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## Introduction

The Learner Satisfaction Survey 2011 to 2012, Version 4, had over 400,000 responses and this provides an enormous potential information source for the sector. At the current time the results from the survey are published at provider level, with a further breakdown by age band (16$18,19+)$, gender and level of study. New Challenges, New Chances articulated a commitment to make available good quality information at more granular levels wherever possible (for example at sector subject area or course level rather than just provider level). Over $90 \%$ of respondents to the Version 4 Learner Satisfaction Survey were matched to the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) allowing us to identify, for these learners, the course or courses they had taken or the sector subject area.

Discussions with providers suggest that learner satisfaction scores at a more granular level would be extremely valuable for planning and selfassessment. In 2011 RCU and Ipsos MORI carried out detailed interviews with 10 providers to seek their views on the value and usefulness of course-level data. There was a general consensus that such data would be useful to potential learners and providers but they raised concerns that the low level of responses at course level might make comparisons at this level very difficult and potentially misleading. Furthermore, they felt that definitions of courses on the ILR learners may not always match learner's understanding of courses they were taking. The general consensus was that data would be more useful at sector subject area tier 1 or tier 2.

This report provides detailed learner satisfaction scores at sector subject area based on matching learner responses to the ILR. The report shows that this approach represents a potentially useful and cost effective way forward for meeting the needs of the sector. The report will hopefully prompt further discussion and research into how a sector subject area measure could be further developed and the feasibility of including these scores in nationally published statistics.

## Calculating sector subject level scores from the main learner satisfaction survey

The subject level scores presented in this report are based on learners responses to the 9 core questions in the survey. The approach is fundamentally different to the more complex system, currently in place, that asks survey respondents separate course-level questions. Responses to separate course-level questions have been low and have not provided the sector with useful comparator information. A subject level score based on existing responses to the core questions has the advantage of being simple to administer and would use hundreds of thousands of responses. The table below summarises the differences between the 2 approaches.

Figure 1: comparison of subject level analysis and existing course-level analysis

| Proposed new subject level analysis | Existing course-level analysis |
| :--- | :--- |
| Results are based on a large number of responses so outputs <br> are likely to be statistically robust. Detailed analysis by more <br> than 1 variable is possible (for example. Local Enterprise <br> Partnership (LEP) area and subject) because of the large <br> number of responses. | Response rates to the course-level questions are poor <br> which means scores are not statistically robust or easy to <br> compare, particularly at subject area level. |
| Uses existing survey responses linked to the ILR and does not <br> ask additional questions. The approach is extremely cost <br> effective. | Respondents are asked 3 additional questions for each <br> course they are taking. This involves additional complexity <br> and cost. |
| The outputs show the overall satisfaction levels of learners who <br> are ppredominantly studying in a particular subject area. Since <br> learners may be studying courses in different subject areas a <br> methodology for deriving the subject score is required. | Learners are asked directly about how good or bad a <br> particular course is. |
|  | Course names used internally by providers are often <br> different from those recorded in LARA/ILR leading to <br> confusion amongst learners when answering the survey. <br> Learners often find it difficult to distinguish between <br> courses that have a separate qualification aim and <br> courses which are modules within a larger qualification <br> aim. |

## Calculating sector subject level scores when learners have multiple aims

Calculating a sector subject area score (based on responses to the 9 core questions) is straightforward if learners are taking 1 or more courses exclusively in a single sector subject area. Likewise learners studying for an Apprenticeship can easily be linked to a single sector subject area related to that framework. However, some learners may be simultaneously studying for 2 or more qualifications at the same time from different sector subject areas. These qualifications may be of similar length (for example. AS-Levels) or 1 programme may be their main study aim and others subsidiary aims (for example. BTEC National Diploma with additional qualifications such as a Health and Safety certificate). The analysis excludes key/functional skills.
The chart below illustrates 3 different ways in which a sector subject area score could be calculated for learners with multiple aims. In general there will be a trade-off between including the largest possible number of responses and being sure that respondents' answers were specific to a particular subject area.


## Methodology 1: Only include survey responses from learners who are

 studying exclusively in a single sector subject area (SSA).With this methodology we will be absolutely sure that responses are relevant to a particular SSA. However, we will be excluding responses even if the proportion of a learner's study in another subject area was minimal. Some providers may regard this as unfair.

Methodology 2: Attribute survey responses to all of the SSAs for the aims that a learner is taking.

This methodology ensures that all responses are included (often several times). However, this may also be seen as inaccurate. The learner response is most likely to relate to their main study programme rather than to a short qualification studied alongside their main study area.

Methodology 3: Attribute survey responses to a learner's main subject area defined as the SSA that covers a certain percentage or more (for example. 80\%) of their overall study programme.
This methodology overcomes some of the problems with methodologies 1 and 2 . Unlike methodology 1 a score will be awarded even if a learner is taking some aims away from their main area of study, provided that these subsidiary aims are only a small proportion of their total study programme. Also, unlike methodology 2, a learner's responses are only included in a single SSA and not multiple times.

[^0]
## Definition for calculating sector subject level scores

Methodology 3 (based on a learner's main subject area) is used as the basis for calculating sector subject scores in this report. This definition ensures that each response is included only once and that responses are not excluded because a learner is also taking small subsidiary aims.

The detailed flow chart on page 10 shows the way in which sector subject scores have been calculated. Key aspects of this definition are discussed below

## Base population for the calculation

The base population for the calculation was taken from the 365,514 valid respondents to the Learner Satisfaction Survey 2011 to 2012 who were matched to the Individualised Learner Record. There were also a small number of learners $(3,145)$ who were on multiple funding streams and in order to ensure that there was a one-to-one match between respondents and funding stream these were excluded from the analysis. Therefore the number of respondents used for the calculations in this report is 362,369 .

## Apprenticeships

If the learner was recorded on the ILR as being on an Apprenticeship, the framework for the Apprenticeship is used to determine the subject area. Just over 20\% of the sample was in this category (75,432 learners). If the ILR indicates that a learner was enrolled on 2 different frameworks with different subject areas during the survey window, they are excluded from the subject level calculation (this only applied to $0.02 \%$ of the sample).

## Learners studying exclusively in one subject area

If a learner was taking qualification aims in 1 subject area only, then their responses are attributed to that subject area. Over $70 \%$ of respondents were either in this category or were taking an Apprenticeship.

## Learners studying exclusively on QCF courses

Over 47,000 (non-Apprenticeship) learners were exclusively studying on courses that were part of the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF) and were taking courses from different subject areas. Since every QCF course has a 'credit value' indicating the amount of study time required to complete the course, it is straightforward to compare the relative size of courses and hence determine a learner's main subject area (if it exists). The rule used in this report was that if $80 \%$ or more of a learner's QCF credit points were in a certain subject area, that subject area was deemed to be their main subject area. All other learners in this category were excluded from the subject level calculation. As a result of the rule a further 34,979 responses were assigned to a subject area.

Figure 2 shows the impact of varying the $80 \%$ rule (within the range $100 \%-50 \%$ ) on the total number of additional learners included in the subject level results. The chart suggests that $80 \%$ provides a good balance between maximising the number of additional responses whilst ensuring that a learner has a clearly identifiable main subject area within their programme of study

Figure 2: Relationship between \% threshold and additional learners included in subject level results


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 \& Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012.

## Learners studying exclusively on non-QCF courses

A small number of learners were taking courses from different subject areas, but none of these courses were part of the Qualifications and Curriculum Framework. However, these courses did have maximum guided learning hours (GLH) figures listed on the OFQUAL website. This allowed us to compare the relative size of courses in order to determine a learner's main subject area. The rule used was that if $80 \%$ or more of a learner's GLH were in a certain subject area, that subject area was deemed to be their main subject area. All other learners in this category were excluded from the subject level calculation. As a result of the rule a further 848 responses were assigned to a subject area. The $80 \%$ figure, was chosen in order to maintain consistency with learners studying exclusively on QCF courses.

## Learners studying on programmes that include both QCF and non-QCF courses

Some learners were taking a mix of both QCF and non-QCF courses from different subject areas. Where we can identify both QCF credit points and/or OFQUAL GLH it is possible to determine the relative size of different courses within a learner's programme and attribute a main area of study (if it exists). In order to do this a way of converting from OFQUAL GLH to QCF credit points is required. The methodology used in this report assumes that 6 GLH is equivalent to 1 QCF credit points (this is based on the average figure for qualifications where both QCF credit points and GLH are recorded simultaneously).

