

The Ofsted logo is written in a white, stylized, handwritten font on a black rectangular background.

# Current provision and outcomes for 16–18-year-old learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities in colleges

---

**Better  
education  
and care**

The findings of this report derive from a survey of 22 colleges and eight local Learning and Skills Councils, and an analysis of the reports of 13 inspections. The purpose of the survey was to evaluate provision for learners between 16–18 years of age with learning difficulties and/or disabilities in post-16 settings.

**Of particular interest to:**

Parents, students with LDD, further education, sixth form and independent specialist colleges, Learning and Skills Council and the Department for Education and Skills.

---

**Age group**  
16–18

**Published**  
January 2007

**Reference no.**  
HMI 2371

---

© Crown copyright 2007

Document reference number: HMI 2371

Website: [www.ofsted.gov.uk](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk)

This document may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial educational purposes, provided that the information quoted is reproduced without adaptation and the source and date of publication are stated.

# Contents

---

<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Key findings</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Background to the survey</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The quality of provision for learners with LDD</b>	<b>6</b>
The nature of learners	6
Teaching and learning	6
Staffing	8
Multi-agency working	8
<hr/>	
<b>Recognising and recording progress and achievement</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Leadership and management</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>The role of the LSC in supporting learners with LDD</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Further information</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex</b>	<b>16</b>
Colleges visited for this survey	16
Learning and Skills Councils participating in this survey	17
<hr/>	

## Executive summary

The findings of this report derive from a survey of 22 colleges and eight local Learning and Skills Councils (LSC) between September 2005 and March 2006, and an analysis of the reports of 13 inspections carried out by Ofsted between September 2005 and May 2006. The colleges comprised general further education (GFE) colleges, sixth form colleges and independent specialist colleges. The purpose of the survey was to evaluate provision for learners between 16 and 18 years of age with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LDD) in post-16 settings. References to improvements in provision relate to the evidence in the annual report for LDD 2004/05.<sup>1</sup>

The quality of provision was very uneven in the small sample surveyed. A key feature in the most effective colleges visited was the leadership of the principals and senior managers in establishing a college-wide inclusive ethos and commitment to working with learners with LDD. This was the case irrespective of the type of college. Extensive staff development programmes were well attended in these colleges and their effectiveness was measured.

Learners with a range of LDD in GFE and sixth form colleges were as likely to do well as those taught in specialist colleges when they had access to teaching from specialists who were experienced and qualified and had high levels of support.

Good colleges had improved their curriculum management and programmes. They responded well to local needs, emphasising external links and community partnerships. Their data-gathering and analysis had also improved.

Support and guidance for learners were good and often outstanding; learners made good progress in developing their personal and social skills. In-class learning support showed some improvement. The management of learners' behaviour was good in many of the colleges surveyed.

Transition in and out of settings was often unsatisfactory for learners. This was largely due to the lack of transfer of reliable information on learners' achievements and progress.

The number of learners entered for external accreditation had increased substantially: many achieved high pass rates on accredited programmes. However, learners were not always placed on appropriate programmes that best met their individual needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is an internal document. It is used as a source of information when the Ofsted *Annual Report* is being written; the 2004/05 *Annual Report* is available from [www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/annualreport0405/](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/annualreport0405/).

A lack of understanding of, and expertise in, initial, baseline and diagnostic assessment continued to lead to poor target-setting and inadequate monitoring and recording of learners' progress in 18 of the 22 colleges visited.

There was insufficient understanding of how to assess the progress of learners on programmes which were not accredited or how to evaluate their progress against the targets in their individual learning plans. There was too little recognition about what good progress was, leading to setting targets that were not always challenging for learners. Procedures for recognising and recording progress and achievement (RARPA) on non-accredited programmes were at the early stages of development in all the colleges visited.

Work with other agencies, although improved in many areas, was too often dependent on a college's geographical location. The qualifications of staff working with LDD learners had improved, but insufficient staff were qualified to work with learners with autistic spectrum disorders (ASD).

