



Department
for Education

Allocations methodology for the 16 to 19 Discretionary Bursary fund: equalities impact assessment

September 2019

Contents

The proposed approach to funding	3
The public-sector equality duty	4
Summary of proposals	5
Key student cohort	7
Equalities impact assessment	8
Age	9
Disability	9
Gender reassignment and sexual orientation	10
Pregnancy and maternity	10
Race (including ethnicity)	10
Religion or belief	12
Sex	12
Disadvantaged students	13
Full / part-time students	13
Annex A	15
Student numbers /percentages by institution type	16
Student straight-line distance from provision (kilometres)	18
Areas of deprivation tables	19
Full-time / part-time tables	24

The proposed approach to funding

1. This document considers the proposals outlined in the *Allocations methodology for the 16 to 19 Discretionary Bursary - government consultation response* available at <https://consult.education.gov.uk/16-19-funding-team/16-to-19-bursary-fund-discretionary-allocations/>
2. The proposals cover the following areas:
 - a. The revised 2-element methodology for allocating 16 to 19 Discretionary Bursary funding;
 - b. The additional factors to be used in the calculation of each element.
3. This impact assessment considers the possible differential impacts of these proposals on groups sharing the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010.

The public-sector equality duty

4. The Equality Act 2010 identifies the following as protected characteristics for the purpose of the public-sector equality duty:
 - Age
 - Disability
 - Gender reassignment
 - Pregnancy and maternity
 - Race (including ethnicity)
 - Religion or belief
 - Sex
 - Sexual orientation

5. Under Section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010, the Secretary of State has a duty to have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, in particular, the need to:
 - i. remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic
 - ii. take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it
 - iii. encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, in particular, the need to:
 - i. tackle prejudice
 - ii. promote understanding

Summary of proposals

6. To introduce a revised allocations methodology for the 16 to 19 Discretionary Bursary (DB) that has two elements:
 - 1) support for financial disadvantage to help young people meet the general costs of participating, using a recognised, up-to-date indicator for students' levels of deprivation – the threshold for support to be set at students living in the 27% most deprived areas by Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) (2015),

and
 - 2) support for specific costs affecting some students more than others, weighted to reflect higher/lower travel costs and whether the student is undertaking a T Level Industry Placement – the threshold of deprivation for this element of the calculation will be set at students living in the 60% most deprived areas by IMD (2015).

7. In addition, the methodology will reflect the following:
 - a. the travel element will use distance to travel and rurality as factors for that calculation;
 - b. for students with a home and delivery postcode in the London area this element will be reduced by half, so as to account for the additional support these students have available to them via the Transport for London (TfL) offer; and
 - c. a small element that accounts for the additional costs likely to be faced by disadvantaged students undertaking T Level Industry Placements.

8. 95% of respondents to the consultation supported updating the methodology to allocate DB funding so that it better matches the financial disadvantage and need across the country. There was a high degree of support among respondents for many of the proposals, and a majority support across all the proposals (71% to 88%).

9. In supporting the proposals, respondents agreed that:
 - a. change was needed to reflect current levels of deprivation,

- b. a postcode-based methodology to denote deprivation would be preferable to one based upon previous free school meals status, and
 - c. the methodology should account for expected costs; specifically travel and T Level Industry Placement costs, and that distance and rurality were acceptable proxies for travel costs, and that a reduction to account for the Transport for London (TfL) offer was a pragmatic step.
10. To ensure that individual students can be supported to the same or similar degree throughout their study programme, we aim to introduce any decreases over 4 years – for this to be possible, we will also need to introduce the increases over the same timeframe. We will work with representative bodies over the coming months to communicate the transition arrangements.