As a result of the rule a further 9,808 responses were assigned to a subject area
The five processes discussed above deal with $94.8 \%$ of the survey responses in the base sample. The remaining learners $(18,923)$ took a range of courses across different subject areas and one or more of these courses has no indication of course size (either QCF credit points or GLH). For these learners, it is impossible to determine whether they have a main subject area and so were excluded from the calculation.

## Learners on 'A-Level' Programmes

An important category of learner not include in the subject level scores is the classroom-based A-Level student taking 2 or more A-Levels in different subject areas (for example. Maths, ICT and Business Studies). These learners are genuinely taking courses across more than 1 subject area and no one area dominates (that is,. greater than $80 \%$ ). In total there are 12,599 learners who responded to the survey who were taking 2 or more A-Levels (or AS/A2), which represents approximately $3.4 \%$ of all survey responses. We have therefore created a separate reporting category for classroom-based A-Level students in addition to the 15 sector subject areas.

## Note on statistical significance

As this report is based on national data (from approximately 360,000 learners), the number of responses in most of the analysis categories are sufficiently large to provide robust results. Care must be taken however with a small number of analysis categories where the volumes of responses are comparatively small, (particularly where these are fewer than 250).

All results are based on unweighted responses to the FE Choices Learner Satisfaction Survey. This follows the same methodology used for the current course level results. As a result, this report does not identify results which could be skewed by disproportionate levels of particular learner groups within subject areas.

If this methodology was to be implemented at a provider level, the following issues may need to be investigated. Are weightings required for each subject area?

- If weightings are to be applied, which learner groups should be used?
- What statistical quality tests would be most appropriate for provider level scores (the current LS methodology has no tests for results by particular learner groups)? Quality tests might include for example a:
- minimum number of responses in a subject area
- maximum confidence interval for responses in a subject area
- maximum level of skew in a subject area


## Selecting Respondents Subject Area for Learner Satisfaction Survey
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## Subject level analysis outputs

The remainder of the report includes tables and charts showing subject-level results based on the methodology described in the previous section. Subject analysis is presented at sector subject area tier 1 (and at tier 2 for Apprenticeships).

Subject level results are included for the following categories:

- All learners
- 16-to 18-year-old Apprenticeships
- 16 to18 classroom-based
- 19+ Apprenticeships
- 19+ work-placed training
- 19+ classroom-based.

The data categories used within this report are based on the latest definitions of funding streams supplied by the Skills Funding Agency
The report focuses on 3 of the 9 questions asked in the survey (the questions which are most relevant for a subject level analysis):

- Q3. How good or bad is the teaching on your course?
- Q4. How good or bad is the respect staff show to you?
- Q9. Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?

Figure 3: Average mean learner satisfaction scores by subject and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 4: Subject by question 9 - average mean score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 5: Survey Responses* by subject for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

## All Learners

| Subject Area | Number of Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 | 7 |  | 9 | 1 10 | Unweighted Score | \% of Respondents Scoring 8 or more |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSA1: Health, Public Services and Care | 47,354 | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% |  | 1.0\% | 1.6\% |  | 5.0\% |  | 5.8\% | 11.9\% | 19.4\% | 21.1\% | 33.0\% | 8.28 | 73.4\% |
| SSA2: Science and Mathematics | 5,8981 | 0.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% |  | 1.5\% | -2.3\% |  | 6.4\% |  | 8.1\% | 15.8\% | - 22.6\% | - 20.3\% | - 21.0\% | 7.80 | 63.9\% |
| SSAB: Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Care | 13,2491 | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.8\% |  | 1.5\% | 2.2\% |  | - 6.2\% |  | 7.8\% | 14.7\% | 21.5\% | - 20.2\% | - | 7.94 | - 66.2\% - |
| SSA4:Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies | 33,718 | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% |  | 1.2\% | 1.7\% |  | 5.2\% |  | 6.0\% | 13.3\% | 20.9\% | 21.3\% | - 28.7\% | 8.14 | 70.9\% |
| SSA5: Construction, Planning and the Built Environment | 21,7661 | 0.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.6\% |  | 1.1\% | 1.7 |  | 5.6\% |  | 6.4 | 13.6\% | 21.8\% | 20.9\% | - 27.1\% | 8.08 | 69.9\% - |
| SSA6: ICI | 18,930 | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% |  | 1.0\% | 1.7\% |  | 4.7\% |  | 5.5\% | 13.2\% | 19.8\% | 19.8\% | 33.1\% | 8.27 | 72.7\% |
| SSAZ: Retail and Commercial Enterprise | 37,826 | 0.2\% | 0.2 | 0.4\% |  | 0.9\% | 1.3 |  | 4.7\% |  | 5.4\% | 11.3\% | 17.9\% | 21.8\% | 35.8\% | 8.41 | 75.5\% - |
| SSA8: Leisure, Travel and Tourism | 17,420 | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.6\% |  | 1.2\% | 1.6\% |  | 5.6\% |  | 7.1\% | 16.1\% | 23.8\% | -20.6\% | 22.7\% | 7.97 | 67.1\% |
| SSA9: Arts, Media and Publishing | 28,850 | 0.4 | 0.3\% | 0.5\% |  | 1.0\% | 1.6\% |  | 5.3\% |  | 6.7\% | 15.0\% | 22.6\% | 21.4\% | 25.2\% | 8.07 | 69.2\% |
| SSA10: History, Philosophy and Theology | 1,271 | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.7\% | 1.4\% |  | 4.2\% |  | 4.8\% | 12.5\% | 21.7\% | 22.7\% | 31.1\% | 8.35 | 75.5\% |
| SSA11: Social Sciences | $316^{1}$ | - | <5 | $\leq 5$ |  |  | 2.8 |  | 4.7\% |  | 4.1\% | 10.8\% | 20.9\% | 19.6\% | _ 35.4\% | 8.35 | _76.0\% |
| SSA12: Languages, Literature and Culture | 3,424 |  |  | 0.2\% |  |  |  |  | 3.4\% |  |  | 10.7\% | 23.0\% | 20.4\% | 36.1\% | 8.52 | 79.5\% |
| SSA13: Education and Training | 4,655 |  |  | 0.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 11.0\% | 19.1\% | -21.7\% | 1 - 37.7\% | -8.53 | _ $78.5 \%$ |
| SSA14: Preparation for Life and Work | 44,3081 | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% |  | 0.5\% | 0.9\% |  | 3.3\% |  | 3.3\% | 7.6\% | 13.7\% | 18.4\% | 51.6\% | 8.86 | 83.7\% |
| SSA15: Business, Admin and Law | 36,148 ${ }^{1}$ | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 1 | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 1 | 3.8\% |  | 4.3\% | 10.3\% | 17.2\% | 21.3\% | 40.3\% | 8.57 | 78.8\% |
| Learner on 2+A-Levels | 12,599\| | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% |  | 1.3\% | 2.4\% |  | 6.7\% | 1 | 8.4\% | 19.1\% | 25.9\% | 19.8\% | 14.8\% | 7.66 | 60.4\% |

Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

* $0=$ Very bad and $10=$ VerygGood

Figure 6: Subject by question 9: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or more
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 7: Mean learner satisfaction score by subject and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 8: Subject by question 9 - mean score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 9: Survey responses* by subject for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

## 16 to18 Apprenticeships



Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

* $0=$ Very bad and $10=$ Very good

Figure 10: Subject by question 9 - Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or more (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 11: Mean learner satisfaction score by Subject (SSA tier 2) and Question

