCET areas (although the majority of CCET areas are coterminous with Local Authority areas), by specific wards, for instance Community First wards or by parts of local authority areas, for example north Powys. In doing, however great care needs to be exercised in interpreting data.

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

specified areas		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓	✓	(ONS)	Based on LLWR census data
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
5	To monitor learner flow into specified areas	Proportion of learners in area represented by non residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ travel to learn patterns ○ strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps local provision 	✓	✓	✓		LLWR Population Census Data (ONS)	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
6	To monitor level of e-distance learning	Proportion of resident learners undertaking funded e/distance learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ residents' propensity to engage in e learning ○ strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps local provision 	✓	✓	✓		LLWR Population Census Data (ONS)	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
7	To monitor distances travelled to learn	Average distance travelled to learn by resident learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps in local provision ○ learners' propensity to travel ○ effectiveness of provider and wider transport arrangements ○ additional costs of learning 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding school sixth form students, ACL, WBL providers and open or distance learning. Includes all Welsh domiciled Further Education students enrolled at Welsh FEI's (however they are funded).
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
8		Average distance travelled to learn by non residents learning in area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of specialist provision ○ learners' propensity to travel ○ effectiveness of provider and wider transport arrangements ○ additional costs of learning 						
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
9	To monitor the type and level of learning undertaken	Proportions of resident learners aiming for Key Skills qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps in local provision o strength of employer demand for key skills 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Unique learners in total learner population following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data
		By subject/sector area	o likely future supply of workers possessing key skills	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		By qualification level	o strengths or weaknesses of local pre-16 provision	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		Proportions of resident learners aiming for qualifications other than Key Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o strengths, weaknesses and/or gaps in local provision o strength of employer demand for skills 					LLWR	
		By subject/sector area	o likely future supply of skilled workers	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓	✓		
10	To monitor the likely relevance of learning provided	Variation in proportions of resident learners from projected employment levels:	o May provide proxies for gaps in provision relative to forecast occupational profile of area (notwithstanding that the Subject/sector areas do not map directly onto Standard Occupational Categories)	✓	✓	✓		LLWR FSW Forecasts	<u>HEALTH WARNING</u> ELWa subject/sector area classifications do not map well onto Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) used in the FSW Forecasts. Measures are only given for those subject/sector areas which match loosely to SIC codes and users should regard them as <u>very loose</u> proxies only. Any variances highlighted <u>will</u> require further investigation
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
11	To monitor degree to which learner population is representative of population as a whole	Variance in proportion of learners undertaking learning through medium of Welsh from proportion of Welsh speakers in population as a whole	○ absence of Welsh medium provision locally	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Unique learners following at least one ELWa funded learning activity. Figures based on where some learning is in the medium of Welsh.
12		Variance in proportion of learners from ethnic minority groups from representation in population as a whole	○ success/failure in reaching minority ethnic groups	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Unique learners following at least one ELWa funded learning activity. Only includes self-assessed ethnicity.
13		Variance in proportion of learners with disabilities from population as a whole	○ adequacy of learner support adequacy of facilities and/or accommodation ○ success/failure in reaching disabled people	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Unique learners following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Only includes self-assessed disability.
		Variance in proportion of learners in different age groups from population as a whole	○ success/failure in engaging learners of different ages in lifelong learning agenda	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Unique learners following at least one ELWa funded learning activity
14		Proportion male learners	By subject/sector area	○ extent to which provision reflects or challenges gender stereotypes	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR
	Proportion female learners	✓			✓	✓	✓		
15	Proportion female learners	By subject/sector area	✓		✓	✓	✓		
	Proportion female learners		✓		✓	✓	✓		

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

INFORMATION ON PROGRESSION

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
16	To monitor learners' destinations	Leavers' destinations in terms of: % continuing existing programme of learning % entering new non HE learning programme % entering higher education % entering new employment % continuing current employment % seeking work/unemployed % entering self-employment % entering voluntary work % entering other destinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ strengths, weaknesses and gaps in learning networks ○ relevance of learning provision ○ learners' propensity to progress into further learning ○ degree to which 'learning works' message has got through 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Measure from all leavers for WBL, Further Education & ACL. Based on January census data from LLWR. Figures are of all learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes. For Further Education learners destinations, data excludes Further Education at HEIs. Figures include number of learners progressing from completed learning programmes i.e. an individual learner may appear more than once if they complete more than one programme in the academic year.
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
		By provider type		✓	✓				
		By provider							
17	To monitor value added through participation in learning	Changes in learner attainment levels upon leaving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ strengths, weaknesses and gaps in learning networks ○ differences in ability or predisposition to achieve among learner groups/types 	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By learner groups		✓	✓	✓			
		By provider type		✓	✓	✓			
		By provider							

INFORMATION ON ATTAINMENT

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
18	To monitor completion and 'drop out' rates	% learning activity and learning programmes completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strengths and weaknesses of provision o Perceived relevance of provision o Quality of guidance given to learners 	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by qualification level [learning activity only]		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by provider type		✓	✓	✓	✓		
19		% learners dropping out of learning within 12 weeks of starting planned learning programme:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strengths and weaknesses of provision o Perceived relevance of provision o Quality of guidance given to learners 	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by provider type		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by provider							
20	To monitor attainment rates here]	% of entries for award that are achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strengths and weaknesses of provision o Perceived relevance of provision o Quality of guidance given to learners 	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by qualifications levels		✓	✓	✓	✓		
		by provider type		✓	✓	✓	✓		
21	To monitor costs of attainment	Average cost to ELWa per CEU achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Cost effectiveness of provision o Efficiency of provision 	✓	✓	✓	✓		
22	To monitor attainment rates	Estyn KQ1 assessment how well do learners achieve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strengths and weaknesses of provision 					Estyn Inspection Report	
		by provider							

INFORMATION ON SATISFACTION

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
23	To monitor learner satisfaction	Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths, weaknesses and gaps in provision ○ Quality of support provided to learners ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and provision 	✓				WLSS 2003	The 2003 Welsh Learner Satisfaction Survey provides information at an all Wales level only: survey data is unreliable below that level.
		By provider type		✓					
24	Learner satisfaction with teaching/training	Learner satisfaction with teaching/training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of teaching/training ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and provision 	✓				WLSS 2003	
		By provider type		✓				WLSS 2003	
25	Learner satisfaction with learning management	Learner satisfaction with learning management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of provider facilities ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and service provided 	✓				WLSS 2003	
		By provider type		✓				WLSS 2003	
26	Learner satisfaction with provider facilities	Learner satisfaction with provider facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of provider facilities ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and provider facilities 	✓				WLSS 2003	
		By provider type							
27	Learner satisfaction with provider IT facilities	Learner satisfaction with provider IT facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of provider IT facilities ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and provider facilities 	✓				WLSS 2003	
		By provider type							

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
PROVIDE LEVEL INFORMATION									
28	To monitor perceived relevance of provision	Estyn KQ3 assessment: how well do learning experiences meet the needs and interests of learners and the wider community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of teaching/training ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and provision 					Estyn Inspection Reports	
29	To monitor quality of support	Estyn KQ4 assessment: how well are learners cared for, guided and supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of teaching/training ○ Mismatches between learner expectations and provision 					Estyn Inspection Reports	

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

INFORMATION ON BUSINESS COMMITMENT

REF	PURPOSE	MEASURE	POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
30	Employer engagement in funded learning	Number of employers supporting funded learning	○ Extent of providers' engagement with employers	✓	✓	✓			
		By provider		✓	✓	✓			
31	Employer engagement in funded learning	Proportion of employers supporting funded learning	○ Extent to which employers are involved with funded learning programmes	✓	✓	✓			
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
32	Employer engagement in funded learning	Proportion of work-related learning programmes supported by employers	○ Extent to which employers are involved with funded learning programmes	✓	✓	✓		LLWR	
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
PROVIDER LEVEL INFORMATION									
33	To monitor perceived relevance of provision to employers	Estyn KQ3 assessment: how well do learning experiences meet the needs and interests of learners and the wider community	○ Strengths, weaknesses and gaps in learning provision					Estyn Inspection Reports	

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

INFORMATION ON LEARNING INFRASTRUCTURE

REF	PURPOSE	QUERY	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
34	To monitor level of learner choice	Average distance travelled to learn by residents learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level of provision available locally ○ Extent to which local provision meets local demand 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Includes all Welsh domiciled Further Education students at Welsh FEI's, regardless of funding stream
		By subject/sector area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gaps in local provision 	✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Residents' preparedness to travel to learn 	✓	✓	✓			
35	Number of providers delivering provision within 20 miles of learners' places of residence		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level of competitive rivalry in 'market' ○ Level of provision available locally 	✓	✓	✓	✓	LLWR	Includes all Welsh domiciled Further Education students at Welsh FEI's, regardless of funding stream
		By subject/sector area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extent to which local provision meets local demand 	✓	✓	✓			
		By qualification level		✓	✓	✓			
37		% learners with 1st choice provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Degree to which learners' expectations met 	✓	✓	✓	✓		
38		Variance between proportion of resident learners undertaking some learning in Welsh and proportion preferring to learn through the medium of Welsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Degree to which demand for Welsh medium provision is being met 	✓	✓	✓		LLWR	Learners following at least one ELWa funded learning activity Based on LLWR census data

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	QUERY	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
39	To monitor the likely relevance of learning provided	Variance between proportion of resident learners from projected employment levels in area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ proxies for gaps in provision relative to forecast occupational profile of area (notwithstanding that the Subject/sector areas do not map directly onto Standard Occupational Categories) 					LLWR FSW Forecasts	HEALTH WARNING ELWa subject/sector area classifications do not map well onto Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) used in the FSW Forecasts. Measures are only given for those subject/sector areas which match loosely to SIC codes and users should regard them as <u>very</u> loose proxies only. Any variances highlighted <u>will</u> require further investigation
		By subject/sector area		✓	✓	✓			
40	To monitor strength of provider human resources and human resource management	Average qualification level held by staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher/trainer competence ○ Provider ability to attract professional staff ○ Provider investment in continuous professional development 					SIR	Includes staff undertaking teaching and supporting teaching and learning (excludes other support staff and staff with unknown qualifications). Data currently available for FEI staff only.
		By provider type		✓	✓	✓			
41		Proportion of staff with teaching/training qualification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher/trainer competence ○ Provider ability to attract professional staff ○ Provider investment in continuous professional development 					SIR	Includes staff undertaking teaching and supporting teaching and learning (excludes other support staff). Data currently available for FEI staff only.
		By provider type		✓	✓	✓			
42		Persistent incidences of staff shortages/recruitment difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provider ability to attract professional staff ○ Provider investment in continuous professional development 						Data not currently available
		By provider type		✓	✓	✓			
		By provider		✓	✓	✓			

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	QUERY	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
43	To monitor efficiency in use of human resources	Learner load per FTE teaching/training staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ under utilised capacity ○ incidences of unfilled places ○ possible opportunities for rationalisation ○ extent to which economies of scale derived ○ staff recruitment/retention problems 	✓	✓			SIR SAR LLWR HEF Vol 2: Enrolments	Published in: 'HE, Further Education and Training Statistics in Wales 02/03'. Data currently available for FEI staff only.
		By provider							
44		Learner load per FTE teaching and support staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ under utilised capacity ○ incidences of unfilled places ○ possible opportunities for rationalisation ○ extent to which economies of scale derived ○ staff recruitment/retention problems 	✓	✓			SIR SAR LLWR HEF Vol 2: Enrolments	Published in: 'HE, Further Education and Training Statistics in Wales 02/03'. Data currently available for FEI staff only.
		By provider							

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	QUERY	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
PROVIDER LEVEL INFORMATION									
45	To monitor quality of learning provided	Estyn KQ2 assessment: How effective are teaching and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of provision 					Estyn Inspection Reports	
46	To monitor provider management and financial strength	Estyn KQ5 assessment How effective are leadership and strategic management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of leadership and strategic management ○ Potential for growth, development or change 					Estyn Inspection Reports	
47		Estyn KQ6 How well do leaders and managers evaluate and improve quality standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengths and weaknesses of leadership and strategic management ○ Potential for growth, development or change 					Estyn Inspection Reports	
48		Quality standards held by provider e.g. ISO, IiP etc	○ Professionalism of organisation					Estyn Inspection Reports	
49		Quality of staff management and development arrangements	○ Professionalism of organisation					Estyn Inspection Reports	
50		Proportion of revenue derived from ELWa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Responsiveness to market ○ Capacity to access other sources of funding ○ Organisations' 'entrepreneurialism' 					Provider Accounts	
51		Financial strength: Ratio of current assets to current liabilities (current ratio)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capacity to make changes ○ Ability to 'enterprise' and/or respond to market 					Provider Accounts	

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

REF	PURPOSE	QUERY	INDICATORS OF:	SPATIAL LEVEL				DATA SOURCES	NOTES
				Wales	Region	LA	Other		
52	To monitor efficiency in resource usage	Estyn KQ7 assessment: How efficient are leaders and managers at using resources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengths and weaknesses of leadership and strategic management Scope for improving efficiency 					Estyn Inspection Reports	
53		Variance from national average learner load per FTE teaching/training staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> under utilised capacity incidences of unfilled places possible opportunities for rationalisation extent to which economies of scale derived staff recruitment/retention problems 					SIR SAR LLWR HEF Vol 2: Enrolments	Published in: 'HE, Further Education and Training Statistics in Wales 02/03'. Data currently available for FEI staff only.
54		Average cost to ELWa per CEU achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost effectiveness of provision Efficiency of provision 					No Current Source (Will require LLWR to be integrated with ELWa's accounting system)	
55	To monitor the quality of provider resources	Adequacy of estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> capacity to respond to 'market' capacity to use technology to derive economies of scale or meet learner demand areas where investment is required 					Estyn Inspection Reports	
		By subject/sector area							
		Adequacy of learning resources							
		Adequacy of ILT facilities							
		Adequacy of VC/Multi Media facilities							
		Variance from national norm in % learners pursuing particular programmes of learning							

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

disproportionate levels		By subject/sector area							
		Proportion of provision subcontracted							
		By subject/sector area							

6. Findings from the Evaluation of the Pilot

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The proposed model was evaluated:

On a CCET area basis through:

- A discussion with Flintshire CCET on the model as populated with data specifically for Flintshire
- Posing written questions to CCET members
- Follow-up interviews with selected CCET Members.

Internally, through discussions with ELWa staff.

Sectorally through:

- Discussions with CITB staff on the model as populated with construction sector data
- Meeting with, presentation to and feedback from the Swansea Bay construction group, co-ordinated by Jobcentre Plus⁶

6.2 It seems fair to say that feedback was very varied: making best use of the model is likely to require some careful consideration on the part of ELWa, and – probably – significant support and guidance to many of those who would be in a position to make good use of the model and the data it can present.

6.3 Further, there may be some question over the current stage of development of potential users' thinking at present, in terms of whether the links can be made between the availability of fairly sophisticated planning data and its use in influencing provision at a local level.

6.4 Internal Stakeholder Perceptions

6.4.1 Even within ELWa, levels of interest in and capabilities for using the model vary a good deal. A number of potential users of the model have high hopes of what it could deliver, especially those operating at a more strategic level. The key area of potential benefit is perceived to be informing the planning process and providing active support for corporate planning and budgeting purposes. The model also has clear potential uses in informing provider management at either a national or regional / local level.

⁶ One of two sub-regional groups comprising the South West Wales Construction Forum – a partnership of providers and other stakeholders offering an advisory and support function for the construction sector in the region.

- 6.4.2 Internal users at this level are likely to be highly familiar with, or have access to those with, the relevant analytical skills to maximise the benefits offered by the model. Perhaps more importantly, they can be expected to possess a good knowledge of the limitations on what the data can provide and the relevant policy and geographic / sectoral contexts for making informed judgements.
- 6.4.3 Internal stakeholders used to such analysis will appreciate the likelihood that ‘more questions than answers will be raised’, and that the data available will be non-exhaustive, at least during the early developmental phase of both the model and its usage.
- 6.4.4 One key aspect of the successful roll out of the model is that it will need to be considered in the context of other policy developments within and beyond ELWa, most notably that it should be seen as an integral element of the emerging Planning and Funding Framework. Indeed, the structure of the model has been designed with this in mind. The model is also very relevant to the Quality Framework, which measures providers’ performance against benchmarks for many of the areas covered in the model, including learner completion rates, attainment rates, destinations, and Estyn grades.
- 6.4.5 For the successful integration of the model into mainstream planning activities, there will undoubtedly be a need for targeted staff development in terms of its use and application. This is likely to require some resource to provide initial training and ongoing support – an internal user helpdesk.
- 6.4.6 There will also be a resource implication with regard to maintaining the model, ensuring its relevance, accuracy and currency and updating the queries available to reflect the changing needs of practitioners – perhaps especially as users’ abilities and therefore expectations develop.
- 6.4.7 There is also hope within ELWa that the model, as was always intended, will prove of great interest and benefit to outside organisations. This turns out to be somewhat optimistic in the light of discussions held with Flintshire CCET in particular, but nevertheless – with the right kind of support and training – key staff within ELWa remain confident that the model ‘could’ prove an extremely valuable tool for CCETs, learning providers and others interested in adjusting patterns of supply more precisely to meet learner needs – in ways which keep duplication and overlap to a minimum.
- 6.4.8 Early stakeholder discussions with regional ELWa staff indicated that “grass roots” practitioners may be a little more sanguine about the prospects for adoption of the model by partners – depending on the resources available for further analysis and

the ability of partners to adopt an objective view of issues such as duplication or “nugatory competition”.

6.4.9 Discussions with data suppliers, understandably, raised a number of reservations about the data held within the model. Issues here included:

- The incorporation of information that is now somewhat out of date (this will be less of a problem with LLWR but a significant issue for Estyn inspection grades which could be up to six years old.)
- The limitations of adopting a census approach – and the possible distortion of perceptions of the learning market which this could imply
- The different bases upon which some information has been collected, and the different levels of confidence which should be attached to data from these different sources
- Issues over levels of data access for different user groups and the implications of vesting provider specific data in, for example, CCETs, which have no constitutional basis for data protection registration.

6.4.10 Overall, we see concerns like these as largely inescapable, but clearly those using the model should be issued with, and actively draw on, appropriate ‘health warnings’ about what the model can and cannot do.

6.4.11 Suppliers of data were well aware that they might be expected to give support to non-specialist users, provide interpretation and guidance, and generally ‘own’ the processes associated with operating and updating the models. Whilst no direct resistance to this function arose (indeed, a number of interviewees were confident that benefits to several groups of stakeholders – not least ELWa - would ensue), concerns were expressed regarding the need for resourcing and clear definitions of roles and responsibilities in relation to this.

6.4.12 In practice, an accessible, web-based dissemination mechanism will play an important part in using the model well. We now understand that there are some practical issues regarding the dissemination of diverse datasets via the SuperSTAR interface, and especially in the creation of data queries presented as percentages⁷.

6.4.13 This is clearly a drawback in terms of user access and it raises the possibility of duplication of effort in terms of both data preparation and presentation. From the user perspective, there is a serious risk of “brand confusion” if the model sits outside SuperSTAR, which has been piloted with providers as the main source of provider and learner data in future.

6.4.14 However, the model can adequately fulfil its purpose (albeit less accessibly) as a series of spreadsheets posted elsewhere on the ELWa website.

⁷ [We are informed that the issues referred to are not insurmountable by any means but additional resource would be required to set up the SuperSTAR system and audit of supply databases in such a way as to be suitable for dissemination by this means.]

6.4.15 Whichever dissemination channel is chosen, it is clear that although user practices and capabilities are evolving rapidly, much training, familiarisation and support do seem to be essential if the model's potential is to even be approached. It is also worthy of note that the less accessible the means of dissemination, the higher the likely level of resource required to support and embed the model in mainstream usage.

6.5 External Stakeholders

6.5.1 The pilots with Flintshire CCET and Construction Skills were chosen to access reaction from distinct and diverse settings. In practice this was borne out as the responses from these external stakeholder groups were relatively polarised, although some desire for access to data on which to base planning decisions was common.

Flintshire CCET

6.5.2 An electronic copy of the model for Flintshire was circulated to members of the CCET, followed up by a presentation and discussion at a regular CCET meeting.

6.5.3 There was evidence that a high proportion of CCET members were not in a position to use the model well at all:

- Some seemed not to have read the information presented to them and were not familiar with the contents
- Many failed to grasp the concept of the model or “what it’s all about”
- The majority of concerns related to issues of scope, e.g. relating to sixth forms, links to 14-19 policies, which the model is simply not designed to address.

6.5.4 One of the fundamental issues was the expectation that the model could provide “the answer” to planning provision in Flintshire. Hence, much of the discussion with the CCET revolved around the purpose and structure of the model, rather than its content or ability to fulfil its remit.

6.5.5 Clearly, more work is needed to sell the concept and intended purpose of the model as an information source or data framework, which can provide answers – once the user has sufficiently formulated the question or questions that can successfully inform the planning process.

6.5.6 In the meeting with Flintshire CCET, members began to appear more enthusiastic once one of those present had posed some theoretical questions for the model to address, such as “Does travel to learn distance affect participation in a given subject?”

- 6.5.7 There were genuine fears from those present that the presentation of a model based on incomplete data could lead to erroneous conclusions being drawn in relation to current or planned provision. Also, members were acutely aware of the possible impact of cross-border travel on learner information.
- 6.5.8 Later feedback from providers present at the Flintshire event highlighted a degree of scepticism from some of those present. One private training provider felt that the planning process was *de facto* becoming more centralised and that there was little role to play at a local level. He also felt that the system of making Annual Recommendations for incorporation in the Regional Statement of Needs and Priorities was too far removed from the core planning process: “*We end up with an anodyne plan that bears no resemblance to local needs*”.
- 6.5.9 Another concern expressed was that of analysing provision by CCET area; providers questioned whether the market can be defined by such tight geographic areas.
- 6.5.10 It was agreed, however, that the model provides much of the information that could inform planning at a local level, if the infrastructure and accountability existed for this to be practicable.
- 6.5.11 In terms of additional information that could be offered by providers to inform the model, there was some discussion around indicators such as customer perceptions, for example – to be measured by the proportion of places taken up in relation to offers issued. However, doubts were expressed as to whether such information could be collected and shared on an objective basis across providers.
- 6.5.12 Clearly the lesson learned from the Flintshire pilot is that considerable groundwork needs to be carried out to embed the concept of the model amongst CCET members. Having said that, there is undeniable interest in aspects of the information that the model could provide, although the extent to which this could currently be incorporated into joint planning is questionable.

Construction Skills

- 6.5.13 The discussions held with Construction Skills were more positive, especially in terms of support for devising the Sector Skills Agreement. However, concerns were again expressed in terms of the remit for the model – and the potential dangers of using partial information for planning.
- 6.5.14 One particular concern here was provision funded from alternative sources, such as ESF, that provided under the New Deal programme by JobCentre Plus, provision funded by the Princes Trust, or delivery in prisons. For example, one provider in Swansea has secured European funding for 120 Modern Apprenticeships in

construction, which clearly represents a significant element of delivery in the local area.

- 6.5.15 Construction Skills has adopted a strong focus on issues of quality in construction learning. To this end, they have commissioned work on identifying best practice amongst construction learning providers. One of their concerns in planning terms is to distinguish between provision based on workplace experience and that conducted totally on paper (which they consider impacts on the employability of students) – information which is not currently available to them.
- 6.5.16 Other perceived measures of quality put forward included customer satisfaction, or facilities in provider premises such as childcare or female toilets.
- 6.5.17 Overall, however, there was strong support for the model as a first step towards better and more consistent planning information.
- 6.5.18 The initial meeting with the co-ordinator for the Swansea Bay construction group revealed a good level of understanding of provision mapping at a sub-regional level. The group has worked with Swansea CCET to develop a shared understanding of provision in the area and to investigate novel approaches to co-ordinating delivery.
- 6.5.19 This was followed by circulation of the Flintshire CCET Template to members (construction data was not available at this time), to convey an understanding of the data fields available in the model. A short presentation was given to a subsequent meeting of the Swansea Bay group, along with a discussion with the group centred on sample construction sector data for the South West region.
- 6.5.20 There was general understanding of the rationale for the model and an appreciation of its aims. The majority of concerns expressed by those present related once again to issues around the remit of the model and the availability of data for non-core funded provision, in particular:
- HE data (for issues of progression)
 - JobCentre Plus provision / New Deal
 - ESF Funded provision
 - 14-19 data / schools data, especially with the rise of vocational provision in schools

6.5.21 Issues of content included:

- The need for clarity of definition with regard to “attainment”⁸
- The possible inequity of using a December census date, with regard to WBL providers
- The benefits of being able to present a rolling year-on-year comparison in future.

6.5.22 However, the overall feeling was one of optimism that this information could assist the group (and Swansea CCET) to progress some of its existing initiatives and further its understanding. Providers in the area have already looked at reshaping provision in line with the funding available to individual partners and were clearly in a position to know some of the questions that need to be asked. They were also comfortable and confident with the concepts presented and the vocabulary used in presenting them.

6.6 Summary

6.6.1 Internally within ELWa, and especially at a strategic level, there is enthusiasm for the concept of the model and its potential applications. The skills and understanding necessary to take advantage of what the model has to offer are generally available to the relevant players.

6.6.2 The two external pilots represent a useful illustration of the range of skills, abilities, understanding and expectations that face the dissemination and implementation of the model on a wider basis.

6.6.3 It is difficult to say whether the Flintshire CCET response was something of a ‘one off’ response. It is certainly possible that with greater support, increased familiarity with the model and not without some encouragement, much more ‘realistic’ and effective usage might have been described.

6.6.4 This may be just a matter of time, or it may reveal a more fundamental issue – that many providers simply do not use baseline data for planning purposes, but amend provision on the basis of the previous year’s offer, changed incrementally according

▪ ⁸ We understand that ELWa proposes to introduce new standard measures from autumn 2005

to perceptions of local change in demand from employers and learners. Providers faced with zero growth may also be discouraged from changing provision more radically, as any increase in provision in one curriculum area has to be matched by a reduction in another.

- 6.6.5 In summary, the worst case is that access to the model may breed confusion, incorrect interpretation and frustration that issues of particular interest are not addressed - generally bringing the model into disrepute. However, tentative evidence also emerged that a number of more 'sophisticated' potential users perceive the model to be of great interest: Encouragingly, the representative of Swansea CCET at the construction group meeting demonstrated a far higher degree of comfort with the information than her colleagues in Flintshire had.
- 6.6.6 The model can also potentially give more cognisant colleges and other training providers significant data to help identify and capitalise upon 'competitive advantage' positions. This aspect itself will require management with regard to data access and usage at provider level.
- 6.6.7 Overall, it does seem that external stakeholders will need not only a good deal of support to use the model well, but must also be committed to devoting a great deal of effort to familiarising themselves with what the model can and cannot do.
- 6.6.8 This will include them developing the kinds of techniques that are appropriate for using the data it contains and how to interact with the chosen dissemination mechanism for the model. For these users in particular, it is vital that the model is presented effectively, via a user-friendly interface that can provide: Top level reports to give an overview and engender confidence in the user. The ability to mine deeper into the raw data to perform customised queries and the potential for cross tabulations across region or sector, for comparison purposes.
- 6.6.9 It will disadvantage the model if it cannot be integrated into the information available via SuperSTAR. However, the development of a parallel dissemination system elsewhere on the ELWa website will still allow the model to fulfil its remit.

7. Conclusions, Recommendations

7.1 Overall Conclusions

- 7.1.1 Returning to the overall objectives for this project, it is important not to lose sight of the opportunities ELWa has for now matching – and, perhaps, exceeding – the kinds of models available elsewhere in the UK which “*provide a framework model for managing information about the supply of learning and enable informed decisions to be made.*” The Welsh model, outlined primarily in Section 4, has proved itself to be both technically deliverable, and valuable in supporting various kinds of analyses, through the piloting and development work we have carried out.
- 7.1.2 However, this is not the end of the story. We can already say that some categories of user are likely to need a good deal of support before they can make the best use of the opportunities the model offers (although more ‘informed’ users have already proved themselves able to gain benefits from it more or less as it stands).
- 7.1.3 There are inevitable limitations within the data available (e.g. over the age of some of it, and capabilities for spatial disaggregation elsewhere). Because the model sets up a number of predefined standard reports (focusing on sectors and CCETs so far), actual and potential users with different perspectives have understandably expressed reservations.
- 7.1.4 Crucially, of course, the model will need to evolve over time, with data being updated, users building up their own expertise and familiarity with the model, new ways of presenting information developed, and so on.
- 7.1.5 We have noted a number of technical developments within ELWa – particularly the introduction of SuperSTAR but also further enhancements to the National Funding and Planning System and work on Provider Performance Reviews. Many providers continue to upgrade their own MI and Quality systems too. Clearly these developments are likely to have important implications for how the model is populated, accessed, developed and used. In essence, how these developments and the framework model are aligned have to be matters for others, and lie outside our terms of reference,
- 7.1.6 All of this means that our conclusions have to include raising a number of issues which need to be addressed by ELWa and its strategic partners in relation to using the model to its full potential.

7.2 Setting the Context for Operating the Audit of Supply Model Effectively

7.2.1 We have said already that the model outlined earlier in this report is technically robust, will ‘add value’ to many decision-making processes, and many fields can be appropriately populated with available data. Setting and maintaining the context for the model is going to need very careful consideration indeed, however, and we believe key issues can best be summarised through a series of questions which ELWa and its partners will need to consider before setting a definite strategy for rolling out the model.

7.2.2 These questions are:

- What will be ELWa’s overall view about how, and by whom, supply-side data can reasonably be used?
- Can any more clarity be developed about the expected purpose of supply side information, and how it may link with demand side information?
- A number of misconceptions and misunderstandings were apparent amongst potential users during piloting: how may these best be dispelled?
- Who will support ‘less sophisticated’ actual and potential users?
- Who will ‘own’ and ‘champion’ the model, taking responsibility for promoting the model, introducing new information, technical controls (e.g. linked to DPA requirements), resolving concerns and queries?
- How will the model be set up technically (e.g. how will it be linked to SuperSTAR)?
- Piloting the models showed just how much effort is required to populate fields with data from the various available sources: how should this be done/ resourced in future?
- Developing and supporting the model will require appropriate resourcing; how will this be allocated; where will staffing resources be located?
- How can any additional resources best be managed, to allow a strong ‘user-focus’ for a reasonably wide range of potentially interested parties, alongside appropriate levels of technical rigour.

7.3 Recommendations

7.3.1 Our terms of reference required us to “*develop a project plan for the full audit of supply to be undertaken in 2004 or later*”. Because our primary conclusions are that the model outlined earlier in this report would be both technically feasible and valuable for many stakeholders, it is tempting to move straight to drafting such a project plan, perhaps leading up to the ‘roll-out’ of a more fully developed model somewhere around the middle of 2005.

7.3.2 Ideally, ELWa should seek to make data available to users as swiftly as possible – bearing health warnings, if necessary - and without ‘over-sanitising’ information.

7.3.3 Because of the importance of resolving the questions posed in 7.2, however, we recommend a more measured, stepwise approach which might be based around:

- Consideration of this report by stakeholders; resolution (maybe partial at this stage) of questions of access, technical support (particularly links with SuperSTAR), overall purposes, and likely 'ownership' (maybe January-March 2005)
- Summary of stakeholder discussions presented as formal 'position paper' (maybe April 2005)
- Full 'business case' for investing in necessary staffing, technical support, etc agreed within ELWa; procedure manual for updating, access, dissemination, etc produced (maybe June 2005)
- Main fields populated, active promotion of what the model can deliver (starting September 2005)
- Continuing support, evolution, review ...

7.3.4 Because of the significant resourcing implications this approach could present, and the rapidly changing context for the model, a number of formal 'break points' could be built-in, notably if there is no agreement about the content of the 'position paper' or if the necessary resources cannot be justified within the 'business case'. Having said that, the extent to which this work cuts across a whole raft of other ELWa initiatives should not be underestimated and it should not be moved forward in isolation. As well as the NPFS work, quality framework changes and new provider performance measures mentioned in the report, this work impacts on:

- Work being progressed on performance indicators
- the WBL series of targets and performance indicators developed,
- existing operational plan performance measures
- the joint ELWa-National Assembly Statistical First Releases planned
- ongoing work in defining participation rate calculations
- planned learning network analyses
- SSC data requirements/agreements
- data analysis for Pathfinders

Glossary of Terms

CF	The National Assembly's Communities First Programme
DAS	Data and Analytical Services (department within ELWa)
IMD	The National Assembly's Index of Multiple Deprivation
LLWR	Lifelong Learning Wales Record
NPF	National Planning Framework
RSNP	Regional Statement of Needs and Priorities
SIR	FE colleges' Staff Individualised Records (SIR) returns
TTLA	Travel to Learn Area
TTWA	Travel to Work Area
CCET	Community Consortium for Education and Training
ELWa	Education and Learning Wales
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
PLASC	Pupil Level Annual School Census
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
ACE	Adult Continuing Education
SSC	Sector Skill Council
NPFS	National Planning Framework and Funding System
FES	Further Education Statistics
DPA	Data Protection Act
SIMS	Student Information Management System
SAR	Self Assessment Report
QDP	Quality Development Plan
ESF	European Social Fund
ILR	Individualised Learner Record
SSDA	Sector Skills Development Agency
SIC	Standard Industrial Classifications
SOC	Standard Occupational Classifications
FEI	Further Education Institution
CoVE	Centre of Vocational Excellence
ACL	Adult & Community Learning
WBL	Work Based Learning
FRESA	Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action
LEA	Local Education Authority
UFI	University for Industry
GCE	General Certificate of Education
FEGIS	Scottish Further Education Funding Council Geographical Information System
SFEFC	Scottish Further Education Funding Council
LLSC	Local Learning and Skills Council
ISR	Individualised Student Record
ILR	Individualised Learner Record
NOP	National Opinion Polls
WLSS	Welsh Learner Satisfaction Survey
VCE	Vocational Certificate of Education
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
StAR	Strategic Area Review
CITB	Construction Industry Training Board

APPENDIX 1:

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

References

Department for Education and Skills (2002), Success for All: Reforming Further Education and Training: Our Vision for the Future, DFES

DTZ Piedad Consulting (2002), Demand and Supply of Further Education in Scotland, SFEFC

ELWa,(2002) Institutional Support Manual – Staff Records 2002/2003, Version 1, ELWa

ELWa (2003), Circular NC/C/03/10LPD: Aiming for Excellence: Quality Framework, ELWa

ELWa,(2003) Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) Technical Specification, Version 1.3.3, ELWa

ELWa (2003), Guidance on Piloting Provider Performance Review, ELWa

ELWa (2004), Circular NC/C/04/04NPF: The National Planning Framework: Planning post-16 provision funded by ELWa, ELWa

Hurley, N., Macleod, C., Anderson, K., Ross, D., (Blake Stevenson Ltd) and J. Fairley (2001), 'Mapping Lifelong Learning Provision in Scotland', SPICE

Miller Research (2001), Audit and Mapping of Post-16 Education and Training in Swansea, Swansea CCET

Learning and Skills Council (2002), Circular 02/03: 'Data Collection: Collection Arrangements on Learner Data', LSC

Learning and Skills Council (2003), Individualised Learner Record 2003/04: Specification of the Individualised Learner Record for 2003/04, LSC

Learning and Skills Council (2003), Circular 03/06 'Strategic Area Reviews: Arrangements and Guidance for Strategic Area Reviews', LSC

Learning and Skills Council (2003), Circular 03/15 'Funding: Plan-led Funding for Further Education', LSC

NOP (2003), Welsh Learner Satisfaction Survey, ELWa

Scottish Further Education Funding Council Geographical Information System (FEGIS) web site <http://fegis.sfefc.ac.uk/access.cfm>

Bibliography

Bentley Jennison Consulting (2004), LSC Gloucestershire Strategic Area Review Consultation Plan, LSC Gloucestershire

DTZ Piedad (2000), Higher Education in Cumbria Summary Report, AGHEC

ELWa (2003), Guidance for LEAs and Schools: Post-16 Pupil Level Annual Schools Census (Post-16 PLASC), ELWa

ELWa (2003), Circular 03/08: Implementation of and Timetable for the National Funding System, ELWa

ELWa (2004), Circular NC/C/04/02LDP: Aiming for Excellence: Consultation on quality assurance of post-16 provision in schools, ELWa

Estyn (2002), The Common Inspection Framework for Education and Training in Wales, Estyn

Learning & Skills Council Bedfordshire & Luton (2004), Strategic Area Review: January 2004 Revision, LSC

Learning & Skills Council Gloucestershire (2003), Strategic Area Review Action Plan, LSC

Learning & Skills Council for Kent and Medway (2003), 'Learning and Skills in Kent and Medway: 2003-04 Assessment: *Informing Ashford and Shepway Young People: Strategic Area Review*', LSC

Learning and Skills Councils for Central, East, North, South and West London (2003), Pan-London Strategic Area Review Methodology: Common Review Framework, LSC

NCER (2003), 2003 Year 11 GCSE Examinations Pupil References Analysis, Halton Borough Council

NOP Social and Political (2003), Welsh Learner Satisfaction Survey 2003, NOP World

APPENDIX 2:

PARTIALLY POPULATED MODEL FOR FLINTSHIRE

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Ref	MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshir e	Flint Castle	Notes
	Number of residents in funded FE/WBL	168380	33393	5804	74	
	Residents learning in home UA area	96909	17261	2979	53	
	% of residents learning in home UA area	58%	52%	51%	72%	
	Residents learning in other UA area	61913	12057	2036	11	
	% of residents learning in other UA area	37%	36%	35%	15%	
	Residents undertaking funded e/distance learning	9558	4075	789	10	
	% of residents undertaking funded e/distance learning	6%	12%	14%	14%	
	Non residents of UA learning in area	51134	12643	1376	0	
	% post 16 residents in learning	7.3%	6.3%	4.9%	-	a.
	% of post 16 residents undertaking funded e/distance learning	0.41%	0.76%	0.67%	-	b.
	Average distance travelled to learn by learners in area	13.3	15	11.6	-	5 c.
	Proportions of residents aiming for Key Skills qualifications					
	Level 4 +	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Level 3	3%	4%	6%	8%	
	Level 2	11%	15%	16%	12%	
	Level 1	6%	7%	6%	9%	
	Below level 1	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Proportions of residents aiming for qualifications other than Key Skills					
	Level 4 +	2%	2%	3%	4%	
	Level 3	26%	26%	25%	15%	
	Level 2	28%	35%	33%	34%	
	Level 1	21%	15%	14%	20%	
	Below level 1	5%	3%	2%	5%	
	Proportions of residents by programme area/route					6 7
	Agriculture, Horticulture & Animal Care	1%	2%	3%	2%	
	Arts, Media and Publishing	16%	17%	17%	16%	
	Business, Administration and Law	5%	4%	4%	2%	
	Construction, Planning and the Built Environment	3%	3%	2%	0%	
	Education and Training	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies	6%	7%	7%	6%	
	Health, Public Services and Care	9%	8%	8%	14%	
	History, Philosophy and Theology	1%	1%	4%	7%	
	Information and Communication Technology	18%	21%	17%	13%	
	Languages, Literature and Culture	7%	5%	6%	9%	
	Leisure, Travel and Tourism	3%	2%	2%	1%	
	Preparation for Life and Work	19%	13%	14%	13%	
	Retail and Commercial Enterprise	4%	5%	5%	7%	
	Science and Mathematics	8%	10%	10%	7%	
	Social Sciences	1%	1%	1%	1%	
	% undertaking learning through medium of Welsh	3%	9%	1%	0%	8
	% learners from ethnic minority groups	3%	1%	1%	3%	9
	% learners with disabilities	6%	5%	4%	9%	10
	% male learners	40%	40%	44%	34%	
	% female learners	60%	60%	56%	66%	

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are for numbers of unique funded learners in FE/WBL
- 3 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes excluding self and employer funded learners
- 4 Small number of learners at ward level means percentages at ward level are less reliable than at other geographies
- 5 Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding WBL providers and open or distance learning
- 6 Number of learners by programme area contains all activities
- 7 QCA Learning Areas were used
- 8 Figures based on where some learning is in the medium of Welsh
- 9 Figures only include self-assessed ethnicity
- 10 Figures only include self-assessed disability

Sources

- a. Source: Population figures based on 2001 census
- b. Source: Population figures based on 2001 census
- c. Source: 2002/03 ISR & ILR data

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshir e	Flint Castle	Notes
Learners' destinations					
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	24.5	4.5	9.6	10.9	5
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	7.5	1.3	2.6	2.7	
% leavers entering higher education	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	
% leavers entering new employment	1.2	1.8	2.4	5.5	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	3.4	3.1	4.8	4.5	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	0.8	1.5	1.6	1.8	
% leavers entering self-employment	0.04	0.07	0.2	0.0	
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.01	0.01	0.0	0.0	
% leavers entering other destinations	62.3	87.6	78.6	74.5	6
6th form learners' destinations					
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning					
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)					
% leavers entering higher education					
% leavers entering new employment					
% leavers entering continuing current employment					
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed					
% leavers entering self-employment					
% leavers entering voluntary work					
% leavers entering other destinations					
FE learners' destinations					
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	24.5	3.0	9.1	11.3	7
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	7.5	1.0	2.6	3.1	
% leavers entering higher education	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0	
% leavers entering new employment	1.2	1.4	2.1	4.1	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	3.4	2.0	3.6	3.1	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	0.8	0.7	1.1	1.0	
% leavers entering self-employment	0.04	0.07	0.2	0.0	
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.01	0.009	0.0	0.0	
% leavers entering other destinations	62.3	91.6	81.1	77.3	
WBL learners' destinations					
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	19.8	24.3	17.9	7.7	
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	8.8	5.3	3.1	0.0	
% leavers entering higher education	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.0	
% leavers entering new employment	9.7	7.0	6.5	15.4	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	21.7	19.3	24.4	15.4	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	12.6	11.4	9.6	7.7	
% leavers entering self-employment	0.2	0.06	0.0	0.0	
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.05	0.03	0.0	0.0	
% leavers entering other destinations	26.6	32.2	37.9	53.8	6
Change in learners' attainment levels upon leaving					

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are from all leavers in 2003/04 for WBL, FE & ACL
- 3 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes
- 4 Small number of learners at ward level means percentages at ward level are less reliable than at other geographies
Figures include number of learners progressing from completed learning programmes i.e. an individual learner may appear more than once if they complete more than one programme in the academic year 2003/04
- 5 Data not reliable (will be ready for December 2004)
- 6 Data not reliable (will be ready for December 2004)
- 7 Figures exclude FE learners at HEIs

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshire	Flint Castle
% learners completing planned learning programme				
% learners aiming for level 3+ qualification completing				
% learners aiming for level 2 qualification completing				
% learners aiming for < level 2 qualification completing				
% 6th form learners completing planned learning				
% FE learners completing planned learning				
% WBL learners completing planned learning				
% ACE learners completing planned learning				
Learners' attainments				
% learners achieving qualifications at level 4+				
% learners achieving qualifications at level 3				
% learners achieving qualifications at level 2				
% learners achieving qualifications at level 1				
% learners achieving qualifications at level <1				
% 6th form learners achieving qualifications at level 3+				
% FE learners achieving qualifications at level 3+				
% WBL learners achieving qualifications at level 3+				
% ACE learners achieving qualifications at level 3+				
% 6th form learners achieving qualifications at level 2				
% FE learners achieving qualifications at level 2				
% WBL learners achieving qualifications at level 2				
% ACE learners achieving qualifications at level 2				
% 6th form learners achieving qualifications at level <2				
% FE learners achieving qualifications at level <2				
% WBL learners achieving qualifications at level <2				
% ACE learners achieving qualifications at level <2				

Notes

- 1 Data will not be available until later in 2004

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshire	Flint Castle
Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience				
Learner satisfaction with teaching/training				
Learner satisfaction with provider facilities				

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshire	Flint Castle
Number of employers supporting funded learning				
Proportion of employers supporting funded learning				
Proportion of work-related learning programmes supported by employers	7.8%	12.4%	10.6%	14.5%

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	North Wales	Flintshire	Flint Castle	Notes
Average distances travelled to learn	13.3	15	11.6	-	2 a.
Average number of providers delivering provision within 20 miles of learners' places of residence	24	7	4	-	
% learners with 1st choice provider	NOT LLWR				
Learners and potential learners' perceptions of choice available	NOT LLWR				
Number of learners with some of their learning in Welsh	5020	2950	64	0	
Number of learners preferring to learn in Welsh	2387	1136	20	0	
Providers' perceptions of gaps in provision					
Careers Wales' perceptions of gaps in provision					
Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience					
Learner satisfaction with teaching/training					
Learner satisfaction with provider facilities					
Average qualification level held by staff					4
Professional Degree (including Further Degree)	57.7%	57.6%			b.
HND/HNC	11.5%	13.4%			
2 A-Levels/OND/ONC	8.5%	4.9%			
4 or 5 GCSE's (Grades A-C)	5.0%	4.2%			
4 GCSE's (Grade D-G)	1.1%	1.8%			
Other Formal Qualifications	15.3%	17.4%			
No Formal Qualifications	0.9%	0.6%			
Proportion of staff with teaching/training qualifications	63.7%	59.1%			5 b.
Persistent incidences of staff shortages/recruitment difficulties					
Learner load per FTE teaching/training staff	13.3	13.9	11.2	1 b.	
Learner load per FTE teaching & support staff	10.1	11.1	8.5	1 b.	
Average cost to ELWa of CEUs achieved					

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes
- 2 Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding WBL providers and
- 3 For full time students, student load = 1 full time full year of 30 weeks and over.
For other modes, student load is derived from the students' taught hours divided by the sector average for full time full year students
- 4 Includes staff undertaking teaching (excludes staff supporting teaching and learning and those with unknown qualifications)
- 5 Includes both staff undertaking teaching (excludes support staff)

Sources

- a. 2002/03 ISR & ILR data
- b. 2002/03 SIR (Staff Individualised Record)
Staff Aggregate Record 2002/03 included for sub-contracted tuition in teaching and learning departments
2002/03 ISR (Individualised Student Record)

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Flintshire			Deeside College			WCOH			NWT			ADT			CTB			UoW Bangor			SDA			Notes	
	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales	Flintshire Domiciled	Rest of Wales	Outside Wales		
Numbers of learners in funded FE/WBL/6th Form/ACE	5804	1016	4856	307	2640	850	115	773	599	71	72	496	28	10	412	228	-	-	-	97	586	26	55	86	4	
Share of local 'market'																										
Average distance travelled to learn by learners	11.61	16.4			6.2			6.3																	4	
Numbers of learners aiming for qualifications																									5	
Key Skills																										
Level 4 +	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Level 3	345	81	407	25	217	39	11	14	12	0	0	25	3	2	28	38	-	-	-	0	0	0	3	4	0	
Level 2	929	255	969	47	417	124	8	46	25	5	41	229	9	5	280	83	-	-	-	0	0	0	23	46	1	
Level 1	324	84	355	18	127	21	3	30	13	6	7	33	0	3	58	86	-	-	-	0	0	0	21	20	2	
Below level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Aims																										
Level 4 +	160	37	109	16	46	31	5	12	11	2	0	5	0	0	1	5	-	-	-	24	72	4	6	11	1	
Level 3	1474	510	2029	120	469	166	21	128	155	10	30	133	11	3	96	59	-	-	-	33	273	10	9	32	0	
Level 2	1911	298	1342	73	704	228	22	378	235	33	19	101	6	7	242	104	-	-	-	40	239	12	28	38	3	
Level 1	790	121	748	53	389	214	16	168	125	11	6	78	4	0	23	20	-	-	-	0	3	0	0	0	0	
Below level 1	143	42	455	30	15	1	2	63	58	10	1	29	1	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Numbers of learners by programme area/route																										6
Agriculture, Horticulture & Animal Care	408																									
Arts, Media and Publishing	2645																									
Business, Administration and Law	632																									
Construction, Planning and the Built Environment	366																									
Education and Training	0																									
Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies	1139																									
Health, Public Services and Care	1235																									
History, Philosophy and Theology	537																									
Information and Communication Technology	2665																									
Languages, Literature and Culture	908																									
Leisure, Travel and Tourism	252																									
Preparation for Life and Work	2082																									
Retail and Commercial Enterprise	768																									
Science and Mathematics	1480																									
Social Sciences	118																									
% undertaking learning through medium of Welsh	1.1	1.3	3.7	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.7	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.9	-	-	-	0.0	0.2	0.0	5.5	3.5	0.0	
% learners from ethnic minority groups	0.8	1.2	1.8	2.0	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.0	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.4	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	8
% learners with disabilities	3.5	0.0	0.3	0.3	3.0	1.8	2.6	7.0	5.2	5.6	0.0	2.4	7.1	0.0	0.2	0.4	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	8
% male learners	44.1	47.6	41.4	45.9	45.8	55.6	52.2	35.7	29.0	46.5	87.5	51.4	60.7	80.0	73.8	60.5	-	-	-	4.1	19.6	11.5	50.9	34.9	0.0	
% female learners	55.9	52.4	58.6	54.1	54.2	44.4	47.8	64.3	71.0	53.5	12.5	48.6	39.3	20.0	26.2	39.5	-	-	-	95.9	80.4	88.5	49.1	65.1	100.0	
Notes																										
1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for LLWR																										
2 Figures (unless stated) are for numbers of unique learners in FE/WBL																										
3 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes																										
4 Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding WBL providers and open or distance learning																										
5 Figures are for unique learners within each dataset																										
6 Number of learners by programme area contains all activities																										
7 QCA Learning Areas used																										
8 Figures only include self-assessed ethnicity																										
Sources																										
a. Source: 2002/03 ISR & ILR data																										

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Flintshire	Yale College	Deeside College	WCOH	NWT	ADT	CITB	UpoW Bangor	SDA
Learners' destinations									
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	9.6	1.0	33.8	3.8	41.1	0.0	-	0.0	3.8
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	2.6	0.7	6.8	19.2	1.8	0.0	-	0.0	19.2
% leavers entering higher education	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	5.0	0.0
% leavers entering new employment	2.4	2.9	4.0	19.2	3.6	42.9	-	10.0	19.2
% leavers entering continuing current employment	4.8	0.4	15.1	23.1	16.1	57.1	-	50.0	23.1
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	1.6	2.5	1.3	15.4	19.6	0.0	-	10.0	15.4
% leavers entering self-employment	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
% leavers entering other destinations	78.6	92.4	37.9	19.2	17.9	0.0	-	25.0	19.2
Change in learners' attainment levels upon leaving									

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Flintshire							
	Yale College	Deeside College	WCOH	NWT	ADT	CITB	UpoW Bangor	SDA
% learners completing planned learning programme								
% learners aiming for level 3+ qualification completing								
% learners aiming for level 2 qualification completing								
% learners aiming for < level 2 qualification completing								
% learners achieving qualifications								
% learners achieving qualifications at level 4+								
% learners achieving qualifications at level 3								
% learners achieving qualifications at level 2								
% learners achieving qualifications at level 1								
% learners achieving qualifications at level <1								
Estyn KQ1 assessment								
how well do learners achieve								
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Construction	3	4	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-
Engineering	1	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF
General Education	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Secretarial and Office Technology	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism and Leisure	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Welsh for Adults	-	2	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Business and Management	-	4	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Average cost to ELWa per CEU achieved								
Date of last Estyn inspection	Mar-04	May-03	Dec-01	See Note	Sep-00	Jun-99	Oct-99	May-01

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Flintshire							
	Yale College	Deeside College	WCOH	NWT	ADT	CITB	UpoW Bangor	SDA
Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience								
Learner satisfaction with teaching/training								
Learner satisfaction with provider facilities								
Estyn KQ3 assessment: how well do learning experiences meet the needs and interests of learners and the wider community								
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Construction	2	1	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-
Engineering	2	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF
General Education	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Secretarial and Office Technology	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism and Leisure	-	1	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Welsh for Adults	-	1	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Business and Management	-	1	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Estyn KQ4 assessment: how well are learners cared for, guided and supported								
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Construction	2	2	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-
Engineering	2	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF
General Education	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Secretarial and Office Technology	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism and Leisure	-	2	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Welsh for Adults	-	2	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Business and Management	-	2	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Date of last Estyn inspection	Mar-04	May-03	Dec-01	See Note	Sep-00	Jun-99	Oct-99	May-01

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Flintshire							
	Yale College	Deeside College	WCOH	NWT	ADT	CITB	UpoW Bangor	SDA
Number of employers supporting funded learning [Suggest measure % of work-related Learning Programmes supported by employers]	0.0	28.6	0.0	49.3	99.1	0.0	63.1	75.8
Proportion of employers supporting funded learning								
Estyn KQ3 assessment: how well do learning experiences meet the needs and interests of learners and the wider community								
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Construction	2	1	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-
Engineering	2	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF
General Education	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Secretarial and Office Technology	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism and Leisure	-	1	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Welsh for Adults	-	1	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Business and Management	-	1	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Sport and Resrecreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Date of last Estyn inspection	Mar-04	May-03	Dec-01	See Note	Sep-00	Jun-99	Oct-99	May-01

Notes:

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Yale College	Deeside College	WCOH	NWT	ADT	CITB	UoW Bangor	SDA	Notes
MANAGEMENT & FINANCIAL STRENGTH									
Estyn KQ5 assessment:									
how effective are leadership and strategic management									
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Construction	2	3	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-	
Engineering	2	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	
General Education	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Secretarial and Office Technology	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Tourism and Leisure	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Welsh for Adults	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Business and Management	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-	
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-	
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-	
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Estyn KQ6 assessment:									
how well do leaders and managers evaluate and improve quality standards									
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Construction	3	3	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-	
Engineering	3	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	
General Education	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Secretarial and Office Technology	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Tourism and Leisure	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Welsh for Adults	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Business and Management	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-	
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-	
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-	
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Quality of health & safety assurance systems

Financial health rating

% revenues derived from sources other than ELWa

Estyn KQ7 assessment:

how efficient are leaders and managers at using resources

Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Construction	2	3	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-
Engineering	2	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF
General Education	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Secretarial and Office Technology	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism and Leisure	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Welsh for Adults	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Business and Management	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landbased	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-	-
Technology	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Business Administration	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Hospitality	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF

Adequacy of estates

Accommodation:

Construction	Satisfactory
Engineering	Excellent
Tourism and Leisure	Very Good
Art and Design	Very Good
Health, Care and Public Services	Very Good
Hair and Beauty	Very Good

Main site	Very good	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Good	Good
Other sites	Roxborough House - good Bersham Road - shortcomings	High quality off site	Demountable buildings - unsat Wallasey - unsuitable Stretford - unsuitable Employer sites - good	Good	

Nursery Facilities	Good
Residential Facilities	50 Learners
Administration & Staff Facilities	Unsatisfactory

Accessibility for Physically Disabled	Mostly accessible	Mostly accessible			Generally good
---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	--	----------------

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Learning Resources

Learning Resource Centres	Effective & well used Good opening hours Well stocked with a books Well stocked with Engineering journals Well stocked with Construction journals		Too little space				Well equipped
Resources & Equipment: General					Good	Good	Good
Construction	Satisfactory to good						
Engineering	Very good			Motor Vehicle - very good			
General Education	Very good						
Other General Education			Insufficient books & journals				
Secretarial and Office Technology	Satisfactory to good						
Tourism and Leisure Hospitality			Insufficient books & journals			Inadequate	
Standard of ICT Infrastructure	Adequate	Good	Main site - adequate Outreach centres - inadequate - but some use of laptops	Main site - well equipped Work-based - some use of laptops			Main site - well equipped Work-based - some use of laptops
Proportion of Classrooms with Computers Quality of VLE		50%+ Use being extended	Use being extended	Piloting e-NVQs		N/A	Good for Floristry
Computer to FT Students Ratio Standard of Computer Stock	1:4 Adequate - 25% needs updating	1:4					
Computer to Staff Ratio Support Available to Staff	Helpdesk	30 staff have home computers					
Quality of Video Conferencing Facilities Quality of Multi Media Facilities		Good Good					

QUALITY

Estyn KQ2 assessment:
how effective are teaching, training and

Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Construction	2	3	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	-
Engineering	1	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-
Manufacturing	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF
General Education	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other General Education	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Secretarial and Office Technology	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism and Leisure	-	2	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Welsh for Adults	-	2	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Business and Management	-	3	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Art and Design	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Living Skills	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Catering	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Caring and Health	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Computing	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Landbased Technology	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	-	-	-
Retailing and Customer Service	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Foundation for Work	-	-	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-
Health, Care and Public Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Business Administration	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	Pre CIF
Hospitality	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	Pre CIF	-
Hair and Beauty	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-	-
Postgraduate Studies (Higher Skills)	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF	-
Retail and Warehousing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF
Sport and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pre CIF

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Careers Wales' perceptions of provider

Job Centre Plus' perceptions of provider

Associations' perceptions of provider e.g. Fforwm, SHA, NTPN

% learners for whom 1st choice provider

Quality awards held

Investors in People Award

ISO 9001 (1994)
EFQM Excellence Award
(2002)

Investors in People Award (1998)

STAFFING

Average qualification level held by staff	Investors in People Award	ISO 9001 (1994) EFQM Excellence Award (2002)	Investors in People Award (1998)
Professional Degree (including Further Degree)	64.8%	47.3%	29.7%
HND/HNC	20.7%	7.7%	17.8%
2 A-Levels/OND/ONC	3.0%	4.3%	11.9%
4 or 5 GCSE's (Grades A-C)	2.7%	5.7%	5.1%
4 GCSE's (Grade D-G)	0.3%	1.4%	1.7%
Other Formal Qualifications	8.1%	32.7%	33.9%
No Formal Qualifications	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%

Persistent incidences of staff shortages/recruitment difficulties

Learner load per FTE teaching/training staff	12.8	9.2	10.4
Learner load per FTE teaching & support staff	10.6	6.5	6.7
Variance from national average learner load per FTE teaching/training staff	-0.5	-4.1	-2.9

Quality of staff management and development arrangements

Quality of staff management and development arrangements	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Staff development strategy in place	✓						
Clear job descriptions in place		✓					
Individual staff development plans in place			✓				
Staff appraisal processes in place				✓			
Managers trained to appraise staff		✓					
Induction systems in place			✓				
for new F/T staff	✓						
for new P/T staff	✓						
Mentoring systems in place				✓			
for new F/T staff	✓						
for new P/T staff	✓						
Teacher/trainer training leading to qualifications provided	✓	✓					
Subject/industry specific training provided	✓						
Other training provided	✓	✓		✓		✓	
Industrial placements offered			✓				
Training/staff development evaluated			✓	✓			✓

3
a

1
a
1
a

2

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

SPECIALISMS

Variance from national norm in % of learners pursuing particular programme areas/routes programme areas

(Use QCA learning areas)

Variance from national norm in % of LLDD

Variance from national norm in % of Welsh medium provision

-3.0

-1.5

-3.0

-1.8

-2.8

0.9 4

% learners undertaking funded e-learning

% provision sub contracted

Nature of provision sub contracted

Nature of collaboration with other providers

Reason for collaboration

Date of last Estyn inspection

Mar-04

May-03

Dec-01

See Note

Sep-00

Jun-99

Oct-99

May-01

Notes

- 1 For full time students, student load = 1 full time full year of 30 weeks and over.
For other modes, student load is derived from the students' taught hours divided by the sector average for full time full year students
- 2 Average for FEIs only
- 3 Includes staff undertaking teaching (excludes staff supporting teaching and learning and those with unknown qualifications)
- 4 Figures based on where some learning is in the medium of Welsh
All figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
All figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes

Source

- a 2002/03 SIR (Staff Individualised Record)
Staff Aggregate Record 2002/03 included for sub-contracted tuition in teaching and learning departments
2002/03 ISR (Individualised Student Record)

APPENDIX 3:

**PARTIALLY POPULATED MODEL FOR
THE CONSTRUCTION SECTOR**

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Ref	MEASURE	National	SW Wales	Carmarthen shire	Notes
	Number of residents in funded FE/WBL				
	Residents learning in home UA area				
	% of residents learning in home UA area				
	Residents learning in other UA area				
	% of residents learning in other UA area				
	Residents undertaking funded e/distance learning				
	% of residents undertaking funded e/distance learning				
	Non residents of UA learning in area				
	% post 16 residents in learning				
	% of post 16 residents undertaking funded e/distance learning				
	Average distance travelled to learn by learners in area				
	Proportions of residents aiming for Key Skills qualifications				
	Level 4 +	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Level 3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Level 2	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
	Level 1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Below level 1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Proportions of residents aiming for qualifications other than Key Skills				
	Level 4 +	0.8%	0.6%	0.0%	
	Level 3	18.6%	14.7%	8.7%	
	Level 2	49.9%	52.5%	59.0%	
	Level 1	24.2%	23.9%	19.2%	
	Below level 1	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Proportions of residents by programme area/route				6
	Construction, Planning and the Built Environment	2.7%	2.4%	2.5%	7
	% undertaking learning through medium of Welsh	0.9%	0.7%	2.4%	8
	% learners from ethnic minority groups	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%	9
	% learners with disabilities	2.4%	3.0%	1.0%	10
	% male learners	93.0%	95.3%	96.9%	
	% female learners	7.0%	4.7%	3.1%	

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are for numbers of unique funded learners in FE/WBL
- 3 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes excluding self and employer funded learners
- 4 Small number of learners at ward level means percentages at ward level are less reliable than at other geographies
- 5 Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding WBL providers and open or distance learning
- 6 Number of learners by programme area contains all activities
- 7 QCA Learning Areas were used
- 8 Figures based on where some learning is in the medium of Welsh
- 9 Figures only include self-assessed ethnicity
- 10 Figures only include self-assessed disability

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	SW Wales	Carmarthen shire	Notes
Learners' destinations				
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	29.7%	52.9%	69.4%	5
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	4.8%	5.5%	2.1%	
% leavers entering higher education	30.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering new employment	2.9%	2.5%	1.7%	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	5.3%	3.5%	5.8%	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	3.7%	1.9%	0.4%	
% leavers entering self-employment	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering other destinations	53.0%	33.5%	20.2%	6
6th form learners' destinations				
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	-	-	-	
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	-	-	-	
% leavers entering higher education	-	-	-	
% leavers entering new employment	-	-	-	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	-	-	-	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	-	-	-	
% leavers entering self-employment	-	-	-	
% leavers entering voluntary work	-	-	-	
% leavers entering other destinations	-	-	-	
FE learners' destinations				
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	27.2%	56.8%	74.9%	7
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	4.8%	6.0%	1.1%	
% leavers entering higher education	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering new employment	2.5%	0.8%	0.6%	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	4.0%	2.0%	1.7%	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	3.6%	1.1%	0.0%	
% leavers entering self-employment	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering other destinations	57.5%	33.2%	21.8%	
WBL learners' destinations				
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	43.2%	43.1%	54.8%	
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	5.0%	4.1%	4.8%	
% leavers entering higher education	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering new employment	5.2%	9.0%	4.8%	
% leavers entering continuing current employment	12.0%	9.3%	17.7%	
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	4.2%	4.8%	1.6%	
% leavers entering self-employment	0.5%	0.7%	1.6%	
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% leavers entering other destinations	29.8%	29.0%	14.5%	6

Change in learners' attainment levels upon leaving

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are from all leavers in 2003/04 for WBL, FE & ACL
- 3 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes excluding self and employer funded learners
- 4 Small number of learners at ward level means percentages at ward level are less reliable than at other geographies completed learning programmes i.e. an individual learner may appear more than once if they complete
- 5 more than one programme in the academic year
- 6 Data not reliable (will be ready for December 2004)
- 7 Figures exclude FE learners at HEIs

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	SW Wales	Carmarthen shire
% learners completing planned learning programme			
% learners aiming for level 3+ qualification completing			
% learners aiming for level 2 qualification completing			
% learners aiming for < level 2 qualification completing			
% 6th form learners completing planned learning			
% FE learners completing planned learning			
% WBL learners completing planned learning			
% ACE learners completing planned learning			
Learners' attainments			
% learners achieving qualifications at level 4+			
% learners achieving qualifications at level 3			
% learners achieving qualifications at level 2			
% learners achieving qualifications at level 1			
% learners achieving qualifications at level <1			
% 6th form learners achieving qualifications at level 3+			
% FE learners achieving qualifications at level 3+			
% WBL learners achieving qualifications at level 3+			
% ACE learners achieving qualifications at level 3+			
% 6th form learners achieving qualifications at level 2			
% FE learners achieving qualifications at level 2			
% WBL learners achieving qualifications at level 2			
% ACE learners achieving qualifications at level 2			
% 6th form learners achieving qualifications at level <2			
% FE learners achieving qualifications at level <2			
% WBL learners achieving qualifications at level <2			
% ACE learners achieving qualifications at level <2			

Notes

- 1 Data will not be available until later in 2004

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	SW Wales	Carmarth enshire
Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience			
Learner satisfaction with teaching/training			
Learner satisfaction with provider facilities			

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	SW Wales	Carmarthenshire
Number of employers supporting funded learning			
Proportion of employers supporting funded learning			
Proportion of work-related learning programmes supported by employers	21.6%	24.2%	29.8%

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for Lifelong Learning Wales Record (LLWR) data
- 2 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	National	SW Wales	Carmarthenshire	Notes
Average distances travelled to learn				
Average number of providers delivering provision within 20 miles of learners' places of residence				
% learners with 1st choice provider	NOT LLWR			
Learners and potential learners' perceptions of choice available	NOT LLWR			
Number of learners with some of their learning in Welsh				
Number of learners preferring to learn in Welsh				
Providers' perceptions of gaps in provision				
Careers Wales' perceptions of gaps in provision				
Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience				
Learner satisfaction with teaching/training				
Learner satisfaction with provider facilities				
Average qualification level held by staff				
6th forms				
FE				
WBL				
ACE				
Proportion of staff with teaching/training qualifications				
Persistent incidences of staff shortages/recruitment difficulties				
Average learner to full-time equivalent staff ratio				
Average cost to ELWa of CEUs achieved				

Notes

- 1 Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes excluding self and employer funded learners
- 2 Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding WBL providers

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	Carmarthenshire	City & County of Swansea (WBL)		Coleg Sir Gar		Neath Port Talbot College		Pembrokeshire College		Swansea College	
		South West Domiciled	Rest of Wales	South West Domiciled	Rest of Wales	South West Domiciled	Rest of Wales	South West Domiciled	Rest of Wales	South West Domiciled	Rest of Wales
Numbers of ELWa funded learners within the Construction, Planning and Built Environment sector	421	157	5	281	11	715	57	306	21	143	7
Share of local 'market'											
Average distance travelled to learn by learners											
Numbers of learners aiming for qualifications within the Construction, Planning and Built Environment sector											
Key Skills											
Level 4 +	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Below level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Aims											
Level 4 +	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 3	47	52	0	22	0	101	10	69	6	10	1
Level 2	319	103	5	190	9	387	41	186	18	73	2
Level 1	104	16	0	104	8	157	2	89	2	88	5
Below level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Numbers of learners by programme area/route Construction, Planning and the Built Environment											
% undertaking learning through medium of Welsh	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% learners from ethnic minority groups	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.4	0.0
% learners with disabilities	1.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	1.8	1.6	4.8	1.4	0.0
% male learners	96.9	96.8	100.0	97.2	90.9	96.1	98.2	93.8	95.2	97.2	100.0
% female learners	3.1	3.2	0.0	2.8	9.1	3.9	1.8	6.2	4.8	2.8	0.0
Notes											
1	Figures (unless stated) based on week of 1st Dec 2003 for LLWR										
2	Figures (unless stated) are for numbers of unique learners in FE/WBL										
3	Figures (unless stated) are of learners domiciled in Wales with valid postcodes excluding self and employer funded learners										
4	Average distance travelled is by direct measurement excluding WBL providers and open or distance learning										
5	Figures are for unique learners within each dataset										
6	Number of learners by programme area contains all activities										
7	QCA Learning Areas used										
8	Figures only include self-assessed ethnicity										
9	Figures only include self-assessed disability										

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	City & County of Swansea (WBL)	Coleg Sir Gar	Neath Port Talbot College	Pembrokeshi re College	Swansea College
Learners' destinations					
% leavers continuing existing programme of learning	9.9	100.0	100.0	76.7	2.5
% leavers entering new programme of learning (not HE)	3.7	0.0	0.0	5.1	15.6
% leavers entering higher education	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% leavers entering new employment	11.1	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
% leavers entering continuing current employment	4.9	0.0	0.0	6.7	1.5
% leavers entering seeking work/unemployed	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1
% leavers entering self-employment	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% leavers entering voluntary work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% leavers entering other destinations	63.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	79.3
Change in learners' attainment levels upon leaving					

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE	City & County of Swansea (WBL)	Coleg Sir Gar	Neath Port Talbot College	Pembrokehire College	Swansea College
% learners completing planned learning programme					
% learners aiming for level 3+ qualification completing					
% learners aiming for level 2 qualification completing					
% learners aiming for < level 2 qualification completing					
% learners achieving qualifications					
% learners achieving qualifications at level 4+					
% learners achieving qualifications at level 3					
% learners achieving qualifications at level 2					
% learners achieving qualifications at level 1					
% learners achieving qualifications at level <1					
Estyn KQ1 assessment how well do learners achieve					
Construction					
Engineering					
Manufacturing					
Average cost to ELWa per CEU achieved					
Date of last Estyn inspection					

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE

Overall learner satisfaction with learning experience

Learner satisfaction with teaching/training

Learner satisfaction with provider facilities

Estyn KQ3 assessment:
how well do learning experiences meet the needs and interests of learners and the wider community

Construction
Engineering
Manufacturing

Estyn KQ4 assessment:
how well are learners cared for, guided and supported

Construction
Engineering
Manufacturing

Date of last Estyn inspection

City & County of Swansea (WBL)	Coleg Sir Gar	Neath Port Talbot College	Pembrokehire College	Swansea College

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

MEASURE

City & County of Swansea (WBL)

Colleg Sir Gar

Neath Port Talbot College

Pembrokeshire College

Swansea College

MANAGEMENT & FINANCIAL STRENGTH

Estyn KQ5 assessment:
how effective are leadership and strategic management

Construction
Engineering
Manufacturing

Estyn KQ6 assessment:
how well do leaders and managers evaluate and improve quality standards

Construction
Engineering
Manufacturing

Quality of health & safety assurance systems

Financial health rating

% revenues derived from sources other than ELWa

Estyn KQ7 assessment:
how efficient are leaders and managers at using resources

Construction
Engineering
Manufacturing

Adequacy of estates
Accommodation
Learning resources
ICT
VLE

Ability to comply with DDA

QUALITY

Estyn KQ2 assessment:
how effective are teaching, training and assessment

Construction
Engineering
Manufacturing

Persistent incidences of staff shortages/recruitment difficulties

Average learner of full-time equivalent staff ratio

Variance from national average learner to full time equivalent staff ratio

Quality of staff management and development

SPECIALISMS

Variance from national norm in % of learners pursuing particular programme areas/routes
programme areas

Variance from national norm in % of LLDD

Variance from national norm in % of Welsh medium provision

% learners undertaking funded e-learning

% provision sub contracted
Nature of provision sub contracted

Nature of collaboration with other providers
Reason for collaboration

Date of last Estyn inspection

APPENDIX 4:

LLWR DATA FIELDS

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Leamer dataset

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
LN01	Unique Learner Identifier (ULI)	UNIQUEID	All learners	13	Alphanumeric
LN02	Learner identifier with provider	LEARN_ID	All learners	20	Alphanumeric
LN03	Provider identifier	PROVI_ID	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LN04	Surname	LSURNAME	All learners	40	Alphanumeric
LN05	Forename(s)	LFORENAM	All learners	40	Alphanumeric
LN06	Current home : sub dwelling	SUBDWELL	Mainstream - funded	40	Alphanumeric
LN07	Current home : dwelling	DWELLING	Mainstream – funded	40	Alphanumeric
LN08	Current home : street	STREETNM	Mainstream – funded	40	Alphanumeric
LN09	Current home : locality	LOCALITY	Mainstream – funded	35	Alphanumeric
LN10	Current home : town/city	HOMETOWN	Mainstream – funded	30	Alphanumeric
LN11	Current home : postcode	POSTCODE	Mainstream – funded	8	Alphanumeric
LN12	Current home : telephone number	TEL_NUMB	Mainstream – funded	15	Alphanumeric
LN13	National Insurance Number	NAT_INSU	Work-related programmes	9	Alphanumeric
LN14	Surname on 16th birthday	SRNAME16	All learners	40	Alphanumeric
LN15	Date of birth	DATEBRTH	All learners	8	Date
LN16	Gender	LEARNGEN	All learners	1	Alphanumeric
LN17	Ethnic Origin	ETHNICOR	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LN18	National Identity	NAT_IDEN	Mainstream – funded	3	Alphanumeric
LN19	First language	FLANGUAG	Mainstream – funded	1	Alphanumeric
LN20	School last attended	LT SCHOOL	Mainstream – funded	8	Alphanumeric
LN21	Year left school	YEARLEFT	Mainstream – funded	4	Numeric

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Learning Programme dataset

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
LP01	Unique Learner Identifier (ULI)	UNIQUEID	All learners	13	Alphanumeric
LP02	Learner identifier with provider	LEARN_ID	All learners	20	Alphanumeric
LP03	Provider identifier	PROVI_ID	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LP04	Learning programme identifier	LPROG_ID	All learners	10	Alphanumeric
LP05	ELWa Office	ELWOFFIC	All learners	3	Alphanumeric
LP06	Data release date	RELEASED	Mainstream - funded	8	Date
LP07	Mode of attendance	MODE_ATT	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LP08	Domicile	DOMICILE	Mainstream - funded	4	Alphanumeric
LP09	Postcode(at start of learning programme)	POST_SLP	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LP10	Unitary authority code	UNITARID	All learners	3	Alphanumeric
LP11	Employment status at start of programme	EMPSTART	All learners	1	Alphanumeric
LP12	Employer name	EMPLNAME	Work-related programmes	60	Alphanumeric
LP13	Employer postcode	EMPLPOST	Work-related programmes	8	Alphanumeric
LP14	SOC code	SOC_CODE	Work-related programmes	4	Alphanumeric
LP15	Employer role	EMP_ROLE	All learners	1	Alphanumeric
LP16	Sector code	SECTORCOD	Mainstream on WBL	3	Alphanumeric
LP17	Type of learning programme	TYPE_LPG	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LP18	Status before learning	STAT_BLN	Mainstream on WBL	3	Alphanumeric
LP19	Expected length of learning programme	EXPTLENG	Mainstream - funded	3	Numeric
LP20	Joint Provider	JOINTPRV	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LP21	Type of highest qualification achieved prior to learning programme	TYPEHQUA	Mainstream – funded	2	Alphanumeric
LP22	Level of highest qualification achieved prior to learning programme	LVL_HQUA	Mainstream – funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP23	Welsh speaker indicator	WELSH_SP	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP24	Preferred language of learning	PREFLANG	Mainstream – funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP25	Financial support for learner	FIN_SUPP	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LP26	Total fees paid for learning programme	TOT_FEES	Mainstream – funded	5	Numeric
LP27	Reserved	RESERVED	All learners	3	Alphanumeric
LP28	Major source of fees	MAJ_FEES	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LP29	Disability (self-assessed)	DISABLE1	Mainstream - funded	2	Alphanumeric
LP30	Disability (assessed by external organisation)	DISABLE2	Mainstream – funded	2	Alphanumeric
LP31	Learning difficulty	DIFFICUL	Mainstream - funded	2	Alphanumeric
LP32	Disadvantaged grouping	DISADVAN	Mainstream – funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP33	Level of fluency in Welsh at start of programme	FLU_START	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP34	Level of numeracy assessed at start of learning programme	NUM_STRT	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP35	Level of literacy assessed at start of learning programme	LITY_SRT	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP36	Level of fluency in Welsh at termination of learning programme	FLU_TERM	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP37	Level of numeracy assessed at termination of learning programme	NUM_TERM	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
LP38	Level of literacy assessed at termination of learning programme	LIT_TERM	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LP39	Framework achievement	FWORKACH	Mainstream on WBL	1	Alphanumeric
LP40	Employment status at end of learning programme	ESTATEND	Mainstream on WBL	1	Alphanumeric
LP41	Reason for termination of learning programme	TERM_REA	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LP42	Destination immediately following learning programme	DEST_IPL	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LP43	Destination sixth months after leaving	DESTSIXM	Mainstream - funded	2	Alphanumeric
LP44	Provider specified field 1	PROVSP_1	No learners	20	Alphanumeric
LP45	Provider specified field 2	PROVSP_2	No learners	20	Alphanumeric

Learning Activity dataset

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
LA01	ULI (Unique Learner Identifier)	UNIQUEID	All learners	13	Alphanumeric
LA02	Learner identifier with provider	LEARN_ID	All learners	20	Alphanumeric
LA03	Provider identifier	PROVI_ID	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LA04	Learning programme identifier	LPROG_ID	All learners	10	Alphanumeric
LA05	Learning activity identifier	LACTI_ID	All learners	2	Numeric
LA06	Learning aim reference	LAIM_REF	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LA07	Learning activity reference used by provider	LAPRVREF	All learners	20	Alphanumeric
LA08	Title of learning activity	TITLE_LA	All learners	40	Alphanumeric
LA09	Date commenced learning activity	STARTDTE	All learners	8	Date
LA10	Expected end date of learning activity	EENDDATE	All learners	8	Date
LA11	Mainstream Purchasing / Funding	MAIN_STR	All learners	1	Alphanumeric
LA12	Learner Commissioned Purchasing	LCOM_PUR	All learners	3	Alphanumeric
LA13	Learner Financial Support	LFIN_SUP	All learners	3	Alphanumeric
LA14	Learning Network Investment Funding	LNET_INV	All learners	3	Alphanumeric
LA15	LLDD indicator	LLDDFUND	Mainstream - funded	1	Alphanumeric
LA16	Additional Learning Support	ADDLNSPT	Mainstream - funded	2	Alphanumeric
LA17	Other source of funding	OTHERFND	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LA18	ILA database reference	ILA_DBRF	All learners	20	Alphanumeric
LA19	Guided contact hours	CONT_HRS	All learners	4	Numeric
LA20	Method of delivery	DELIVERY	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LA21	Subject of learning	SUB_LEAR	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LA22	Credit level of learning activity	LEV_LEAR	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
LA23	Credit value of learning activity	CREDITVL	All learners	5	Numeric
LA24	Learning hours	LEARNHRS	Mainstream - funded	4	Numeric

AUDIT OF SUPPLY

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
LA25	Proportion of learning activity delivered through the medium of Welsh	WELSHMED	Mainstream - funded	3	Numeric
LA26	Type of Welsh medium learning	WELSHLEA	Mainstream – funded	2	Numeric
LA27	Franchise / partnership percentage	FRANPART	All learners	3	Numeric
LA28	Provider delivering learning	PROV_TPP	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LA29	Postcode of site	PCDV5ITE	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
LA30	Date terminated learning activity	TERMDATE	All learners	8	Date
LA31	Completion status	COMPSTAT	All learners	1	Alphanumeric
LA32	Special funding rules 1	SPFUNDR1	Mainstream - funded	3	Alphanumeric
LA33	Special funding rules 2	SPFUNDR2	Mainstream – funded	3	Alphanumeric
LA34	Provider specified field 1	PRSPECF1	No learners	20	Alphanumeric
LA35	Provider specified field 2	PRSPECF2	No learners	20	Alphanumeric
LA36	ESTYN inspection area	ESTYN_ID	Mainstream - funded	4	Alphanumeric

Award dataset

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
AW01	ULI (Unique Learner Identifier)	UNIQUEID	All learners	13	Alphanumeric
AW02	Learner identifier with provider	LEARN_ID	All learners	20	Alphanumeric
AW03	Provider identifier	PROVI_ID	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
AW04	Learning programme identifier	LPROG_ID	All learners	10	Alphanumeric
AW05	Learning activity link	LACTLINK	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
AW06	Award entry identifier	AWARDENT	All learners	2	Numeric
AW07	Awarding body identifier	AWARDBOD	All learners	10	Alphanumeric
AW08	Award learning aim reference	AWARDREF	All learners	8	Alphanumeric
AW09	Title of award	AW_TITLE	All learners	80	Alphanumeric
AW10	Date entered for award	DATEENTR	All learners	8	Date
AW11	Date of result	DATERESU	All learners	8	Date
AW12	Result	RESULTAW	All learners	4	Alphanumeric
AW13	Award credit value	AWARDVAL	All learners	5	Alphanumeric
AW14	Award credit Level	AWARD LV	All learners	1	Alphanumeric
AW15	Type of award	AWRDTYPE	All learners	2	Alphanumeric
AW16	Medium of assessment	MEDIUMAS	Mainstream – funded	1	Alphanumeric
AW17	Award funding rules 1	AWFUNDR1	Mainstream – funded	3	Alphanumeric
AW18	Award funding rules 2	AWFUNDR2	Mainstream – funded	3	Alphanumeric
AW19	Exam board identifier	EXAMBRDI	All learners	20	Alphanumeric

HE dataset

Code	Field Name	Abbreviation	Mandatory for	Field Length	Field Type
HE01	ULI (Unique Learner Identifier)	UNIQUEID	HE	13	Alphanumeric
HE02	Learner identifier with provider	LEARN_ID	HE	20	Alphanumeric
HE03	Provider identifier	PROVI_ID	HE	8	Alphanumeric
HE04	Learning programme identifier	LPROG_ID	HE	10	Alphanumeric
HE05	Reserved	HERESERV	HE	2	Alphanumeric
HE06	Nationality	NATIONAL	HE	4	Alphanumeric
HE07	New entrant to HE	NEWHEENT	HE	1	Alphanumeric
HE08	Term time accommodation	TERMACCO	HE	1	Alphanumeric
HE09	Fee Band	FEE_BAND	HE	2	Alphanumeric
HE10	Major source of HE tuition fees	HE_TFEES	HE	2	Alphanumeric
HE11	UCAS Number	UCASNUM	HE	9	Alphanumeric