Key student cohort

11. For the 2018/19 academic year, approximately £127m was allocated to institutions for Discretionary Bursaries.
12. Any change in the DB allocations methodology has the potential to impact on any individual within the 16 to 19 cohort that is in financial hardship, and therefore to affect students who share protected characteristics. The transitional arrangements that will be put in place aim to support students currently in receipt of an award at the same or similar levels throughout their study programme.
13. While the policy itself does not target any group in particular, the modelling for the revised methodology suggests that the impact of the proposed changes is likely to lead to higher allocations at FE colleges and lower allocations at schools (including academies) and 6th form colleges (at summary level). This reflects the number of students likely to be in need of financial support at these institutions. Data from the DfE's Young Person's Matched Administrative Dataset (YPMAD) for 2017/18 shows that there is a higher percentage of students with home postcodes in the top 27% most deprived areas studying at FE colleges compared to studying at schools and sixth form colleges (see table 9 in Annex A). This summary level masks the changes at institution level which will result in both decreases and increases for all provider types. Our proposed transition plan should help to mitigate against any short-term negative impacts for individual students.

Equalities impact assessment

14. Our assessment is that there are impacts on students who share protected characteristics but that the policy as a whole should benefit students in most financial need, thereby advancing the equality of opportunity for students who may otherwise have not been able to participate in education.
15. The revised methodology will distribute funding more towards those in most financial need, helping to even out the different levels of support currently seen nationally. It will provide a better match to the costs faced by students to participate, and more accurately reflect the number of disadvantaged students at each institution (compared to the current methodology).
16. The YPMAD data set out in the tables in Annex A, suggests the notable differences to the impact on students with protected characteristics include:
 - a. Gender – since there are higher percentages of male students at FE colleges these students are more likely to benefit from higher allocations being available. In addition, lower percentages of males in both schools and sixth form colleges, where allocations (at summary level) are likely to decrease will result in fewer males than females being impacted by this change (table 2).
 - b. Special Educational Needs (SEN) – there is a higher percentage of students with SEN at FE colleges than other institutions noted in the YPMAD data hence these students are more likely to benefit from the methodology change compared to students with no SENs noted (table 3).
 - c. Race (including ethnicity) – FE colleges have a higher percentage of White students than schools and sixth form colleges. In addition, schools and sixth form colleges have higher percentages of Asian and Black students. The summary change to allocations would therefore suggest that White students could see the most benefit from the methodology change (table 4).
17. Institutions will retain the existing flexibility to support those in most financial hardship – regardless of any protected characteristics. As they do now, institutions should look at each student's needs on their own merits, and adjust the financial assistance offered depending on the personal and local circumstances of the student.
18. There was general consensus among respondents that the methodology changes will result in a more equitable system for all and have an overall positive impact on all students facing financial challenges to participate.

Age

19. The age range for the DB is 16 to 19 years – students aged up to 24 years with an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHP) and students aged 19 or over continuing on a study programme they began aged 16 to 18 (19+ continuers), are also eligible. The revised methodology takes no other account of a student's age therefore students, including those who share the protected characteristic of age, are unlikely to be adversely affected by the changes on the basis of their age.

Disability

20. A number of consultation respondents expressed concern that the new methodology would not specifically address the challenges students with special educational needs and/ or disabilities (SEND) face in relation to travel. YPMAD data for 2017/18 shows that students with special educational needs tend to travel further than others - 8.7km compared to 7.7km for all students (in a straight-line distance); see table 6 in Annex A.
21. As explained in the government's consultation response, the availability and cost of transport in each location is an important factor when considering individuals' needs. The revised methodology is intended as a general indicator of the travel need at an institution level and individuals in financial need who have an additional SEND could be supported at the discretion of the provider.
22. We would expect institutions to pay particular attention where any student had additional financial needs to participate, including in relation to transport. Where transport costs were higher due to a student having SENDs, we would expect the institution to consider whether the student could be supported for their additional costs.
23. Respondents also highlighted that students with SEND were more likely to face additional challenges to participate in the T Level Industry Placements. In response to feedback to the T Level funding consultation, the government announced a set of new models and approaches for the completion of Industry Placements, in particular for students with SEND; this announcement was made on 19 May 2019 and is available on [gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk).

Gender reassignment and sexual orientation

24. While we do not collect data by these characteristics it is unlikely that the changes to the methodology will have an adverse impact on students who share these protected characteristics.
25. Respondents to the consultation noted that some LGBT+ and trans students choose to travel to colleges outside their local area because they feel safer and more supported than at providers closer to home. Since the new methodology recognises the additional costs of travel this should be beneficial to eligible students who share this protected characteristic.

Pregnancy and maternity

26. We do not expect any differential impact on students sharing this protected characteristic as a result of changes to the methodology. However, this group of students are likely to benefit from the retained local flexibilities that allow institutions to take account of each student's needs and to reflect this in any financial assistance being offered. Separate to the DB, the costs of childcare during education can be supported via the Care to Learn scheme. We would expect institutions to be aware of, and to communicate the availability of the Care to Learn scheme to any young parents they have studying with them.

Race (including ethnicity)

27. The revised methodology may have differential impacts on those who share the protected characteristic of race if individuals identifying with a specific racial or ethnic group are disproportionately represented in some areas.
28. In 2011, the majority of the UK population described themselves as belonging to the White ethnic group (87% or 55 million). The remaining 13% (8.1 million) belonged to an ethnic minority group – the equivalent of one person in 8 in the UK¹. In the broadest terms, the race of a student is predictable by where they

1

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/keystatisticsandquickstatisticsforlocalauthoritiesintheunitedkingdom/2013-10-11>

live since the majority of all ethnic groups were located in urban areas, with the White and Mixed ethnic groups more likely to be in rural areas than others. At the broad category level, the White ethnic group is fairly evenly dispersed across England. However, other ethnic groups are most likely to be concentrated in London. More than half (58%) of people who identified as Black were located in London, as were more than 1 in 3 (36%) who identified as Asian. After London, people who identified as Black or Asian were most likely to live in the West Midlands, at 10% and 14% respectively².

29. The YPMAD data for 2017/18 shows that 59.7% of Black students and 51.3% of Asian students had home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas (table 11 in Annex A) – the revised disadvantage element is likely to have a beneficial impact on students who identify as BME, share the characteristic of race and live in these areas. 24.6% of White students have home postcodes in the 27% of most deprived areas so White students are less likely to receive support based on this factor, however these students may attract the travel element as explained below.
30. Since students from ethnic groups are more likely to live in urban areas than rural ones, they are also more likely to be able to benefit from the existing post 16 concessionary transport offers available in urban locations compared to White students. Adding a travel element to the methodology could therefore help to alleviate the high costs of travel that are more likely to be faced by White students in rural areas.
31. Responses to the consultation noted that more BME students live in urban areas. Since the travel element is based upon rurality and distance to travel, it is likely to provide greater support to White students living in rural areas. Our assessment is that any differential impact should be evened out by more BME students living in disadvantaged areas and therefore attracting the disadvantage element of the allocations methodology.
32. A respondent raised concern that Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) students might be disadvantaged by the use of a postcode-based methodology to denote deprivation. The respondent appeared to be concerned that if no postcode was recorded, then no support would not be available – that is not the case. The number of students concerned is very small - school census /

² <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/national-and-regional-populations/regional-ethnic-diversity/latest>.

ILR data from 2017/18 records that 964 students identify as Gypsy or Irish Traveller (0.08%). Where the provider is unable to provide postcode data in respect of their GRT students a national average percentage will be applied to their calculation, so these students would form part of the cohort being supported by the allocations methodology.

Religion or belief

33. Religion or belief is not considered to be directly relevant to the new allocations methodology that will be used. However, there may be differential impacts on those who share the protected characteristic of religion or belief if individuals identifying with a specific religion or belief are disproportionately represented in some areas. Institutions would be expected to use the retained local flexibilities to take account of each student's needs and to reflect this in any financial assistance being offered.

Sex

34. The YPMAD data shows that the proportion of males and females with postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD is similar – 30.6% and 30.7% respectively (table 10 in Annex A). As mentioned in paragraph 13, the proposed changes are likely to lead to higher allocations at FE colleges and lower allocations at schools (and academies) and 6th form colleges. YPMAD data shows there is a higher percentage of females in schools (52.8%) and 6th form colleges (55.3%) compared to males (47.2% and 44.7% respectively), and there are more males than females in FE colleges (53.5% vs. 46.5%) – see table 2 in Annex A. FE colleges have a higher percentage of students with SENs and from White backgrounds (see tables 3 and 4 respectively in Annex A). However, the intention of the revised methodology is to distribute funding more towards those in most financial need and students, including those who share protected characteristics, should not be adversely affected on the basis of their gender or the type of institution they attend.

35. Furthermore, the proposed transition plan, mentioned in paragraph 10, should help ensure that individual students are not adversely affected in the short-term.

36. The YPMAD distance data (table 6 in Annex A) shows that males and females travel relatively similar straight line distances (8.0km for males, 7.7km for females), and the differences by gender for each provider type are also relatively small – this suggests that the distance factor in the new methodology should not have a differential impact by gender.

Disadvantaged students

37. Although not a protected characteristic for the purposes of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), we have also considered the impact on students who are considered to be disadvantaged, using students living in 27% most deprived areas (or not) as a proxy for this.
38. Respondents to the consultation agreed that the current methodology was no longer supporting the most disadvantaged students nationally, remarking that the group of students they needed to support had changed substantially over the past 10 years.
39. The data in Annex A (table 8) shows that 30.6% of students have home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD. The data also shows (table 6) that students in these areas tend to travel shorter distances than those in the remaining 73% of areas – 6.3km compared to 8.6km overall.

Full / part-time students

40. We considered whether full-time and part-time students would need different levels of support on the basis that travel and other costs might generally be lower for someone not studying full-time, and looked at whether building in a part-time/full-time element to the methodology would have a differential impact on students with protected characteristics.
41. The YMAD data shows the following:
 - a. slightly more males than females are part-time - 9.7% and 7.8% respectively – the corresponding figures for full-time study are 90.3% (males) and 92.2% (females) – table 15.
 - b. the majority of part-time students are White (76.7%), as are the majority of full-time students (75.5%) – this is consistent with their proportion within the total cohort (75.6%). The next highest group of part-time students by ethnicity is Asian - 9.7% of part-time and 10.9% of full-time students identify as Asian – this is also consistent with the proportion of Asian students in the total cohort (10.8%) – table 17.
 - c. 24.9% of part-time students have some SEN support, the figure for full-time students is 13.5% - students requiring SEN support make up 14.5% of the whole cohort – table 16.
 - d. 30.6% of the total cohort have home postcodes in the 27% of most deprived areas by IMD, with 37.6% of part-time students and 30.0% of full-time students living in these areas – table 19.

- e. part-time students tend to travel further than full-time students (11.8km compared to 7.5km) – table 20.
42. There may be differential impacts on those who share some protected characteristic if we included a downward adjustment for students studying part-time.
 43. We concluded that it would not be possible to determine conclusively that there is a difference in travel costs for those who study part-time and those in full-time study (i.e. that 2 or 3 days of travel would usually amount to a lesser cost than a weekly travel pass). In relation to 'other costs', we determined that it is unlikely these will be less if a student is studying part-time as they are likely to require the same books and equipment whether studying 2 or 5 days per week. In respect of Industry Placements, we considered it more likely that part-time students will attend full-time for the period of their placement.
 44. In changing the DB allocation methodology our intention is to better match financial disadvantage and need across the country. As we are not able to conclusively suggest that - in general - a student studying part-time would have substantially lower participation costs than one studying full-time, we have determined we will not introduce a full-time/part-time element to the methodology.
 45. We would encourage institutions to continue to use their local flexibilities to support the costs incurred by individual students. This continues to be particularly important where students undertake short courses (as opposed to attending throughout the academic year).

Annex A

The categories of institution used here are based on the following institution types recorded in the Young Person's Matched Administrative Dataset (YPMAD). Note: this is based on the student's 'main' institution type in 2017/18 recorded in YPMAD, defined as where they studied their highest study aim in 2017/18. This does not take into account students who move between different institution types.

The table below shows the categories of institutions recorded in the YPMAD data.

Schools – Mainstream	Maintained School CTC Sponsor Academy Converter Academy Free School
Sixth Form Colleges	Sixth Form Colleges
FE Colleges	FE Colleges
Other	Other KS4 / KS5 sourced Other ILR sourced NISVQ (National Information System for Vocational Qualifications) data

The tables below include academic age 16-18 year olds at selected institution types in 2017/18, who were in state schools at age 15.

Students whose main institution type is recorded as a Special School, Pupil Referral Unit, Independent school, or Work Based Learning/Entry to Employment (i.e. apprenticeships) are excluded from these figures.

Students who study their highest study aim in an excluded institution alongside a lower study aim in an included institution are also excluded from these figures, therefore the total student numbers here are slightly lower than in other published sources.

Percentages are based on unrounded figures, and may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Distances are calculated for each student as straight line distance between their home postcode and learning delivery postcode (or postcode of provider's main address if unavailable). These are then summed and divided by the number of students in each category to calculate the mean straight-line distance for each category. Students with missing postcode data are excluded, and note that straight line distance does not necessarily correspond with actual distance or time taken to travel.

Student numbers /percentages by institution type

2017/18 main institution type	Student Numbers	Column Percentages
Schools - Mainstream	402,400	38.1%
Sixth Form Colleges	122,700	11.6%
FE Colleges	455,300	43.1%
Other	75,900	7.2%
Total	1,056,200	100.0%

Table 1: Total

2017/18 main institution type	Student Numbers		Row Percentages	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Schools - Mainstream	212,500	189,900	52.8%	47.2%
Sixth Form Colleges	67,900	54,800	55.3%	44.7%
FE Colleges	211,900	243,400	46.5%	53.5%
Other	35,800	40,100	47.2%	52.8%
Total	528,100	528,200	50.0%	50.0%

Table 2: Gender

2017/18 main institution type	Student Numbers				Row Percentages			
	No identified SEN	SEN support	SEN Statement / EHC	<i>All SEN</i>	No identified SEN	SEN support	SEN Statement / EHC	<i>All SEN</i>
Schools - Mainstream	376,400	22,000	4,000	26,000	93.5%	5.5%	1.0%	6.5%
Sixth Form Colleges	113,500	7,700	1,500	9,200	92.5%	6.3%	1.2%	7.5%
FE Colleges	355,100	73,700	26,600	100,200	78.0%	16.2%	5.8%	22.0%
Other	58,600	12,200	5,100	17,200	77.3%	16.0%	6.7%	22.7%
Total	903,600	115,500	37,100	152,700	85.5%	10.9%	3.5%	14.5%

Table 3: SEN status

2017/18 main institution type	Student Numbers							Row Percentages						
	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Not Obtained	Mixed	White	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Not Obtained	Mixed	White
Schools - Mainstream	8,400	53,500	26,000	2,800	4,400	19,300	288,000	2.1%	13.3%	6.5%	0.7%	1.1%	4.8%	71.6%
Sixth Form Colleges	2,300	17,900	10,000	600	1,200	5,700	85,100	1.8%	14.6%	8.2%	0.5%	0.9%	4.6%	69.4%
FE Colleges	6,500	35,100	22,200	900	4,500	19,000	367,200	1.4%	7.7%	4.9%	0.2%	1.0%	4.2%	80.6%
Other	1,000	7,800	4,100	200	800	3,500	58,600	1.3%	10.2%	5.4%	0.2%	1.0%	4.6%	77.2%
Total	18,100	114,200	62,400	4,400	10,800	47,500	798,900	1.7%	10.8%	5.9%	0.4%	1.0%	4.5%	75.6%

Table 4: Ethnicity

	Student Numbers			Row Percentages		
	16 years	17 years	18 years	16 years	17 years	18 years
School - Mainstream	202,200	181,100	19,100	50.3%	45.0%	4.7%
Sixth Form College	58,800	53,700	10,100	48.0%	43.8%	8.3%
FE College	188,400	169,800	97,200	41.4%	37.3%	21.3%
Other	27,400	26,100	22,400	36.1%	34.4%	29.5%
Total	476,800	430,600	148,800	45.1%	40.8%	14.1%

Table 5: Age at start of academic year

Student straight-line distance from provision (kilometres)

		Mean student distance to provision (kilometres)								
		All	Gender		Deprivation		SEN status			
2017/18 main institution type	Number of students	All Students	Female	Male	In 27% most deprived areas by IMD	In remaining 73% of areas	No identified SEN	SEN support	SEN Statement / EHC	All SEN
Schools - Mainstream	393,500	4.7	4.6	4.7	3.9	4.9	4.6	4.7	5.4	4.8
Sixth Form Colleges	121,400	7.9	8.0	7.6	5.6	8.9	8.0	6.7	6.8	6.7
FE Colleges	445,400	10.2	10.3	10.1	7.5	11.8	10.5	9.3	9.6	9.4
Other	63,600	11.0	10.9	11.0	8.1	13.1	10.8	10.2	14.6	11.5
All institutions	1,023,900	7.9	7.7	8.0	6.3	8.6	7.7	8.3	9.6	8.7
All institutions excluding Other	960,400	7.6	7.5	7.7	6.1	8.3	7.5	8.1	9.0	8.3

Table 6: Gender, In 27% most deprived areas by IMD and SEN status

2017/18 main institution type	Mean student distance to provision (kilometres)							Age (at start of academic year)		
	Ethnicity							16	17	18
	White	Mixed	Asian	Black	Chinese	Any Other Ethnic Group	Information Not Obtained			
Schools - Mainstream	4.8	4.6	3.6	4.9	4.9	3.8	5.4	4.6	4.7	4.9
Sixth Form Colleges	8.8	7.5	4.7	6.3	9.9	5.6	7.5	7.9	7.9	7.5
FE Colleges	10.8	9.5	6.1	9.4	9.5	7.5	10.3	9.8	9.9	11.8
Other	11.7	11.3	5.7	10.7	8.2	9.9	11.8	9.7	9.7	15.2
All institutions	8.4	7.4	4.7	7.1	6.6	5.7	8.1	7.3	7.4	11.1
All institutions excluding Other	8.2	7.1	4.6	6.9	6.5	5.5	7.8	7.2	7.3	10.6

Table 7: Ethnicity /Age

Areas of deprivation tables

	Numbers	Column Percentages
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	323,500	30.6%
Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	709,400	67.2%
Unknown	23,300	2.2%
Total	1,056,200	100.0%

Table 8: total

	Student Numbers			Row Percentages		
	Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas	Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	Unknown	Percentage of students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas	Percentage of students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	Unknown
School - Mainstream	91,900	301,600	8,900	22.8%	75.0%	2.2%
Sixth Form Colleges	37,900	83,600	1,200	30.9%	68.2%	1.0%
FE Colleges	166,000	286,100	3,200	36.5%	62.8%	0.7%
Other	27,800	38,000	10,100	36.6%	50.1%	13.3%
Total	323,500	709,400	23,300	30.6%	67.2%	2.2%

Table 9: IMD deprivation – institution type

	Numbers	
	Female	Male
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	162,100	161,400
Students with home postcodes in the Remaining 73% of areas	355,100	354,300
Unknown	10,900	12,500
Total	528,100	528,200

	Column Percentages	
	Female	Male
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	30.7%	30.6%
Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	67.2%	67.1%
Unknown	2.1%	2.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Table 10: Gender

	Numbers							Row Percentages						
	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	White	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	White
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	9,200	58,600	37,200	1,300	3,400	17,100	196,800	2.8%	18.1%	11.5%	0.4%	1.0%	5.3%	60.8%
Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	8,600	52,900	23,800	3,000	7,200	29,300	584,700	1.2%	7.5%	3.4%	0.4%	1.0%	4.1%	82.4%
Unknown	400	2,700	1,400	100	300	1,100	17,400	1.7%	11.4%	5.9%	0.5%	1.2%	4.7%	74.6%
Total	18,100	114,200	62,400	4,400	10,800	47,500	798,900	1.7%	10.8%	5.9%	0.4%	1.0%	4.5%	75.6%

	Column Percentages						
	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	White
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	50.6%	51.3%	59.7%	28.9%	31.2%	36.0%	24.6%
Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	47.2%	46.4%	38.1%	68.7%	66.3%	61.7%	73.2%
Unknown	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%	2.5%	2.5%	2.3%	2.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 11 - Ethnicity

	Numbers			Row Percentages		
	16	17	18	16	17	18
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	145,200	126,300	52,000	44.9%	39.0%	16.1%
Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	327,600	299,400	82,300	46.2%	42.2%	11.6%
Unknown	4,000	4,900	14,500	17.0%	20.9%	62.2%
Total	476,800	430,600	148,800	45.1%	40.8%	14.1%

	Column Percentages		
	16	17	18
Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	30.5%	29.3%	34.9%
Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	68.7%	69.5%	55.3%
Unknown	0.8%	1.1%	9.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 12: Age at start of academic year

Full-time / part-time tables

Status	Numbers	Column Percentages
Full-time	963,900	91.3%
Part-time	92,400	8.7%
Total	1,056,200	100.0%

Table 13: total

2017/18 main institution type	Learner Numbers		Row Percentages	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Schools - Mainstream	391,500	10,900	97.3%	2.7%
Sixth Form Colleges	118,300	4,400	96.4%	3.6%
FE Colleges	398,700	56,700	87.6%	12.4%
Other	55,400	20,400	73.1%	26.9%
Total	963,900	92,400	91.3%	8.7%

Table 14: Institution type

Status	Numbers		Row Percentages	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Full-time	487,100	476,800	50.5%	49.5%
Part-time	41,000	51,400	44.4%	55.6%
Total	528,100	528,200	50.0%	50.0%

Status	Column Percentages	
	Female	Male
Full-time	92.2%	90.3%
Part-time	7.8%	9.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Table 15: Gender

Status	Numbers				Row Percentages		
	No identified SEN	SEN support	SEN Statement / EHC	Any SEN	No identified SEN	SEN support	SEN Statement / EHC
Full-time	834,200	99,400	30,200	129,700	86.5%	10.3%	3.1%
Part-time	69,400	16,100	6,900	23,000	75.1%	17.4%	7.5%
Total	903,600	115,500	37,100	152,700	85.5%	10.9%	3.5%

Full-time or part-time status	Column Percentages			
	No identified SEN	SEN support	SEN Statement / EHC	Any SEN
Full-time	92.3%	86.1%	81.5%	84.9%
Part-time	7.7%	13.9%	18.5%	15.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 16: SEN status

Status	Numbers							Row Percentages						
	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	White	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	White
Full-time	16,500	105,300	57,000	4,100	9,800	43,200	728,100	1.7%	10.9%	5.9%	0.4%	1.0%	4.5%	75.5%
Part-time	1,600	8,900	5,400	300	1,100	4,200	70,800	1.8%	9.7%	5.9%	0.3%	1.2%	4.6%	76.7%
Total	18,100	114,200	62,400	4,400	10,800	47,500	798,900	1.7%	10.8%	5.9%	0.4%	1.0%	4.5%	75.6%

Status	Column Percentages						
	Any Other Ethnic Group	Asian	Black	Chinese	Information Not Obtained	Mixed	White
Full-time	91.0%	92.2%	91.3%	93.7%	90.2%	91.1%	91.1%
Part-time	9.0%	7.8%	8.7%	6.3%	9.8%	8.9%	8.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 17: Ethnicity

Status	Numbers			Row Percentages		
	16	17	18	16	17	18
Full-time	451,900	405,500	106,500	46.9%	42.1%	11.0%
Part-time	24,900	25,100	42,300	27.0%	27.2%	45.8%
Total	476,800	430,600	148,800	45.1%	40.8%	14.1%

Status	Column Percentages		
	16	17	18
Full-time	94.8%	94.2%	71.6%
Part-time	5.2%	5.8%	28.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 18: Age at start of academic year

Status	Numbers			Row Percentages		
	Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	Unknown	Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	Unknown
Full-time	288,800	661,500	13,600	30.0%	68.6%	1.4%
Part-time	34,800	47,900	9,700	37.6%	51.9%	10.5%
Total	323,500	709,400	23,300	30.6%	67.2%	2.2%

Status	Column Percentages		
	Students with home postcodes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD	Students with home postcodes in the remaining 73% of areas	Unknown
Full-time	89.3%	93.2%	58.4%
Part-time	10.7%	6.8%	41.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 19: Students with home post-codes in the 27% most deprived areas by IMD, and those in the remaining 73%

2017/18 main institution type	Mean student distance to provision (kilometres)	
	Full-time or part-time status	
	Full-time	Part-time
Schools - Mainstream	4.6	4.9
Sixth Form Colleges	7.9	8.0
FE Colleges	9.8	13.1
Other	10.9	11.1
All institutions	7.5	11.8
All institutions excluding Other	7.3	12.0

Table 20 – student distance to provider (in kilometres)



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2019

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3
email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk
write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus
download www.gov.uk/government/consultations

Reference: DfE-00160-2019



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk