

Official Sensitive



Department
for Education

FE Funding and Accountability Reform Equality Impact Assessment

July 2023

Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	5
Section 1: Tailored, Non-Qualification Provision	7
1.1 Summary of reforms	7
1.2 Analysis by characteristic	7
1.3 Analysis of impacts	8
1.4 Decision making	9
1.5 Monitoring and evaluation	9
Section 2: Funding Rates	11
2.1 Summary of reforms	11
2.2 Analysis of impacts	12
2.3 Decision making	13
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	13
Section 3: AEB Procurement	14
3.1 Monitoring and evaluation	14
3.2 Analysis of impacts	15
3.3 Decision making	16
3.4 Monitoring and evaluation	17
Annex A - Tailored, Non-Qualification Provision	18
2021/22 R14 data	18
Annex B - Funding Rates	23
2021/22 R14 data	23
Annex C - AEB Procurement	27
2021/22 R14 data	27

Executive summary

This Equality Impact Assessment sets out an analysis of the potential impact of the Further Education Funding and Accountability reforms being taken forward following the recent consultation.¹ These are a wide-ranging set of reforms which seek to improve how funding is used to reskill and upskill adults and to strengthen the accountability systems for FE providers. Many of these reforms will affect all providers, bringing benefits for learners through the stronger link between the training available to them and the employment opportunities in their local area; they will also bring benefits for providers through an improved funding model. For example, the introduction of Accountability Agreements for grant-funded FE providers to outline their plans to contribute to local and national skills needs.

Three areas of the reforms either change the focus of provision, or the funding levels available. We have undertaken a close evaluation of these reforms to assess their potential impact, which is summarised in this document. These areas are:

1. Purpose of tailored, non-qualification provision;
2. Changes to the adult skills funding rates;
3. Changes to Adult Education Budget (AEB) procurement.

Responsibility for adult skills is devolved in around 60% of the country and these areas are responsible for commissioning and funding provision. Therefore, the above policies only apply directly to non-devolved provision, and our analysis only applies to learners in non-devolved areas.

Our findings are as follows:

- In our reforms of tailored learning (referred to as non-qualification provision in the previous consultation), we have not identified any impacts under limbs 1, 2, or 3 of Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.² The change to remove provision purely for 'leisure' purposes is likely to have limited impact on learners. This is because we will continue to fund provision for wider outcomes which will impact positively on learners, and thus a large proportion of the current provision is likely to continue. We fully expect most learners to be able to access a suitable offer and providers can still deliver courses for 'leisure' with learners paying full cost fees.
- The new funding rates will support the quality of provision and help to deliver the skills our current and future economy needs, delivering a positive impact on

¹ [FE Funding and Accountability consultation](#)

² The limbs are defined as follows: limb 1 – The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation (to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics); limb 2 – The need to promote equality of opportunity (to take steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people); limb 3 – The need to foster good relations between groups (to encourage people from protected groups to participate in public life or other activities where their participation is disproportionately low).

learners by giving them the skills they need to get high value jobs. With our reforms to funding rates, we are only increasing or retaining the weighting for Subject Sector Areas (SSAs) and slightly increasing the current average base rate of funding. We estimate that 78% of courses in adult provision will attract more funding and 2% will remain the same. While funding rates for a minority of individual courses (20%) will reduce, providers are free to use their funding flexibly and maintain delivery of such courses or there are other courses that learners can take which overall will attract more funding in the future. We therefore anticipate an overall positive impact under limb 2 for all groups in future, and no impacts under limbs 1 and 3. We have examined historical variations in take up of individual courses between different groups and while these show that for all groups, the majority of learners were on courses seeing an increase in funding, some groups are slightly more represented than others in the courses seeing reductions. However, we do not expect these groups to be adversely affected in reality: the mix of learners on different courses changes year to year and providers are able to use their funding flexibly in determining the amount of resource spent on individual courses and will benefit from the increased overall funding rates.