Progression from pre-entry level to entry level programmes continued to improve, but learners' progression to employment, vocational programmes and further training was underdeveloped. In weak provision too little emphasis was given to work experience programmes and developing learners' work-related skills. Self-assessment reports in these colleges, whilst often accurate in identifying issues, were generally insufficiently specific about what action was needed to improve provision.

The quality of planning, nationally and regionally, to meet the needs of learners with LDD was variable. A local LSC often had insufficient data about learners with LDD and there were insufficient numbers of regional staff with relevant knowledge and understanding of the needs of such learners.

## Key findings

- ❑ In the most effective colleges visited, irrespective of the type of college, the leadership of senior managers was the key factor in establishing a positive inclusive ethos and a commitment to work with learners with LDD.
- ❑ The effective colleges provided an extensive range of programmes. Support and guidance for learners were good.
- ❑ Transition in and out of settings was often unsatisfactory for learners due to the lack of transfer of reliable information on learners' achievements and their progress.
- ❑ Eighteen of the 22 colleges lacked understanding about, and expertise in, initial, baseline and diagnostic assessment of learners' needs, how to assess their progress on programmes which were not accredited and how to evaluate their progress against their targets.

- ❑ Progression from pre-entry level to entry level programmes had improved but learners' progression to employment, vocational programmes and further training remained underdeveloped. Colleges placed insufficient emphasis on developing learners' work-related skills.
- ❑ Learners' achievement on accredited programmes was good and many learners achieved high pass rates on these. Accreditation, however, did not always meet learners' identified needs.
- ❑ Colleges' self-assessment reports did not always analyse issues with sufficient rigour to improve provision and outcomes.
- ❑ All colleges in the survey met their duties under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) as amended by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 (SENDA).<sup>2</sup> However, not all of them had good safeguarding or child protection procedures; the monitoring of Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) checks was also unsatisfactory in eight colleges.
- ❑ The quality of information about learners with LDD and the numbers involved held by the LSCs nationally and regionally, in many instances, did not give a clear picture of provision or enough information to plan future provision. Local LSCs had too few staff who had enough knowledge and understanding of the needs of learners with LDD.

## Recommendations

The LSC, nationally and locally, should:

- improve the collection and use of information, nationally and regionally, in order to identify gaps and enhance provision and outcomes for learners
- improve national and regional strategic planning for learners with LDD
- provide training for its staff about learners with LDD
- improve the support for work placements and progression to employment.

Colleges should:

- improve teachers' understanding of assessment, including the processes for recognising and recording learners' achievements
- provide learners with more opportunities for work experience placements and programmes that develop their work-related skills

---

<sup>2</sup> The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 is available from [www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1995/1995050.htm](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1995/1995050.htm). The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 is available from [www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2001/20010010.htm](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2001/20010010.htm).

- develop routes to enable learners with LDD to progress to supported employment and vocational programmes
- agree on what is meant by good progress for learners with LDD in order to provide suitable challenges for them
- improve self-assessment and quality assurance measures, including the use of data from observations of teaching
- provide robust and accurate records of all the checks carried out on staff through recruitment and vetting procedures.

## Background to the survey

1. The survey took place at a time when post-16 provision generally was under scrutiny through the reviews conducted by Sir Andrew Foster and Sir Sandy Leitch. Both reviews published reports on their findings at the end of 2005.
2. The government commissioned the Leitch review to consider the future skill needs of the economy in the United Kingdom and the implications for policy of achieving the necessary level of change. Its report noted:

Skill levels have an important impact on employment and social welfare... Low skills levels are particularly pronounced in certain groups. For example, over 40% of people with a disability have no qualifications at all.<sup>3</sup>
3. The Foster review was commissioned to consider the future role of FE colleges. It published its report in November 2005.<sup>4</sup> A White Paper, *Further education: raising skills, improving life chances*, published in March 2006, responded to the findings.<sup>5</sup>
4. Other work was commissioned by the LSC from Peter Little who was asked to lead a strategic review of planning and funding of all LSC provision for learners with learning difficulties and disabilities. This was the first major, comprehensive review of such provision since the 1996 report, *Inclusive Learning*, produced by the Further Education Funding Council committee, chaired by the late Professor John Tomlinson.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Sir Sandy Leitch, *Skills in the UK: The long-term challenge: interim report* (ISBN 1845321219), HM Treasury, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Sir Andrew Foster, *Realising the potential: a review of the future role of further education colleges*, DfES, 2005; available from [www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryID=20&ContentID=18](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryID=20&ContentID=18).

<sup>5</sup> *Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances*, DfES, 2006; available from [www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/furthereducation/](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/furthereducation/).

<sup>6</sup> John Tomlinson *Inclusive Learning: Report of the Learning Difficulties And/or Disabilities Committee* (ISBN 0113613415), TSO, 1996.

5. The aim of the Little review was to 'better inform and shape LSC provision in order to meet growing demand and secure the best education and training for LDD learners'. *Through excellence to inclusion*, the review's report, made around 80 recommendations, including the overarching recommendation that:

In order to take forward the systematic transformation outlined in the review the LSC should develop a national strategy for the regional/local delivery, through collaboration with partners of provision for learners with learning difficulties and or disabilities across the skills sector that is high quality, learner centred and cost effective.<sup>7</sup>

6. The survey findings reflect many of the recommendations of the Little review.

## **The quality of provision for learners with LDD**

### **The nature of learners**

7. The nature of learners with LDD varies widely. In some of the colleges in the survey, learners had previously not been in education or training (NEET) whilst, in others, learners had moderate or specific learning difficulties. Learners with profound and multiple learning difficulties were less likely than others to be placed in GFE and sixth form colleges. Nevertheless, they were as likely to do well as those taught in specialist colleges when they had access to high levels of support and teaching from specialists who were experienced and qualified in these areas. All the colleges surveyed reported a substantial increase in the number of learners identified with ASD, including Asperger's syndrome.

### **Teaching and learning**

8. Although some outstanding teaching was seen during the survey, much of it was only satisfactory. The outstanding teaching was based on comprehensive planning to meet learners' needs. Teachers were ambitious for their learners who valued and enjoyed the challenges set for them. They achieved most when they were given tasks that were real and practical. Classrooms, information technology suites and training kitchens were of good quality.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Through inclusion to excellence: the report of the steering group for the strategic review of the LSC's planning and funding of provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities across the post-16 learning and skills sector*, Learning and Skills Council, November 2005; available from <http://readingroom.lsc.gov.uk/lsc/2005/research/commissioned/through-inclusion-to-excellence.pdf>.



9. Teachers and learning support assistants worked cooperatively. Colleges who provided for learners with hearing or visual impairments often gave very good specialist support. Partnerships with external agencies provided additional support. Additional learning support for learners with dyslexia was often good.
10. Progression from pre-entry to entry level programmes had improved. However, in the colleges visited, too few programmes were available at levels one and two. The lack of a curriculum framework for learners with LDD often meant that learners followed programmes based on the requirements of awarding bodies rather those which met their own, very specific needs. For example, external awards did not illustrate the sometimes significant increases in learners' social and personal confidence.
11. Progression to employment and vocational programmes for learners remained underdeveloped. In the colleges visited, learners had few opportunities to progress to supported employment. Work experience programmes and developing work-related skills were not emphasised sufficiently. Many providers reported difficulties in developing work placements because of the demands it placed on their resources, as well as employers' reluctance to offer placements to learners with LDD.

**Good practice: a whole college approach to progression**

A large GFE college had 144 learners on a wide variety of programmes. Learners at pre-entry and entry level had vocational options in business administration, retail, sport, recreation, hair, beauty, information and communication technology (ICT), hospitality and catering. The careful choice of qualifications met the learners' needs for practical learning and eased progression. For example, programmes followed the same recording format. Locating learners in mainstream curriculum areas helped progression and improved teachers' understanding of LDD. Useful weekly taught tutorials addressed the Every Child Matters outcomes. The college also monitored and analysed the impact of additional learning support at level one and used the findings to improve provision.

