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## Executive Summary

## Methodology

The results presented in this report are based on an amalgamation of data from the LSC's Individualised Student Records (ISR $20 / 22$ ) and the manual returns for $2000 / 2001$. The ISR is a collection of data on all students enrolled at colleges in the Further Education sector, including specialist-designated colleges and students in external institutions on provisions that are funded by the LSC.

## Key Findings

Some of the key findings of this report are as follows:

- Overall, 7.9 per cent of Further Education students studying on council funded provisions were in receipt of some form of Learner Support Funding.
- 6.9 per cent of students received Access Funds, 0.9 per cent of students received Childcare Support and 0.1 per cent of students received Residential Bursaries.
- Broken down by age, 15.4 per cent of students between 16 to 18 years old, 9.5 per cent of 19 to 24 year olds, and 4.1 per cent of those 25 years old or over are estimated to be in receipt of Access Funds.
- On the subject of gender, 60 per cent of Further Education students were female, compared with 64 per cent of Access Fund recipients. The higher proportion of female students receiving Access Funds may partly reflect Access Fund allocation relating to childcare.
- Members of ethnic minorities were proportionally more likely to be in receipt of Learner Support Funding than their white counterparts, forming at least 13 per cent of the overall student population, but 23 per cent of the Access Fund recipients.
- Recipients of Access Funds or Residential Bursaries were more likely to report a disability or learning difficulty than their student counterparts who did not receive such funding. 6.2 per cent of Access Fund recipients report a learning difficulty and 5.2 percent of Access Fund recipients report a disability, compared to 2.6 per cent and 2.9 per cent respectively among non-recipients.
- The data demonstrate that Access Funds and Childcare Support are targeted towards students living in areas of greatest deprivation. Residents in areas with the highest deprivation were twice as likely to receive Access Funds than residents in areas of low deprivation.
- Retention rates are higher among Access Fund students than among students overall. In the population as a whole, the Retention rate was just over 81 per cent, compared with Access Fund recipients ( 87 per cent), Childcare recipients ( 88 per cent), and Residential Bursaries ( 90 per cent).
- Achievement rates among those in receipt of Learner Support, however, are slightly lower than among those who are not in receipt of support. This is possibly because the recipients of Learner Support are among the most disadvantaged students.


## 1. Methodology

### 1.1 Summary

This report reviews the allocation and impact of Learner Support Funding among students studying within institutes of Further Education.

The main body of the report is in three parts:

- Chapter 2 provides headlines on the distribution of Access Funds, and other government funds or initiatives, by student characteristics, college and course types.
- Chapter 3 examines in greater detail the association between Learner Support Funding and retention.
- Chapter 4 focuses on the relationship between Learner Support Funding and achievement.

The Appendix provides additional headline (numbers) estimates for people in receipt of Learner Support Funding by individual and course characteristics, broken down by age groups (ie '16 to 18 ', '19 to 24 ' and ' 25 or over').

### 1.2 Methodology

### 1.2.1 Data sets

The results presented in this paper are based on an amalgamation of data from the LSC's Individualised Student Records (ISR 20/22) and the manual returns for 2000/2001. The Individualised Student Records (ISR) is a collection of data on all students enrolled at colleges in the Further Education sector, including specialistdesignated colleges and students in external institutions on provisions that are funded by the LSC. Each student has a single record in the student data set providing details of the student's individual characteristics, including their date of birth, sex and ethnicity. They also have one or more associated records in the qualification aims data set, recording details of each qualification they are taking, the type of course and Learner Support arrangement.

### 1.2.2 Reporting of Learner Support

The ISR represents the most comprehensive record of students in Further Education that is currently available. However, evidence from the LSC's manual returns data, covering the Learner Support expenditure of every Further Education institution, suggests that the ISR may be under-reporting the receipt of Learner Support Funding (if the manual returns data is to be considered the more reliable source). The under-reporting varies with the fund in question. Comparing Access Funds reported in the ISR with the manual returns data suggests that approximately two-thirds of those in receipt of Access Funds are not recorded as such in the ISR. Similarly, over half of those in receipt of Childcare Support or Residential Bursaries may not be reported as such within the ISR.

To overcome the potential problems associated with the under-reporting of Learner Support within the ISR, the ISR estimates have been 'grossed up' using estimates from the manual returns data. Given the degree of under-reporting, and consequently the size of the corresponding grossing factors, cases in which the reported cell sizes are small (under 1,000 ) should be treated with caution. All numbers presented in this paper have been rounded to the nearest 100.

Finally, it must be stressed that these estimates are an attempt to improve upon the undercounting of Learner Support recipients within ISR 20/22. They should not, however, be used to comment upon the student population in general, ie on issues not specifically related to Learner Support, as in such instances the unweighted ISR data may be a more appropriate reference.

### 1.2.3 Future analysis

A question that will arise regarding the current approach is one of longitudinal comparability and reproducibility. To avoid double collection, in future years the manual returns data will not report on the number of students in receipt of awards. This will not be an issue if successful measures are undertaken to improve the reporting of student level data within the ISR. However, in the event of undercounting within future data sets, there will be a need to develop new approaches to this research. It is beyond the scope of this paper to consider how future analysis will be conducted but there are a number of options that may be worth reviewing.

At present, the ISR records the type of government initiative from which a student is benefiting and allows a value of ' 0 ' to be recorded if no information is provided/the student is not in receipt of support. If future years were to distinguish between 'no information provided/available' and 'not in receipt of support', it may be possible to assess the degree of 'item non-response' associated with the Learner Support variables and to track the level of non-response more easily at the college level. The additional information may be used to control for the effects of such nonresponse. This is similar to the approach currently used in coding ethnicity fields and those relating to learning difficulties and/or disabilities.

A second possibility would be for researchers to consider the relationship between the average number, amount and types of awards made available and the average number of students in receipt of those awards. The assumption underlying any analysis, however, is that it would be possible to find an association that remains constant. Even if this is true of previous years, it may not be true of future ones, particularly if there are changes to the policy environment (eg through the introduction of EMAs).

It is clear, however, that future research would require early consideration of these issues and potential alternatives.

### 1.2.4 Sample

In Chapter 2, the results are based on students in institutions of Further Education who are on council funded courses, ie are eligible for Learner Support Funding. Higher Education Institutions (HEls) and students who are predominantly on non-council funded courses are excluded from the analysis. In Chapter 3, the focus is on the qualification. Non-council funded courses, courses that were still in continuation, or courses in which an assessment was yet to be made are not included in the analysis.

## 2. Headline Results for Learner Support 2000/2001

### 2.1 Overall

There were approximately 3.5 m students studying council funded courses within Further Education institutions between 2000/2001. Almost eight per cent (7.9) of these students are in receipt of some form of Learner Support Funding.

Broken down by types of funds, approximately seven (6.9) per cent of students received Access Funds, 0.9 per cent of students received Childcare Support and 0.1 per cent of students received Residential Bursaries.

### 2.2 Learner Support Funding and age

The majority of students in Further Education (over 80 per cent) were 19 years old and over. This is reflected in the distribution of Access Fund recipients, where nearly 60 per cent were over the age of 18. In the case of Childcare Support, over 90 per cent were over the age of 18 . Residential Bursaries were the main exception and 65 per cent of students receiving Residential Bursaries were under 19 years old, while 90 per cent were under the age of 25 .

Figure 2.1: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by age group (per cent)


Table 2.1: Learner Support Funding by age group

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 to 18 inclusive | 102,500 | 1,800 | 2,900 | 557,100 | 664,400 |
| 19 to 24 inclusive | 41,000 | 700 | 6,700 | 381,300 | 429,800 |
| 25 and over | 100,900 | 300 | 21,800 | $2,318,000$ | $2,441,000$ |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis
Table 2.1 reports the actual numbers of Access Fund recipients by age group. Approximately 102,000 ( 15.4 per cent) of students between the ages of 16 and 18 are estimated to be in receipt of Access Funds, out of a population of 664,000 . Among 19 to 24 year olds, 41,000 out of an estimated 430,000 students (or 9.5 per cent) were in receipt of Access Funds, while among students over 24 years old the percentage fell to 4.1 per cent (ie 101,000 students out of 2.4 million).

### 2.3 Learner Support Funding and gender

Females are more likely to benefit from Learner Support Funding than their male counterparts. Sixty per cent of Further Education students were female, compared with 64 per cent of Access Fund recipients. The higher proportion of female students receiving Access Funds may partly reflect Access Fund allocation relating to childcare.

Figure 2.2: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by sex (per cent)


Source: IES Analysis
In Table 2.2, we can see that females have greater representation among Access Fund recipients irrespective of age group. The fact that more than 70 per cent of recipients who are over 25 years old were female, may reflect the use of Access Funds to support childcare-related needs.

Table 2.2: Learner Support Funding by gender and age group (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 8}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 57.5 | 49.4 | 66.3 | 50.6 | 51.7 |
| Male | 42.5 | 50.6 | 33.7 | 49.4 | 48.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ to 24 inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 61.7 | 46.6 | 86.9 | 56.1 | 57.1 |
| Male | 38.3 | 53.4 | 13.1 | 43.9 | 42.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 25 and over |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 70.6 | 47.2 | 83.6 | 62.0 | 62.5 |
| Male | 29.4 | 52.8 | 16.4 | 38.0 | 37.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: IES Analysis

### 2.4 Learner Support Funding and ethnicity

Table 2.3: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by ethnicity (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bangladeshi | 1.0 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Black African | 4.7 | 0.3 | 4.1 | 1.7 | 2.0 |
| Black Caribbean | 3.5 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| Black Other | 2.1 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Chinese | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Indian | 2.5 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Pakistani | 4.0 | 0.4 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| White | 67.1 | 91.9 | 70.6 | 75.3 | 74.7 |
| Other - Asian | 1.6 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Any other | 3.5 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| Not known | 9.5 | 3.9 | 6.9 | 12.5 | 12.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: IES Analysis
Table 2.3 illustrates the distribution of ethnic groups among Learner Support Fund recipients. Although white students make up at least 74.7 per cent of the student population, they account for only 67.1 per cent of Access Fund recipients. On the whole, members of ethnic minorities were more likely to be in receipt of Learner Support Funding than their white counterparts, forming at least 13 per cent of the overall student population, but 23 per cent of the Access Fund recipients. It should be noted, however, that there is a wide degree of non-response and these figures must be treated with caution.
Table 2.4: Learner Support Funding by ethnicity and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Bangladeshi | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
| Black African | 2.9 | 6.4 | 5.8 | - | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 1.8 |
| Black Caribbean | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| Black Other | 2.3 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 0.4 | - | 1.3 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| Chinese | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.1 | - | - | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Indian | 3.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Pakistani | 6.7 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.9 | - | 1.0 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| White | 66.6 | 64.9 | 68.5 | 92.8 | 91.2 | 89.0 | 85.9 | 74.5 | 67.4 | 75.5 | 71.3 | 75.9 | 74.2 | 70.8 | 75.5 |
| Other - Asian | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| Any other | 2.9 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 4.6 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 2.2 |
| Not known | 8.9 | 8.9 | 10.4 | 4.5 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 6.1 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 11.3 | 13.5 | 9.0 | 10.9 | 13.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^0]We can see from Table 2.4 that there are some differences between membership of ethnic minority groups, receipt of Learner Support Funding and age. Members of ethnic minority groups appear to have disproportionate representation among Access Fund recipients, irrespective of their age, but the level of disproportion is greatest among those aged 25 years and over. Among 16 to 18 year olds, ethnic minority groups account for at least 16.8 per cent of the student population and 24.6 per cent of the Access Fund population, while among those 25 years old or over they represent 11.2 per cent of the student population and 21 per cent of Access Fund recipients.

### 2.5 Learner Support Funding and college type/mode of attendance/residential status

There is some correlation between the types of funding that students may receive and the type of college they attend (Table 2.5). Unsurprisingly, most Residential Bursaries went to students in Specialist Colleges and to students living in accommodation owned or managed by the college (Table 2.6). Students within Specialist Colleges were also around six times more likely to receive Childcare Support. (The breakdown of Tables 2.5 and 2.6 by age, is reported in the Appendix).

Table 2.5: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by institution type (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FE college | 85.6 | 15.9 | 56.4 | 79.2 | 79.4 |
| Sixth form college | 6.5 | - | 1.5 | 5.5 | 5.6 |
| Specialist college | 2.5 | 82.4 | 10.4 | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| External institution | 5.3 | - | 22.3 | 9.8 | 9.6 |
| Specialist designated | 0.1 | - | 9.4 | 3.9 | 3.7 |
| Dance/Drama | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 2.6: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by residential status (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student living in college <br> accommodation on campus | 0.4 | 44.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Student living in college | 4.4 | 6.3 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 2.5 |
| managed accommodation | 95.2 | 49.1 | 97.7 | 97.5 | 97.3 |
| Student not living in <br> college accommodation | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: IES Analysis
The breakdown by mode of attendance (Figure 2.3) reveals that Learner Support Funding was proportionally more likely to be provided to students on full-time courses than part-time ones.

Figure 2.3: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by mode of attendance (per cent)


Source: IES Analysis
Over three-quarters of council funded students were on part-time courses, while less than 30 per cent of Access Fund recipients studied part-time. Among Childcare Support recipients the distribution is closer to the population as a whole, and just over 70 per cent of students in receipt of Childcare Support were on part-time courses.

Separating out mode of attendance, age and receipt of Access Funds, suggests that although full-time students were more likely to receive funding than their parttime counterparts, the effect of mode of attendance on the likelihood of receiving support is reduced as age increases (Table 2.7).

### 2.6 Qualification aims

Tables 2.8 and 2.9 illustrate the distribution of Learner Support by level of qualification aim and qualification type. Recipients of Access Funds or Residential Bursaries were generally more likely to be participating in higher level (NVQ level 3 or equivalent) study (Access Fund recipients were twice as likely than the student population as a whole to be studying at NVQ level 3 or equivalent, while those on Residential Bursaries were nearly three times as likely.

Table 2.7: Learner Support Funding by mode of attendance and age group (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 8}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time full-year | 93.0 | 97.4 | 53.4 | 74.0 | 76.9 |
| Full-time part-year | 0.8 | 0.7 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 2.3 |
| Part-time | 6.2 | 1.8 | 41.4 | 23.4 | 20.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ to 24 inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time full-year | 67.8 | 91.7 | 29.2 | 15.7 | 21.1 |
| Full-time part-year | 3.9 | 3.8 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 7.9 |
| Part-time | 28.3 | 4.5 | 61.3 | 76.0 | 71.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 25 and over |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time full-year | 41.8 | 70.0 | 16.8 | 3.7 | 5.4 |
| Full-time part-year | 5.1 | 1.9 | 5.5 | 6.4 | 6.3 |
| Part-time | 53.1 | 28.1 | 77.7 | 90.0 | 88.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 2.8: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by NVQ level of qualification aim (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 \& Entry | 15.2 | 2.1 | 24.2 | 28.5 | 27.6 |
| 2 | 29.2 | 27.0 | 29.6 | 25.8 | 26.0 |
| 3 | 49.1 | 67.9 | 24.0 | 23.2 | 25.0 |
| $4,5 \& \mathrm{HE}$ | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Other | 5.4 | 1.5 | 20.9 | 20.8 | 19.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^1]Table 2.9: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by type of qualification aim (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A/AS GCE A2 level | 10.2 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 5.9 | 6.1 |
| GCSE | 2.3 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| GNVQ precursor | 12.5 | 52.9 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 4.4 |
| GNVQ/AVCE | 13.5 | 6.7 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 4.3 |
| NVQ | 13.6 | 5.9 | 10.8 | 8.6 | 8.9 |
| Access to HE | 6.0 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| HNC/HND | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| OCN | 1.3 | - | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Additional NVQ/GNVQ | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 40.5 | 31.4 | 73.0 | 73.9 | 71.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: IES Analysis

### 2.7 Learner Support Funding and reported disability/ learning difficulty

Table 2.10 presents the distribution of Learner Support Funding by whether the student reports a disability or learning difficulty. The data reveals that recipients of Access Fund or Residential Bursary support were more likely to report a disability or learning difficulty than their non-recipient counterparts ( 6.2 per cent of Access Fund recipients report a learning difficulty and 5.2 per cent of Access Fund recipients report a disability, compared to 2.6 per cent and 2.9 per cent respectively among non-recipients).

The relationship between Learner Support Funding and student age is reported in Tables 2.11 and 2.12. Both Access Fund and Residential Bursary recipients were also more likely to report a disability or learning difficulty than their non-funded counterparts, irrespective of their age group. Among Access Fund recipients, the higher the age group, the more likely (relative to those in their age cohort) the students are to report a disability or learning difficulty.

Table 2.10: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by disability and/or learning difficulty (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability | 5.2 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| No disability | 71.9 | 85.7 | 81.8 | 68.9 | 69.2 |
| Not known/no information | 22.9 | 10.7 | 16.6 | 28.3 | 27.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning difficulties | 6.2 | 7.1 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| Learning difficulty | 70.8 | 82.1 | 81.5 | 69.1 | 69.3 |
| No Learning difficulty | 22.9 | 10.7 | 16.6 | 28.5 | 28.0 |
| Not known/no information | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]
### 2.8 Learner Support Funding and widening participation uplift

The LSC's method of allocating widening participation funding is partly based on a modified version of the DTLR's Index of Deprivation. According to the scale, wards are given funding uplifts ranging from zero to 12 per cent depending on their level of relative deprivation.

Table 2.11: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by disability and age (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 8}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability | 4.2 | 5.4 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| No disability | 74.8 | 86.1 | 89.6 | 73.4 | 73.7 |
| Not known/no information | 21.0 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 23.7 | 23.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability | 5.0 | 5.7 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| No disability | 73.3 | 82.5 | 82.1 | 69.2 | 69.9 |
| Not known/no information | 21.7 | 11.8 | 16.3 | 28.3 | 27.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and over |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disability | 6.3 | 7.1 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| No disability | 68.4 | 76.7 | 80.7 | 67.8 | 67.9 |
| Not known/no information | 25.3 | 16.2 | 17.6 | 29.5 | 29.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: IES Analysis, 2003

Table 2.12: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by learning difficulty and age (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 8}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning difficulty | 6.2 | 10.8 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 4.2 |
| No learning difficulties | 73.0 | 81.2 | 88.4 | 72.4 | 72.6 |
| No information provided | 20.8 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 23.8 | 23.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning difficulty | 7.3 | 7.9 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 3.3 |
| No learning difficulties | 71.2 | 80.6 | 81.5 | 68.8 | 69.3 |
| No information provided | 21.5 | 11.5 | 16.1 | 28.3 | 27.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ and over |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning difficulty | 5.8 | 6.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| No learning difficulties | 68.5 | 76.1 | 80.6 | 68.4 | 68.5 |
| No information provided | 25.7 | 17.1 | 17.5 | 29.7 | 29.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^3]Learner Support Funding by uplift factor is illustrated in Figure 2.4. The graph suggests that Access Funds and Childcare Support are targeted towards areas of greatest deprivation. Students in receipt of Access Fund support were twice as likely to be living in a high uplift area than students overall, while students in receipt of Childcare Support were over 60 per cent more likely to be living in such areas.

For the purposes of this analysis, the uplift factor has been grouped into categories labelled 'low uplift', 'medium uplift' and 'high uplift', based on the full population of students taking Further Education courses. The low uplift covers students living in areas that are up to the 75th percentile of the uplift range, medium uplift covers the 75th to the 90th percentile, while high uplift covers those living in areas with uplifts beyond the 90th percentile.

Figure 2.4: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by widening participation factor (per cent)


Source: IES Analysis
Finally, the relationship between Learner Support Funding, widening participation factor and age is reported in Table 2.13. Across each age group, Access Fund recipients were disproportionately more likely to come from areas of high deprivation. However, the propensity of high uplift students to receive funding appears to increase with age. Students between the ages of 16 to 18 represent ten per cent of the high uplift student population, but nearly 16 per cent of Access Fund recipients in high uplift areas. This compares with students who are 25 years old or over, who represent nine per cent of the high uplift area students, but 21.1 per cent of Access Fund recipients in high uplift areas.

### 2.9 Learner Support Funding, retention/withdrawal and achievement rates

## Retention/withdrawal rates

Retention status is calculated using the methodology developed in FEFC Performance Indicators 1999/2000. In summary:

- If the student is continuing on any qualification of greater than one week in length, the student is treated as retained.
- If the student has completed at least one qualification, of greater than one week in length, and has not withdrawn from any qualification, the student is treated as retained.
- If the student has both withdrawn and completed a qualification, they are treated as retained if they either, completed a qualification after their last withdrawal date, or if their last withdrawal was no more than two months (62 days) after their last completion date.

Table 2.13: Learner Support Funding by widening participation factor and age group (per cent)

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 8}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low uplift | 61.6 | 91.4 | 80.7 | 75.8 | 73.7 |
| Medium | 22.8 | 6.8 | 12.5 | 14.9 | 16.1 |
| High | 15.6 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 9.3 | 10.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ inclusive |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low uplift | 57.2 | 90.8 | 60.4 | 69.7 | 68.4 |
| Medium | 21.7 | 5.4 | 22.4 | 17.6 | 18.0 |
| High | 21.2 | 3.8 | 17.1 | 12.7 | 13.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 25 and over | 58.8 | 84.2 | 62.7 | 77.4 | 76.5 |
| Low uplift | 20.0 | 10.3 | 20.5 | 14.1 | 14.4 |
| Medium | 21.1 | 5.5 | 16.8 | 8.5 | 9.1 |
| High | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: IES Analysis
In all other cases the student is considered to have withdrawn from Further Education.

The relationship between student withdrawal and Learner Support Funding is presented in Figure 2.5. The figure suggests that withdrawal rates are lower among recipients of Learner Support Funding when compared to those not in receipt of support. Among the population as a whole, the withdrawal rate was just under 19 per cent, compared with Access Fund recipients (13 per cent), Childcare recipients (12 per cent) and Residential Bursaries (ten per cent).

## Achievement rates

The achievement rates reported in this paper are based on qualifications level data. Courses that were non-council funded, were still in continuation, or for which the result was not yet known, were excluded from the analysis. The achievement rate was thus defined as the proportion of qualifications for which a result was known that had been completed successfully.

Figure 2.5: Distribution of Learner Support Funding by withdrawal rates (per cent)


Source: IES Analysis
Table 2.14 highlights the achievement rates of Learner Support Funding recipients. The results suggest that achievement rates among those in receipt of Learner Support are slightly worse than those who are not in receipt of support. This is possibly because the recipients of Learner Support are among the most disadvantaged students. Interestingly, when the focus is on students living in areas of high deprivation, those with funding perform slightly better than those who did not receive funding.

Table 2.14: Achievement rates by and Learner Support Funding

|  | $\%$ | N |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Access | 71.1 | 142,200 |
| Residential Bursary | 71.3 | 3,000 |
| Childcare Support | 76.5 | 27,400 |
| None of the above | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ |
| Total | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

Source: IES Analysis

## 3. Retention

This section examines the impact of Learner Support Funding on retention by individual and course-based characteristics. Some of the main conclusions that may be drawn from this analysis are summarised below.

- For both sexes the participation rates of those in receipt of funding was greater than that of the non-recipients. However, the improvement in retention appeared to be greater in males than females.
- When comparisons are made between recipients of Learner Support within each ethnic minority group and retention rates, we find that those in receipt of funding (Access or Childcare) had higher retention rates irrespective of their ethnic origin. Access Funds appeared to be associated with the greatest increases in retention among those students from Pakistani and Chinese backgrounds.
- Irrespective of age, students in receipt of funding were less likely than their non-funded counterparts to withdraw from education. The greatest differential in retention between funded and non-funded students was among those aged over 25. It is likely that this is a reflection of the many underlying and inter-related differences between young and mature students (eg differences in course types, mode of attendance, personal circumstances etc.) rather than simply an age effect per se.
- The impact of Access Funding on retention varies with the students' mode of attendance. Access Funds appear to have a positive impact on retention among those students studying full-time part-year and those studying on part-time courses. There is little difference, however, between full-time full-year students who receive Access Fund support, and those who do not. Students in receipt of Childcare Support had higher retention levels, irrespective of mode of attendance.
- Learner Support Funding is more strongly associated with improvements in retention among students taking lower level qualifications (eg NVQ levels 2 or below) than higher ones.
- There is a positive association between Learner Support Funding and retention, irrespective of the level of deprivation in which the student is domicile.

Table 3.1: Retention rates by sex and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| Female | 87.5 | 155,400 | 90.9 | 1,400 | 88.6 | 26,000 | 82.5 | $1,933,300$ | 82.9 | $2,116,100$ |
| Male | 86.8 | 89,000 | 89.0 | 1,400 | 84.3 | 5,400 | 78.0 | $1,323,200$ | 78.6 | $1,419,100$ |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.2: Retention rates by age and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| 16 to 18 | 87.7 | 91,600 | 90.3 | 2,100 | 87.3 | 3,300 | 85.7 | 565,400 | 86.0 | 662,500 |
| 19 to 24 | 84.6 | 41,600 | 90.4 | 1,000 | 86.5 | 7,100 | 77.8 | 385,200 | 78.6 | 434,900 |
| 25 \& over | 87.7 | 110,900 | 86.9 | 500 | 88.2 | 21,500 | 80.0 | $2,283,400$ | 80.5 | $2,416,300$ |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,100 | 89.9 | 3,700 | 87.7 | 32,000 | 80.8 | $3,235,300$ | 81.3 | $3,515,100$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.3: Retention rates by ethnicity and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| Bangladeshi | 89.1 | 2,500 | - | - | 89.8 | 400 | 82.3 | 19,700 | 83.2 | 22,500 |
| Black African | 88.2 | 11,500 | - | - | 91.9 | 1,300 | 84.2 | 57,000 | 85.0 | 69,700 |
| Black Caribbean | 86.1 | 8,600 | - | - | 89.0 | 900 | 81.8 | 49,900 | 82.5 | 59,400 |
| Black Other | 85.9 | 5,100 | - | - | 86.2 | 500 | 80.6 | 22,000 | 81.6 | 27,600 |
| Chinese | 91.6 | 1,300 | - | - | 84.7 | 200 | 83.2 | 15,400 | 83.8 | 16,800 |
| Indian | 92.3 | 6,100 | - | - | 92.0 | 700 | 85.3 | 65,600 | 86.0 | 72,500 |
| Pakistani | 92.4 | 9,900 | - | - | 88.5 | 1,300 | 83.3 | 60,000 | 84.7 | 71,200 |
| White | 86.5 | 164,000 | 89.6 | 2,600 | 87.2 | 22,200 | 80.7 | $2,451,400$ | 81.1 | $2,640,200$ |
| Other —Asian | 88.0 | 3,900 | - | - | 91.7 | 500 | 81.7 | 37,500 | 82.4 | 41,900 |
| Any other | 86.5 | 8,500 | - | - | 92.2 | 1,300 | 81.0 | 71,500 | 81.8 | 81,300 |
| Not known | 88.5 | 23,200 | 98.1 | 100 | 85.8 | 2,200 | 78.4 | 406,500 | 79.0 | 432,000 |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

[^4]Table 3.4: Retention rates by institution type and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| FE college | 86.9 | 209,200 | 86.4 | 400 | 88.4 | 17,700 | 80.2 | $2,579,600$ | 80.7 | $2,807,000$ |
| Sixth form college | 92.6 | 15,900 | - | - | 88.0 | 500 | 85.8 | 180,500 | 86.4 | 196,900 |
| Specialist college | 89.6 | 6,100 | 90.7 | 2,300 | 85.2 | 3,300 | 70.0 | 49,400 | 73.6 | 61,100 |
| External institution | 84.9 | 13,000 | - | - | 88.4 | 7,000 | 82.5 | 319,400 | 82.7 | 339,400 |
| Specialist designated | 74.7 | 300 | - | - | 85.8 | 3,000 | 82.8 | 127,400 | 82.8 | 130,600 |
| Dance and Drama | - | - | - | - | - | - | 93.3 | 200 | 93.3 | 200 |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.5: Retention rates by mode of attendance and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| Full-time full-year | 87.6 | 165,300 | 90.6 | 2,600 | 88.0 | 7,200 | 87.6 | 557,200 | 87.6 | 732,400 |
| Full-time part-year | 93.0 | 7,500 | - | - | 83.7 | 2,000 | 48.1 | 193,800 | 50.1 | 203,400 |
| Part-time | 85.8 | 71,600 | 77.3 | 200 | 88.1 | 22,300 | 81.6 | $2,505,400$ | 81.8 | $2,599,500$ |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.6: Retention rates by level of qualification aim and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| 1 \& Entry | 85.9 | 37,200 | 86.0 | 100 | 87.9 | 7,600 | 80.5 | 929,600 | 80.7 | 974,500 |
| 2 | 85.2 | 71,400 | 88.1 | 800 | 88.9 | 9,300 | 81.2 | 838,800 | 81.6 | 920,300 |
| 3 | 89.1 | 120,000 | 91.1 | 1,900 | 86.1 | 7,500 | 87.7 | 754,400 | 87.9 | 883,800 |
| $4,5 \& H E$ | 91.5 | 2,800 | - | - | 93.9 | 400 | 92.0 | 55,700 | 92.0 | 58,900 |
| Other | 83.8 | 13,100 | - | - | 87.8 | 6,600 | 71.5 | 678,000 | 71.8 | 697,700 |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.7: Retention rates by type of qualification aim and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| A/AS GCE A2 level | 91.6 | 24,900 | - | - | 88.9 | 500 | 88.7 | 191,300 | 89.0 | 216,800 |
| GCSE | 84.3 | 5,700 | - | - | 82.1 | 700 | 76.8 | 66,700 | 77.4 | 73,000 |
| GNVQ precursor | 88.1 | 30,500 | 90.5 | 1,500 | 86.8 | 1,500 | 86.6 | 121,500 | 87.0 | 154,900 |
| GNVQ/AVCE | 85.7 | 33,000 | 83.3 | 200 | 86.7 | 700 | 85.7 | 119,800 | 85.7 | 153,600 |
| NVQ | 83.7 | 33,200 | 87.3 | 200 | 89.1 | 3,400 | 87.9 | 278,700 | 87.5 | 315,500 |
| Access to HE | 83.8 | 14,700 | 83.3 | 100 | 82.6 | 1,300 | 79.6 | 26,900 | 81.1 | 42,900 |
| HNC/HND | 94.7 | 200 | - | - | - | - | 93.1 | 1,400 | 93.4 | 1,700 |
| OCN | 84.5 | 3,100 | - | - | 90.2 | 500 | 86.4 | 41,500 | 86.3 | 45,200 |
| Additional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NVQ/GNVQ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 91.4 | 800 | 91.9 | 800 |
| Other | 88.3 | 99,100 | 90.9 | 900 | 88.1 | 22,900 | 78.6 | $2,407,900$ | 79.1 | $2,530,800$ |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.8: Retention rates by widening participation category and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| Low uplift | 87.3 | 146,000 | 90.1 | 2,500 | 87.8 | 20,100 | 80.7 | $2,482,400$ | 81.1 | $2,651,000$ |
| Medium | 87.0 | 52,500 | 90.2 | 200 | 87.3 | 6,300 | 80.1 | 476,100 | 80.8 | 535,100 |
| High | 87.3 | 46,000 | 82.9 | 100 | 88.4 | 5,000 | 81.0 | 297,900 | 81.9 | 349,000 |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.9: Retention rates by residential accommodation and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |  |
| Student living in <br> college accom. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| on campus <br> Student living in <br> college managed <br> accom. <br> Student not living in <br> in <br> college accom. | 89.3 | 1,000 | 91.9 | 1,300 | 63.6 | 500 | 63.0 | 4,500 | 71.6 | 7,200 |
| Total | 87.3 | 23,800 | 92.9 | 200 | 86.5 | 200 | 80.9 | 77,300 | 81.4 | 88,400 |

[^5]Table 3.10: Retention rates by main disability and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| Visual impairment | 89.3 | 900 | - | - | - | - | 83.2 | 6,300 | 84.0 | 7,200 |
| Hearing impairment | 90.3 | 900 | - | - | - | - | 84.4 | 8,500 | 85.0 | 9,500 |
| Disability affecting mobility | 91.8 | 1,300 | - | - | - | - | 86.0 | 8,900 | 86.7 | 10,300 |
| Other physical disabilities | 86.5 | 1,400 | - | - | - | - | 87.1 | 6,800 | 87.0 | 8,200 |
| Other medical conditions | 85.4 | 2,900 | 90.5 | 100 | 84.0 | 100 | 83.9 | 16,800 | 84.1 | 19,900 |
| Emotional or behavioural difficulties | s 87.6 | 400 | - | - | - | - | 87.1 | 2,200 | 87.2 | 2,600 |
| Mental ill health | 84.1 | 600 | - | - | - | - | 85.7 | 6,000 | 85.5 | 6,600 |
| Temporary disability after illness | 88.9 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 84.4 | 700 | 85.0 | 800 |
| Profound/complex disability | 90.0 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 89.3 | 1,100 | 89.3 | 1,200 |
| Multiple disabilities | 93.7 | 700 | - | - | - | - | 88.1 | 5,700 | 88.6 | 6,400 |
| Other | 88.3 | 3,400 | - | - | 86.5 | 200 | 86.9 | 26,800 | 87.1 | 30,300 |
| No disability | 87.4 | 175,800 | 90.0 | 2,400 | 88.0 | 25,700 | 81.1 | 2,244,000 | 81.6 | 2,447,800 |
| Not known/ no information | 86.3 | 55,900 | 88.9 | 300 | 87.7 | 5,200 | 79.1 | 922,600 | 79.5 | 984,000 |
| Total | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | 3,256,500 | 81.2 | 3,535,200 |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 3.11: Retention rates by main learning difficulty and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number | Retention | Number |
| Moderate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| learning difficulty | 90.5 | 4,400 | 97.2 | 100 | 88.8 | 100 | 88.6 | 22,300 | 88.9 | 26,900 |
| Severe learning <br> difficulty | 95.3 | 700 | - | - | - | - | 93.8 | 6,900 | 93.9 | 7,700 |
| Dyslexia | 88.4 | 3,400 | 90.9 | 100 | 85.1 | 200 | 84.3 | 14,600 | 85.1 | 18,300 |
| Dyscalculia | 90.9 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 81.3 | 300 | 83.5 | 400 |
| Other specific LD | 90.0 | 1,000 | - | - | 89.5 | 100 | 87.4 | 3,700 | 88.0 | 4,800 |
| Multiple learning <br> difficulties | 86.6 | 1,000 | - | - | 95.1 | 100 | 88.9 | 5,100 | 88.6 | 6,100 |
| Other | 90.7 | 4,600 | - | - | 86.6 | 200 | 88.0 | 23,900 | 88.4 | 28,800 |
| No learning difficulties | 87.3 | 173,200 | 89.8 | 2,300 | 87.9 | 25,600 | 81.1 | $2,250,500$ | 81.6 | $2,451,500$ |
| No information | 86.2 | 56,100 | 87.8 | 300 | 87.6 | 5,200 | 79.1 | 929,200 | 79.5 | 990,700 |
| provided | 87.2 | 244,500 | 89.9 | 2,800 | 87.8 | 31,400 | 80.7 | $3,256,500$ | 81.2 | $3,535,200$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: IES Analysis

## 4. Achievement

In general, recipients of Learner Support Funding had only marginally lower rates of achievement than those who were not in receipt of such support. This should not, however, be considered a causal relationship, as recipients of support are more likely to have other 'risk factors' affecting achievement than their non-funded counterparts. Consequently, we are not necessarily comparing like-with-like. Interestingly, there are variations between student groups: students living in high uplift areas who received Learner Support Funding, for example, performed better than those who did not receive funding.

With regards to some of the other findings:

- There is a less negative association between Access Fund recipients and achievement rates among female students than males.
- All ethnic groups in receipt of Access Funds, except Black Africans, report lower achievement rates than their counterparts who do not receive funding. However, there are differences between ethnic groups, with Black Caribbean, Black other, Chinese, Indian and other Asians performing less negatively than Pakistani and White recipients.
- There is a mixed association between Learner Support Funding, achievement and the level of qualification aim. Access Fund and Childcare students appear to perform better than their non-funded counterparts when they are studying for NVQ level 4 and 5 courses.
- Finally, the association between Learner Support Funding and achievement is also very much dependent upon the level of deprivation. Students living in a high uplift area had higher rates of achievement than their counterparts who were not funded.

Table 4.1: Achievement rates by sex and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| Female | 72.6 | 91,800 | 72.4 | 1,500 | 76.8 | 23,900 | 77.8 | $2,479,200$ | 77.6 | $2,596,400$ |
| Male | 68.2 | 50,300 | 70.2 | 1,500 | 74.3 | 3,500 | 75.0 | $1,682,000$ | 74.8 | $1,737,400$ |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.2: Achievement rates by age and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential | Childcare |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |  |  |  |  |
| 16 to 18 yrs | 68.1 | 74,600 | 72.7 | 2,100 | 72.5 | 2,900 | 73.2 | $1,360,600$ | 73.0 | $1,440,200$ |  |  |  |  |
| 19 to 24 yrs | 70.1 | 20,600 | 68.6 | 700 | 75.6 | 6,200 | 74.8 | 408,900 | 74.6 | 436,400 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 yrs or more | 76.2 | 47,000 | 66.3 | 200 | 77.4 | 18,200 | 78.9 | $2,391,800$ | 78.9 | $2,457,200$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 78.9 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |  |  |  |  |

[^6]Table 4.3: Achievement rates by ethnicity and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| Bangladeshi | 68.1 | 1,700 | - | - | 63.0 | 300 | 69.9 | 30,100 | 69.7 | 32,200 |
| Black African | 66.3 | 6,400 | - | - | 66.2 | 1,100 | 63.8 | 83,400 | 64.0 | 90,900 |
| Black Caribbean | 64.0 | 4,500 | - | - | 63.1 | 800 | 64.9 | 59,700 | 64.8 | 65,000 |
| Black Other | 66.0 | 3,000 | - | - | 72.3 | 500 | 65.2 | 30,100 | 65.4 | 33,600 |
| Chinese | 71.7 | 800 | - | - | 74.6 | 100 | 72.2 | 23,700 | 72.2 | 24,600 |
| Indian | 71.8 | 4,900 | - | - | 75.8 | 600 | 72.2 | 102,100 | 72.2 | 107,700 |
| Pakistani | 67.6 | 7,000 | - | - | 75.9 | 1,200 | 71.6 | 90,200 | 71.3 | 98,400 |
| White | 72.7 | 90,100 | 72.0 | 2,800 | 78.5 | 18,700 | 78.0 | $3,078,700$ | 77.9 | $3,190,300$ |
| Other - Asian | 69.8 | 2,300 | - | - | 74.4 | 500 | 70.8 | 53,400 | 70.8 | 56,200 |
| Any other | 69.5 | 4,600 | - | - | 73.5 | 1,200 | 70.3 | 97,000 | 70.3 | 102,800 |
| Not reported | 69.2 | 17,000 | 59.5 | 100 | 74.9 | 2,300 | 76.8 | 512,700 | 76.5 | 532,100 |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.4: Achievement rates by college type and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |  |  |
| FE college | 69.2 | 116,900 | 73.1 | 300 | 76.7 | 17,100 | 76.3 | $3,103,400$ | 76.1 | $3,237,800$ |  |  |
| Sixth form <br> college | 82.9 | 14,800 | - | - | 86.5 | 400 | 84.5 | 480,900 | 84.4 | 496,100 |  |  |
| Specialist <br> college | 72.0 | 3,800 | 71.1 | 2,600 | 69.7 | 1,900 | 78.1 | 64,100 | 77.3 | 72,400 |  |  |
| External <br> institution | 77.5 | 6,500 | - | - | 81.8 | 5,700 | 76.0 | 322,300 | 76.1 | 334,600 |  |  |
| Specialist <br> designated | 93.9 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.5: Achievement rates by mode of attendance and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential | Childcare |  | None | Total |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| Full-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| full-year | 69.8 | 112,100 | 71.1 | 2,900 | 71.7 | 9,200 | 73.3 | $1,469,700$ | 73.1 | $1,593,900$ |
| Full-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| part-year | 75.8 | 4,200 | - | - | 78.6 | 1,800 | 83.3 | 253,500 | 83.1 | 259,400 |
| Part-time | 75.6 | 25,900 | - | - | 78.9 | 16,400 | 78.0 | $2,438,100$ | 78.0 | $2,480,400$ |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

[^7]Table 4.6: Achievement rates by level of qualification aim and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| 1 \& Entry | 66.8 | 41,000 | 72.0 | 800 | 71.4 | 9,200 | 74.1 | $1,186,600$ | 73.8 | $1,237,600$ |
| 2 | 67.3 | 45,300 | 69.5 | 1,200 | 76.6 | 7,300 | 73.1 | 987,100 | 72.9 | $1,040,900$ |
| 3 | 76.3 | 40,200 | 76.8 | 800 | 77.2 | 3,400 | 78.4 | 952,800 | 78.3 | 997,200 |
| 4,5 \& HE | 72.1 | 500 | - | - | 76.6 | 100 | 64.6 | 32,500 | 64.8 | 33,100 |
| Other | 79.9 | 15,200 | 58.0 | 200 | 82.4 | 7,300 | 81.9 | $1,002,200$ | 81.9 | $1,024,900$ |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.7: Achievement rates by category of qualification aim and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| A/AS GCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A2 level | 76.4 | 19,500 | 64.8 | 100 | 73.5 | 500 | 82.4 | 510,600 | 82.1 | 530,700 |
| GCSE | 79.2 | 6,600 | - | - | 81.1 | 700 | 81.2 | 118,900 | 81.1 | 126,300 |
| GNVQ precursor | 88.2 | 4,200 | 91.1 | 400 | 88.4 | 300 | 82.5 | 61,100 | 82.9 | 66,000 |
| GNVQ/AVCE | 78.5 | 5,800 | 85.2 | 100 | 74.7 | 200 | 77.8 | 72,800 | 77.8 | 78,900 |
| NVQ | 80.6 | 6,800 | 84.9 | 100 | 77.4 | 1,200 | 75.7 | 147,800 | 76.0 | 155,900 |
| Access to HE | 88.0 | 2,800 | - | - | 86.2 | 500 | 83.7 | 17,000 | 84.4 | 20,300 |
| HNC/HND | - | - | - | - | - | - | 78.5 | 300 | 77.9 | 300 |
| OCN | 77.1 | 1,800 | - | - | 73.9 | 400 | 80.6 | 46,600 | 80.4 | 48,800 |
| Additional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NVQ/GNVQ | 61.3 | 2,000 | 55.0 | 100 | 66.5 | 200 | 65.2 | 31,600 | 65.0 | 33,800 |
| Other | 67.0 | 92,600 | 67.7 | 2,300 | 76.1 | 23,500 | 75.5 | $3,154,300$ | 75.2 | $3,272,700$ |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.8: Achievement rates by widening participation uplift and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential | Childcare |  | None |  |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| Low uplift | 71.7 | 86,100 | 71.2 | 2,700 | 77.9 | 17,200 | 78.2 | $3,205,900$ | 78.0 | $3,312,000$ |
| Medium uplift | 70.6 | 30,100 | 72.8 | 200 | 74.5 | 5,500 | 73.4 | 585,100 | 73.2 | 621,000 |
| High uplift | 69.4 | 25,900 | - | - | 73.4 | 4,600 | 68.6 | 370,200 | 68.7 | 400,800 |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | $4,161,200$ | 76.5 | $4,333,800$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.9: Achievement rates by residential status and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| Student living <br> in college accom. on campus $77.0$ | 800 | 79.2 | 1,500 | 71.6 | 500 | 83.1 | 9,300 | 81.7 | 12,200 |
| Student living in college managed accom. | 2,700 | 85.5 | 100 | 86.0 | 100 | 79.2 | 75,600 | 79.2 | 78,600 |
| Student not living in college accom. 70.9 | 138,700 | 60.9 | 1,300 | 76.5 | 26,700 | 76.6 | 4,076,300 | 76.4 | 4,243,100 |
| Total 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | 4,161,200 | 76.5 | 4,333,800 |

Source: IES Analysis

Table 4.10: Achievement rates by disability and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| Visual impairment | 71.7 | 600 | - | - | - | - | 76.9 | 10,200 | 76.6 | 10,800 |
| Hearing impairment | 72.3 | 600 | - | - | - | - | 76.7 | 12,600 | 76.5 | 13,300 |
| Disability affecting mobility | 68.5 | 700 | - | - | 84.6 | 100 | 79.2 | 12,200 | 78.6 | 12,900 |
| Other physical disability | 71.7 | 700 | - | - | - | - | 78.9 | 9,300 | 78.4 | 10,000 |
| Other medical condition | 70.6 | 1,900 | 59.3 | 100 | 69.8 | 100 | 76.5 | 31,100 | 76.1 | 33,200 |
| Emotional/ behavioural difficulties | 82.6 | 200 | - | - | - | - | 81.0 | 3,700 | 81.1 | 4,000 |
| Mental ill health | 75.1 | 300 | - | - | - | - | 78.7 | 8,300 | 78.5 | 8,600 |
| Temporary disability after illness | - | - | - | - | - | - | 76.0 | 1,200 | 75.8 | 1,200 |
| Profound/ complex disabilities | - | - | - | - | - | - | 82.3 | 1,800 | 82.3 | 1,800 |
| Multiple disabilities | 78.1 | 500 | - | - | - | - | 82.2 | 8,200 | 81.9 | 8,700 |
| Other disabilities | s 69.8 | 2,100 | - | - | 82.8 | 200 | 76.3 | 43,200 | 76.0 | 45,600 |
| No disabilities | 71.1 | 104,400 | 72.0 | 2,600 | 76.2 | 22,300 | 76.9 | 2,933,800 | 76.7 | 3,063,200 |
| Not known | 70.7 | 30,100 | 67.3 | 200 | 77.2 | 4,500 | 75.9 | 1,085,500 | 75.8 | 1,120,300 |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | 4,161,200 | 76.5 | 4,333,800 |

[^8]Table 4.11: Achievement rates by learning difficulties and Learner Support Funding

|  | Access |  | Residential |  | Childcare |  | None |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number | Achievement | Number |
| Moderate learning difficulties | 71.2 | 2,500 | 80.2 | 100 | 69.8 | 100 | 76.9 | 40,600 | 76.5 | 43,400 |
| Severe learning difficulties | 88.2 | 500 | - | - | - | - | 82.5 | 10,200 | 82.7 | 10,700 |
| Dyslexia | 67.7 | 2,400 | 70.5 | 200 | 69.3 | 200 | 72.2 | 29,800 | 71.9 | 32,500 |
| Dyscalculia | 78.2 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 74.5 | 500 | 75.1 | 600 |
| Other specific learning difficulties | s 64.9 | 900 | - | - | 70.7 | 100 | 72.0 | 8,600 | 71.4 | 9,500 |
| Multiple learning difficulties | 62.6 | 600 | - | - | - | - | 77.4 | 7,700 | 76.4 | 8,300 |
| Other | 70.5 | 2,800 | 80.7 | 100 | 69.8 | 200 | 74.5 | 41,000 | 74.2 | 44,100 |
| No learning difficulties | 71.3 | 102,500 | 70.8 | 2,400 | 76.5 | 22,200 | 77.0 | 2,929,800 | 76.8 | 3,057,000 |
| Not known | 70.7 | 30,000 | 68.7 | 200 | 77.5 | 4,400 | 76.0 | 1,093,000 | 75.8 | 1,127,600 |
| Total | 71.1 | 142,200 | 71.3 | 3,000 | 76.5 | 27,400 | 76.7 | 4,161,200 | 76.5 | 4,333,800 |

Source: IES Analysis

## Appendix 1: Additional Tables

This section presents additional tables covering:

- Estimated student numbers receiving Learner Support Funding, by individual course and college characteristics (Section A1).
- Estimated proportions of students receiving Learner Support Funding, by individual course or college characteristics and age bands (16 to 18 years, 19 to 24 years and 25 years or over) (Section A2).
- Estimated numbers of students receiving Learner Support Funding, by individual course or college characteristics and age bands (16 to 18 years, 19 to 24 years and 25 years or over) (Section A3).


## A1 Learner support (headline numbers)

Table A1: Learner Support Funding by sex

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 155,500 | 1,400 | 26,000 | $1,933,300$ | $2,116,000$ |
| Male | 89,000 | 1,400 | 5,400 | $1,323,200$ | $1,419,100$ |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A2: Learner Support Funding by ethnicity

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bangladeshi | 2,500 | - | 400 | 20,000 | 22,600 |
| Black African | 11,500 | - | 1,300 | 57,000 | 69,800 |
| Black Caribbean | 8,600 | - | 900 | 50,000 | 59,400 |
| Black Other | 5,100 | - | 500 | 22,000 | 27,600 |
| Chinese | 1,300 | - | 200 | 15,400 | 16,800 |
| Indian | 6,100 | - | 700 | 65,600 | 72,500 |
| Pakistani | 10,000 | - | 1,300 | 60,000 | 71,200 |
| White | 164,000 | 2,600 | 22,200 | $2,451,400$ | $2,640,200$ |
| Other - Asian | 3,900 | - | 500 | 37,500 | 42,000 |
| Any other | 8,500 | - | 1,300 | 71,500 | 81,300 |
| Not known | 23,200 | 100 | 2,200 | 406,500 | 432,000 |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200 \backslash$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A3: Learner Support Funding by institution type

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FE college | 209,200 | 400 | 17,700 | $2,579,600$ | $2,807,000$ |
| Sixth form college | 15,900 | - | 500 | 180,500 | 196,900 |
| Specialist college | 6,100 | 2,300 | 3,300 | 49,400 | 61,100 |
| External institution | 13,000 | - | 7,000 | 319,400 | 339,400 |
| Specialist designated | 300 | - | 3,000 | 127,400 | 130,600 |
| Dance/drama | - | - | - | 200 | 200 |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A4: Learner Support Funding by mode of attendance

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full-time full-year | 165,300 | 2,600 | 7,200 | 557,200 | 732,400 |
| Full-time part-year | 7,500 | - | 2,000 | 193,800 | 203,400 |
| Part-time | 71,600 | 200 | 22,300 | $2,505,400$ | $2,599,500$ |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A5: Learner Support Funding by NVQ level of qualification aim

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 \& Entry | 37,200 | 100 | 7,600 | 929,600 | 974,500 |
| 2 | 71,400 | 800 | 9,300 | 838,800 | 920,300 |
| 3 | 120,000 | 1,900 | 7,500 | 754,400 | 883,800 |
| $4,5 \& H E$ | 2,800 | - | 400 | 56,000 | 58,900 |
| Other | 13,100 | - | 6,600 | 678,000 | 697,700 |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A6: Learner Support Funding by type of qualification aim

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A/AS GCE A2 level | 24,900 | - | 500 | 191,300 | 216,800 |
| GCSE | 5,700 | - | 700 | 66,700 | 73,000 |
| GNVQ precursor | 30,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 121,500 | 154,900 |
| GNVQ/AVCE | 33,000 | 200 | 700 | 119,800 | 153,600 |
| NVQ | 33,200 | 200 | 3,400 | 278,700 | 315,500 |
| Access to HE | 14,700 | 100 | 1,300 | 26,900 | 42,900 |
| HNC/HND | 200 | - | - | 1,400 | 1,700 |
| OCN | 3,200 | - | 500 | 41,500 | 45,200 |
| Additional NVQ/GNVQ | - | - | - | 800 | 800 |
| Other | 99,100 | 900 | 22,900 | $2,407,900$ | $2,530,800$ |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

## Table A7: Learner Support Funding by widening participation factor

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low uplift | 146,000 | 2,500 | 20,100 | $2,482,400$ | $2,651,000$ |
| Medium | 52,500 | 200 | 6,300 | 476,100 | 535,100 |
| High | 46,000 | 100 | 5,000 | 297,900 | 349,000 |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A8: Learner Support Funding by residential status

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student living in college <br> accom. on campus | 1,000 | 1,300 | 500 | 4,500 | 7,200 |
| Student living in college <br> managed accom. | 10,800 | 200 | 200 | 77,300 | 88,500 |
| Student not living in <br> college accom. | 232,700 | 1,400 | 30,700 | $3,174,700$ | $3,439,500$ |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A9: Learner Support Funding by type of disability

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual impairment | 900 | - | - | 6,300 | 7,200 |
| Hearing impairment | 900 | - | - | 8,500 | 9,500 |
| Disability affecting mobility | 1,300 | - | - | 8,900 | 10,300 |
| Other physical disabilities | 1,400 | - | - | 6,800 | 8,200 |
| Other medical conditions | 2,900 | 100 | 100 | 16,800 | 20,000 |
| Emotional or behavioural | 400 | - | - | 2,200 | 2,600 |
| difficulties | 600 | - | - | 6,000 | 6,600 |
| Mental ill health | 100 | - | - | 700 | 800 |
| Temporary disability after illness | 100 | - | - | 1,100 | 1,200 |
| Profound/complex disability | 100 | - | - | 5,700 | 6,400 |
| Multiple disabilities | 700 | - | 200 | 26,800 | 30,300 |
| Other | 3,400 | 2,400 | 25,700 | $2,244,000$ | $2,447,900$ |
| No disability | 175,800 | 300 | 5,200 | 922,600 | 984,000 |
| Not known/no information | 55,900 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |
| Total | 244,500 |  |  |  |  |

Source: IES Analysis

## Table A10: Learner Support Funding by type of learning difficulty

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moderate learning difficulty | 4,400 | 100 | 100 | 22,300 | 26,900 |
| Severe learning difficulty | 700 | - | - | 6,900 | 7,700 |
| Dyslexia | 3,400 | 100 | 200 | 14,600 | 18,300 |
| Dyscalculia | 100 | - | - | 300 | 400 |
| Other specific LD | 1,000 | - | 100 | 3,700 | 4,800 |
| Multiple learning difficulties | 1,000 | - | 100 | 5,100 | 6,100 |
| Other | 4,600 | - | 200 | 23,900 | 28,800 |
| No learning difficulties | 173,200 | 2,300 | 25,600 | $2,250,500$ | $2,451,500$ |
| No information provided | 56,100 | 300 | 5,200 | 929,200 | 990,700 |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis

Table A11: Learner Support Funding by retention status

|  | Access | Residential | Childcare | None | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Withdrawn | 31,200 | 300 | 3,800 | 630,000 | 665,300 |
| Retained | 213,200 | 2,500 | 27,600 | $2,626,500$ | $2,869,900$ |
| Total | 244,500 | 2,800 | 31,400 | $3,256,500$ | $3,535,200$ |

Source: IES Analysis
A2 Learner support by age (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 16 to 18 | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | 25 plus | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| FE college | 82.3 | 92.5 | 86.1 | 13.0 | 18.8 | 27.1 | 52.1 | 65.0 | 54.3 | 76.9 | 87.2 | 78.5 | 77.4 | 87.2 | 78.6 |
| Sixth form college | 13.4 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.1 | - | 4.2 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 19.1 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 18.1 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Specialist college | 3.7 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 86.9 | 80.5 | 59.7 | 38.3 | 6.1 | 8.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| External institution | 0.6 | 3.0 | 11.0 | - | 0.8 | 9.0 | 5.0 | 18.6 | 25.7 | 1.8 | 6.8 | 12.2 | 1.6 | 6.6 | 12.3 |
| Specialist designated | - | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | - | - | 2.9 | 9.0 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 5.0 |
| Dance/drama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table A13: Learner Support Funding by NVQ level and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 \& Entry | 9.6 | 13.3 | 21.7 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 10.0 | 15.2 | 21.0 | 26.4 | 12.3 | 25.4 | 33.0 | 11.9 | 24.1 | 32.4 |
| 2 | 29.8 | 25.9 | 30.0 | 32.6 | 13.0 | 23.2 | 47.1 | 31.2 | 26.9 | 25.9 | 28.4 | 25.3 | 26.6 | 28.2 | 25.5 |
| 3 | 58.9 | 53.9 | 37.1 | 63.8 | 83.5 | 59.7 | 29.8 | 27.5 | 22.2 | 57.4 | 25.0 | 14.6 | 57.5 | 27.9 | 15.6 |
| 4, 5 \& HE | 0.3 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 0.9 | - | 3.1 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| Other | 1.4 | 5.2 | 9.5 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 19.5 | 23.4 | 4.1 | 18.5 | 25.2 | 3.7 | 17.2 | 24.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^9]Table A14: Learner Support Funding by qualification type and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | 25 <br> plus |
| A/AS GCE A2 level | 19.7 | 7.0 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 | - | 3.8 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 26.2 | 4.4 | 1.2 | 25.0 | 4.6 | 1.3 |
| GCSE | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | - | 1.7 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| GNVQ precursor | 18.2 | 15.1 | 5.6 | 58.1 | 45.2 | 38.6 | 21.8 | 5.1 | 2.2 | 13.9 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 14.7 | 6.5 | 1.2 |
| GNVQ/AVCE | 25.6 | 11.7 | 2.0 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 3.8 | 0.7 | 19.2 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 20.1 | 3.5 | 0.2 |
| NVQ | 11.6 | 14.0 | 15.4 | 4.5 | 9.8 | 6.1 | 9.6 | 12.4 | 10.4 | 9.7 | 11.7 | 7.8 | 10.0 | 11.9 | 8.1 |
| Access to HE | 0.1 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 0.2 | 5.1 | 4.2 | - | 5.2 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 1.3 |
| HNC/HND | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| OCN | 0.4 | 1.4 | 2.2 | - | - | - | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| Additional NVQ/GNVQ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 21.8 | 39.0 | 60.2 | 28.1 | 33.1 | 46.9 | 53.7 | 66.7 | 77.5 | 27.6 | 69.4 | 85.8 | 26.9 | 66.4 | 84.7 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^10]Table A15: Learner Support Funding by residential status and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Student living in college accom. on campus | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 57.7 | 23.3 | 12.3 | 7.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Student living in college managed accom. | 5.2 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 11.5 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Student not living in college accom. | 94.1 | 95.7 | 96.1 | 37.9 | 65.3 | 81.0 | 91.5 | 97.5 | 98.6 | 97.2 | 97.5 | 97.6 | 96.5 | 97.3 | 97.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^11]Table A16: Learner Support Funding by type of disability and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 16 to 18 | 19 to 24 | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $25$ <br> plus | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $25$ plus | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Visual impairment | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Hearing impairment | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Disability affecting mobility | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.3 | - | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Other physical disabilities | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.2 | - |  | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Other medical conditions | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Emotional or behavioural difficulties | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Mental ill health | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Temporary disability after illness | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Profound/complex disability | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Multiple disabilities | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | - | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Other | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 1.1 | - | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| No disability | 74.8 | 73.3 | 68.4 | 86.1 | 82.5 | 76.7 | 89.6 | 82.1 | 80.7 | 73.4 | 69.2 | 67.8 | 73.7 | 69.9 | 67.9 |
| Not known/no information | 21.0 | 21.7 | 25.3 | 8.5 | 11.8 | 16.2 | 8.9 | 16.3 | 17.6 | 23.7 | 28.3 | 29.5 | 23.2 | 27.4 | 29.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table A17: Learner Support Funding by learning difficulties and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | 25 plus | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Moderate learning difficulty | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| Severe learning difficulty | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | - |  | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Dyslexia | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 5.9 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Dyscalculia | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other specific LD | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Multiple learning difficulties | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | - | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Other | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 0.9 | - | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| No learning difficulties | 73.0 | 71.2 | 68.5 | 81.2 | 80.6 | 76.1 | 88.4 | 81.5 | 80.6 | 72.4 | 68.8 | 68.4 | 72.6 | 69.3 | 68.5 |
| No information provided | 20.8 | 21.5 | 25.7 | 8.0 | 11.5 | 17.1 | 8.7 | 16.1 | 17.5 | 23.8 | 28.3 | 29.7 | 23.2 | 27.4 | 29.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table A18: Learner Support Funding by retention status and age group (per cent)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Withdrawn | 12.3 | 15.2 | 12.3 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 13.6 | 12.3 | 13.5 | 11.8 | 14.3 | 22.2 | 20.1 | 13.9 | 21.4 | 19.7 |
| Retained | 87.7 | 84.8 | 87.7 | 90.3 | 90.5 | 86.4 | 87.7 | 86.5 | 88.2 | 85.7 | 77.8 | 79.9 | 86.1 | 78.6 | 80.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^12]A3 Learner support by age (numbers)

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $25$ <br> plus | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $24 \begin{array}{cc} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Female | 58,900 | 25,300 | 71,200 | 900 | 300 | 100 | 1,900 | 5,800 | 18,300 |  | 282,100 | 214, | 1001 | 1,437,100 | 343,800 | 245,500 | 1,526,800 |
| Male | 43,600 | 15,800 | 29,700 | 900 | 400 | 200 | 1,000 | 900 | 3,600 |  | 275,100 | -167, | 300 | 880,800 | 320,600 | 184,300 | 914,200 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 |  | 557,100 | O 381, | 3002 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

[^13]Table A20: Learner Support Funding by ethnicity and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  |  | None |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $25$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 16 & 19 \\ \text { to } 18 & \text { to } 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 25 \\ 24 & \text { plus } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Bangladeshi | 1,700 | 500 | 400 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 200 | 6,200 | 4,100 | 9,400 | 7,900 | 4,700 | 10,000 |
| Black African | 3,000 | 2,600 | 5,900 | - | - | - | - | 200 | 1,100 | 9,700 | 9,800 | 37,500 | 12,800 | 12,600 | 44,400 |
| Black Caribbean | 3,000 | 1,700 | 3,800 | - | - | - | - | 200 | 700 | 9,500 | 5,900 | 34,500 | 12,600 | 7,700 | 39,100 |
| Black Other | 2,300 | 1,100 | 1,700 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 300 | 6,600 | 3,900 | 11,600 | 8,900 | 5,100 | 13,500 |
| Chinese | 500 | 200 | 500 | - | - | - | - | - | 200 | 2,900 | 2,000 | 10,500 | 3,400 | 2,200 | 11,200 |
| Indian | 3,600 | 700 | 1,800 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 500 | 16,900 | 9,000 | 39,700 | 20,600 | 9,900 | 42,000 |
| Pakistani | 6,800 | 1,600 | 1,400 | - | - |  | - | 300 | 1,000 | 17,500 | 13,000 | 29,400 | 24,400 | 14,900 | 31,900 |
| White | 68,300 | 26,600 | 69,100 | 1,700 | 600 | 300 | 2,500 | 5,000 | 14,700 | 420,500 | 0 272,000 1, | 1,758,900 | 493,000 | 304,200 | 1,843,000 |
| Other - Asian | 1,200 | 700 | 2,000 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 400 | 5,200 | 6,700 | 25,600 | 6,400 | 7,400 | 28,000 |
| Any other | 3,000 | 1,700 | 3,900 | - | - | - | 100 | 200 | 1,000 | 11,600 | 12,100 | 47,800 | 14,700 | 14,000 | 52,700 |
| Not known | 9,100 | 3,600 | 10,500 | 100 | - | - | 100 | 400 | 1,700 | 50,400 | 43,000 | 313,100 | 59,700 | 47,100 | 325,300 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | -557,100 | - 381,300 2 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

[^14]Table A21: Learner Support Funding by institution type and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  |  | None |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cr} 16 & 19 \\ \text { to } 18 & \text { to } 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 25 & 25 \\ 24 & \text { plus } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| FE college | 84,300 | 38,000 | 86,900 | 200 | - | 100 | 1,500 | 4,400 | 11,900 | 428,300 | 332,400 | 1,819,000 | 514,400 | 374,800 | 1,917,800 |
| Sixth form college | 13,800 | 800 | 1,400 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 300 | 107,000 | 10,000 | 63,800 | 120,000 | 10,800 | 65,600 |
| Specialist college | 3,800 | 1,100 | 1,300 | 1,600 | 500 | 200 | 1,100 | 400 | 1,700 | 10,600 | 6,400 | 32,400 | 17,000 | 8,400 | 35,600 |
| External institution | 700 | 1,200 | 11,100 | - | - | - | 100 | 1,300 | 5,600 | 10,100 | 25,900 | 283,400 | 11,000 | 28,400 | 300,100 |
| Specialist designated | - | - | 300 | - | - | - | - | 600 | 2,300 | 1,200 | 6,700 | 119,400 | 1,300 | 7,300 | 122,000 |
| Dance/drama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | - |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,900 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

[^15]Table A22: Learner Support Funding by mode of attendance and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $25$ <br> plus | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Full-time full-year | 95,300 | 27,900 | 42,200 | 1,800 | 600 | 200 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 3,700 | 412,300 | 60,000 | 84,900 | 510,900 | 90,500 | 131,000 |
| Full-time part-year | 800 | 1,600 | 5,100 | - | - | - | 200 | 600 | 1,200 | 14,200 | 31,600 | 148,000 | 15,200 | 33,800 | 154,300 |
| Part-time | 6,400 | 11,600 | 53,600 | - | - | 100 | 1,200 | 4,100 | 17,000 | 130,600 | 289,700 | 2,085,100 | 138,300 | 305,500 | 2,155,700 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

Table A23: Learner Support Funding by level of qualification aim and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 \& Entry | 9,900 | 5,500 | 21,900 | - | - | - | 400 | 1,400 | 5,800 | 68,400 | 97,000 | 764,300 | 78,800 | 103,700 | 792,000 |
| 2 | 30,600 | 10,600 | 30,300 | 600 | 100 | 100 | 1,400 | 2,100 | 5,900 | 144,200 | 108,400 | 586,200 | 176,700 | 121,200 | 622,400 |
| 3 | 60,400 | 22,200 | 37,400 | 1,200 | 600 | 200 | 900 | 1,800 | 4,900 | 319,600 | 95,400 | 339,500 | 382,000 | 120,000 | 381,900 |
| 4,5 \& HE | 300 | 700 | 1,800 | - | - | - | 100 | 100 | 200 | 2,000 | 10,200 | 43,500 | 2,400 | 11,000 | 45,500 |
| Other | 1,400 | 2,100 | 9,600 | - | - | - | 100 | 1,300 | 5,100 | 22,900 | 70,500 | 584,500 | 24,400 | 74,000 | 599,300 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,900 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

Source: IES Analysis
Table A24: Learner Support Funding by type of qualification aim and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | 16 to 18 | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | 16 to 18 | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| A/AS GCE A2 level | 20,200 | 2,900 | 1,800 | - | - | - | 100 | 200 | 200 | 145,700 | 16,900 | 28,700 | 166,100 | 20,000 | 30,800 |
| GCSE | 2,700 | 900 | 2,100 | - | - | - | 100 | 200 | 400 | 16,200 | 10,800 | 39,700 | 18,900 | 11,900 | 42,200 |
| GNVQ precursor | 18,600 | 6,200 | 5,700 | 1,100 | 300 | 100 | 600 | 300 | 500 | 77,400 | 21,100 | 23,000 | 97,800 | 27,900 | 29,300 |
| GNVQ/AVCE | 26,200 | 4,800 | 2,000 | 100 | - | - | 300 | 300 | 200 | 106,700 | 10,000 | 3,100 | 133,300 | 15,100 | 5,200 |
| NVQ | 11,900 | 5,800 | 15,600 | 100 | 100 | - | 300 | 800 | 2,300 | 53,900 | 44,500 | 180,400 | 66,100 | 51,100 | 198,300 |
| Access to HE | 100 | 3,900 | 10,800 | - | - | - | - | 300 | 900 | 300 | 6,400 | 20,200 | 400 | 10,700 | 31,900 |
| HNC/HND | - | 100 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 500 | 800 | 100 | 600 | 900 |
| OCN | 400 | 600 | 2,200 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 400 | 2,800 | 6,300 | 32,500 | 3,200 | 7,000 | 35,100 |
| Additional NVQ/GNVQ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 100 | 500 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| Other | 22,400 | 16,000 | 60,700 | 500 | 200 | 100 | 1,500 | 4,500 | 16,900 | 153,900 | 264,800 | 1,989,200 | 178,400 | 285,500 | 2,066,900 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

[^16]Table A25: Learner Support Funding by widening participation uplift and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Low uplift | 63,200 | 23,500 | 59,400 | 1,700 | 600 | 300 | 2,300 | 4,100 | 13,700 | 422,300 | 265,900 | 1,794,200 | 489,500 | 294,000 | 1,867,500 |
| Medium | 23,400 | 8,900 | 20,200 | 100 | - | - | 400 | 1,500 | 4,500 | 83,100 | 67,000 | 326,100 | 106,900 | 77,400 | 350,800 |
| High | 16,000 | 8,700 | 21,300 | - | - | - | 200 | 1,200 | 3,700 | 51,800 | 48,500 | 197,700 | 68,000 | 58,400 | 222,700 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

Source: IES Analysis
Table A26: Learner Support Funding by widening participation uplift and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Student living in college accom. on campus | 700 | 100 | 200 | 1,100 | 200 | - | 200 | 100 | 200 | 2,000 | 600 | 1,900 | 4,000 | 1,000 | 2,200 |
| Student living in college managed accom. | 5,300 | 1,600 | 3,800 | 100 | 100 | - | - | 100 | 100 | 13,600 | 8,900 | 54,800 | 19,100 | 10,700 | 58,700 |
| Student not living in college accom. | 96,500 | 39,300 | 96,900 | 700 | 400 | 300 | 2,600 | 6,500 | 21,500 | 541,500 | 371,900 | 2,261,300 | 641,300 | 418,200 | 2,380,100 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

Source: IES Analysis
Table A27: Learner Support Funding by disability type and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Visual impairment | 300 | 100 | 400 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,400 | 600 | 4,200 | 1,800 | 700 | 4,700 |
| Hearing impairment | 400 | 200 | 400 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,000 | 600 | 6,800 | 1,400 | 800 | 7,300 |
| Disability affecting mobility | 100 | 200 | 1,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 400 | 600 | 7,900 | 600 | 700 | 9,000 |
| Other physical disabilities | 200 | 200 | 1,000 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 600 | 500 | 5,700 | 800 | 800 | 6,700 |
| Other medical conditions | 1,500 | 500 | 1,000 | 100 | - | - | - | - | 100 | 5,400 | 2,000 | 9,400 | 7,000 | 2,500 | 10,500 |
| Emotional or behavioural difficulties | 200 | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 700 | 400 | 1,100 | 1,000 | 400 | 1,200 |
| Mental ill health | 100 | 100 | 500 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 300 | 600 | 5,200 | 300 | 700 | 5,700 |
| Temporary disability after illness | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | 600 | 100 | 100 | 700 |
| Profound/complex disability | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 200 | 800 | 200 | 300 | 800 |
| Multiple disabilities | 200 | 100 | 400 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 600 | 700 | 4,400 | 800 | 900 | 4,800 |
| Other | 1,300 | 600 | 1,500 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 5,700 | 3,200 | 17,800 | 7,000 | 3,900 | 19,400 |
| No disability | 76,700 | 30,100 | 69,000 | 1,600 | 500 | 200 | 2,600 | 5,500 | 17,600 | 408,800 | 264,100 | 1,571,100 | 489,600 | 300,200 | 1,658,000 |
| Not known/ no information | 21,500 | 8,900 | 25,500 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 1,100 | 3,800 | 131,900 | 107,800 | 682,900 | 153,900 | 117,800 | 712,300 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

[^17]Table A28: Learner Support Funding by learning difficulty and age group

|  | Access |  |  | Residential |  |  | Childcare |  |  | None |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { to } 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { to } 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ \text { plus } \end{gathered}$ |
| Moderate learning difficulty | 1,900 | 800 | 1,600 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 6,300 | 3,200 | 12,900 | 8,300 | 4,000 | 14,600 |
| Severe learning difficulty | 200 | 300 | 200 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 600 | 1,200 | 5,100 | 800 | 1,500 | 5,400 |
| Dyslexia | 1,700 | 600 | 1,100 | 100 | - | - | - | 100 | 100 | 6,400 | 2,300 | 5,900 | 8,200 | 3,000 | 7,100 |
| Dyscalculia | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | 100 | 100 | 100 | 200 |
| Other specific LD | 500 | 100 | 400 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,400 | 500 | 1,800 | 2,000 | 700 | 2,200 |
| Multiple |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| learning difficulties | 400 | 200 | 400 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 1,000 | 800 | 3,200 | 1,400 | 1,000 | 3,700 |
| Other | 1,600 | 900 | 2,100 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | 5,600 | 2,900 | 15,400 | 7,300 | 3,800 | 17,600 |
| No learning difficulties | 74,800 | 29,200 | 69,100 | 1,500 | 500 | 200 | 2,500 | 5,500 | 17,600 | 403,400 | 262,500 | 1,584,600 | 482,300 | 297,700 | 1,671,500 |
| No information provided | 21,300 | 8,900 | 25,900 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 1,100 | 3,800 | 132,300 | 107,900 | 689,000 | 154,000 | 117,900 | 718,800 |
| Total | 102,500 | 41,100 | 100,900 | 1,800 | 700 | 300 | 2,900 | 6,700 | 21,800 | 557,100 | 381,300 | 2,318,000 | 664,400 | 429,800 | 2,441,000 |

[^18]Copies of this publication can be obtained from:
P.O. Box 5050

Sherwood
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 ODJ
Tel: 08456022260
Fax: 08456033360
Minicom: 08456055560
© Crown copyright 2003
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