- In our reforms to AEB procurement, we have not identified any impacts under limbs 1 or 3. We expect the impact under limb 2 to be neutral, as learners will be able to access alternative provision. Using historical analysis of take-up of provision, younger people, and Asian/Asian British (12%) and the other minority ethnic groups (4%) are more likely than others to be represented on courses being removed. Looking forward, we expect impacts to be minimal in reality, as there are likely to be other avenues for all these learners to access further education through FE colleges and grant-funded providers. The procurement will include the new funding rates from year 2, incentivising high-value provision and resulting in better economic outcomes for learners.

Introduction

The government consultation on FE Funding and Accountability reform received a large number of thoughtful and detailed responses. We have adjusted some of our proposed reforms to consider the feedback we received to the consultation. The government has set out its response in *Skills for jobs: implementing a new further education funding and accountability system - government consultation response*.

The consultation and government response covered areas of reform such as:

- The national funding framework: Proposals are currently being developed and we will assess the impact of these once finalised.
- Funding for learner and learning support: We are not proposing to make any changes to how funding for learner and learning support is allocated.
- Funding for innovation: In January 2023, we announced that we will introduce a new flexibility for funding innovative provision into ESFA-funded AEB for the academic year 2023 to 2024. It will be for providers to decide whether to make use of this flexibility and for those that do, the overall effect of this policy is likely to be positive for all learners.
- Multi-year funding: We will introduce a multi-year funding approach in this SR period. This proposal does not have any impacts on equalities as it relates to the early setting of budgets within an existing process. Multi-year funding will enable providers to better plan their provision to meet the needs of their learners.

The policies we focus on in this Equality Impact Assessment are as follows:

- Purpose of tailored, non-qualification provision
- Changes to the adult skills funding rates
- Changes to Adult Education Budget (AEB) procurement

We have focused on these areas because we have identified these reforms as likely to have a differential impact on learners. This is because the reforms will either change the funding levels available or shift the focus of provision.

Other reforms set out in the consultation are wide-ranging. They seek to improve how funding is used to reskill and upskill adults; they also seek to strengthen the accountability systems for FE providers. These reforms will benefit learners through the stronger link between the training available to them and the employment opportunities in their local area. The reforms will also provide benefits for providers through an improved funding model. However, these areas of our reforms do not yet have concrete data or a model, and we cannot as such make any certain judgements on their precise impact. We anticipate that any impact will be similar to those set out in Section 2 on the funding rates changes.

In designing our products related to the proposed funding and accountability reforms, we are engaging closely with sector representatives to ensure that diverse views and experiences are taken into account. We are also undertaking extensive user testing with

Official Sensitive

learners, providers, and other stakeholders to ensure that our products are fit for purpose and that no individual needs are overlooked. We will take steps to mitigate any inequalities which become apparent from anecdotal evidence or testing. We will also continue to monitor at regular intervals any possible impact as the proposed reforms are implemented.

On the accountability side, schemes such as Ofsted's enhanced inspections are also providing new evidence on how colleges are working with learners and employers to respond to labour market needs.

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Secretary of State, when exercising the functions of the Secretary of State, to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristics and those who do not

The Equality Act 2010 identifies the following as protected characteristics for the public sector equality duty:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race (including ethnicity)
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Learners with self-declared Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LLDD) will be used as a proxy for the protected characteristic of disability for students. We do not collect data on gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity status; religion or belief; or sexual orientation, and so these characteristics are not included as part of our analysis.

Section 1: Tailored, Non-Qualification Provision

1.1 Summary of reforms

In *Skills for jobs: implementing a new further education funding and accountability system - government consultation response*, we are clarifying the purpose of the Skills Fund non-qualification provision in ESFA-funded areas. By this we mean skills training that does not lead to a formal qualification which will be called 'tailored learning' in future.

We consulted on the proposed objectives for 'non-qualification' provision and we received feedback that the wider benefits of current Community Learning provision, such as health and wellbeing benefits, would be lost under the proposed objectives. As a result, we have revised the objectives that 'tailored learning' can support to ensure that provision can continue to support wider outcomes. 'Tailored learning' should be used in a range of ways to primarily support learners into employment and to progress to further learning, in line with the overall purpose of the Skills Fund, as well as to support the most vulnerable who rely on further education to support their personal development and access to independent living. But it can also support, as the current system does, wider outcomes for local communities such as improving health and wellbeing; equipping parents/carers to support their child's learning; and developing stronger communities. The Skills Fund will not include provision which is purely for 'leisure' purposes.