12. Many learners undertook qualifications about learning to work, based on, for example, completing curriculum vitae and practising interviews, although this did not necessarily prepare them effectively to move into work.
13. For learners with LDD, the Skills for Life initiative had led to an inappropriate emphasis on literacy and numeracy that did not reflect their

specific skills and priorities.<sup>8</sup> Evidence from all the colleges in the survey suggested that funds allocated to Skills for Life targets had significantly increased the number of LDD learners undertaking external accreditation for literacy and numeracy. The effect of funding in this way had resulted in LDD learners undertaking accreditation that did not match their identified learning needs or long-term goals, an issue also identified in the Little report.

## Staffing

14. Overall, staff were well qualified. Several colleges had employed staff with specialist expertise in visual or hearing impairment; however, only six of the colleges visited had staff with sufficient specialist qualifications and/or training and experience in autism. Good provision included extensive and well managed professional development programmes for all staff.

## Multi-agency working

15. Multi-agency working made a key contribution to learners' good progress, achievements and enjoyment. Good multi-agency working enabled colleges to provide an extensive range of programmes. Colleges were active in seeking partnerships, working with local providers and organisations. Responsiveness to community needs and partnerships were important characteristics. The good colleges structured their community provision so that curriculum managers could establish very good communication with local groups. In the better colleges, such links informed needs analysis and strategic planning well. Good provision promoted inclusion.

### **Good practice: a responsive college**

A large GFE college, many of whose learners came from dispersed rural settings, provided for 180 learners, of whom 30 were on discrete programmes. Multi-agency working was a key feature. The local specialist careers officer, representatives from local mainstream and special schools and the education welfare service spoke highly of their open relationship with the college.

A link programme and an annual summer school provided a phased entry to the college. Learners spoke enthusiastically about the way they were treated as adults by teachers during the summer programme which encouraged them to enrol on college programmes. The college's innovative work with the Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB) and a local charity for deaf people resulted in the development of a specialist assessment team working in the county.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Skills for Life website is: [www.dfes.gov.uk/readwriteplus/](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/readwriteplus/).

16. Work with specialist agencies helped to provide support for hearing and visually impaired learners. One good college successfully accommodated a blind learner due to the persistence of her tutor, good additional learning support and specialist input from the local sensory impairment team and the RNIB. There were also good links with special and mainstream schools.
17. Better colleges also had good links to specialist services such as mental health and speech and language therapy. In an independent specialist college, for example, the speech and language therapist had an extended role as a pastoral teacher involved in teaching personal, social and health education. This helped learners to develop an alignment of body language with speech in a range of teaching and learning activities other than in a therapeutic setting.
18. However, access to specialist services was dependent on geographical area. For example, in one LSC area, there were long waiting lists for mental health services, and counselling and psychotherapeutic services would take on learners only for a short time. As learners transferred from children's to adult social services, there were often problems in maintaining relationships because of staff changes; families reported that they felt unsupported. Links with the Connexions service were often good, but colleges often made little use of learners' statements of educational need.

#### **Good practice: support and guidance**

One general further education college supported learners from some of the most deprived wards in the country. Its mentoring programme supported learners who were in contact with crime or other anti-social behaviour, including many who had been excluded from school, to move into mainstream programmes. Multi-agency working with schools and learning organisations was good and Connexions staff were on the college site.

Learners had often attended a school link course prior to entry. They were supported through a learners' programme and all of them had a personal tutor who liaised closely with a learning support worker to provide effective support in lessons. Additional support could also be given to help learners achieve targets, for example to travel independently. The tutorial system was effective.

Relationships between staff and learners were good and promoted enjoyment and achievement. Tutors had a very good understanding of how to manage behaviour. Learners were involved effectively in the process of setting their targets. There was regular formal and informal contact with parents. Support for learners moving on from the college was good and other agencies were involved where appropriate.

19. All the colleges in the survey demonstrated good links with parents and carers and all regularly sought learners' views of the provision. Effective use of student forums, advocates and supported communication systems enabled learners' views to be known. Personal tutors were used effectively and good relationships existed between teachers and learners. There were also examples of good behaviour management programmes.

## Recognising and recording progress and achievement

20. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the LSC have encouraged RARPA in the FE sector but in the colleges in this survey there was little evidence of its impact.<sup>9</sup> Eighteen of the 22 colleges visited had substantial weaknesses in their assessment procedures.
21. Teachers and managers did not understand clearly how to assess non-accredited programmes. The lack of understanding about what constituted good progress was a weakness in many colleges. Procedures for RARPA were often newly developed. Several good colleges had identified the different steps needed for effective RARPA processes, but had not pulled all the parts together. For example, tutors in individual curriculum areas recorded, in various ways, what learners had gained, even when they were not undertaking external awards, but such recording processes were not disseminated to those curriculum areas where they were less well developed.
22. Pre-entry assessment often did not make enough use of information from schools, the Connexions service or learners' statements of individual need, literacy and numeracy, or learners' preferred learning styles; often, there was also a detailed assessment of learning support needs. Too often, however, these assessments were not supplemented by a curriculum-based assessment so there was insufficient analysis of learners' skills and knowledge at the start of their programmes and their long-term goals were often not clarified. This meant that individual learning plans (ILPs) and targets did not challenge or interest learners and could not be used effectively to assess the progress they had made in terms of 'value added' or 'distance travelled' from when they had joined the college.
23. During the survey, learners, teachers, parents and carers gave extensive anecdotal evidence to inspectors about the great gains that learners had made in their personal and social development. For instance, in many colleges, learners with LDD were involved in the student council or were representatives for their programmes. However, such gains were often poorly documented. Inspectors were given portfolios of work (including

---

<sup>9</sup> *Recognising and recording progress and achievement in non-accredited learning* (LSC-P-NAT-050428), Learning and Skills Council, 2005: available from <http://rarpa.lsc.gov.uk/>.

witness statements and photographs) that had been gathered carefully to show what the learner could do. However, this work usually did not represent evidence of progress made during the time the portfolio had been put together. Because initial assessment and target-setting were often poor, it was difficult to judge how much progress the learner had made and what the learner could do as a result of attending college compared to what he or she could do at the start of the programme.

24. In good provision, colleges tried different ways to measure what learners knew and could do in personal and social contexts. For example, one college used methods developed in music and drama, such as observation, to assess learners.

**Good practice: initial and baseline assessment**

A GFE college provided discrete programmes for 35 learners. The college had good pre-entry and initial assessment in partnership with local feeder schools: learners attended two taster weeks before deciding whether or not to join the college; college staff visited the schools; strategies to allow for a smooth transition were shared; specialist agencies were involved and there was continuing initial assessment over the first half term. Programmes were altered as appropriate.

Many learners arrived with low expectations of their own capabilities. The college encouraged them to develop realistic and, ultimately, challenging targets for themselves. Their individual targets focused on personal and social development and these were shared with all staff. Success against these targets was recorded in weekly tutorials and they were updated as appropriate. Teachers recorded success against vocational and/or academic targets at each session, with a full report each half-term. Targets were set to allow learners to progress in very small steps where necessary, particularly during the first year, and became more challenging as their sense of security and confidence increased.

As learners progressed, targets focused increasingly on their potential for employment, wherever possible. The college was starting to develop narrative accounts of progress from learners' first point of contact before joining the college to give a fuller picture of 'distance travelled'.

25. In the colleges visited, the main problem for teachers of learners with LDD was how to identify achievement and evaluate progress. Achievement on accredited programmes was good. However, such awards, while recognising learners' achievements, did not necessarily help them to move to the next stage of their education.