| Subject Area | Q3. How good or bad is the teaching on your course? | Q4. How good or bad is the respect staff show to you? | Q9. Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSA1.2: Nursing and Subjects and Vocations Allied to Medicine | $82-1{ }^{-1} 8.79$ | 82---1--9.18 | 82---1-- $\overline{8.96}$ |
| SSA1.3: Health and Social Care | $837{ }^{-1}-1-\overline{8.91}$ | 839 । 9.22 | 839 - 9.05 |
| SSA1.4: Public Services | 199 - - - - - $8 . \overline{44}$ |  |  |
| SSA1.5: Child Development and Well Being | 2,034 - - - - 8.69 | 2,031 - - - - 9.15 | 2,036 - - 8.87 |
| SSA2.1: Science | 17 - 1 | 17.1 | 17 - 7.76 |
| SSA3.1: Agriculture | $158-1-8.38$ | $153-1$ | $160-8.35$ |
| SSAB3.2: Horticulture and Forestry | $122-$ - - 8.34 | $119-1-8.81$ | $122-1-8.43$ |
| SSAB3.3: Animal Care and Ve-terinary Science | 508-- ד--8. $\overline{8.65}$ | $507{ }^{-1}$ | $509-$ - - 8.74 |
| SSA3.4: Environmental Conservation | $13-1$ | $13-1$ | 13 - 7.15 |
| SSA4.1: Engineering | 3,162 - - 7.97 | 3,166 | 3,170 |
| SSA4.2: Manufacturing Technologies | 2,116 - - 1.97 | 2,114 - - | 2,119 - - 8.02 |
| SSA-4.3: Transportation Operations and Maintenance |  | 2,740 - - -8.8 | 2,747 -- - - 8.62 |
| SSA5.2: Building and Construction | 4,011 - + - - 8.13 | 4,010 - + - - 8.40 | 4,014 - 8 - 8.18 |
| SSA-6.1: ICT Practitioners | 1,062 -- - - 8.69 | 1,062 - - - - 8.59 | 1,062 - - - - $\overline{8 .} \overline{45}$ |
| SSA6.2: ICT for Users | 229 - 1 | 229 - 1 | 229 - 8.61 |
| SSAT.1. Retailing and Wholesaling | $363-$ - - - 8.96 | $363-1-\overline{9.43}$ | $363---\overline{9.20}$ |
| SSA7.2: Warehousing and Distribution | $128-1-8.97$ | $128-1-9.45$ | 129 |
| SSA7.3: Service Enterprises | 4,780 - 8.77 | 4,779 - | 4,783 - 8.87 |
| SSA7.4: Hospitality and Catering | $532-1--8.67$ | $532--1-8.95$ | $534-1-8 . \overline{8}$ |
| SSA8.1: Sport, Leisure and Recreation | 1,503 - - |  | 1,503 - - - 8.75 |
| SSA8.2: Travel and Tourism | $27-1-9.44$ | $27-1-9.56$ | $27-9.67$ |
| SSA9.1: Performing Arts | 50-1-8.10 | 50---1-8.76 | $50-1-7.76$ |
| SSĀ9.2: $\overline{C r a f t s}$ - C-Creative - Arts and Design | $38---7.84$ | $39^{-----1}-13$ | $38---7.82$ |
| SSA9.3: Media and Communication | $24-1$ | $24-1$ | 24.8 |
| SSA9.4: Publishing and Information Services |  |  |  |
| SSA $\overline{13.2}$ - Direct Learning Support | $\overline{192}---{ }^{-}-\overline{8.54}$ | $\overline{192}-{ }^{-1}-\overline{8.96}$ | 191--- $\overline{1} 28$ |
| SSA15.1: Accounting and Finance | $483-1$ | $483-1-8.78$ | $483-8.34$ |
| SSA15.2: Administration | 3,953--1--8.64 | 3,950--1-- 9.17 | 3,954 -- - 8.78 |
| SSA15.3: Business Management | $45-1-1$ | $45-$ - + - - 9.38 | $45-1-9.02$ |
| SSA15.4: Marketing and Sales | $244{ }^{-1}{ }^{\text {- }}$ - - 8.83 | 244 I 9.28 | $245-5-\overline{8.98}$ |

Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 12: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject (SSA tier 2) and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012 . Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

Figure 13: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

## 16 to18 Apprenticeships



Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 14: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 15: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 16: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 17: Mean learner satisfaction score by subject and question

| Subject Area | Q3. How good or bad is the teaching on your course? <br> Base <br> Score |  | Q4. How good or bad is the respect staff show to you? <br> Base <br> Score |  | Q9. Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is? <br> Base <br> Score |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSA1: Health, Public Services and Care |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA2: Science and Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA3: Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Care _ _ _ _ _ 8 , 765 _ _ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA5: Construction, Planning and the Built Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA9: Arts, Media and Publishing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA10: History, Philosophy and Theology _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 19_ _ _ _ _ \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA12: Languages, Literature and Culture |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA14: Preparation for Life and Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSA15: Business, Admin and Law | 6,823 | 7.62 | 6,824 | 7.91 | 6,823 | 7.55 |
| Learner on 2+ A-Levels | 12,208 | 7.69 | 12,208 | 8.11 | 12,209 | 7.66 |

Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 18: Subject by question 9 - mean score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 19: Survey responses* by subject for question 9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

## 16-18 Classroom-Based

| Subject Area | 'Number of \|Responses| <br> 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | $8$ | 9 | 10 | Unweighted Score | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Scoring 8 or <br> more |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSA1: Health, Public Services and Care | 22,523 | _0.6\% | 0.5\% |  | 0.9\% | 1.4 |  | 2.4\% | 7.3\% |  | 8.5 | 16.5\% | 23.0\% | 20.4\% | 18.4\% |  | 61.9 |
| SSA2: Science and Mathematics | 3,7051 | - $0.7 \%$ | 0.5\% |  | 0.8\% | 1.8\% |  | 2.6\% | 7.0\% |  | 9.3\% | 17.1\% | 23.8\% | 20.1\% | 16.3\% |  | 60.2\% |
| SSA3: Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Care | 8,765 | 0.6\% | 0.3\% |  | 0.9\% | 1.7\% |  | 2.5\% | 7.0\% |  | 9.0\% | 16.2\% | 22.8\% | 19.6\% | 19.5\% | 7.73 | 61.9\% _ |
| SSA4: Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies _ | 1-13,6371 | -0.9\% |  |  | 1.0\% | 1.5\% |  | 2.5\% | 7.3\% |  | 8.2\% | 17.1\% | 22.5\% | 19.2\% | 19.1\% |  | 60.9\% |
| SSAS: Construction, Planning and the Built Environment I | I. _ 10,652 | 1.0\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.8\% | 1.5\% |  | 2.1\% | 7.3\% |  | -7.8\% | 15.9\% | 23.0\% | - 19.6\% | _20.5\% | 7.76 | 63.2\% _ |
| SSA6: ICT _ _ _ _ . | 8,619 | _0.8\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.9\% | 1.3\% |  | 2.5\% | 7.1\% |  | 8.1\% | 17.9\% | 23.4\% | -18.5\% | 19.1\% |  | 61.0\% |
| SSAT: Retail and Commercial Enterprise | 16,4531 | $\underline{0}$ | 0.3\% |  | 0.7\% | 1.3\% |  | 1.9\% | 7.0\% |  | - ${ }^{\text {8.1\% }}$ | 15.4\% | 21.7\% | - 20.9\% | 22.4\% | 7.90 | 65.0 |
| SSA8: Leisure, Travel and Tourism_ | 13,459 | -0.5\% |  |  | 0.7\% | 1.3\% |  | 1.8\% | 6.1\% |  | 7.8\% | 17.6\% | 24.9\% | 20.3\% | 18.5\% |  | 63.7 |
| SSA9: Arts, Media and Publishing | $22,762$ |  | $\text { - } 0.3 \%$ |  | $0.5 \%$ | 1.0\% |  |  | 5.4\% |  | -6.9\% | 15.3\% | 23.0\% | 21.9\% | 23.5\% | 8.03 | 68.4 |
| SSA10: History, Philosophy and Theology |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  | <5 | 0.0\% |  | $\leq 5$ | <5 | $\leq 5$ | 36.8\% | $\leq 5$ | 8.21 | 73.7\% |
| SSA11: Social Sciences |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  | S |  |  | <5 | 27.6\% | 20.7\% | 24.1\% | $<\underline{5}$ | 7.86 | 58.6\% |
| SSA12: Languages, Literature and Culture | 242 |  |  |  |  | <5 |  |  | 4.1\% |  | 6.6\% | 11.6\% | 20 | 23.1\% | 29.3\% | 8.21 | 73.1\% |
| SSA13: Education and Training |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.7\% | 22.1\% | 26.5\% | 25.0\% |  | _73.5\% |
| SSA14: Preparation for Life and Work | 10,679 |  | 0.4\% |  | 0.5\% | 1.2\% |  |  | 5.5\% |  | 4.8\% | 10.2\% | 16.1\% | 19.4\% | 39.6\% |  | 75.1\% |
| SSA15: Business, Admin and Law | 6,823 | 0.9\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.7\% | 1.7\% |  | 2.5\% | 8.4\% |  | 9.7\% | 18.8\% | 23.2\% | 18.0\% | 15.9\% | 7.55 | 57.1\% |
| Learner on 2+A-Levels I | 1 12,209 | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 1 | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | 1 | 2.4\% | 6.8\% | 1 | 8.4\% | 19.1\% | 25.9\% | 19.8\% | 14.7\% | 7.66 | 60.4\% |

Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

Figure 20: Subject by Question 9 - Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or more (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 21: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

16-18 Classroom-Based
Figure 22: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 23: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

16-18 Classroom-Based
Figure 24: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 25: Mean learner satisfaction score by subject and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 26: Subject by question 9 - mean score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 27: Survey responses* by subject for question 9

ource: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

* $0=$ Very bad and $10=$ Very good

Figure 28: Subject by question 9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or more
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 29: Mean learner satisfaction score by subject (SSA tier 2) and question

| Subject Area | Q3. How good or bad is the teaching on your course? | Q4. How good or bad is the respect staff show to you? | Q9. Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base Score | Base Score | Base Score |
| SSA1.2: Nursing and Subjects and vocations Allied to Medicine । | $161-8.8$ |  | $161-8.90$ |
| SSA1.3: Health and Social Care | 7,618 _- 8.95 | 7,620 _ - 9.36 | 7,635 _ _ - 9.10 |
| SSA1.4: Public Services | 196 |  | 195 |
| SSA1.5: Child Development and Well Being | 2,897--8.72 | 2,896--+ - 9.28 | 2,898 - 8.8 |
| SSAA2.1: Science $^{\text {a }}$ | $14^{--} \mathbf{1}^{--} 7.64$ | $14^{---1--7.93}$ |  |
| SSSA $\overline{3} .1$ : A Agriculture |  | $108-1-9.22$ | 110 |
| SSAB.2: Horticulture and Forestry | $299--8.79$ | $284-1-{ }^{-1.33}$ | $300--8.8$ |
| SSA 3 .3: Animal Care and Veterinary Science | $794-1$ - 8.59 | $792-1$ - 9.00 | 794 |
| SSA3.4: Environmental Conservation | $13-7.31$ | 13--7.69 | $13-7.54$ |
| SSA4.1: Engineering | 1,573--1-8.13 |  | 1,576-- $\overline{8} .116$ |
| SSAA.2: Manufacturing Technologies | 1,895-8 ${ }^{\text {8,80 }}$ |  | 1,907---8.84 |
| SSAA - $\mathrm{S}^{\text {: Transportation Operations and Maintenance }}$ | 1,276----8.75 |  | 1,277--- $\overline{8.70}$ |
| SSAE.2: Building and Construction | 2,082 | 2,079 - - 1 - 8.79 | 2,081--8. |
|  |  |  | $373-1-8.62$ |
| SSAG6.2: ICT for Users | $921--7-8.80$ |  |  |
| SSA 7.1: $\mathrm{Re}^{\text {etailing and Wholesaling }}$ |  | 1,317 _ - - - 9.59 | 1,320-- |
| SSAT.2: Warehousing and Distribution |  |  | $700-9.17$ |
| SSAT.3: Service Enterprises | 1,885 - 9.08 | 1,883 - 9.33 | 1,882 - 9.14 |
| SSAT.4: Hospitality and Catering | 2,358--1-9.18 |  | 2,367--1--9.2 |
| SSSAB.1: - Sport, Leisure and Recreation | $890-7-1.81$ |  | $890-{ }^{\text {8 }}$ |
| SSA8.2: Travel and Tourism |  |  | 85 |
| STSA9.1: Peerforming Arts | 39- - - 1 |  | 39-- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| SSAP9.2: Crafts, Creative Arts and Design | $42-{ }^{4}$ | $41-{ }^{1}-7.90$ | $42--5-7.50$ |
| SSA9.3: Media and Communication | $13-7.62$ | $13-7.23$ | $13-7.62$ |
| SSA13.1: Teaching and Lecturing | 18 - 9.33 | 18 - 9.39 | 18 - 9.28 |
| SSA13.2: Direct Learning Support | 645--1--8.33 |  | 649 |
| SSA $\overline{15} .11$ : Accounting and Finance | 1,161-- $\overline{8.40}$ | 1,161--+--8.95 | 1,161----8.40 |
| SSA 15.2: A- ${ }^{\text {d mininistration }}$ |  |  | 8,922---- $\overline{8.97}$ |
| SSA $\overline{15} 5.3$ : Business Management | 5,411--+--8.93 |  | 5,429 ${ }^{\text {- }}$ - ${ }^{-1.10}$ |
| SSĀ15.4: Marketing and Sales | 1,790 ---- ${ }^{\text {9.03 }}$ | 1,791--1-- $\overline{9.48}$ |  |

Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 30: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject (SSA tier 2) and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 31: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 32: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 33: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 34: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 35: Mean learner satisfaction score by subject and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

Figure 36: Subject by question 9 - mean score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

ource: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 37: Survey responses* by subject for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

ource: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

* $0=$ Very Bad and $10=$ Very Good

Figure 38: Subject by question 9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or more
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 39: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

Figure 40: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 41: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

Figure 42: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 43: Mean learner satisfaction score by subject and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 44: Subject by question 9 - mean score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 45: Survey responses* by subject for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

| Subject Area | Number of, Responses 1-_ 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | $3$ | $4$ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | $9$ | 10 | Unweighted Score Score | $\%$ of <br> Respondents <br> Scoring 8 or <br> - more |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SSAL: Health, Public Services | 7,393 | 0.2\% | - ${ }^{\text {0.4\% }}$ | 0.5\% | 1.2\% | 1.5\% | 5.0\% | 5.7\% | 12.6\% | 20.2\% | 19.9\% | 32.8\% | 8.27 | 73.0\% |
| SSAZ: Science and Mathematics | 2,161 | 0.7\% | -0.4\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 1.6\% | 5.6\% | 6.0\% | 13.3\% | 20.3\% | 20.8\% | 29.3\% |  | 70.4\% |
| SSAB: Agriculture, Horticulture and Anima | 2,351 | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% | 5.5\% | 7.2\% | 13.7\% | 20.2\% | 18.4\% | 29.7\% |  | 68.3\% |
| SSA4: Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies | 3,428 | 0.7\% | - 0.5\% | 0.8\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% | 6.8\% | 6.4 | 15.6\% | - 20.9\% | 18.4\% | 25.9\%_ | - 7.90 | 65.2\% |
| SSAS: Construction, Planning and the Built Environmen | 3,2781 | 0.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 1.6\% | 5.2\% | 6.7\% | 12.8\% | 20.6\% | -19.2\% | 31.0\% |  | 70.8\% |
| SSAG: ICT | 7,167 | - $0.2 \%$ | 0.1\% | -0.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.9\% | - $2.8 \%$ | - 3.5\% | 9.1 | -16.0\% | 19.6\% | 46.7\% |  | 82.3\% |
| SSAZ: Retail and Commercial Enterprise | 7,555 | - $0.3 \%$ | 0.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 12.1\% |  |  |  |  | 73.0\% |
| SSA8: Leisure, Travel and Tourism | 1,283 |  |  |  | 16\% |  |  |  |  | -21.2\% | 18.3\% | 26.0\% |  | 65.5\% |
| SSA9: Arts, Media and Publishing | 5,7701 | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 4.9\% | 5.6\% | 13.7\% | 20.7\% | -19.5\% | 32.2\% |  | 72.4\% |
| SSA10: History, Philosophy and Theology | 1,251, | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.4\% | 4.3\% | 4.6\% | 12.6\% | 21.7\% | 22.5\% | 31.3\% | 8.36 | - |
| SSA11: Social Sciences | 287 |  |  |  | - ${ }^{5}$ | 2.8\% | 4.9\% | 3.8\% | 9.1\% | 20.9\% | 1 19.2\% | 37.6\% | 8.40 | 77.7\% |
| SSA12: Languages, Literature and Culture | 3,161 |  |  | - |  | -9. | 3.3\% |  | 10.6\% |  | - 20.2\% | 36.6\% |  | 80.1\% |
| SSA13: Education and Training _ | 3,333 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.9\% | 3.5\% | 4.7\% | 11.3\% | 20.3\% | 21.8\% | 36.1\% |  | 78.2\% |
| SSA14:Preparation for Life and Wor | 32,3941 | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.8\% | 6.8\% | 12.9\% | 17.9\% | 55.6\% |  | 86.3\% |
| SSA15: Business, Admin and Law | 5,540, | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 4.9\% | 5.4\% | 14.1\% | 21.2\% | 21.6\% | 29.4\% | 8.23 | 72.2\% |
| Learner on $2+\mathrm{A}$-Levels | 3901 | <5 | $<5$ | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 1.8\% | 5.4\% | 8.7\% | 18.2\% | 24.4\% | - 20.3\% | 17.9\% | 7.77 | 62.6\% |

ource: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

* $0=$ Very bad and $10=$ Very good

Figure 46: Subject by question 9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or more
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 47: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 48: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and gender for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Figure 49: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Cells with fewer than 5 responses are indicated with " $<5$ "

Figure 50: Percentage of respondents scoring 8 or higher by subject and level for question 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
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