This change will ensure that provision is the right choice for learners and improves outcomes for individuals, as well as being value for money and meeting wider skills and employment needs.

1.2 Analysis by characteristic

The data on characteristics below is from the most recent academic year 2021/22, based on the learner data available from the Individualised Learner Record (ILR). A detailed breakdown of data for each characteristic is presented at Annex A.

Age

6% of learners studying Community Learning were aged 19-24 and 27% were aged 60 and over. 14% of learners taking Formula Funded non-regulated provision were aged 19-24 and 10% were aged 60 and over. The purpose of 'tailored learning' includes wider outcomes, so whilst we will continue to prioritise progression to further learning and employment outcomes, the impact on learners of different ages is neutral.

Disability

22% of learners who undertook Community Learning provision were LLDD. 22% of learners in Formula Funded non-regulated provision were LLDD. The impact on learners with a learning difficulty and/or disability (LLDD) is neutral as we will continue to fund suitable provision. Provision for learners to live independently will also continue.

Race

Most learners undertaking Community Learning provision were white (84%) with 16% of learners from black, Asian, or other minority ethnic groups. 21% of learners undertaking family learning provision were from black, Asian, or other minority ethnic groups. 62% of learners on Formula Funded non-regulated provision were white with 38% declaring themselves from black, Asian, or other minority ethnic groups. Of those learners who undertook Formula Funded non-regulated provision, 30% were undertaking ESOL learning aims, of these 70% were from black, Asian, or other minority ethnic groups. The impact on learners is neutral as we will continue to fund suitable provision, including ESOL learning aims.

Sex

The highest proportion of learners were female (75% undertook Community Learning provision and 63% undertook Formula Funded non-regulated provision). The impact on learners is neutral as we will continue to fund suitable provision.

To note for all characteristics: we cannot distinguish which, if any, learning aims use public funding to support purely 'leisure' purposes, so it is difficult to determine the impact on particular groups of learners. However, we are not reducing the amount of funding allocated to providers, and so we believe there would be minimal impact on learners because we fully expect that most learners will be able to access suitable provision. Provision is at the discretion of the provider. Providers can offer courses on a full cost fee-paying basis for learners who are participating in learning for 'leisure only' purposes.

Learners who require provision for essential skills for life and work; preparation for employment; vocational; and introductory technical courses will still be able to access provision. Provision for learners who are likely to be further from the labour market will continue. Provision to support mental health and well-being, and provision to support stronger communities will also continue, where it helps people to progress in life and work.

1.3 Analysis of impacts

We have set out an analysis of the characteristics of learners currently taking up Community Learning and Formula Funded non-regulated provision. We do not currently collect detailed information on what the Community Learning courses consist of, the purpose of this provision or the outcomes it obtains. We have more detailed information for Formula Funded non-regulated provision as it is funded using a national set of funding rates (but does not lead to a qualification). Learning aims include planned activity in hours and levels, e.g., Entry Level, Level 1, Level 2, etc. Overall, we are not able to assess how providers might adjust their provision to reflect the new Skills Fund objectives, but as these will continue to support a wide range of provision, we estimate that these will be broadly neutral.

1.4 Decision making

In relation to the protected characteristics of age, disability, race, and sex, we have not identified any impacts under limb 1 – *the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation (to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics)*; limb 2 – *the need to promote equality of opportunity (to take steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people)*; or limb 3 – *the need to foster good relations between groups (to encourage people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low)*.

We are continuing to prioritise those furthest from the labour market and those who need the most support to progress to more formal learning or employment, particularly the most disadvantaged and least likely to participate, which may include learners in rural areas and people on low incomes with low skills. The Skills Fund will continue to support the most vulnerable, including those with special educational needs and disabilities.

The Skills Fund will include provision for wider outcomes. This will impact positively on learners, because a large proportion of the current provision is likely to continue in some form. For example, we will be funding family learning and provision which supports stronger communities. We are working with the sector to improve our data on the nature, purpose, and outcomes of this provision.

Funding arrangements: As referenced in the government response, we have considered the impact of our intention to fund tailored learning in the Skills Fund as a single provider level amount.³ We do not anticipate that this change will directly impact learners, as providers will still have access to the same level of funding.

The new funding arrangements will result in the removal of non-regulated formula funding from providers whose AEB provision is procured through contracts (as they are paid on delivery). Currently, 1,000 learners access provision through this route. We anticipate that the impact on learners will be minimal as tailored provision will continue to be available through grant-funded providers. The equality impacts of wider changes to AEB procurement are discussed in further detail in Section 3.

1.5 Monitoring and evaluation

To ensure that the impact on learners remains minimal, we will assess data received through the ILR (quarterly and end year), along with any other relevant data. We are also improving data collection via the ILR, including developing a new set of learning aims which better describe provision. This will give us a more detailed dataset which will allow

³ This would be based on what the provider historically received for this provision: that is, the sum of their Community Learning and any non-regulated formula funding they claimed.

Official Sensitive

us to better monitor any impact on learners.

Section 2: Funding Rates

2.1 Summary of reforms

We currently assign funding rates for adult provision depending on the length and cost of the course, using a matrix banding approach. However, this creates three problems in that: it does not incentivise growth in training which delivers the skills most needed for economic growth; the funding rates are arbitrary; and funding is used ineffectively because the underlying funding rate (funding per hour) between different courses vary hugely simply due to where they sit in the funding bands. This has the risk of distorting providers' decisions in the courses they put on, as the funding rate for some courses is just too low for the hours required.

Our reforms address these issues firstly by boosting funding for provision which delivers the skills most in need currently and in the future. The funding rates in the new Skills Fund will reflect both the relative cost of delivery and relative economic value of different courses. In doing so, we are only increasing or slightly increasing the average base rate in the current system (that is, the average funding before programme weighting is applied) for sector subject areas (SSAs). Therefore, overall, most providers and learners will benefit as funding will increase for 78% of the courses.

Secondly, we address these issues by creating a simpler set of funding rates, with sliding scale to fund courses on their guided learning hours (GLH) to remove the arbitrary variation in funding rates caused by the cliff edges in the current matrix bands. While we have ensured that no SSA will be moved to a funding band that gives a lower weighting than the existing programme weightings, the impact of this change will lead to changes in the funding rates for individual courses as we move away from the matrix banding to fund courses on their GLH.

In addition, from academic year 2024 to 2025 we are also removing a historical transitional protection where a number of courses (10%) continue to be funded on the basis of their credit, and as a result are currently funded at a higher or lower rate in the matrix than they should be for their GLH. We are making these changes to ensure that these courses are accurately funded for their GLH, which means that some courses will gain or lose funding from this aspect of the changes.

The result of these changes will see 78% of courses seeing an increase in funding; 2% no change; and only 20% of courses will see reductions in funding: these are courses which have an unjustifiably higher funding rate than other similar courses.

Overall, we therefore expect the impact of our reforms to be positive for learners. We have tested whether particular groups of learners are likely to be more affected than others by the courses seeing reductions in funding by looking at the impact on historical learners.

DfE only funds providers direct for non-devolved provision (40%), as MCAs (60%) have the freedom to set their own funding rates. Therefore, our analysis only applies to adult provision in non-devolved areas. Information collected via the ILR shows 412,000 enrolments (our baseline) on ESFA AEB courses in the academic year 2021 to 2022.⁴ Of these:

- 63% declared themselves as female and 37% declared themselves as male
- 17% were aged between 19 and 24, 66% were aged between 25 and 49 and 17% were aged 50 and over
- 76% declared themselves as white, 23% declared themselves as black, Asian, or other minority ethnic group
- 21% self-declared a learning disability and/or disability

A detailed breakdown of data for each characteristic is presented at Annex B. These baseline figures are important for looking at the impact of the changes.