26. While awards are very important in allowing learners, employers, parents and carers to recognise success, the content which leads to such an award needs to be clear and relevant. Many awards did not ensure that learners had the appropriate levels of knowledge and understanding for starting their next programme.

**Good practice: key factors in effective assessment**

- good liaison and sharing of information with partners, for example schools
- pre-entry assessment that shows clearly what learners know and can do
- initial assessment over time to establish a secure baseline
- baseline assessment used to set challenging targets that learners can understand
- regular formative assessment to inform learners of their progress and set new targets
- summative assessment involving learners in assessing their own learning.

## **Leadership and management**

27. A key factor in the success of the best colleges was the leadership of the principal and senior managers in establishing a strong college-wide ethos of equality and high aspirations. In these colleges, managers were knowledgeable and committed to working with learners with LDD. They had created strong, regional, strategic partnerships and organisational structures that improved access for learners through flexible curricula and staffing. They reported that joint strategic area reviews had led to more coherent provision in their areas.
28. Procedures for self-assessment were largely well understood and involved staff in a review of the area for which they were responsible. However, self-assessment documentation was often in a standard cross-college format, as were formats for lesson plans, and therefore these were not always sufficiently flexible to reflect the more complex issues relating to some learners. Many of the self-assessment reports seen during the survey identified weaknesses which the inspectors had also identified, but the reports were often insufficiently analytical and detailed about how to improve provision. Observations of teaching, for example, frequently failed to identify issues relating to poorly developed ILPs, poor records of learners' progress or the lack of individual objectives in planning learning.
29. Most of the colleges visited collected quantitative data relatively well, but some senior managers' understanding of LDD limited the extent to which such data were used effectively. For example, staff were asked to use college-wide systems for reporting on and measuring 'value added'. However, this failed to capture the 'distance travelled' for LDD learners

since an average GCSE points score was not a helpful starting point for this for most of them.

30. The colleges in the survey were aware of their duties under the DDA as amended by SENDA. They had responded well to improving access to buildings and considered reasonable adjustments in terms of teaching and learning, such as moving classes to more accessible areas and providing appropriate additional support.
31. Nineteen of the colleges surveyed met their legal obligations in relation to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 (RRA).<sup>10</sup> The three who did not were being supported and monitored by their local LSC. However, there was little evidence that race relations training was having an impact on the curriculum or on teaching and learning materials.
32. Policies for safeguarding and child protection were in various stages of development across the colleges in the survey. Thirteen colleges had satisfactory procedures, but not all had given training to staff. For the most part, colleges had effective procedures for CRB checks on staff, but five of them were unable to provide evidence of the status of newly appointed staff and in three college staff awaiting the outcome of their CRB checks worked with learners without the required supervision.

**Good practice: key factors in effective leadership and management**

- a clear vision from senior managers about how provision should develop and an inclusive ethos
- a commitment from senior managers to working with learners with LDD
- extensive external partnerships and good multi-agency working
- good communication at all levels
- robust quality assurance mechanisms
- well established child protection and safeguarding procedures
- good accommodation and resources
- accurate and self-critical self-assessment
- rigorous, well monitored action plans deriving from self-assessment.

## **The role of the LSC in supporting learners with LDD**

33. Local and national LSCs had supported colleges well to audit their premises and comply with SENDA legislation. They had also supported colleges by providing training to meet race relations legislation. In one region they had supported a network of colleges to improve the observation of teaching and the processes of self-assessment.

---

<sup>10</sup> The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 is available from [www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/20000034.htm](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/20000034.htm).

