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Executive Summary

Guidance on Equality and Diversity Impact Measures (EDIMs)

From: Phil Barnett, Assistant Director – Equality and Diversity Team, Quality and Standards Directorate

Intended recipients: Local Learning and Skills Councils (local LSCs)

This guidance requires action by local LSC Executive Directors, Strategic Planning staff, Equality and Diversity staff, Management Information staff, Research and Evaluation staff and staff working on quality and standards and learning programmes. Actions to develop EDIMs to be completed by 31 March 2003.

This guidance will assist local LSCs with developing and mainstreaming EDIMs for the 2003/04 Strategic Planning round. This guidance:

• explains what EDIMs are
• outlines the rationale for employing EDIMs to achieve equality of opportunity for all learners
• suggests the methodology for calculating baselines from which to proceed
• proposes a methodology for developing EDIMs and monitoring change over time (see annex C).

This guidance will help local LSCs to:
• set local measures for the participation, retention and achievement of learners
• ensure that those measures include learners drawn from groups currently underrepresented or underachieving in learning provision
• meet the expected requirements of the 2003/04 Corporate Guidance on Strategic Planning
• provide data for the LSC Equality and Diversity Report to the secretary of state.

This is an early guidance note that is precursor to a final circular to be published in September 2002.
Introduction

1 This guidance will help local learning and skills councils to:

- Set local measures for the participation, retention and achievement of learners
- Ensure that those measures include learners drawn from groups currently underrepresented or underachieving in learning provision
- Meet the expected requirements of the 2003/04 Corporate Guidance on Strategic Planning
- Provide data for the LSC Equality and Diversity Report to the secretary of state.

2 This guidance requires action by local LSC Executive Directors, Strategic Planning staff, Equality and Diversity staff, Management Information staff, Research and Evaluation staff and staff working on quality and standards and learning programmes.

3 This guidance does not apply to strategic plans currently being drafted. It aims to assist local LSCs with developing and mainstreaming EDIMs for the 2003/04 Strategic Planning round. This guidance:-

- Explains what EDIMs are
- Outlines the rationale for employing EDIMs to achieve equality of opportunity for all learners
- Suggests the methodology for calculating baselines from which to proceed
- Proposes a methodology for developing EDIMs and monitoring change over time (see annex C).

4 This guidance meets needs identified at the three LSC Equality in Practice seminars held in autumn 2001. This is an early guidance note that is precursor to a final circular to be published in September 2002. It also supports the 2001 strategic Planning Guidance issued by National Office to local LSCs. It is likely that EDIMs will be mandatory for the 2003/04 strategic planning round. This Guidance deals with disaggregating the local learning targets but the final circular may well deal with
disaggregating the national targets. Colleagues working on national targets are working on ways of measuring the local targets. This activity will help when developing EDIMs more widely for 2003/04.

Key features of equality and diversity impact measures

Key features of equality and diversity impact measures are that:

- they address key equality and diversity issues prioritised by the local LSC through its needs analysis and strategic planning
- they disaggregate the generic targets set by local LSCs and contribute to meeting them
- they are based on a local analysis of the learner cohort
- they may relate to inequality based on age, sex, race, disability, geographical area, occupational sector etc.
- they will provide challenging but realistic targeted measures for improvement
- they will relate to participation, retention and achievement at each level of qualification and learning activity
- they will equip local LSCs and their providers to address inequality systematically as part of their mainstream activities
- they will measure progress against a locally developed baseline, have clear milestones, monitoring and reporting procedures (see page 6 for the main sources from which baselines can be developed)
- they feature or will feature in local LSC strategic plans.

6 The LSC is committed to ensuring that in meeting all its targets, it moves towards equality and social inclusion rather than consolidate inequality and social exclusion. It wishes to avoid targets being met only by drawing on the traditional cohorts of learners. By disaggregating the learning targets for participation, retention and achievement by age, sex, race and disability, local LSCs will have a mechanism that will enable them to manage and drive inclusion by identifying the desired profile of learners at different stages of the system; allowing them then to devise methods for ensuring such profiles are achieved. The consistent application of EDIMs as a planning tool will enable the LSC to demonstrate the changes that result from its programmes and initiatives. EDIMs are to be set as stretch measures to be achieved incrementally over a set period of time. Equality and Diversity cannot be managed if it is not measured.

7 Currently, all local LSCs are required to set local learning targets for each of the five areas to which a value is ascribed nationally. Namely:

- 16 – 18 year olds participation in learning
- level 2 attainment at age 19
- level 3 attainment at age 19
- adult attainment at level 3
- basic skills (literacy and numeracy) improvements.
8 Disaggregating the contributors to each local learning target by age, sex, race and disability will show how people from each of these groups would contribute towards achieving the target. National and local targets focus on participation and achievement levels and importantly the provision of Basic Skills is also a key component. EDIMs take in wider considerations of participation, retention and progression that will subsequently contribute towards achievement by underrepresented or disadvantaged groups. They have important implications for the short and long term, as addressing inequality in these aspects of learning provision should result in increased overall achievement over time. See annex A for an example of how EDIMs can be developed from the target for 16 – 18 year olds participation in learning.

What equality impact measures will look like

9 EDIMs will develop from an agreed baseline position and set out the stretch measure to be achieved in respect of different groups of people within a given timescale. They might be stated in numerical terms, for example, ‘to reduce participation, retention, and achievement gaps between different groups of learners by five percent over a four-year period’. They might also be presented in a more broadbased statement such as ‘to achieve parity in participation, retention and achievement by rates specific groups of learners over a defined period’. (See Annex C) In either case, milestones should be identified so that change can be monitored at specific intervals over the timescale.

What happens if EDIMs are not achieved?

10 EDIMs will be formulated using the best evidence and advice available to ensure that they are both challenging and achievable. Given that, failure to meet them should trigger an examination of a number of factors. For example:

- has the failure been caused by localised failure of particular providers
- has the failure been general across providers
- has there been proper communication about EDIMs from the local LSC to all providers
- were providers properly and fully involved with the formulation of EDIMs
- did all parts of the LLSC ‘buy in’ to the principle and detail of the EDIMs
- were the EDIMs set correctly?

11 The answers to these and other relevant and linked questions will give rise to a range of responses, including training, examination of contractual participation, examination with providers of recruitment and outreach, examination of provider’s equality and diversity policies and their application and a revision of the particular EDIMs.

12 In no circumstances should EDIMs become overly rigid or unamenable to revision, although they should, at the same time, be used seriously and consistently to drive improvement.
13. Improvements to data for establishing baselines will be available from the analysis of the 2001 census information. When available in 2003, this data will help to assess the relevance of existing targets to see if they need revising or adjusting in light of changing circumstances. Consistency and compatibility between WBL and FE data is compromised by the different data collection systems and reporting periods for each sector. The format and content of the forthcoming ILR (2003) should enable consistent analysis of WBL and FE data. Local LSCs will continue to use FE and WBL data to monitor progress when piloting EDIMs in early 2002.

Piloting EDIMs with pathfinder LLSCs¹

14. Local LSCs are encouraged to consider setting EDIMs in their strategic plans. While not mandatory for 2002/3, it is expected that it will be mandatory for 2003/4. The LSC has convened six pathfinder local LSCs to pilot EDIMs during 2002. The pilot will inform the development of the formulae for creating the measures, create guidance on the sources of baseline data and how to apply the formula. Following the pilot, the entire process will be evaluated in time to build the lessons into the 2003/04 strategic planning round and disseminate examples of effective practice. This will be followed by LSC circular to embed equality and diversity impact measures in the strategic planning process. This work is geared to local LSCs, and it is local LSCs who will take this process into their planning and to their own providers. As equality and diversity impact measures are intended to address local circumstances, they will need ultimately to be reflected in the plans and contracts of providers to ensure delivery.

Timetable for 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish pilot with 6 pathfinder LSCs</td>
<td>January 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement EDIMs with pathfinder LSCs</td>
<td>March 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate process as experienced during the pilot</td>
<td>August 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish Council Circular on the use of EDIMs drawing on the experience of the pathfinder LSCs</td>
<td>September 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With strategic planning and national targets teams to input to strategic planning guidance for 2002 onwards</td>
<td>September 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist local LSCs with implementing EDIMs following planning guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex A – Establishing baselines for EDIMs
Annex B – Management Information, Analysis and reporting
Annex C – an example of developing EDIMs in relation to the national target to increase 16-18 year old participation in learning.

¹ Pathfinder LLSCs piloting equality and diversity impact measures in 2002; Cheshire and Warrington, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, London West, West Yorkshire and Tees Valley.
**List of national and local baseline and performance data sources**

**National data sources**

- Census of Population projections based on 1991 Census. Analysis of 2001 Census will be available 2003 via Office for National Statistics (ONS) and National Online Manpower information System (NOMIS)
- Labour Force Survey boosted for summer 2001 to enable reliability at local LSC level. This data is available via ONS and NOMIS.

**Administrative data sources**

- Individualised Student Record (ISR) – National LSC
- Work Based Learning Interim Individualised Learner Record (ILR) - National LSC
- School Performance Statistics – DfES.

**Local baseline data sources**

- Careers/Connexions Year 11 School Leaver Destinations statistics – Connexions/Careers Services
- Household Survey data – Local/Regional LSC research
- Economic and Labour Market Assessments – Local LSC Report
- School Statistics - LEA
- Employer/Business Surveys – Local LSC research.

The forthcoming circular (September 2002) will identify specific data sources for establishing baselines and monitoring participation, retention and achievement in relation to EDIMs.
Annex A
Establishing baselines for EDIMs

To measure change that has taken place under the LSC, it is appropriate to establish EDIM baseline measures for the position at 2001. For WBL, standard period reports should be the basis of ongoing local LSC monitoring activity. FE data will be from the ISR.

Using local data

At national and local levels, the Labour Force Survey (LFS) is the only available reliable dataset for measuring adult attainment at all levels and participation in learning. Despite the enhancement to this dataset in August 2001 the data did not enable disaggregation by age, disability or ethnicity with any reliability. Demographic projections based on the 1991 census are equally unreliable at local level. To compensate for limitations in national datasets, administrative sources School Leavers’ Destinations Data, School Statistics/ISR/WBL Statistics should be used to provide reliable local analysis. Some of these data sources were used to establish the local LSC baseline positions in respect of the 2004 targets for 16-18 and 19 year olds. Therefore, developing EDIMs based on these sources ensures consistency of approach and data compatibility.

Careers Services/Connexions Year 11 School Leaver Destinations Data collected over three years disaggregated by sex, race and disability can be used to ascertain the characteristics of the 16-18 year old cohort. School Leaver Destinations data is gathered via a 100 percent survey. However, the analysis, accounts for all leavers to base the result on the total cohort. The results show the number and proportion of 16 year olds who enter FE, WBL, a job or whose destination is unknown due to migration and other factors. Comparative analysis focusing on proportions rather than actual numbers of people from specific groups should ensure consistency of approach. However, need to take care when reporting on small numbers of people and where data is not recorded.

All performance issues need to be analysed and then further processed to identify issues relevant to age, sex, race and disability. Although rates of participation retention and achievement across these groups will vary, appropriate analysis should be undertaken to identify the extent of inequality. The standard Comparator approach to measuring equality and diversity should provide robust information. Comprehensive analysis will be required for each group and occupational areas at local LSC and provider levels.

2 The Comparator approach to assessing equality of opportunity suggested in this guidance uses the representation or ‘distribution’ of specific groups of people in the overall dataset as the base comparator figure. We are also considering using some measure of ‘significance’ that takes account of sample sizes in determining which groups should be the focus of specific EDIMs.
Annex B
Management Information, analysis and reporting

The use of comparators in all analysis is the bedrock of the approach to establishing EDIMs. The first statistical component involves disaggregating the cohort available to enter learning by age, sex, race and disability. Subsequent analyses would provide essential learner information, for example:

- Proportion participating in learning by age, sex, ethnicity and disability
- Proportion retained by age, sex, ethnicity and disability
- Proportion achieving by age, sex, ethnicity and disability (including qualification level and curriculum area/Standard Occupational Category)
- Proportion progressing to a higher level course or into Higher Education by age, sex, ethnicity and disability.

Analyses should also consider the impact of multiple factors, for example, sex and disability.

Local LSCs are currently piloting different analysis and reporting systems to produce a suite of Management Information reports on general performance, with additional reports featuring equality of opportunity comparisons.

One local LSC identified that analysis would be required to inform approaches to addressing issues that were characteristic of the local LSC area as a whole, and those at district level. They produce standard performance and equality of opportunity reports to identify patterns in participation, retention, outcome and progression by age, sex, ethnicity and disability. They also produced similar analysis at provider level.

Careers Services School Leavers Destinations data helps to track the take up of WBL to show how take up compares across districts by percentage of the Year 11 cohort v percentage going onto WBL and other provision. This then considers the Equality of Opportunity dimension.
Annex C

An example of disaggregating the 16-18 year old WBL cohort for the Young People participation target by sex, race and disability.

Setting the actual impact measures is the final statistical component in establishing and embedding EDIMs. This stage sets out expected increases from particular groups from the baseline position and sets the impact measure that should be achieved to reduce equality gaps in recruitment, retention, achievement and progression.

See annex C.

Strategic planning guidance contains baseline data for each local target. Local targets baseline data set out the numbers or proportions of people that would be required to meet the target. Baseline information is generic, and is not disaggregated by age, sex, ethnicity or disability to identify the increased representation required from specific groups that would be required to meet the local target. This example shows what disaggregated participation data might look like at local LSC level. This example shows broad ethnic groupings, as the specific ethnic groups could not fit into the space available. All analysis by ethnicity would use the standard ethnic categories.

Table 1: Summary results of baseline analysis to identify inequality in participation by learners' occupational sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation sector</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Sex %</th>
<th>Ethnicity %</th>
<th>Disability %</th>
<th>Programme %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>Majority/Minority</td>
<td>No/Yes</td>
<td>NVQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>8322</td>
<td>61/39</td>
<td>95/5</td>
<td>92/8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td>95/5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>16.16%</td>
<td>29/71</td>
<td>90/10</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>99/1</td>
<td>99/1</td>
<td>97/3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing and Customer Care</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
<td>48/52</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Public Services</td>
<td>8.98%</td>
<td>9/91</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td>88/12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>58/42</td>
<td>97/3</td>
<td>86/14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>78/22</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>97/3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair and Beauty</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>6/94</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td>86/14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>88/12</td>
<td>99/1</td>
<td>96/4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Sport and Travel</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td>92/8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Professional</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>35/65</td>
<td>96/4</td>
<td>97/3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Design</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>78/22</td>
<td>98/2</td>
<td>91/9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>75/25</td>
<td>95/5</td>
<td>89/11</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The formula for assessing the extent of inequality of opportunity
All LSC analyses should embed equality measures in a standard Comparator format. That is achieved by applying a simple formula. For example, with WBL participation, if there are 100 male starts and 70 enter AMA (70%) and 50 female starts and 35 enter AMA (70%) we have sex equality within AMA with a comparator value of 1.000 (70%÷70%=1.000). Variances either side of 1.000 should identify the extent of equal opportunity issues to inform planning and action. The same formula applies to comparing retention and achievement. All analysis should compare participation levels between men and women, all ethnic groups, different age groups, people with disabilities and people without disabilities.

Table 2: Summary Equal Opportunities Comparator Analysis (1.000 = equality in participation levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal Opportunities</th>
<th>Ethnic minority</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Lifeskills</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8322</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>16.16%</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>6.110</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing and Customer Care</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Public Services</td>
<td>8.98%</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>5.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair and Beauty</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Sport and Travel</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Professional</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Design</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WBL ILR1

The main participation issues for Young People using the ‘Comparator’ approach in the analyses in Tables 1 and 2 are:

**Gender participation** – Table 1 shows the participation gender split is of learners excluding those on Lifeskills is 61% male 39% female. There is some indication of gender stereotyping in some occupational categories. For example, in Table 2, the 98/2% male bias in Engineering and the 91/1% female bias in Health care and Public relations.
Example EDIM 1: To increase the representation of women learners in the engineering classification from 2% in 2001 to 10% in 2004.

Ethnic participation – Table 1 shows the ethnic split for participation excluding those on Lifeskills is 95% white 5% ethnic minority. Table 2 shows that ethnic minority learners in Business Administration provision are 4 (4.153) times less likely as white learners to be on Lifeskills.

Example EDIM 2: To equalise participation rates for ethnic minority learners participating on MA Business Administration by 2004. (The small numbers of learners from ethnic minority groups in this analysis (not shown here) would make this EDIM stretching but achievable)

Disability participation – Table 1 shows that 8% of participants excluding those on Lifeskills have a disability. This Table also shows that 97/3% imbalance in favour of people without disabilities in the Management and Professional category should be of particular concern Table 2 shows that people with disabilities are 2 times as likely to go into Lifeskills programmes as those without.

Example EDIM 3: To increase the proportion of people with disabilities participation in Management and Professional learning provision from 3% in 2001 to 5% in 2004.

For all EDIMs, Interim monitoring would be included against set milestones to the achievement date.

---

The broad distinction between ethnic minority and ethnic majority is applied in this analysis for illustration purposes only. It is recommended that analysis by ethnicity should cover specific ethnic groups as an overall minority/majority distinction could mask issues facing specific groups.
All equality and diversity analysis should be capable of picking up crosscutting issues such as gender and ethnicity in line with the Birmingham LSC example cited on page 18 of the LSC Corporate Plan - Strategic Framework to 2004. It is expected that staff responsible for equality and diversity within local LSC will liaise with colleagues on accessing and analysing data when developing EDIMs. A list of key areas of assistance at national LSC follows.

**Key National LSC contacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collections and Analysis Team</td>
<td>02076 49 3724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE and WBL/ILR data issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Strategic Planning Team</td>
<td>02076 49 3917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Planning process and timetable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Learning Targets Team</td>
<td>02076 49 3830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the National Learning Targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Diversity Team</td>
<td>02067 70 3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues relating to equality and diversity and EDIMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>