2.2 Analysis of impacts

68% of learners in academic year 2021 to 2022 undertook courses where our reforms led to an increase in funding rate. 12% undertook courses that saw their funding rate staying the same, and 20% saw a reduction in funding rate. Overall, therefore, 80% of learners were on courses that either saw an increase in funding or stayed the same; while only 20% were on courses which saw a reduction in funding rate.

A breakdown of impacts by characteristic is included below based on academic year 2021 to 2022 delivery (also see data included at Annex B). We have completed our analysis by looking at the makeup of learners on all courses, which we compare with the makeup of learners on courses seeing a reduction in funding rate.

Analysis by characteristic

Age

Based on historical delivery in 2021 to 2022, older adults were slightly more represented on the courses seeing reductions in funding (with younger adults slightly more represented on the courses seeing increases in funding). Adults aged 50 and over made up 17% of all learners, but 21% of learners who are on courses that will see a reduction in funding rate.

⁴ Based on final full year 2021/22 data.

Disability

Based on historical delivery in 2021 to 2022, learners with a learning difficulty and/or disability were slightly more represented on the courses seeing a reduction in funding: overall, 21% of learners have self-declared a learning difficulty or disability, but this is 23% of learners for those who are on courses that will see a reduction in funding rate.

Race

Based on historical delivery in 2021 to 2022, learners from the white population were slightly more represented on the courses seeing a reduction in funding: (79% compared to 76% baseline). Conversely, black, Asian, or other minority ethnic groups were more represented on the courses seeing an increase in funding (24% compared to 23% baseline).

Sex

Based on historical delivery in 2021 to 2022, female learners were more represented on courses seeing an increase in funding: females represent 63% of all learners, but only 46% of learners were on courses that see reductions in funding. Conversely, male learners were more represented on the courses seeing a reduction in funding. Males are more represented in the course seeing a reduction: 37% of all learners are male, but 54% of learners on courses seeing reductions are male.

2.3 Decision making

In relation to the protected characteristics of age, disability, race, and sex, we have not identified any impacts under limb 1 (*the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation*) or limb 3 (*the need to foster good relations between groups*). Under limb 2 (*the need to promote equality of opportunity*), we expect a positive benefit for all groups overall, because 78% of courses are seeing an increase in funding. While some groups were slightly overrepresented in the courses losing historically, providers can use their funding flexibly in deciding how to resource courses and the take up of particular courses varies year to year and future learners have a variety of courses to choose from, the majority of which have higher funding rates than now.

We received support for the funding rate reforms from our consultation.

2.4 Monitoring and evaluation

We will monitor the ways in which our funding is used by FE providers. We will assess data received through the ILR (annually) to understand the distribution of learners across different courses to inform policy making.

Section 3: AEB Procurement⁵

3.1 Monitoring and evaluation

The FE Funding and Accountability consultation states that we will explore how we can improve the ways in which we procure provision, ensuring that it has a clear and distinct purpose.

40% of the AEB is non-devolved and we currently procure a portion (11%) of this AEB (approximately £75 million per year including £12 million of Free Courses for Jobs funding). Further devolution of the AEB is underway, with the AEB expected to be fully devolved by 2030. Therefore, we anticipate that further devolution will result in any centrally contracted provision falling away if this is achieved.

We are procuring in a way which aligns with reforms occurring within the system (i.e., through adopting the new funding rates in the second year of the contract), and the procurement specification tightens up on what we buy – focusing on qualifications only⁶ – and on how we manage contracts, through a new KPI framework to ensure that providers are delivering adequate provision. This will not only better support learners into well-paid jobs, but it will pave the way for a stable and high-performing ITP market as we move into the next phase of devolution.

To improve value for money, we have asked bidders to tilt their provision towards qualifications (and away from tailored, non-qualification provision), which will increase the evidence of value for money of the procurement. This is also consistent with our funding reforms as non-regulated Formula Funded provision will be merged with non-Formula Funded Community Learning, thereby removing the funding stream which we would have used in contracts for services.⁷

New funding rates will be introduced in year 2 of the contracts, which should incentivise providers to put on high-value courses which lead to better outcomes for individuals. This should also lead to better value-for-money for government, as the same quantum of AEB funding will now deliver greater employment and wage returns for each learner.