34. The LSC *Agenda for Change* programme has outlined the LSC's vision for the post-16 sector.<sup>11</sup> It has promoted a regional structure, with extensive changes in staffing as a result. During the survey, some local LSCs reported that, as a result of these changes, they no longer had a nominated person with responsibility for learners with LDD.
35. Local and national LSCs rely on data from the Connexions service. However, these give an accurate picture only of learners with statements of special educational need. Local placement boards help to give an accurate picture of the numbers of learners attending independent specialist colleges, but information about learners with LDD in general further education colleges is less robust. Systems for collating information from individual learner records (ILRs) by disability are weak and data often derive from learners' own declaration of their individual learning needs. Mechanisms for tracking learners with LDD information – for example, where they have been educated or details about their progress – are not effective; ILRs do not provide a historic account of what a learner has done, since they can be changed as learners move from programme to programme. As a result, it is not possible to judge whether or not learners are undertaking appropriate programmes or whether progression is effective. Mechanisms for tracking learners' destinations are insufficient. Finally, the strategic focus on achievements or accreditation as a means of demonstrating measurable outcomes is not always appropriate for learners with LDD.

## Notes

The survey of 22 colleges and eight LSCs took place between September 2005 and March 2006 to evaluate the effectiveness of provision and outcomes for learners between the ages of 16–18 with LDD in post-16 settings. The colleges were selected to represent GFE colleges, sixth form colleges and independent specialist colleges. Additional information was drawn from a scrutiny of 13 inspection reports inspected between September 2005 and May 2006. The majority of the local LSCs in which the colleges were situated were also included in the survey.

The colleges' provision for learners with LDD was inspected: some provision was discrete and some was integrated into mainstream provision. A case study of an individual learner was also undertaken in each college. During the visits, inspectors met senior managers, staff, learners, parents, carers and external partners, observed lessons and scrutinised documentation. Telephone or face-to-face interviews were held with the local LSCs.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Learning and skills: the agenda for change – the prospectus* (LSC-P-NAT-050483), Learning and Skills Council, 2005; available from [www.lsc.gov.uk/Whatwedo/afc.htm](http://www.lsc.gov.uk/Whatwedo/afc.htm).



## Further information

*A new deal for welfare: empowering people to work*, Department of Work and Pensions, 2006; available from [www.dwp.gov.uk/welfarereform/legislation\\_green\\_paper.asp](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/welfarereform/legislation_green_paper.asp).

*Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances*, DfES, 2006; available from [www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/furthereducation/](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/publications/furthereducation/).

*Race equality in further education*, Commission for Black Staff in Further Education, 2002; available from [www.lifelonglearninguk.org/currentactivity/race\\_equal\\_in\\_fe.html](http://www.lifelonglearninguk.org/currentactivity/race_equal_in_fe.html).

*Race equality in further education* (HMI 2463), Ofsted, 2005; available from [www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/2463](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/2463).

Sir Andrew Foster, *Realising the potential: a review of the future role of further education colleges*, DfES, 2005; available from [www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryId=20&ContentID=18](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/furthereducation/index.cfm?fuseaction=content.view&CategoryId=20&ContentID=18).

Sir Sandy Leitch, *Skills in the UK: The long-term challenge: interim report* (ISBN 1845321219), HM Treasury, 2005.

*Through inclusion to excellence: the report of the steering group for the strategic review of the LSC's planning and funding of provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities across the post-16 learning and skills sector*, Learning and Skills Council, November 2005; available from <http://readingroom.lsc.gov.uk/lsc/2005/research/commissioned/through-inclusion-to-excellence.pdf>.

## **Annex**

### **Colleges visited for this survey**

Alderwasley Hall Independent Specialist College

Bournville College of Further Education

Bradford College

Brighton Hove and Sussex Sixth Form College

Calderdale College

Chesterfield College

City College Brighton and Hove

Derby College

Furness College

Hastings College of Arts and Technology

Lindeth College of Further Education

City College Manchester

Manchester College of Arts and Technology

Mount Camphill Community College

Redbridge College

St Helens College

South Downs College

South East Derbyshire College

Southport College

Lakes College West Cumbria

Leeds Thomas Danby College

Westminster Kingsway College

## **Learning and Skills Councils participating in this survey**

Birmingham and Solihull

Derbyshire

Greater Merseyside

Greater Manchester

London Central

London East

Sussex

West Yorkshire