The quantum of funding for the procurement is remaining the same, even though we are not funding the non-regulated provision.

⁵ Note that this does not appear in the consultation response as there are no specific questions about the AEB procurement.

⁶ There are some exceptions to this, for example, supporting work experience for traineeship-type provision.

⁷ Providers who receive contracts for services are paid on delivery, while our new funding model for non-qualification provision will see providers paid a notional provider level amount. The latter is not consistent with our current contracting model.

3.2 Analysis of impacts

The analysis below explores the impact of removing non-regulated Formula Funded provision from the procurement and takes into account the protected characteristics of those who access learning via the AEB-procured provision and then the subset who access the non-regulated provisions which we are proposing to remove. This data used for our evidence is from the academic year 2021/22. A detailed breakdown of data for each characteristic is presented at Annex C.

Analysis by characteristic

Age

Based on historical data between academic year 2021 and 2022, the majority of people studying provision funded through the current AEB procurement are between the ages of 25 to 34 (30%); 35 to 44 (27%); and 45 to 59 (24%). The removal of non-regulated provision will have a higher proportion of younger ages compared to the overall procured cohort, with those aged between 19 and 24 accounting for 23% of learners compared to 14% in the AEB procured cohort generally.

Our main mitigation is that there are other avenues for this group to access further education through FE colleges and grant-funded providers, with those aged between 19 and 24 being a key target cohort within the AEB.

Some may be accessing non-regulated provision through Sector-based Work Academy Programmes (SWAPs) targeted at unemployed persons. Our other mitigation is to continue to offer SWAPs to reach these learners but only for qualification-based provision.⁸

Disability

Based on historical data between academic year 2021 and 2022, the impact on learners with learning difficulties and disabilities (LLDD) should be neutral, as the proportion of learners with LLDD is roughly the same where they are doing non-regulated provision compared to the overall procured cohort. 21% of the entire AEB procured cohort is LLDD compared to 20% of the subset non-regulated provision.

Race

Based on historical data between academic year 2021 and 2022, most of those studying provision through the current procurement are white (83%) followed by Asian/Asian British (7%) and black/African/Caribbean/black British (4%). The other minority ethnic groups make up 2% of the procurement. There is higher representation of Asian/Asian

⁸ This does not factor in the recent Budget announcement of additional funding for SWAPs as the procurement was launched beforehand.

British (12%) and the other minority ethnic groups (4%) on the courses that are being removed. The ability to access provision through grant-funded providers and the continued support for SWAPs will help to mitigate this.

Sex

Based on historical data between academic year 2021 and 2022, the overall cohort is predominately females at 63% with 37% males. The non-regulated provision is equally split by males at 50% and females 50% meaning that males are more represented compared to females. The mitigations will be the same as set for 'age' and 'race'.

3.3 Decision making

In relation to the protected characteristics of age, disability, race, and sex, we have not identified any impacts under limb 1 (*the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation*) or limb 2 (*the need to promote equality of opportunity*). We have removed non-regulated provision from the AEB procurement. However, we expect the impacts under limb 3 (*the need to foster good relations between groups*) to be neutral. This is because the procurement is not the only means to access non-qualification provision. There will continue to be opportunities for learners to do so through grant-funded providers who will continue to offer this provision. 88-90% of AEB is delivered through grant-funded providers.

The quantum of funding being spent on procurement is the same. Therefore, the policy change to give more qualification-based provision should result in there being alternate pathways for learners as they could get an equivalent qualification. The bulk of non-regulated provision is provided through grant-funded provision and there will continue to be opportunities for learners to access this via those providers. For example, a prospective learner who wants to do a non-regulated ESOL course may be able to access this via a grant-funded provider or alternatively find a qualification-based equivalent to meet their learning needs.

We also know that some of these learners are accessing non-regulated provision through DWP on the basis that they are receiving unemployment benefits. This is through Sector-based Work Academy Programmes (SWAPs) which provide learners with a mix of qualification and non-qualification-based provision to support them into employment. In 2021, there were 4,000 ESFA-funded learners where SWAPs were delivered by ITPs. SWAPs are made up predominately of qualification-based provision.

We have mitigated against this by ensuring that the changes only impact the type of learning they would undertake as we continue to fund the qualification-based part of SWAPs. Therefore, these learners will still have access to AEB provision, but the nature of that provision will have changed slightly.

3.4 Monitoring and evaluation

We will be collecting ILR data throughout the procurement which will provide us with further details about the characteristics of learners, and we will monitor these to ensure that the impact on learners is minimal.

Annex A - Tailored, Non-Qualification Provision

2021/22 R14 data

Learner numbers have been rounded to nearest 100.

Age

Community Learning participation

Age	Learners	% Learners
Below 19	500	0.3%
19-24	9,900	6.3%
25-34	29,700	18.8%
35-44	34,200	21.6%
45-59	40,900	25.9%
60+	42,800	27.1%
Total	158,000	100%

Formula Funded non-regulated participation

Age	Learners	% Learners
19-24	7,100	14.4%
25-34	13,000	26.4%
35-44	13,000	26.3%
45-59	11,500	23.4%
60+	4,700	9.6%
Total	49,300	100%

Disability

Community Learning participation

Disability	Learners	% Learners
Learning Difficulty/Disability	32,800	22.1%
No Learning Difficulty/Disability	115,900	77.9%
Not Known	9,300	-
Total	158,000	100.0%

Formula Funded non-regulated participation

Disability	Learners	% Learners
Learning Difficulty/Disability	10,600	22.1%
No Learning Difficulty/Disability	37,400	77.9%
Not Known	1,200	-
Total	49,300	100%

Race (which includes nationality)

Community Learning participation

Race		Learners	% Learners
		158,000	100%
Asian/Asian British		11,800	7.8%
	Any other Asian Background	3,000	2%
	Bangladeshi	1,300	0.9%
	Chinese	1,000	0.6%
	Indian	3,200	2.1%
	Pakistani	3,300	2.1%

Black/African/ Caribbean/Black British		4,100	2.7%
	African	2,700	1.8%
	Any other black/African/Caribbean Background	600	0.4%
	Caribbean	800	0.5%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Group		3,000	2%
	Any other mixed/multiple ethnic background	1,200	0.8%
	White and Asian	800	0.5%
	White and black African	400	0.3%
	White and black Caribbean	700	0.4%
White		128,700	84.4%
	Any other white Background	12,300	8.1%
	English/Welsh/Scottish/ Northern Irish/British	115,300	75.6%
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	100	0.1%
	Irish	1,000	0.7%
Other Ethnic Group		4,800	3.2%
	Any other ethnic group	3,200	2.1%
	Arab	1,600	1%
Not Known		5,300	-
	Not Provided	5,300	-
	Total	158,000	100%

Community Learning participation

Race		Learners	% Learners
		158,000	100%
Asian/Asian British		11,800	7.8%
	Any other Asian Background	3,000	2%
	Bangladeshi	1,300	0.9%
	Chinese	1,000	0.6%
	Indian	3,200	2.1%
	Pakistani	3,300	2.1%
Black/African/ Caribbean/Black British		4,100	2.7%
	African	2,700	1.8%
	Any other black/African/Caribbean Background	600	0.4%
	Caribbean	800	0.5%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Group		3,000	2%
	Any other mixed/multiple ethnic background	1,200	0.8%
	White and Asian	800	0.5%
	White and black African	400	0.3%
	White and black Caribbean	700	0.4%
White		128,700	84.4%
	Any other white Background	12,300	8.1%
	English/Welsh/Scottish/ Northern Irish/British	115,300	75.6%
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	100	0.1%
	Irish	1,000	0.7%

Other Ethnic Group		4,800	3.2%
	Any other ethnic group	3,200	2.1%
	Arab	1,600	1%
Not Known		5,300	-
	Not Provided	5,300	-
	Total	158,000	100%

Sex

Community Learning participation

Sex	Learners	% Learners
Female	117,900	74.6%
Male	40,100	25.4%
Total	158,000	100%

Formula Funded non-regulated participation

Sex	Learners	% Learners
Female	31,300	63.4%
Male	18,000	36.6%
Total	49,300	100%

Annex B - Funding Rates

2021/22 R14 data

Learner numbers have been rounded to nearest 100.

Age

Total Learners

Age	Learners	% Learners
19-24	70,100	17%
25-49	271,800	66%
50+	70,400	17%
Total	412,300	100%

Learners on courses losing funding

Age	Learners	% Learners
19-24	12,800	16%
25-49	51,900	63%
50+	17,600	21%
Total	82,300	100%

Learners on courses increasing in funding or funding staying the same staying the same

Age	Learners	% Learners
19-24	57,300	17%
25-49	219,900	67%
50+	52,700	16%
Total	330,000	100%

Race

Total Learners

Race	Learners	% Learners
Asian/Asian British	38,700	9%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	23,200	6%
Mixed/ Multiple Ethnic Group	13,600	3%
Other Ethnic Group	20,100	5%
White	311,800	76%
Unknown	5,000	1%
Total	412,300	100%

Learners on courses losing funding

Race	Learners	% Learners
Asian/Asian British	6,500	8%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	4,200	5%
Mixed/ Multiple Ethnic Group	2,600	3%
Other Ethnic Group	2,600	3%
White	65,400	79%
Unknown	1,000	1%
Total	82,300	100%

Learners on courses increasing in funding or funding staying the same

Race	Learners	% Learners
Asian / Asian British	32,200	10%
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	19,000	6%
Mixed / Multiple Ethnic Group	11,000	3%
Other Ethnic Group	17,500	5%
White	246,400	75%
Unknown	4,000	1%
Total	330,000	100%

Disability

Total Learners

Disability	Learners	% Learners
No learning difficulty/disability	325,500	79%
Learning difficulty/disability	86,700	21%
Total	412,300	100%

Learners on courses losing funding

Disability	Learners	% Learners
No learning difficulty/disability	63,800	77%
Learning difficulty/disability	18,500	23%
Total	82,300	100%

Learners on courses increasing in funding or funding staying the same

Disability	Learners	% Learners
No learning difficulty/disability	261,700	79%
Learning difficulty/disability	68,200	21%
Total	330,000	100%

Sex

Total Learners

Sex	Learners	% Learners
Female	261,700	63%
Male	150,600	37%
Total	412,300	100%

Learners on courses losing funding

Sex	Learners	% Learners
Female	38,200	46%
Male	44,100	54%
Total	82,300	100%

Learners on courses increasing in funding or funding staying the same

Sex	Learners	% Learners
Female	223,500	68%
Male	106,500	32%
Total	330,000	100%

Annex C - AEB Procurement

2021/22 R14 data

Learner numbers have been rounded to nearest 100.

Age

Age	Learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	% learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	Learners on non-regulated courses only	% learners on non-regulated courses only
19-24	7,100	14%	240	23%
25-34	15,000	30%	280	27%
35-44	13,500	27%	210	20%
45-59	12,100	24%	240	23%
60+	2,000	4%	70	7%
Total	49,700	100.00%	1,040	100.00%

Race

Race	Learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	% learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	Learners on non-regulated courses only	% learners on non-regulated courses only
Asian/Asian British	3,500	7%	130	12%
Black/African/Caribbean/ Black British	2,100	4%	90	9%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Group	1,400	3%	30	3%
Other Ethnic Group	900	2%	40	4%
White	41,500	83%	750	72%
Unknown	400	1%	10	1%
Total	49,700	100.00%	1,040	100.00%

Disability

Disability	Learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	% learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	Learners on non-regulated courses only	% of learners on non-regulated courses only
No learning difficulty/disability	37,400	79%	820	80%
Learning difficulty/disability	9,700	21%	210	20%
Unknown	2,500		10	
Total	49,700	100.00%	1,040	100.00%

Sex

Sex	Learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	% learners on regulated and non-regulated courses	Learners on non-regulated courses only	% learners on non-regulated courses only
Female	31,100	63%	510	50%
Male	18,600	37%	520	50%
Total	49,700	100.00%	1,040	100.00%



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2023

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications



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



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk