



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/74040/>

Version: Published Version

Monograph:

Golden, Sarah, O'Donnell, Lisa, Benton, Tom et al. (2006) Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the Second Cohort - Research Report. Research Report. DfES Research Reports . Department for Education and Skills , Nottingham.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the Second Cohort

Sarah Golden, Lisa O'Donnell,
Tom Benton and Peter Rudd
National Foundation for Educational Research

Research Report
No 786

*Evaluation of Increased Flexibility
for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme:
Outcomes for the Second Cohort*

*Sarah Golden, Lisa O'Donnell,
Tom Benton and Peter Rudd*

National Foundation for Educational Research

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© National Foundation for Educational Research 2006
ISBN 1 84478 786 9

Contents

	page
Acknowledgements	i
Executive summary	iii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Aims and objectives	4
1.3 Research methods	4
2. Achievements of young people participating in the second cohort of IFP	7
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Achievement of IFP qualifications	13
2.3 Total achievement at key stage 4	20
2.4 Achievement of Level 2 by IFP participants	33
2.5 Summary and conclusion	38
3. Post-16 destinations of young people participating in the second cohort of IFP	41
3.1 Introduction	41
3.2 Location of destination post-16	41
3.3 Factors which appeared to influence progression into further education or training	44
3.4 Conclusion	48
4. Conclusions	51
Appendix A: Representativeness of respondents	53
Appendix B: Points scores for qualifications	59
Appendix C: Variables included in the multi-level model analyses	61
Appendix D: Numbers of young people included in the analysis	69

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their sincere thanks to DfES for commissioning the research and particularly to Maura Lantrua, Project Manager, for her expert guidance and support throughout. We are most grateful to the members of the project steering group, in particular Lynda Lawrence and Charles Ritchie from the DfES and Karen Murray from the LSC, for their helpful feedback and guidance in completing the research.

The research team wish to gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the staff in schools and colleges who provided the data on students' achievements and destinations, on which this report is based. We recognise also the support of the Lead Partners and Local LSCs in supporting the evaluation of the first two cohorts of IFP.

The research team are indebted to colleagues in the NFER. We appreciate the help of Sarah Walkey and Catherine Cox in the Research Data Services Department in administering the data collection so efficiently and Edward Wallis and colleagues in the Database Production Group for cleaning and processing the data. Finally, we are most grateful to Julia Rose, Project administrator, for her calm, invaluable support throughout the evaluation.

Executive summary

Introduction

The Increased Flexibility Programme for 14 to 16 year olds (IFP) was introduced in 2002. The aim of the programme was to ‘create enhanced vocational and work-related learning opportunities for 14 to 16 year olds of all abilities who can benefit most’ – this included supporting provision of the GCSEs in vocational subjects. The first cohort of Year 10 students embarked on their programme in 2002 and this was followed by a second cohort in 2003 and subsequent cohorts in the following years.

The IFP was the first national programme which formalised partnership working between post-16 and pre-16 education providers to deliver a broader curriculum for young people at key stage 4. Since its inception, the programme has expanded in the context of a continuing focus on improving the curriculum and qualification routes for 14 to 16 year olds and integrating these into a 14-19 framework. Through the IFP, partnerships between colleges and training providers and around 2000 schools have been established along the lines set out in the 14-19 Implementation Plan, and these have continued to develop and mature since the second cohort embarked on their programme.

The DfES commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) to undertake a national evaluation of the first and second cohorts of IFP students, in order to examine the extent to which the aims and objectives of the IFP were being met.

This summary focuses on the outcomes for participants who participated in the programme between 2003 and 2005 (cohort 2) during a time of change in 14 to 19 policy. It should be stressed that this summary reflects the outcomes for only the second cohort of young people to participate in this new and developing approach to delivering a more flexible and vocational curriculum through institutions working in partnership. The evaluation of the second cohort of IFP participants aimed to:

- evaluate the extent to which the IFP has fulfilled its national aims, objectives and targets
- assess the impact of vocational qualifications and new work-related learning opportunities on young people’s attainment and post-16 progression.

Key findings

- The IFP exceeded its target in so far as the majority of young people made a positive **transition**. The majority (87 per cent) of young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP progressed into further education or training. This was consistent with the percentage of the first cohort who progressed.
- The IFP was also positively associated with the **attainment** of participants, but this was not consistent across all types of qualifications studied. Young people who took NVQs and GNVQs did better than might be expected, given their prior attainment, while those taking other vocational qualifications¹ did less well. Young people taking GCSEs in vocational subjects achieved at levels broadly commensurate with expectations.
- IFP appeared to be particularly advantageous for particular **types of students**. Female students gained more points in their IFP qualification than similar students who were male. However, male students who took NVQs gained more points than female students taking NVQs, once prior attainment and other factors were taken into account. Students with lower attainment at key stage 3 gained higher total point scores at key stage 4, relative to their prior attainment, than similar students with higher key stage 3 attainment.

Outcomes for IFP cohort 2: Achievement of qualifications

Using multi-level model analysis, the research examined the extent to which the IFP met its objectives in relation to the attainment of young people who participated in the programme. This analysis explored their attainment, compared with similar students who had not participated, in terms of:

- their achievement of the IFP qualifications they had undertaken
- their total points score at key stage 4 and their eight highest grades achieved
- their achievement of five A*-C GCSE grades or equivalent.

Early analysis² revealed that students who participated in the second cohort of IFP differed significantly from their peers in some key respects. They were significantly more likely to be male, white, in receipt of free school meals and recognised for school action or school action plus on the register of SEN than their peers in the same schools. Moreover, the attainment at key stage 3 was lower overall among the whole IFP cohort than for all students in their year

¹ 'other vocational qualifications' in this report comprise all qualifications taken by IFP participants that were not identified as GCSEs in vocational subjects, GNVQs or NVQs. This 'other vocational qualification' group includes all the entry-level qualifications, while the other three qualification types include level 1 and 2 qualifications.

² Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Profile of Partnerships and Students 2002 and 2003* (DfES Research Report 558). London: DfES.

group not participating in the programme. These differences were taken into account in the statistical models.

Did the IFP participants achieve their IFP qualification and what influenced this?

- The **majority of participants** in the second cohort of IFP had **achieved the qualifications** that they had undertaken through the programme. Overall, without taking into account prior attainment, 93 per cent of the GCSEs in vocational subjects undertaken were achieved at grades A* to G and 39 per cent at A* to C grades. Of the GNVQs undertaken 81 per cent were achieved. Around two-thirds (64 per cent) of NVQs, and 58 per cent of other vocational qualifications undertaken by a sample of young people, were achieved.
- Students' achievement of the qualification that they were undertaking through IFP was associated with their **prior attainment**. Higher attainment at key stage 3 was associated with higher attainment in students' IFP qualifications. However, the relationship between key stage 3 attainment and achievement of other vocational qualifications was less strong than was the case with the other types of qualifications studied which may suggest that they are assessing different skills and knowledge.
- Once prior attainment and other characteristics were taken into account, **female** students achieved higher points in their IFP qualifications than similar students who were male. However, **male** students who were taking NVQs gained more points than female students taking NVQs.
- The **location** where a young person pursued their IFP qualification did not emerge as being significantly associated with their achievement of that qualification.

Did the IFP participants do as well as might be expected at key stage 4 and what affected this?

Overall, participation in IFP was positively associated with the attainment of participants, but this was not consistent across all types of qualifications studied. Young people who took NVQs and GNVQs did better than might be expected, given their prior attainment, while those taking other vocational qualifications did less well. Young people taking GCSEs in vocational subjects achieved at levels broadly commensurate with expectations.

More specifically:

- Taking the students' prior attainment and other background characteristics into account, young people who participated in IFP, and took **NVQs and GNVQs**, achieved more points in total at key stage 4 than similar students who did not participate in the programme and *did not take these qualifications*.
- It appeared that the young people who had **lower attainment** at key stage 3 (level 4 and below), and took NVQs gained even more in terms of the

points achieved than their peers with higher attainment who took these qualifications.

- Young people who had taken **other vocational qualifications** through IFP gained fewer points at key stage 4 than similar students who had not taken any vocational qualifications once prior attainment and other background characteristics had been taken into account.
- However, this **varied in relation to prior attainment**. Young people who had lower attainment at key stage 3 (below level 4), and took other vocational qualifications, gained more points than might be expected while those with higher attainment gained fewer points than would be expected given their prior attainment and other background characteristics.
- The analysis of the achievement of young people who took **GCSEs in vocational subjects** through IFP revealed a more mixed picture. It was possible to compare these young people firstly with similar students who had not taken any vocational qualifications and secondly with similar students who had taken these qualifications but had not participated in IFP.
- It appeared that students who took GCSEs in vocational subjects through IFP achieved slightly but significantly **more points** in total at key stage 4, compared with students who had not taken any vocational qualifications and had not participated in IFP.
- However, this achievement was associated with the type of qualification studied. Students who took GCSEs in vocational subjects, but did not participate in IFP, also achieved more points in total at key stage 4 than similar students who did not take these qualifications. Moreover, they achieved more points still than similar students who *had* taken these qualifications *and* had participated in IFP.
- The achievement of young people taking GCSEs in vocational subjects appeared to differ in relation to some characteristics. **Female** students, and those of **Black heritage**, who undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects through IFP gained significantly more points than similar students who were male, or were White, once prior attainment and other characteristics were taken into account.

What was the overall achievement for students who discontinued their involvement in IFP?

- Around 15 per cent of the IFP cohort who had embarked on GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects appeared to have **discontinued** their involvement prior to the end of Year 11. The analysis suggests that discontinuing involvement in IFP was associated with significantly lower attainment at key stage 4 than might have been the case had the student either sustained their involvement, or not embarked on IFP.
- Those who had discontinued appeared to be more likely to be eligible for free school meals, recognised for action on the register of SEN and have lower prior attainment, than might be expected given the profile of IFP participants in cohort 2 as a whole.

Did IFP participants achieve five A* to C grade GCSEs or equivalent?

- In terms of achieving the level 2 threshold of five GCSE passes at grades A* to C, or equivalent, students who had participated in IFP had a **lower probability** of achieving this compared to similar students who had not participated in the programme, once prior attainment and other background characteristics had been taken into account. It is worth noting, however, that 32 per cent of young people were undertaking qualifications through IFP at level 1, and six per cent were taking entry level qualifications, which would not contribute to the level 2 threshold.
- Young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP had a **lower probability** of achieving the level 2 threshold **including mathematics and English**, compared to students who were similar in terms of prior attainment and other background characteristics but did not participate in the programme. Moreover, IFP participants achieved lower grades in English and in mathematics compared with similar students who had not participated in the programme and this difference was more marked among those taking NVQs and other vocational qualifications. However, further analysis suggested that IFP participants who undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects, NVQs and other vocational qualifications made significantly less progress between key stages 2 and 3, *before they embarked on the programme*, than might be expected given their prior attainment and other characteristics.

Did IFP participants progress into further learning post-16?

- The **majority** (87 per cent) of young people who participated in the second cohort of the IFP were reported by schools to have **continued into further education or training** after finishing Year 11, which exceeds the target for IFP partnerships of 75 per cent.
- A range of variables emerged as being influential on young people's post-16 destination, including their IFP experience pre-16. Students who had taken an **other vocational qualification** through the programme had a **lower probability** of continuing into further learning post-16 compared to students in the IFP cohort who were similar in terms of prior attainment and other background characteristics but had taken NVQs, GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects.
- While the reasons for this are not clear, the evaluation of the first cohort of IFP participants suggested that continuity in qualification type may support continued participation post-16 and that a smaller proportion of young people who took other vocational qualifications pre-16 continued into similar qualifications post-16 compared with those who took NVQs.
- Where IFP participants had progressed into further learning, those who had undertaken an **NVQ** or **other vocational qualification** had a greater probability of progressing into FE (compared with sixth forms) than students who had taken GNVQs or GCSEs in vocational subjects through the IFP.

Summary

Overall, the majority of participants in the second cohort of IFP had **achieved their qualifications** and had achieved in line with expectations given their prior attainment and other background and school-level characteristics. Indeed, those taking NVQs and GNVQs had achieved more points in total than students who were similar in terms of their prior attainment and background characteristics but had not participated in IFP but who may have been undertaking vocational qualifications. The attainment outcomes for the second cohort of participants were similar to those of the first cohort in many respects. However, for cohort 2, those taking GCSEs in vocational subjects achieved less well compared with similar students taking the same qualifications: this was not the case with the first cohort.

The majority (87 per cent) of the representative sample of young people had **progressed onto further education or training** after completing their involvement in IFP. This proportion exceeded the target for the programme of 75 per cent of participants remaining in learning post-16.

Implications for policy and practice

The experiences of the first and second cohort of IFP participants may be helpful for informing the 14-19 Implementation Plan and similar programmes. The findings relating to the second cohort point to a number of possible implications for policy:

- **Sustaining progression** The finding that 87 per cent of cohort 2 IFP participants progressed to further education, training or employment, is very similar to the destinations finding for cohort 1. This suggests, again, that students' experience of IFP usefully contributes to engaging them in learning post-16. It is worth noting, however, that it is not possible to know what these young people might have chosen to engage with post-16, had they not participated in IFP in Years 10 and 11. An interesting area of investigation would be to explore the extent to which these transitions can be sustained, so that the young people remain in learning until the completion of their post-16 course or programme of study, or indeed, continue into further learning in the longer term.
- **Provision of appropriate qualification types** It appears that studying 'other' vocational qualifications through IFP may lead to different outcomes for young people than studying NVQs, GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects. Young people who had undertaken other vocational qualifications had a lower probability of continuing into further learning post-16 compared with their peers who participated in IFP but undertook other types of qualifications. Consequently, those involved with examination entry policies and curriculum provision for the 14 to 16 age group may wish to further scrutinise the types of qualifications that students are undertaking in order to ensure that they are appropriate for their needs.

- **English and mathematics provision within IFP programmes** The analysis indicated that young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP had a lower probability of achieving the level 2 threshold of the five GCSE passes at grades A* to C, or equivalent than similar students who had not participated in the programme. This was also the case when their achievement of level 2 including English and mathematics was examined. Moreover, on average, they achieved lower grades than similar students who had not participated in the programme in their English and mathematics GCSEs. Partnerships may wish to explore locally the reasons that could explain the apparent relationship between IFP participation and achievement in mathematics and English. This could entail investigating the extent to which they offer support to IFP participants in relation to their core subjects, where lessons in these subjects are missed as a consequence of participation, and whether, and in what ways support could be enhanced. Moreover, there may be value in examining approaches to timetabling and identifying good practice which enables young people to participate in such provision without missing core subjects.
- **Addressing discontinuation** A notable minority of young people (around 15 per cent) appeared to have discontinued their involvement in IFP before the end of Year 11. Such discontinuation was associated with students achieving significantly fewer points at key stage 4 than similar students who had either not embarked upon IFP, or had sustained their involvement. It appears that young people who had lower attainment, were eligible for free school meals or were recognised for action on the register of SEN were over-represented among those who discontinued. Those responsible for the programme at a national level may wish to consider how the needs of this minority might best be addressed in the delivery of the programme. In addition, partnership staff may wish to identify young people with these characteristics early in the programme and consider the need to target additional support at them with the aim of minimising the risk of them discontinuing their involvement.
- **Location of study** The location where students pursued their IFP qualification, such as school, college or a training provider, did not emerge as being significantly associated with differences in the achievement of qualifications. This is in contrast to the analysis of the first cohort of IFP participants, which drew on questionnaire data relating to delivery that was not available for the analysis of the second cohort, and found that students achieved more points where delivery was shared or they studied principally at school. The finding that the location of study does not appear to be associated with outcomes for young people in the second cohort, may suggest that staff responsible for delivery in college have built on their experience of the first cohort and may also have drawn more fully on school staff's knowledge and expertise. If this is the case, then these developments should be continued and consolidated.

Summary of research methods

In the autumn term of 2003, a baseline data collection exercise which identified the schools and individual students who were participating in the

second cohort of IFP was undertaken. IFP partnerships identified all of the schools that were involved in their partnership and the majority of these schools (63 per cent) identified the Year 10 students who were participating in the IFP. This data was matched to NFER's Register of Schools and the DfES's National Pupil Database (NPD) which contain background information on schools and pupils.

A representative sample of around 14,500 students in 496 schools in 100 IFP partnerships was identified, and schools were asked to provide details of the students' achievements and destinations at the end of Year 11. Consequently, details of students' achievements in this report are drawn from two sources of data:

- The DfES's National Pupil Database (NPD) – this contains details of all students' attainment in their key stage 3 assessments and the achievement of GCSEs, including GCSEs in vocational subjects, and GNVQs at key stage 4.
- Data provided by schools on the achievement of NVQs and other vocational qualifications for a sample of IFP participants.

In addition to indicating the achievements of students, school staff were asked to identify the destinations of students post-16, using a list of pre-coded options. A total of 233 schools responded, representing 5006 IFP participants. However, school staff were not always able to provide details of students' destinations, and consequently the destinations analysis is based on details for 3789 individuals. The sample of students for whom details of their achievements and destinations were provided, was broadly representative of the cohort as a whole.

Multi-level modelling techniques were used to examine the factors associated with students' attainment and destinations. This statistical technique enables variables at school-level, area-level and student-level (such as individuals' prior attainment) to be controlled for statistically. Consequently, the findings take into account these influential factors. However, the possible effect of, for example, students' motivation, learning preferences and personal circumstances cannot be taken into account, or explored, through this quantitative analysis as such data was not available.

The attainment analysis allows a comparison between students who participated in IFP and students who were similar in terms of their prior attainment and other background characteristics, who attended similar schools, but were not known to have participated in IFP. The analysis of students' destinations and their achievement of their IFP qualification compares students within the IFP cohort who were similar in terms of their prior attainment and other background characteristics.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Increased Flexibility Programme for 14 to 16 year olds (IFP) was introduced in 2002 in response to *The Green Paper: 14-19: extending opportunities, raising standards* (2002).³ The Green Paper had set out a proposal to further increase curriculum flexibility in order to enable pupils to learn at a pace which is appropriate to them and pursue individually focused programmes to help them meet their potential. It also announced the introduction of GCSEs in vocational subjects which would provide the opportunity for young people to achieve vocational qualifications which have parity of esteem with existing ‘academic’ qualifications.

The IFP aimed to broaden opportunities for young people through the creation of ‘enhanced vocational and work-related learning opportunities for 14 to 16 year olds of all abilities who can benefit most’ – including through supporting provision of the GCSEs in vocational subjects. The IFP built on developments in the education system over a number of years to enable the curriculum to better meet the needs of young people. For example, in 1998, schools had become able to disapply the National Curriculum and set aside up to two or three subjects in order that a student might follow an extended work-related learning programme. This was followed, in 2000, with regulations to enable schools to disapply the curriculum so that students could emphasise relevant areas of the curriculum or consolidate their learning.

Around 300 partnerships were established through the IFP to achieve the aims of the programme. Each of these had a ‘Lead Partner’, the majority of which were FE colleges. The partnerships involved links with schools and, in some instances, other colleges, training providers and employers. Funding to support these partnerships was channelled through Local Learning and Skills Councils (LLSCs) who also had responsibility for monitoring the process.

Although many schools and colleges had already developed partnerships through which school students could undertake taster sessions and courses at a further education (FE) college, the IFP was the first national programme to provide an opportunity to formalise these partnerships. It provided specific funding to post-16 education providers to develop and consolidate partnerships with schools, through which vocational provision could be

³ Department for Education and Skills (2002). *14-19: Extending Opportunities, Raising Standards. Consultation Document* (Cm. 5342). London: The Stationery Office.

delivered. It also provided formal recognition of these relationships through the local LSC's overall responsibility for the programme.

The first cohort of Year 10 students embarked on their programme in 2002 and this was followed by a second cohort in 2003, which is the focus of this report. Subsequent cohorts have followed, and the programme has continued to develop, in the following years. As the IFP, and 14-19 provision have continued to develop, the range of vocational qualifications which are available for use with pre-16 students has developed and expanded. In addition to more qualifications gaining recognition on the DfES's Section 96 list of qualifications approved for use with pre-16 students, awarding bodies for vocational qualifications have also developed new qualifications, such as Business and Technology Education Council (BTEC) First certificates. Therefore, qualifications are now available which students who were participating in the first two cohorts of IFP were not able to undertake, and the experience and outcomes for these cohorts reflect the nature and type of qualifications available at the time.

Since the inception of IFP, there has been considerable change and refocusing of provision for young people aged 14-19. Indeed, the expansion of the IFP took place in the context of a continuing focus on improving the curriculum and qualification routes for 14 to 16 year olds, providing increased flexibility in the curriculum and integrating these into a 14-19 framework. The Tomlinson Report (14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform: Report of the Working Group on 14-19 Reform), published in October 2004, recommended a 'strengthening of the vocational offer' and called for 'better vocational programmes' and 'rationalised vocational pathways'.⁴ The experience of IFP partnerships has informed the development of these changes. The 2005 White Paper: 14-19 Education and Skills, makes several mentions of the Increased Flexibility Programme, stressing its role in creating greater curriculum choice and offering a variety of locations of study.⁵ In setting out the future development of 14-19 provision, the 14-19 Implementation Plan which followed the White Paper states that:

*We must support every area to develop a system in which schools and colleges can offer more to young people through working together than they could on their own.*⁶

Through the IFP, partnerships have been established along the lines set out in the Implementation Plan, between colleges and training providers and around

⁴ Working Group on 14-19 Reform (2004). *14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform: Report of the Working Group on 14-19 Reform*. London: DfES. Chapter 8 and p. 8.

⁵ Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons (2005). *14-19 Education and Skills (Cm.6476)*. London: The Stationery Office.

⁶ Department for Education and Skills (2005). *14-19 Education and Skills Implementation Plan*. London: The Stationery Office. p.6.

2000 schools. These partnerships aimed to fulfil the objectives of the IFP which were to:

- raise the attainment in national qualifications of participating pupils
- increase young people's skills and knowledge
- improve social learning and development
- increase retention in education and training after 16.

In meeting these objectives, the partnerships are working towards a set of targets that are as follows:

- one-third of the young people involved in IFP should gain at least one GCSE in a vocational subject at level 2 (over and above their predicted GCSEs)
- one-third of students should gain at least one NVQ at level 1 (over and above their predicted GCSEs)
- three-quarters of IFP participants should progress into further education or training
- attendance rates of the young people involved should match those of the average key stage 4 cohort.

The DfES commissioned the NFER to undertake a national evaluation of the first and second cohorts of IFP students, in order to examine the extent to which the aims and objectives of the IFP were being met. The evaluation of the first cohort of participants⁷ found that the IFP had met its objectives in so far as the majority of young people had achieved their qualifications and, in the case of those who took NVQs and GNVQs, had gained more points than would be expected. The majority of participants in the first cohort progressed on to further learning. Furthermore, there was evidence⁸ that participants had improved their social skills and their confidence in their employability skills and had a more positive attitude towards school by the end of the programme than they had when they were in Year 10. In addition to the outcomes for the young people, evidence from the majority of schools and colleges revealed that they had more effective partnerships as a result of their involvement in IFP. As the partnerships had matured, contact between institutions had become more informal and frequent, and formal mechanisms for sharing information had been increasingly established.

⁷ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L., Benton, T. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the First Cohort*. (DfES Research Report 668). London: DfES.

⁸ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: the Second Year* (DfES Research Report 609). London: DfES.

This report focuses on the outcomes for the second cohort of participants who completed the programme in summer 2005. As such, it reflects the outcomes for only the second group of young people who were participating in a new and developing approach to delivering a more flexible and vocational curriculum through institutions working in partnership.

1.2 Aims and objectives

The evaluation of the second cohort of IFP participants aimed to:

- evaluate the extent to which the IFP has fulfilled its national aims, objectives and targets
- assess the impact of vocational qualifications and new work-related learning opportunities on young people's attainment and post-16 progression.

Details of the research methods used for the evaluation are outlined below.

1.3 Research methods

In order to achieve the aims and objectives detailed above, the following research methods were adopted.

In the autumn term of 2003, a baseline data collection exercise which identified the schools and individual students who were participating in the second cohort of IFP was undertaken. IFP partnerships identified all of the schools that were involved in their partnership and the majority of these schools (63 per cent) identified the Year 10 students who were participating. This data was matched to NFER's Register of Schools and the DfES's National Pupil Database (NPD) which contain background information on schools and pupils. In addition to identifying the individual students participating in the programme, school staff provided details of the qualifications the students were pursuing and the location where they undertook these qualifications.

A representative sample of around 14,500 students in 496 schools in 100 IFP partnerships was identified and schools were asked to provide details of the students' achievements and destinations at the end of Year 11. Consequently, details of students' achievements in this report are drawn from two sources of data:

- The DfES's National Pupil Database (NPD) – this contains details of all students' attainment in their key stage 3 assessments and the achievement

of GCSEs, including GCSEs in vocational subjects, and GNVQs at key stage 4.

- Data provided by schools on the achievement of NVQs and other vocational qualifications for a sample of IFP participants.

As the NPD contains details for all students nationally relating to their GCSE and GNVQ attainment, it was possible to compare the outcomes for IFP participants with the outcomes in the same type of qualifications for students who did not attend schools that participated in IFP.

Details of the achievements of students who had undertaken NVQs and other vocational qualifications were provided in the autumn term of 2005 by a sample of schools. School staff were asked to indicate whether each student had achieved, or not achieved, the qualification that school staff had indicated in the autumn of 2003 that the student was undertaking. It is worth noting that the data provided by schools was, therefore, based on the understanding and interpretation of school staff of the qualifications that students were undertaking and whether they had achieved these qualifications.

Details of students' achievements were provided by 180 schools representing a total of 1877 NVQs and other vocational qualifications. In order to equate these students' achievements with those of students undertaking GCSEs, the NVQs and other vocational qualifications were 'scored' by the research team using the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority's (QCA) scoring system (see Appendix B for details). It should be noted that the number of points assigned to the qualifications vary according to the qualification type, level achieved and, indeed subject studied. In their guidance in relation to the use of the equivalence scores, QCA point out that higher points relate to the size of the qualification being studied and do not necessarily reflect a 'better' qualification.⁹

In addition to indicating the achievements of students, school staff were asked to identify the destinations of students post-16, using a list of pre-coded options which were as follows:

- school sixth form
- FE college
- training provider
- apprenticeship
- other job with training
- job without training
- looking after home / family

⁹ Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2005). *FAQs about Figures for the School and College Performance Indicators* [online]. Available: http://www.qca.org.uk/14-19/developments/downloads/FAQs_school_and_college.pdf [28 April, 2006].

- not in work
- something else
- destination unknown.

A total of 233 schools responded, representing 5006 IFP participants. However, school staff were not always able to provide details of students' destinations, consequently the destinations analysis is based on details for 3789 individuals.

The sample of students for whom details of their achievements and destinations were provided, was broadly representative of the cohort as a whole. Details of the representativeness of the respondents is provided in Appendix A.

The evaluation of the second cohort of IFP draws on the findings of the evaluation of the first cohort and early findings relating to the second cohort. These include analyses of the baseline data,¹⁰ the case-study visits,¹¹ the baseline surveys¹² and the follow-up surveys of young people, schools and colleges and training providers¹³ and the outcomes for the first cohort.¹⁴

¹⁰ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Profile of Partnerships and Students 2002 and 2003* (DfES Research Report 558). London: DfES.

¹¹ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2004). *Implementing the Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: the Experience of Partnerships and Students* (DfES Research Report 562). London: DfES.

¹² Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Morris, M. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds: the First Year* (DfES Research Report 511). London: DfES.

¹³ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: the Second Year* (DfES Research Report 609). London: DfES.

¹⁴ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L., Benton, T. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the First Cohort* (DfES Research Report 668). London: DfES.

2. Achievements of young people participating in the second cohort of IFP

Achievement of IFP qualifications

- The majority of participants in the second cohort of IFP had achieved the qualifications that they had undertaken through the programme. A total of 93 per cent of the GCSEs in vocational subjects undertaken were achieved at grades A* to G and 39 per cent at A* to C grades. Of the GNVQs undertaken 81 per cent were achieved. Around two-thirds (64 per cent) of NVQs, and 58 per cent of other vocational qualifications, undertaken by a sample of young people were achieved. (Section 2.2)
- Students' achievement of the qualification that they were undertaking through IFP was associated with their prior attainment. However, the relationship between key stage 3 attainment and achievement of other vocational qualifications was less strong than was the case with the other types of qualifications studied which may suggest that they are assessing different skills and knowledge. (Section 2.2.3)
- Female students achieved higher points in their IFP qualifications than similar students who were male. However, male students who were taking NVQs gained more points than female students taking NVQs. (Section 2.2.3)
- Young people who pursued qualifications in the subjects areas of care and childcare, science, arts, administration and business and sports, leisure and tourism achieved more points than similar students who did not take these subjects. (Section 2.2.3)
- The location where a young person pursued their IFP qualification did not emerge as being significantly associated with their achievement of that qualification. (Section 2.2.3)

Total achievement at key stage 4

- Young people who participated in IFP gained slightly more points in their total points achieved across all of their examinations than similar students who did not participate in IFP. However, they gained fewer points across their eight highest grades achieved. (Section 2.3.1)
- This achievement varied in relation to the types of qualifications studied by IFP participants. Those who studied NVQs and GNVQs gained significantly more points, while those who studied other vocational qualifications and GCSEs in vocational subjects gained significantly fewer points. This contrasts with the outcomes for the first cohort of participants where those who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects did not differ significantly from their peers. (Section 2.3.1)
- Compared to students in the same schools who had not participated in IFP, and had not undertaken any vocational qualifications, those who participated in IFP and undertook GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects, gained significantly more points in total at key stage 4. (Section 2.3.2)

- Young people who participated in, and completed, IFP and took GCSEs in vocational subjects or GNVQs, gained fewer points in total at key stage 4 compared to similar students in the same schools who took the same types of qualifications. (Section 2.3.2)
- Female students, and those of Black heritage, who undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects through IFP gained significantly more points than similar students who were male, or were White. (Section 2.3.2)
- Around 15 per cent of the IFP cohort who had embarked on GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects appeared to have discontinued their involvement prior to the end of Year 11. The analysis suggests that discontinuing involvement in IFP was associated with significantly lower attainment at key stage 4 than might have been the case had the student either sustained their involvement or not embarked on IFP. (Section 2.3.4)
- Those who had discontinued appeared to be more likely to be eligible for free school meals, recognised for action on the register of SEN and have lower prior attainment, than might be expected given the profile of the cohort as a whole. (Section 2.3.4)
- Young people who participated in IFP, and undertook NVQs through the programme, gained significantly more points in total than similar students who had not participated in IFP, and were not known to have undertaken any vocational qualifications including GCSEs in vocational subjects or GNVQs. However, IFP participants who had undertaken other vocational qualifications gained significantly fewer points. (Section 2.3.5)
- Participation in IFP, and taking NVQs and other vocational qualifications, appeared to be particularly advantageous for students who had lower attainment at key stage 3. While the number of points they achieved was fewer than that of their peers with higher attainment at key stage 3, such students gained even more points than might be predicted in relation to their prior attainment. (Section 2.3.5)

Achievement of five A* to C grade GCSEs or equivalent

- In terms of achieving the level 2 threshold of five GCSE passes at grades A* to C, or equivalent, students who had participated in IFP had a lower probability of achieving this compared to similar students who had not participated in the programme. It is worth noting, however, that 32 per cent of young people were undertaking qualifications through IFP at level 1, and six per cent were taking entry level qualifications, which would not contribute to the level 2 threshold. (Section 2.4)
- Young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP had a lower probability of achieving the level 2 threshold including mathematics and English, compared to similar students who did not participate in the programme. Moreover, IFP participants achieved lower grades in English and in mathematics compared with similar students who had not participated in the programme and this difference was more marked among those taking NVQs and other vocational qualifications. (Section 2.4)

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the achievement of young people at the end of Year 11, who participated in IFP, in terms of the qualifications they achieved. It examines:

- The extent to which young people achieved the qualification that they undertook through IFP and the factors associated with achievement of qualifications taken through IFP.
- The total achievement at key stage 4 of students who had completed IFP, taking into account background factors and prior attainment. This analysis provides, where possible, a comparison with similar students who did not participate in IFP.
- The outcomes for young people who embarked on the IFP, including those who subsequently discontinued their involvement in IFP before the end of Year 11, and the characteristics of such young people.
- The extent to which participation in IFP appears to have been more beneficial for specific sub-groups of young people.


A wide range of factors influence young people's attainment at key stage 4, including their individual characteristics and attainment, the school they attend and the area they live in. The multi-level model analysis seeks to take into account these factors and examines the extent to which their participation in IFP appears to be associated with their attainment over and above the range of other influential factors. A full list of the variables that have been included in the analysis is provided in Appendix C (Tables C1 and C2). The main factors which emerged as influencing young people's attainment at 16 were as follows:

- **attainment at key stage 3** – higher attainment at key stage 4 was associated with higher attainment at key stage 3
- **sex** – being female was associated with higher attainment at key stage 4
- **English as an additional language** – having English as an additional language was associated with higher attainment at key stage 4
- **Special Educational Needs (SEN)** – being recognised for school action and school action plus was associated with lower attainment at key stage 4
- **local area** – living in an area with comparatively high unemployment, high levels of individuals with no qualifications, high levels of individuals engaged in routine occupations and high levels of council housing, were associated with lower attainment at 16
- **pupil mobility** – changing schools between key stage 3 and key stage 4 was associated with lower attainment at 16
- **free school meals** – being eligible for free school meals, or attending a school where a high proportion of students were eligible for free school meals, were associated with lower levels of attainment.

The analysis presented in this report explores the relationship between participation in IFP and attainment at key stage 4. It compares students who are similar in all respects except that they either participated, or did not participate, in IFP and presents the apparent influence of IFP on attainment over and above the range of variables explored in the statistical model.

In considering the outcomes for the second cohort of IFP participants, it is worth reflecting on the nature of the cohort. Analysis of the baseline data¹⁵ provided by schools indicated that students who participated in the second cohort of IFP differed significantly from their peers in some key respects. In detail, IFP participants were significantly more likely to be male, White, in receipt of free school meals and recognised for school action or school action plus on the register of SEN than their peers in the same schools. Moreover, they differed in terms of their key stage 3 attainment compared with their peers in the same schools, in that this was lower overall among the IFP cohort than for all students. This difference is illustrated in Figure 2.1 which shows the attainment at key stage 3 of young people who participated in IFP, and took GCSEs in vocational subjects, those who participated in IFP and took NVQs, other vocational qualifications and GNVQs, and all students in their year group in the same schools, and nationally. A similar difference was found in terms of their key stage 4 attainment in 2005 and students who attended IFP schools gained slightly, but significantly fewer points overall than similar students in other schools. This 'school effect' has been taken into account statistically in the analysis.

¹⁵ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Profile of Partnerships and Students 2002 and 2003* (DfES Research Report 558). London: DfES.

Figure 2.1 Key stage 3 attainment of Year 10 students 2003-2004 (cohort 2)

Source: NFER evaluation of IFP – baseline data autumn 2003 and NPD 2003
All those for whom data was available on NPD

The majority of schools adopted some form of selection of students for the first cohort of participants¹⁶ and around half of schools¹⁷ said that they had changed their criteria for selection of the second cohort and 42 per cent had altered their procedure. The criteria which schools took into consideration when selecting students to participate included their interest or strength in the vocational area, their attitude and learning preferences. However, while the statistical models can take into account a wide range of variables that might influence young people's attainment, they can only be based on available data. Consequently, the possible effect of, for example, students' motivation, learning preferences and personal circumstances cannot be taken into account, or explored, through this quantitative analysis.

Three outcomes for students are examined in the analysis:

- **Total points achieved** at key stage 4. This reflects the full achievement of students in terms of the points achieved in all the examinations they undertook. As such it reflects the quantity of qualifications undertaken and a student could gain the same points by achieving less well in more

¹⁶ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Morris, M. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds: the First Year* (DfES Research Report 511). London: DfES.

¹⁷ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: the Second Year* (DfES Research Report 609). London: DfES.

qualifications as a student who achieves more points in fewer qualifications.

- Points achieved in the **eight highest grades** achieved at key stage 4. The 'best eight' outcome reflects the quality of the students' achievement, as distinct from its quantity. For example, a student who had achieved lower grades in more qualifications would not gain as many points as a student who may have taken fewer qualifications, but gained higher grades.
- Achievement of *five A* to C grades*, or equivalent, at key stage 4 (Level 2). This includes achievement of any subject at grades A* to C and achievement of five passes at grades A* to C including mathematics and English.

The analysis is based on QCA point scores where a C grade at GCSE (single award) is 40 points. Further details of the point scores for GCSEs, double award GCSEs, GNVQs, NVQs and other vocational qualifications are provided in Appendix B.

In order to explore fully the outcomes for IFP participants, different analytical models were constructed to make a number of comparisons. These were as follows:

- Comparisons **within the IFP cohort** of the factors associated with achievement of the qualification undertaken through IFP. This analysis examines whether achievement of IFP qualifications appears to differ according to students' prior attainment and other background characteristics such as their gender, ethnicity or free school meal eligibility (Section 2.2.3).
- Comparison of all students who embarked on IFP and all students who did not¹⁸ (Section 2.3.1).
- All students who had embarked on, and completed, IFP taking GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs, compared with all students who did not participate in IFP and took these qualifications (Section 2.3.2).
- Comparison between students who embarked on a course through IFP, and *may or may not have discontinued*, undertaking GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs, and students who had not taken any type of vocational qualification (Section 2.3.3).
- Comparison between students who embarked on GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs and *discontinued their involvement in these*, and students who had not undertaken any vocational qualifications (Section 2.3.4).
- Comparison between students who embarked on a course through IFP, and may or may not have discontinued, undertaking NVQs and other

¹⁸ IFP students may or may not have completed the programme. Non-IFP students may or may not have undertaken vocational qualifications.

vocational qualifications and students who had not undertaken any vocational qualifications (Section 2.3.5).

In addition, significant differences between the outcomes for students in the second cohort of IFP, and their peers who had participated in the first cohort,¹⁹ are presented as appropriate.

The analysis of the achievement of qualifications taken through IFP is based on the outcomes for around 15,500 IFP students taking four types of qualifications as follows:

- 11,928 students who embarked on GCSEs in vocational subjects
- 2450 students who embarked on GNVQs
- 543 students who took NVQs
- 662 students who took other vocational qualifications.

The data for students taking GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs was drawn from the National Pupil Database and details of students taking NVQs and other vocational qualifications were provided for a representative sample of students by schools. Further details of the numbers of different types of students used for different analyses are provided in Appendix D.

2.2 Achievement of IFP qualifications

2.2.1 Overall achievement of IFP qualifications

The majority of the young people achieved the qualifications that they had taken through IFP. More specifically:

- 93 per cent of the 15,699 GCSEs in vocational subjects that were undertaken by IFP students were achieved at grades A* to G. Among these achievements, 39 per cent were at grades A* to C and six per cent at either A* or A grade.
- 81 per cent of the 2813 GNVQs that were taken by IFP participants were achieved. In more detail, 81 per cent of the Foundation-level GNVQs, and 78 per cent of the Intermediate GNVQs undertaken, were achieved.
- 64 per cent of the 807 NVQs undertaken by students in the sample were achieved.
- 58 per cent of the 1274 other vocational qualifications undertaken by students in the sample were achieved.

¹⁹ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L., Benton, T. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the First Cohort* (DfES Research Report 668). London: DfES.

The proportions of IFP participants who had achieved GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs were similar, albeit slightly higher, to those for young people who had participated in the first cohort of IFP (2002-2004). Among cohort 1 participants, 91 per cent had gained grades A* to G in GCSEs in vocational subjects and 36 per cent had achieved grades A* to C. In addition, 80 per cent of cohort 1 participants had achieved a GNVQ. The proportion who had achieved NVQs was similar, although slightly lower, among cohort 2 participants (66 per cent in cohort 1) and the proportion who achieved other vocational qualifications was notably smaller in cohort 2 compared with cohort 1 (67 per cent in cohort 1).

This sample of young people had undertaken a wide variety of different qualifications within the types of qualifications. The most widely taken qualifications for which data was provided by schools or was available on the NPD, included:

GNVQs

- GNVQ Intermediate information and communication technology (ICT)
- GNVQ Intermediate science
- GNVQ Intermediate business.

NVQs

- NVQ level 1 hairdressing
- NVQ level 1 performing engineering operations
- NVQ level 1 food preparation
- NVQ level 1 preparing and serving food
- NVQ level 1 sport, recreation and allied studies.

Other vocational qualifications

- CITB/City and Guilds level 1 foundation certificate in building craft occupations
- ABC level 1 certificate in motor vehicle studies
- CACHE level 1 award in caring for children
- Entry level certificate in skills for working life.

The types of qualifications which are categorised as ‘other vocational qualifications’ in this report comprise all qualifications taken by IFP participants that were not identified as GCSEs in vocational subjects, GNVQs or NVQs. It is worth noting that the ‘other vocational qualification’ group includes all the entry-level qualifications, while the other three qualification types include level 1 and 2 qualifications. However, the majority of NVQ,

GNVQ and other qualifications taken by this sample of students were at level 1 and only a minority of other vocational qualifications were at entry level.

The GCSEs in vocational subjects undertaken by this sample of IFP participants are discussed in detail in the next section.

2.2.2 Achievement of GCSEs in vocational subjects

Compared to the achievement of GCSEs in vocational subjects nationally, a slightly greater proportion of young people who participated in IFP achieved the qualifications at grades A*-C and A*-G than their peers, as can be seen in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Proportions of students achieving GCSEs in vocational subjects: IFP participants and other students in IFP schools and nationally

	IFP students in cohort 2	IFP students in cohort 1	All students at IFP schools	All students nationally
Total number of GCSE in vocational subject entries	15,669	14,718	98,525	141,460
% A/A*	5.6	5.3	5.0	5.0
% A*-C	39.3	36.1	38.1	38.7
% A*-G	92.9	90.9	92.2	92.2

Source: Amended NPD 2005 and 2006 and NFER baseline data 2002 and 2003

The table indicates students' raw scores and does not take into account prior attainment

Nationally, students who were known to have participated in IFP accounted for 11 per cent of GCSEs in vocational subjects undertaken. It was notable that a greater proportion of the GCSEs in vocational subjects were undertaken by students in engineering (26 per cent) and health and social care (14 per cent). It may be the case that the IFP partnerships particularly facilitated the provision of GCSEs in these subject areas. As can be seen in Table 2.2, the proportions of young people who achieved grades A* and A, A* to C, and A* to G, varied across the eight subject areas.

Table 2.2 Proportions of students achieving each GCSE in a vocational subject: IFP participants and other students in IFP schools and nationally

	IFP students in cohort 2	All students at IFP schools	All students nationally
Number of art and design entries	660	4156	5575
% A/A*	19.7	15.3	15.2
% A*-C	59.7	53.8	53.9
% A*-G	97.6	95.5	95.3
Number of business entries	1755	14,198	20,638
% A/A*	9.7	8.2	8.3
% A*-C	49.4	48.5	48.6
% A*-G	93.4	93.3	93.2
Number of health and social care entries	3135	16,143	22,943
% A/A*	8.1	6.5	6.7
% A*-C	46.5	42.6	43.8
% A*-G	95.3	93.9	94.4
Number of leisure and tourism entries	2000	11,829	16,093
% A/A*	2.9	2.5	2.6
% A*-C	30.8	27.9	28.3
% A*-G	91.9	89.8	89.5
Number of manufacturing entries	495	3141	4327
% A/A*	2.4	2.9	2.4
% A*-C	23.4	26.5	25.1
% A*-G	87.3	88.4	87.8
Number of science entries	1638	12,180	17,207
% A/A*	1.7	1.5	1.4
% A*-C	38.5	32.9	32.5
% A*-G	98.0	96.9	96.6
Number of engineering entries	1981	5879	7603
% A/A*	1.8	2.1	2.4
% A*-C	26.0	24.6	25.4
% A*-G	89.4	89.5	89.4
Number of ICT entries	4005	30,999	47,074
% A/A*	4.7	4.3	4.4
% A*-C	38.9	38.6	39.2
% A*-G	90.9	90.3	90.5

Source: Amended NPD 2006 and NFER baseline data 2003

The table indicates students' raw scores and does not take into account prior attainment

It appears from the simple grades achieved by IFP participants that these students achieved similarly or slightly better than their peers across the eight subject areas. For example, 60 per cent of IFP participants who studied Applied Art and Design achieved grades A* to C, compared with 54 per cent of their peers, and 47 per cent of those taking Health and Social Care achieved grades A* to C, compared with 43 per cent of their peers. However, this does

not take into account the prior attainment and other characteristics of the IFP cohort.

Further multi-level model analysis, which controlled for the effect of a range of variables (see Appendix C for details) revealed that, as was found nationally, differences in attainment in each subject were not explained by students' prior attainment and other variables included in the models. Nevertheless, once prior attainment and other background variables were taken into account, no significant differences emerged in the grades achieved between IFP participants and their peers who did not participate in the programme in terms of their achievements in each of the eight GCSEs in vocational subjects. In other words, the apparent differences illustrated in Table 2.2 in achievement in individual GCSEs in vocational subjects, between IFP participants and their peers are explained by differences in their prior attainment and gender. Moreover, there was no significant difference in the achievement in these subjects between students who attended schools that participated in IFP and those who did not. This suggests that there was no discernable wider effect of engaging in an IFP partnership on GCSEs in vocational subjects taught outside the programme in the wider school.

2.2.3 Factors associated with achievement of qualifications undertaken through IFP

As noted above, the majority of young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP achieved the qualification they undertook. This section examines a range of variables that may have an impact on achievement of IFP qualifications including:

- young people's personal **background characteristics**, such as attainment, gender and ethnicity
- characteristics of the **IFP partnership**, such as its size in terms of the number of participating schools
- the **nature of delivery** including location of delivery, qualification type and the broad subject areas studied
- **characteristics of the school** young people attended, such as whether it was comprehensive to 16 or had a sixth form
- features of the **area where IFP participants lived**, derived from the census, such as the proportion of home ownership and nature of employment.

As might be expected, given the range in the number of points assigned to qualifications of different types, the analysis indicated that there were significant differences in the achievement of IFP qualifications in relation to the different **types of qualifications** studied. For example, a 'typical' student who had undertaken an NVQ would achieve 107 points on average. This compares to 87 points for a similar student taking a GNVQ, 45 points for a

similar student taking a GCSE in a vocational subject and 39 points for a similar student taking an other vocational qualification. These differences are taken into account in the analysis and the associations noted below occur over and above the effect of the qualification type.

Students' **prior attainment** at key stage 3 was, on the whole, associated with their achievement of the qualification that they had studied through IFP. Overall, students who had higher prior attainment scored more points in their IFP qualification than similar students with lower prior attainment. However, the analysis showed that the association between prior attainment and achievement of other vocational qualifications was less strong than was the case in relation to GCSEs in vocational subjects, GNVQs and NVQs. In other words, key stage 3 attainment was a less effective predictor of outcomes in other vocational qualifications. Moreover, further analysis suggested that a stronger relationship exists between key stage 3 attainment in mathematics and science and achievement of NVQs, while the relationship between attainment in key stage 3 English and GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs was stronger. This may suggest that the assessment of other vocational qualifications is examining different skills to those assessed by key stage 3 assessments and, indeed, different skills to those assessed by the other types of qualifications undertaken through IFP.

Students' **background characteristics** were associated with differences in their attainment in their IFP qualification. It emerged that:

- Young people who were **female** achieved seven more points than similar students who were male. However, further exploration showed that **male students who took NVQs** achieved more points than similar students who were female who were taking these types of qualifications. This analysis cannot explain why, as was the case for the first cohort, male students appear to benefit more from NVQs than their female peers. However, the responses of participants in the first cohort to questionnaire surveys indicated that male students were significantly more likely to have a preference for practical applied learning, compared to their female peers.²⁰ Such learning preferences may have been more suited to undertaking an NVQ than other qualifications.
- Students who were recognised for school action or school action plus on the register of **SEN** achieved fewer points than similar students not recognised for action.
- Those who were in receipt of **free school meals** achieved fewer points in their IFP qualification than similar students who were not in receipt of free school meals.

²⁰ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Morris, M. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds: the First Year* (DfES Research Report 511). London: DfES.

- The **ethnic background** of students was *not* significantly associated with differences in achievement in their IFP qualification, where there were sufficient numbers to conduct a robust analysis.

The qualifications that young people were undertaking were grouped into 17 broad **vocational areas** for previous analysis.²¹ These broad areas include qualifications of all types which related to the vocational area. Analysis was undertaken to explore the extent of any differences between achievement in these broad vocational areas, taking into account the type of qualification, so that any differences reported are over and above the qualification type differences noted above. It appeared that students achieved more points where they had studied qualifications in the following subject areas than similar students who had not undertaken qualifications in these areas:

- care and childcare
- science
- arts
- administration and business
- sports, leisure and tourism.

This does not suggest that students taking other subjects do less well than might be expected but, rather, that the other subject areas did not emerge as making a significant difference.

While these differences emerged across the qualification types, further exploration revealed that students who were taking an other vocational qualification in the subject areas of administration and business or arts, gained significantly fewer points than similar students taking other types of qualifications in these two subject areas. There may be value, therefore, in exploring the nature of other vocational qualifications in these subjects and the extent to which they are appropriate for IFP participants.

The **location** where students pursued their IFP qualification, such as at school, college or a training provider, did not emerge as being significantly associated with differences in the achievement of qualifications. Analysis of the first cohort of IFP participants, which drew on questionnaire data relating to delivery that was not available for the analysis of the second cohort, found that students achieved more points where delivery was shared or they studied principally at school.²² Although data on the extent of shared teaching was not

²¹ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2004). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibilities for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Profile of Partnerships and Students 2002 and 2003* (DfES Research Report 558). London: DfES.

²² Golden, S., O'Donnell, L., Benton, T. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the First Cohort* (DfES Research Report 668). London: DfES.

available for the second cohort, the finding that the location of study does not appear to be associated with outcomes for young people in the second cohort, may suggest that staff responsible for delivery in college may have built on the experience of the first cohort and may also have drawn more fully on school staff's knowledge and expertise. Qualitative visits to IFP partnerships during the first and second cohorts revealed that college staff had developed strategies for teaching younger students more effectively²³ and this may be reflected in the absence of any significant difference in relation to location of delivery for the second cohort.

A range of **contextual school and area factors** were taken into account in the analysis (see Appendix C for details of the school and area characteristics included). It emerged that IFP participants who:

- attended schools that were comprehensive to 16 gained significantly more points in their IFP qualification than similar students who did not attend schools that were comprehensive to 16
- attended schools with high proportions of students recognised with SEN gained fewer points than their peers who attended schools with lower proportions of students recognised for action on the register of SEN.

As might be expected, students in areas of deprivation, reflected in high migration, high levels of unemployment, individuals with no qualifications, high proportions of individuals in routine occupations and high levels of council housing, achieved fewer points than their peers not living in areas with these characteristics.

2.3 Total achievement at key stage 4

2.3.1 Overall attainment by students who embarked on IFP

Section 2.2 examined the achievement by the students of the qualifications that they had pursued through their IFP experience. As the majority of students achieved their qualification, this will have added to the suite of qualifications achieved at the end of their compulsory schooling. This section explores the overall outcomes across this suite of qualifications for young people who remained involved in the IFP by the end of Year 11 in terms of their **total points** and **eight highest grades** achieved. As noted in Section 2.1, the analysis provides a comparison between young people who participated in the programme and their peers who were similar in terms of attainment,

²³ Golden, S., Nelson, J., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2004). *Implementing the Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: the Experience of Partnerships and Students* (DfES Research Report 562). London: DfES.

background characteristics, and schools attended, but who were not known to have participated in IFP.²⁴

Overall, young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP, achieved significantly more **points in total** at key stage 4 than similar students in the same schools who did not participate in IFP and who may or may not have taken GCSEs in vocational subjects or GNVQs. Participants in the second cohort achieved slightly, but significantly, more points (three points more) than similar students who had not participated in IFP, once prior attainment and other background factors had been taken into account. However, they achieved slightly but significantly fewer points (four points fewer) in their **eight highest grades** achieved. This indicates that, as was the case among the first cohort of participants, the IFP participants' achievement reflects achievement of a greater quantity of qualifications as distinct from achieving higher grades in their qualifications.

The total points achieved by young people were associated with the type of qualification that they had undertaken through IFP. It appeared that:

- those who had undertaken **NVQs** gained **43 points more** than similar students in the same school who had not participated in IFP
- those who had undertaken **GNVQs** gained **42 points more** than similar students in the same school who may or may not have undertaken these qualifications
- those who had undertaken **other vocational qualifications** gained **16 points fewer** than similar students in the same school who had not participated in IFP
- those who had undertaken **GCSEs in vocational subjects** achieved **three points fewer** than similar students in the same school who may or may not have taken these qualifications.

The achievement of these students in terms of their **eight highest grades** achieved indicated that, while those who had undertaken NVQs did not differ significantly from their peers who had not participated, those who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects and other vocational qualifications achieved significantly fewer points in their eight highest grades (four points and 21 points respectively). However, those who had undertaken GNVQs gained significantly more points (seven points).

While the outcomes in relation to those taking NVQs and other vocational qualifications were similar for the first and second cohorts, students in the first cohort who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects did not differ significantly from their peers in their total points whereas in the second cohort

²⁴ Some schools were known to be involved in IFP but did not indicate which of their students were participating. These schools have been excluded from the analysis.

they gained slightly but significantly fewer points. In contrast, the difference between students in the second cohort who undertook GNVQs, and their peers who had not participated in IFP, was greater than was the case among participants in the first cohort, although in both cases IFP participants had gained more points.

Further analysis explored the extent to which IFP participants' total attainment at key stage 4 differed in relation to the **subject area** of the qualifications that they studied. This analysis indicated that, once qualification type was taken into account in the statistical models, there was little evidence of consistent significant differences across the subject areas. However, there were some indications that, once the type of qualification and other background factors including gender had been taken into account, students achieved significantly more points in total where they had studied care and childcare, hair and beauty and arts-based subjects.

2.3.2 Attainment by students who completed IFP and took GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs

Section 2.2 illustrated that students who participated in IFP accounted for around 11 per cent of all students nationally who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects. Those students who took these qualifications and GNVQs, and were not known to have participated in IFP, form a comparison group for the analysis of outcomes for the IFP cohort. As noted above, the type of qualification studied was associated with different outcomes and analysis of the differences between students who participated in IFP, and similar students taking *the same qualification* who did not participate in the programme, takes this into account. Thus it enables an exploration of the impact of IFP and of the possible outcomes for students had they pursued the same type of qualification but had not chosen to take part in the programme. It should be noted that the cohort of IFP participants referred to in this section includes only those who were known to have *embarked on and completed* the programme. As such, the analysis 'excludes' those who discontinued their involvement who, as will be discussed later, achieved significantly less well than similar students who either did not embark on or complete participating in IFP.

Those who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects gained slightly, but significantly, more points than similar students in the same school who had not taken any vocational qualifications (16 points more). Young people who had taken GNVQs achieved 96 points more than similar students in the same school who had not taken any vocational qualifications. However, when the effect of the qualification type was taken into account, and the IFP participants are compared with similar young people taking the same qualifications, it emerges that:

- Students who undertook **GCSEs in vocational subjects** through IFP gained **11 points fewer** in their total score than similar students who undertook these qualifications but did not participate in IFP.
- Students who undertook **GNVQs** through IFP gained **nine points fewer** in their total score than similar students who took these qualifications but did not participate in IFP.

These findings are illustrated in Figures 2.2 and 2.3 which indicate the total points achieved at key stage 4 in relation to prior attainment at key stage 3. Each figure presents the outcomes for three groups of students as follows:

- **IF:** Young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP and took GCSEs in vocational subjects (Figure 2.2) or GNVQs (Figure 2.3)
- **Non-IF:** Young people who *did not* participate in IFP but took GCSEs in vocational subjects (Figure 2.2) or GNVQs (Figure 2.3)
- **Non-vocational:** Young people who *did not* participate in IFP and *did not* take GCSEs in vocational subjects or GNVQs.

Figure 2.2 Total points achieved at key stage 4: IFP cohort 2 participants taking GCSEs in vocational subjects who completed the programme and comparison students





Figure 2.3 Total points achieved at key stage 4: IFP cohort 2 participants taking GNVQs who completed the programme and comparison students



The figures reveal the relationship between attainment at key stage 3 and key stage 4 for these students. It shows that, while IFP participants and those taking GCSEs and GNVQs outside of IFP gained more points at key stage 4 than their peers with similar attainment at key stage 3 who did not take such qualifications, this difference was more marked among those taking GCSEs in vocational subjects for those at lower levels of attainment at key stage 3. In other words, students with lower attainment benefited more from taking GCSEs in vocational subjects than similar students with higher prior attainment.

As can be seen in Figure 2.2, although the IFP participants with all levels of attainment at key stage 3 had achieved more points at key stage 4 than similar students who had not undertaken any vocational qualifications (including GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs), they had achieved slightly fewer points in total than their peers who had undertaken these types of qualifications but had not participated in IFP. This reflects the findings among the first cohort of IFP participants and, indeed, participants in the second cohort gained even fewer points than their peers than was the case among the first cohort.

Figure 2.3 shows that the IFP participants who completed the programme, and took GNVQs, gained more points than similar students who did not participate and did not undertake any vocational qualifications. However, similar young people who undertook these qualifications, but did not participate in IFP, gained more points at key stage 4 than either their peers who participated in

IFP, or those who had not taken any vocational qualifications. While this was also the case among participants in the first cohort, the difference between participants in IFP, and their peers who did not participate, was slightly less in the second cohort.

Further analysis revealed other student characteristics that appeared to be associated with benefiting more from participating in IFP and undertaking GCSEs. For example, it appeared that:

- **Female** students who participated in IFP and undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects gained **28 points more** than similar IFP participants taking these qualifications who were male. This difference was greater than the difference between female and male students not participating in IFP where females gained 23 points more.
- Although as noted in Section 2.2.3, the ethnic heritage of a young person was not significantly associated with their achievement of the qualifications that they studied through IFP, young people of **Black heritage** who participated in IFP and undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects gained **28 points more** in total than similar IFP participants taking these qualifications who were White. This difference was greater than the difference between Black students and White students who did not participate in IFP where Black students gained 13 points more than their similar White peers.

This suggests that young people who were female, and those who were Black, and who undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects through IFP, may have benefited more in terms of their attainment at key stage 4 than their similar peers who did not have these characteristics.

No significant differences were found in relation to students taking GNVQs through IFP.

There was some evidence that students' total achievement at key stage 4 varied in relation to the characteristics of the school they attended. Although there was no significant difference among those taking GCSEs in vocational subjects and other vocational qualifications in relation to whether they attended a rural or non-rural school, the analysis indicated that:

- students who attended schools in rural areas, and undertook NVQs, gained significantly more points at key stage 4 than similar IFP participants who took these types of qualifications outside rural areas
- conversely, those who attended schools in rural areas, and undertook GNVQs through IFP, gained significantly fewer points than similar students taking these qualifications but not in rural areas.

Although this analysis suggests some differences among IFP participants in relation to the rurality of their school's location, it is worth noting that this

difference may be associated with other partnership-level factors. For example, models of delivery among partnerships with rural schools, have not been included in the analysis.

In terms of the eight highest grades achieved, young people who participated in IFP, and took GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs, achieved significantly fewer points than similar students who took these qualifications but did not participate in IFP. More specifically:

- IFP participants who undertook **GCSEs in vocational subjects** gained **six points fewer** in their eight highest achievements than similar students in the same school who took these qualifications but did not participate in IFP
- IFP participants who undertook **GNVQs** gained **six points fewer** in their eight highest achievements than similar students in the same school who took these qualifications but did not participate in IFP. Moreover, compared with participants in the first cohort, the difference between IFP participants and their peers was less among the second cohort.

It appears, therefore, that in terms of the best eight achievements, young people who participated in IFP still achieved fewer points than similar students taking the same qualifications but not participating in IFP. This suggests that students who participated in IFP achieved slightly lower grades across all the qualifications they studied than students who studied GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs but did not participate in IFP.

Indeed, further analysis revealed that students who participated in IFP were undertaking more qualifications, on average, in their curriculum time, than their peers who had not participated in the programme. In more detail, students at schools not participating in IFP, and those in IFP schools but not participating in the programme, undertook an average of nine GCSEs or equivalent qualifications. However, young people who took GCSEs in vocational subjects and NVQs through IFP undertook an average of ten GCSEs or equivalent and those who had taken GNVQs had been engaged with 11 GCSEs or equivalent. Students who participated in IFP and took other vocational qualifications had undertaken an average of eight GCSEs or equivalent. This analysis suggests that, overall, IFP participants had the opportunity to gain more points by taking more qualifications than their peers who had not participated in the programme. Nevertheless, this also indicates that they had a greater number, or equivalent number, of qualifications to complete within the available curriculum time.

2.3.3 Attainment by students who embarked on IFP, and took GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs

The analysis in Section 2.3.2 illustrated the outcomes for young people participating in the second cohort of IFP, taking GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs, who had sustained their involvement in the programme. However, across the cohort, around 15 per cent of young people who were said to have embarked on IFP, did not appear as having entered the appropriate qualification on the NPD. This group of students may have discontinued and were ‘controlled for’ in the analysis in Section 2.3.2. However, as a proportion of young people in any year of the IFP may discontinue, including this group of students in the analysis reveals the likely outcomes from a programme such as IFP were it to be undertaken by all students nationally. This section presents the outcomes for all students who *embarked* on IFP, as distinct from all those who *completed* the programme as presented in Section 2.3.2.

When the effect of the type of qualification is taken into account, the analysis revealed that:

- students who embarked on IFP and took **GCSEs in vocational subjects** gained **four points more** than similar students who did not participate in IFP and did not take any vocational qualifications
- students who embarked on IFP and took **GNVQs** gained **64 points more** than similar students who did not take any vocational qualifications and did not participate in IFP.

Figures 2.4 and 2.5 illustrate the outcomes at key stage 4 in terms of total points achieved in relation to students’ prior attainment at key stage 3. It presents data from three groups of students as follows:

- **IF:** Young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP and took GCSEs in vocational subjects (Figure 2.4) or GNVQs (Figure 2.5)
- **Non-IF:** Young people who *did not* participate in IFP but took GCSEs in vocational subjects (Figure 2.4) or GNVQs (Figure 2.5)
- **Non-vocational:** Young people who *did not* participate in IFP and *did not* take GCSEs in vocational subjects or GNVQs.

Figure 2.4 Total points achieved at key stage 4: IFP cohort 2 participants taking GCSEs in vocational subjects who embarked on the programme and comparison students





Figure 2.5 Total points achieved at key stage 4: IFP cohort 2 participants taking GNVQs who embarked on the programme and comparison students



As can be seen in Figure 2.4, students who embarked on IFP and undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects, generally achieved similar points in total at key stage 4 to similar students who had not participated in the programme and not taken these qualifications. Amongst students with lower prior attainment it can be seen that involvement in IFP was associated with increased total points

compared to similar students who had not taken these qualifications. In contrast, those who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects, but had not participated in IFP²⁵ gained more points than their peers who had either participated in IFP or not taken these qualifications. This differs from the outcomes presented in Figure 2.2 where IFP participants achieved slightly more points than similar students who had not undertaken any vocational qualifications.

Figure 2.5 indicates that, although students who participated in IFP and had undertaken GNVQs achieved more points than similar students who did not undertake vocational qualifications or participate in IFP, this difference was again less marked than was the case when the achievement of only those who completed the programme is examined (see Figure 2.3).

2.3.4 Characteristics and outcomes for students who discontinued their involvement in IFP

The differences between the outcomes for IFP participants who completed the programme and those who embarked on it is explained by the negative effect on the outcomes for the cohort as a whole of the achievement of those who appear to have discontinued their involvement in IFP. As noted above, around 2700 students had discontinued and it appears that:

- Those who **discontinued GCSEs in vocational subjects** attained **66 points fewer** than would be expected given their prior attainment and other background characteristics
- Those who **discontinued GNVQs** attained **44 points fewer** than would be expected given their prior attainment and other background characteristics.

This suggests that discontinuing involvement in IFP was associated with significantly lower attainment at key stage 4 than might have been the case had the student either sustained their involvement or not embarked on IFP.

Exploration of the characteristics of the students who appeared to have discontinued their participation revealed that those who had discontinued undertaking GCSEs in vocational subjects were significantly more likely to be those who:

- were male
- were eligible for free school meals
- were recognised for school action or school action plus on the register of SEN
- had lower prior attainment at key stage 3.

²⁵ It should be noted that the comparison group only includes students who entered their qualification and does not include students who embarked on the qualification and discontinued as in the IFP cohort.

than might be expected given the profile of the second cohort of IFP participants as a whole who were undertaking these qualifications.

Those students who had discontinued undertaking GNVQs were also significantly more likely to have lower prior attainment, be eligible for free school meals and recognised for action on the register of SEN than would be expected given the profile of the cohort taking GNVQs. In addition, they were more likely to be female.

As noted in the report of the outcomes for the first cohort of participants, interviews with staff in nine partnerships revealed a variety of possible reasons for young people discontinuing, some of which were related to IFP provision while others were not. The report stated that:

Those [reasons] which related to IFP included inappropriate selection of students, lack of motivation and commitment from the students, inability of the young people to cope in an adult environment and students missing lessons in order to participate. Staff also cited issues that were not directly related to IFP including wider problems with school, exclusion from school and personal reasons. In addition, staff in two schools noted the challenge of reintegrating students who discontinued their involvement into the school curriculum.²⁶

2.3.5 Achievement by students who completed IFP and took NVQs and other vocational qualifications

More than 40 per cent of the young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP had undertaken NVQs and other vocational qualifications through the programme (19 per cent and 24 per cent respectively). It was not possible to identify a comparison group of students who took these same qualifications but did not participate in IFP.²⁷ Therefore, the analysis in this section presents the outcomes for young people who undertook these types of qualifications compared with similar students who did not participate in the programme and were not known to have taken any vocational qualifications, including GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs.

In terms of the total points achieved at key stage 4, the analysis revealed that:

²⁶ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L., Benton, T. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the First Cohort* (DfES Research Report 668). London: DfES. (pp 24-25)


²⁷ An appropriate comparison group of students would be those who took NVQs and other vocational qualifications and attended schools that did not participate in IFP. It was not possible to identify a comparison group of similar students who had taken these qualifications but had not participated in IFP in national datasets. The achievements for a sample of the IFP cohort were gathered directly from schools. The analysis is based on data for 679 students who were taking NVQs and 966 students who were taking other vocational qualifications.

- young people who had participated in IFP and undertaken **NVQs** had achieved **49 points more** than similar students who had not undertaken such qualifications
- young people who had participated in IFP and undertaken **other vocational qualifications** had achieved **nine points fewer** than similar students who had not undertaken such qualifications.

However, this varied in relation to students' prior attainment at key stage 3, as illustrated in Figure 2.6. The figure presents the attainment at key stage 4 for three groups of students as follows:

- **IF NVQ:** students who participated in the second cohort of IFP and undertook an NVQ through the programme
- **IF OVQ:** students who participated in the second cohort of IFP and undertook an other vocational qualification
- **Non-vocational:** students who did not participate in IFP and did not take any vocational qualifications (including GCSEs in vocational subjects, GNVQs, NVQs and other vocational qualifications).

Figure 2.6 Total attainment at key stage 4 of young people who achieved NVQs and other vocational qualifications, and all students nationally



As can be seen in Figure 2.6, young people who had undertaken NVQs through IFP gained more points at key stage 4 than similar students who had not taken any vocational qualifications. Within this group of students, it was evident that those with lower prior attainment at key stage 3 gained even more points than their peers who had higher attainment. In other words, participation in IFP appeared to be particularly advantageous, in terms of points achieved, to young people with lower attainment who undertook NVQs.

Among students who undertook other vocational qualifications, a different pattern emerges. It appears that students who had achieved up to around level 3 at key stage 3, and took other vocational qualifications, gained more points than similar students who had not participated in IFP. However, among those with higher levels of attainment at key stage 3 who undertook other vocational qualifications, their achievement was less than might be expected given their prior attainment and other characteristics. This may reflect to some extent the earlier finding (see Section 2.2.3) that key stage 3 attainment was not a strong predictor of attainment of other vocational qualifications. Consequently, while these findings may imply that young people with higher attainment at key stage 3 may wish to scrutinise the value of undertaking an other vocational qualification, they may also wish to take into consideration the value to them of employing and gaining different skills to those measured by standard key stage 3 and 4 assessments.

In considering the findings relating to the achievement of other vocational qualifications, it is worth noting that all entry-level qualifications undertaken through IFP are included in the other vocational qualifications group, as no entry-level NVQs, GCSEs in vocational subjects or GNVQs are available. The number of points which a student can gain through achieving an entry level qualification is notably fewer. However, although around one quarter (28 per cent) of young people who were undertaking other vocational qualifications were undertaking entry-level qualifications, the difference between the achievements of students who undertook other vocational qualifications through the IFP, and those who did not, does not appear to be explained by the level of qualification studied by IFP participants.

The variation in points achieved by students with different attainment at key stage 3 is further illustrated in Table 2.3 which presents examples of likely points achieved by young people with key stage 3 attainment at levels 3 and 6.

Table 2.3 Number of points achieved by students at key stage 4: comparison of IFP participants who took NVQs and other vocational qualifications and students who did not participate in IFP

Type of student	Expected point score
Typical student who did not participate in IFP and attained level 3 at key stage 3	163
IFP participant who took an NVQ and attained level 3 at key stage 3	224
IFP participant who took an other vocational qualification and attained level 3 at key stage 3	170
Typical student who did not participate in IFP and attained level 6 at key stage 3	404
IFP participant who took an NVQ and attained level 6 at key stage 3	447
IFP participant who took an other vocational qualification and attained level 6 at key stage 3	357

A typical student reflects the majority characteristics of the sample. In this case a typical student is White, male, attended a school that was not participating in IFP and was comprehensive to 18

Source: NFER evaluation of IFP cohort 2: achievement data provided by schools and National Pupil Database

The analysis did not reveal any other significant differences between any sub-groups of young people who had participated in IFP and undertaken these types of qualifications.

2.4 Achievement of Level 2 by IFP participants

In addition to the total points achieved, and eight highest grades, it was possible to explore the attainment of young people in terms of their achievement of the level 2 threshold which is represented by five GCSE passes, or equivalent, at grades A* to C. This section examines the IFP participants' achievement of level 2 and their achievement in the core subjects of mathematics and English which were included in DfES's GCSE Achievement and Attainment tables from 2005/6. In examining the findings, it is worth taking into consideration that many of the young people participating in IFP who were not taking GCSEs in vocational subjects, were undertaking qualifications at level 1 (32 per cent) or entry level (six per cent). Such qualifications cannot contribute to the achievement of the level 2 threshold and, consequently, their achievement of five passes at A* to C would be drawn from the qualifications that they achieved outside of the IFP.

Overall, 32 per cent of young people who participated in IFP achieved level 2 while 57 per cent of students who did not participate in the programme achieved this level. A total of 21 per cent of IFP participants achieved five A* to C passes at GCSE including English and mathematics. Among young people who did not participate in the programme, 44 per cent achieved this.

However, these findings do not take into account the attainment at key stage 3 of the students. The remaining analysis explores achievement of level 2 taking into account prior attainment.

When the achievements of the young people who were taking GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs through IFP, are compared with similar students taking the same types of qualifications but not participating in IFP, it appears that IFP participants have a lower probability of achieving level 2 compared with their peers, as can be seen in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4 Probability of students who completed IFP, and non-IFP students taking the same types of qualification, achieving level 2

Student characteristics	Probability of achieving level 2 (percentage)
Typical student studying GCSE in vocational subject not through IFP	48
Typical IFP participant studying GCSE in vocational subject	45
Typical student studying GNVQ not through IFP	86
Typical IFP participant studying GNVQ	84

A typical student reflects the majority characteristics of the sample. In this case a typical student is White, male, attended a school that was not participating in IFP and was comprehensive to 18 and not taking any vocational qualifications including GNVQs unless specifically stated

Source: NFER evaluation of IFP cohort 2: achievement data provided by schools and National Pupil Database.

The probability of students who attended a school that was participating in IFP achieving level 2 did not differ significantly from that of similar students in non-IFP schools. However, students who undertook GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects through the programme had a slightly lower probability of achieving level 2 compared to similar students taking such qualifications outside of the programme.

A comparison of the young people who embarked²⁸ on the second cohort of the IFP, with similar students who did not participate in IFP and who may or may not have been taking vocational qualifications, revealed that IFP participants had a lower probability of achieving the level 2 threshold. The only exception was where IFP participants had studied GNVQs, as can be seen in Table 2.5.

²⁸ This group includes those who subsequently discontinued.

Table 2.5 Probability of students who embarked on IFP, and non-IFP students, achieving level 2

Student characteristics	Probability of achieving level 2 (percentage)
Typical student in a school not participating in IFP	54
Typical student, in an IFP school, who was not participating in IFP	55
Typical IFP participant studying GNVQ	72
Typical IFP participant studying GCSE in vocational subject	49
Typical IFP participant studying other vocational qualification	32
Typical IFP participant studying NVQ	30

A typical student reflects the majority characteristics of the sample. In this case a typical student is White, male, attended a school that was not participating in IFP and was comprehensive to 18
Source: NFER evaluation of IFP cohort 2: achievement data provided by schools and National Pupil Database

The lower probability of young people who undertook NVQs and other vocational qualifications through IFP achieving level 2 may reflect that the majority of these qualifications undertaken were at level 1, as noted above. It is notable that young people who had undertaken GNVQs had a significantly greater probability of gaining level 2 than similar students who did not take these qualifications. Moreover, this difference was significantly greater than was found among the first cohort of IFP participants.

Although attending a school that was participating in IFP did not make a significant difference to the probability of students achieving level 2, other school characteristics were associated with variation in the probability of achieving level 2. More specifically, for students who were 'typical' in all other respects:

- Students who attended a Specialist school had an increased probability of achieving level 2 (60 per cent). However, this probability was reduced where the specialism of the school was not technology.
- Students who attended a grammar school had an increased probability of achieving level 2 (62 per cent).

The level 2 threshold reflects achievement of GCSE passes in any subject. However, achievement in the core subjects of mathematics and English are a government priority and further analysis investigated the achievement of five A* to C passes, including mathematics and English, by IFP participants and their peers.

An exploration of the factors associated with achieving four or more GCSEs at A* to C revealed that 37 per cent of IFP participants achieved this number of qualifications. Once students' prior attainment and other background

characteristics were taken into account, it emerged that the factors associated with achieving this level did not differ from those associated with achieving five or more A* to C passes.

The probability of achieving five A* to C GCSE passes or equivalent including mathematics and English was lower than the achievement of the level 2 threshold in any subjects. A typical student who did not attend a school that was participating in IFP had a 25 per cent probability of achieving this target and this probability was the same for students who attended IFP schools but were not participating in the programme. This reflects a change from the experience in IFP schools in 2004 where students in IFP schools had a lower probability of achieving five A* to C grades including mathematics and English.

The probability of students who were participating in IFP achieving this target varied in relation to the qualification that they were pursuing. More specifically, compared with similar students not participating in IFP, young people who were working towards:

- GNVQs through IFP had a 23 per cent probability of achieving the target and were not significantly different from similar students who did not participate in IFP
- GCSEs in vocational subjects through the IFP had a 21 per cent probability of achieving the target
- NVQs through IFP had an 11 per cent probability of achieving five A* to C grades including mathematics and English
- other vocational qualifications through IFP had a ten per cent probability of achieving this target.

These comparisons reflect those relating to the achievement of level 2 in any subject, in so far as the students who were pursuing NVQs and other vocational qualifications were significantly less likely to have achieved the threshold than their peers.

In order to explore this further, students' achievement in English and mathematics examinations were examined separately. This revealed that the overall achievement in English among non-IFP participants in IFP schools did not differ significantly from achievement in schools that were not participating in the programme. However, young people taking each type of qualification through IFP had achieved significantly lower grades in their **English** examination than similar students in the same school who were not participating in IFP. This difference is equivalent to around ten per cent of students who were undertaking GCSEs in vocational subjects through IFP gaining one grade lower than might be expected given their prior attainment and other background characteristics. This effect was equivalent to around five per cent of those who had undertaken GNVQs through IFP gaining one

grade lower. As might be expected given the lower probability of achieving the level 2 threshold among students who had been working towards NVQs and other vocational qualifications, the difference was more marked among the students taking these qualifications. The effect was equivalent to 20 per cent of those taking NVQs achieving one grade lower in English than might be expected and 30 per cent of those taking other vocational qualifications achieving one grade lower.

When IFP participants' achievement of **mathematics** was examined it emerged that, although achievement by non-IFP participants in IFP schools did not differ significantly from achievement in schools that were not part of the programme, the achievement of IFP participants did differ significantly from that of their peers. This effect was equivalent to four per cent of young people who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects through IFP achieving one grade lower in their mathematics examination than might have been expected given their prior attainment and background characteristics. Among those who had worked towards NVQs through IFP, this effect was equivalent to around ten per cent gaining one grade less than might be expected and around 18 per cent of those taking other vocational qualifications achieving one grade lower. Young people who had undertaken GNVQs did not differ significantly from their similar peers in their achievement in mathematics.

It is notable that the difference between IFP participants and their similar peers is greater in relation to achievement of English than mathematics. This may reflect a possible preference among students in certain subject areas who participated in IFP for the type of learning and understanding involved in mathematics in contrast to English. It is possible that young people who participate in IFP prefer 'vocational' learning in contrast to more 'academic' subjects, and these individual preferences which can not be explored through this analysis, are associated with their achievement in mathematics and English. These findings may reflect students' achievement at key stage 4 in relation to their attainment in key stage 3 assessments. It may be that the students made less progress between key stage 3 and 4 than they had made between key stage 2 and 3 which may be related to the nature of learning at key stage 4, and at a different time in their lives and maturity.

Further analysis of students' progress in mathematics and English between key stages 2 and 3 indicated that those who undertook GCSEs in vocational subjects, NVQs and other vocational qualifications through IFP made significantly less progress between key stages 2 and 3 than might be expected given their prior attainment and other characteristics. In other words, some IFP participants were already making less progress in mathematics and English before embarking on the programme and, indeed, this may have been a factor that led to them participating in, or being selected for, IFP.

Another factor that may be associated with the IFP participants' achievement in mathematics and English would be whether they had missed any of these lessons as a result of participating in IFP. While it is not possible to know whether this was the case among participants in the second cohort of IFP, around 38 per cent of cohort 1 participants said that they missed English lessons and 37 per cent said that they missed mathematics lessons.

2.5 Summary and conclusion

Overall, the majority of young people who had participated in the second cohort of IFP had achieved the qualification that they had undertaken through the programme. In addition, the cohort as a whole had achieved total points commensurate with expectations, given their prior attainment and other background characteristics. However, this varied in relation to the qualifications that they had undertaken. While, in general, those who had undertaken GNVQs and NVQs gained more points than might be expected, those who had undertaken other vocational qualifications and GCSEs in vocational subjects had achieved fewer points.

Comparisons between young people who had undertaken GCSEs in vocational subjects and GNVQs through the IFP, and those who had taken the same qualifications but had not participated in the programme, revealed that the IFP participants gained significantly fewer points in total at key stage 4 than those who had not participated in the programme.

While achievement at key stage 4 was associated with prior attainment at key stage 3, and students who achieved higher levels at key stage 3 also generally achieved higher levels at key stage 4, there were indications that young people with lower levels of key stage 3 attainment, who had undertaken NVQs through the programme, gained significantly more points to a greater extent than their peers who had higher levels of attainment. Moreover, the evidence suggested that male students who had undertaken NVQs gained more points than similar students taking these qualifications who were female.

A notable minority of young people, who appeared to have discontinued their participation in IFP before the end of Year 11, gained significantly fewer points at key stage 4 than similar students who had either not embarked on IFP, or had sustained their involvement in the programme. While it is not possible to ascertain the reasons for discontinuation from the data available, it emerged that the young people who had discontinued were more likely to be those who had lower levels of attainment, were eligible for free school meals and recognised for action on the register of SEN.

Students who had participated in IFP had a lower probability of achieving five A* to C grades at GCSE or equivalent than similar students who had not

participated in the programme. This was also reflected in their achievement of five A* to C grades including mathematics and English and their achievement in these two individual subjects.

Analysis suggested that the relationship between key stage 3 attainment and the achievement of other vocational qualifications was less strong than was the case with other types of qualifications studied through the programme. Moreover, the relationship between key stage 3 attainment in English was a more effective predictor of achievement in GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects than NVQs or other vocational qualifications. Conversely, achievement at key stage 3 in mathematics and science was a more effective predictor of achievement in NVQs. This suggests that there may be a relationship between the nature of the skills being assessed by different qualifications and the different core subjects.

3. Post-16 destinations of young people participating in the second cohort of IFP

Key findings

- The majority (87 per cent) of young people who participated in the second cohort of the IFP were reported by schools to have continued into further education or training after finishing Year 11, which exceeds the target for IFP partnerships of 75 per cent. (Section 3.2)
- A range of variables emerged as being influential on young people's post-16 destination, including their experience pre-16, through IFP. Students who had taken an other vocational qualification through the programme had a lower probability of continuing into further learning post-16. (Section 3.3)
- Students who had undertaken an NVQ or other vocational qualification through the IFP were significantly more likely to have continued into further education at an FE college or training provider, than at a school sixth form. (Section 3.3)
- Young people who had attended a school without a sixth form pre-16, and those who had studied at least part of their IFP course at a college with high overall retention rates also had an increased probability of studying at an FE college post-16. (Section 3.3)

3.1 Introduction

As outlined in Chapter 1, one of the targets of the IFP is that three-quarters of participants should progress into further education or training. This chapter examines the extent to which this objective has been achieved for the second cohort of IFP. More specifically, this chapter presents findings relating to:

- the main types of post-16 destinations for a sample of students, as reported by schools
- the factors which appeared to influence post-16 destinations.

3.2 Location of destination post-16

This chapter draws on information on individual students' destinations after finishing Year 11, provided by 233 schools in autumn 2005. These schools provided data on the post-16 destinations of 3789 young people who were

involved in the second cohort of the IFP. Analysis of the representativeness of the young people for whom data on post-16 destinations was provided revealed that these students were broadly representative of all students in the second cohort of the IFP.²⁹ This suggests that the proportion of young people who had continued into further education or training post-16 identified for this sample of students could be generalised to the cohort of IFP participants as a whole.

In addition, there were a further 559 young people for whom schools reported that their post-16 destinations were 'unknown'. There were also a further 658 students who had participated in the IFP in these schools, for whom schools did not provide any details of their post-16 destinations, which represented 13 per cent of the 5006 young people in the overall sample of responding schools. These young people for whom destinations were unknown were not included in the analysis of post-16 destinations reported in this chapter. Exploration of the characteristics of this sub-sample of young people revealed that those whose post-16 destination was unknown by schools were slightly more likely than IFP participants overall to have taken a GNVQ through the programme, and to have attended a school with a sixth form. However, analysis revealed that these factors did not have a significant influence on post-16 destinations. Therefore, this suggests that, if data on the post-16 destinations of these young people had been available, and they had been included in the analysis, the findings would not differ.

Table 3.1 presents the post-16 destinations of students who participated in the second cohort of the IFP, as reported by schools. As the table illustrates, the majority of young people were reported to have continued in education or training post-16. More than half of the young people (51 per cent) were said to be taking a course at an FE college, while 18 per cent were following a course at a school sixth form. Seven per cent of young people (271 individuals) were reported to have embarked on an apprenticeship, while the same proportion were in another job with training. Only a small proportion of young people were not in work (five per cent) or were looking after their home or family (one per cent).

These findings were broadly similar to the post-16 destinations of the young people who participated in the first cohort of the IFP. However, a lower proportion of young people in the second cohort were said to be taking a course at a school sixth form (18 per cent compared with 25 per cent in the first cohort).³⁰

²⁹ See Appendix A for details of the representativeness of the sample of young people for whom data was provided by schools.

³⁰ It is worth noting that there were no differences between cohorts 1 and 2 in the proportion of schools in the sample with sixth forms.

Table 3.1 Young people's destinations post-16: reported by schools

Destination	Cohort 2 %	Cohort 1 %
FE college	51	51
School sixth form	18	25
Apprenticeship	7	6
Other job with training	7	6
Job without training	6	5
Not in work	5	4
Training provider	4	3
Looking after home/ family	1	<1
Something else	2	1
N=	3789	2831

A single response item

Source: NFER Evaluation of the Increased Flexibility Programme: destinations data provided by schools, autumn 2005

Aggregation of the above data revealed that, overall, **87 per cent of IFP participants in cohort 2 had continued into some form of further education or training** after finishing Year 11 (which includes the following destinations: FE college, schools sixth form, apprenticeship, other job with training, training provider). Among cohort 1 participants, 90 per cent appeared to have continued into further learning or employment. However, the sample of cohort 1 participants was not representative of the IFP cohort as a whole. Consequently, the data was weighted statistically³¹ and it emerged that **87 per cent of cohort 1 participants** in the weighted sample had progressed to further education, employment or training.

An alternative way of aggregating the data is to explore the proportion of young people who were reported to have continued into further learning or Government-supported training (GST) (which includes taking a course at a school sixth form or an FE college or undertaking an apprenticeship). A total of 76 per cent of young people in cohort 2 were reported to have taken this route post-16.

Comparison with the national figures on participation in education and training post-16 in 2004,³² which are based on data from the Schools' Census and the Individualised Learner Record (ILR), revealed that a higher proportion of young people who had been involved in IFP had continued in further

³¹ The sample of respondents for cohort 2 was representative (see Appendix A) so it was not necessary to apply any weighting.

³² Department for Education and Skills (2006). *Participation in Education and Training by 16 and 17 Year Olds in each Local Area in England: 2003 and 2004* (Statistical First Release 3/2006). London: DfES.

learning at an FE college (51 per cent), compared with the proportion of young people aged 16-17 who had done so nationally (28 per cent). Similarly, a higher proportion of IFP students had progressed to work-based learning (an apprenticeship or other job with training) – 14 per cent of IFP participants, compared with seven per cent nationally. In contrast, a lower proportion were attending a school sixth form (18 per cent of IFP participants, compared with 29 per cent nationally).

3.3 Factors which appeared to influence progression into further education or training

Using the post-16 destination data provided by schools, multi-level regression analyses were carried out to explore the relative impact of a range of factors on young people's post-16 destinations. More specifically, the purpose of the model was to examine which factors appeared to be associated with IFP participants' continuation into further education and training. The variables accounted for in the model included:³³

- **student-level variables** – such as prior attainment at key stages 3 and 4 and background characteristics
- **school-level characteristics** – such as school type, and whether the school had specialist status
- **college-level variables** – including achievement and retention rate data (16-18 and 19+), and data on the quality of teaching and learning (16-18) in the colleges attended by young people as part of the IFP (drawn from reports of OFSTED and the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI))
- **census variables** – these were derived from census data at student level and included characteristics of the local area such as levels of employment and migration.

The associations that were found between these variables and continuation into further education or training are discussed below.

Key stage 4 achievement (total score) – as might be expected, student achievement influenced post-16 destination. Higher achievement at key stage 4 was strongly associated with an increased probability that young people would continue into further education or training after finishing Year 11 (total achievement at key stage 4 was found to be a stronger predictor of post-16 progression than eight highest grades achieved). It is worth noting that achievement of a vocational qualification through the IFP was not

³³ See Appendix C for a full list of variables included in the multi-level model analysis. The model included only those young people for whom schools had provided details of their post-16 destination. Young people whose post-16 destination was 'unknown' were excluded from the model.

significantly related to post-16 progression. However, as discussed in detail in Chapter 2, participation in IFP does contribute to total achievement at key stage 4, and thus, contributes to progression as part of the overall suite of qualifications achieved at key stage 4.

A separate analysis indicated that students who achieved the level 2 threshold of five GCSEs at grades A* to C or equivalent, were significantly more likely to progress into further education or training. While, overall, 89 per cent³⁴ had made this transition, among those who had achieved the level 2 threshold, 97 per cent did so, compared with 84 per cent of those who had not achieved this level at key stage 4.

The type of qualifications that students undertook through the IFP also appeared to influence their post-16 destination:

Studying an other vocational qualification through IFP – even when other student and school characteristics were taken into account, there was a negative association between studying an other vocational qualification and a student going into further education or training. Students who took these qualifications through IFP had a lower probability of continuing into further learning after Year 11, compared with similar IFP students who took different qualifications. It is worth noting that this is only partially explained by the fact that studying an other qualification through the IFP has a negative impact on achievement at key stage 4 (as reported in Chapter 2).

Further exploration was undertaken to examine whether the level of the qualification studied by those taking other vocational qualifications may be a factor, as all the entry-level qualifications undertaken by IFP participants are classified as other vocational qualifications, as noted in Chapter 2. However, the number of participants taking qualifications at this level is too few to allow for a conclusive robust analysis.

While it is not possible, through this analysis, to surmise why young people who had taken other vocational qualifications had a lower probability of continuing in learning, the evaluation of the first cohort of IFP participants revealed that the proportion of students who intended to remain in the same subject area post-16 was greater among those who had undertaken NVQs and GNVQs through IFP than for those who had taken GCSEs in vocational subjects or other vocational qualifications.³⁵ Moreover, although 40 per cent of the sample of young people in the first cohort who had undertaken other vocational qualifications continued to take an other vocational qualification post-16, 57 per cent of those who had taken an NVQ continued on to an NVQ

³⁴ This analysis is based on all those for whom destination data was provided by schools and who matched to NPD. Consequently, the figure differs from the 87 per cent figure reported elsewhere.

³⁵ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds programme: The Second Year*. London: DfES Research Report 609.

post-16.³⁶ While this may reflect the availability of appropriate qualifications post-16, it may also suggest that continuity in qualification type may support continued participation post-16.

The subject area of qualifications undertaken by students was *not* significantly associated with differences in post-16 destinations, where there were sufficient numbers to conduct a robust analysis.

The type of school that IFP students attended appeared to influence their post-16 destination, as students who attended a **comprehensive school without a sixth form** had a lower probability of continuing into further education or training, compared with similar students in comprehensive schools with a sixth form. This finding may reflect a wider experience of students making the transition to post-16 learning from schools without sixth forms and, although experienced by IFP participants, may be unrelated to the programme itself. Nevertheless, it suggests that participation in IFP has not removed the effect of attending a school that is comprehensive to 16 on participation post-16.

However, the college variables included in the analysis did not appear to have a significant impact on post-16 destinations – the overall attainment and retention rates of the colleges that students attended as part of the IFP did not appear to significantly influence whether participants continued into further learning or not.

To illustrate these findings, Table 3.2 and Figure 3.1 below provide examples of the degree of impact that some of the above factors might have on a young person's likelihood of continuing into further learning post-16. These indicate the effect that a feature, like taking an other vocational qualification, or attending a comprehensive school without a sixth form, has on a young person's progression, over and above other influential factors which are controlled for, such as the characteristics of the individual (including their key stage 4 attainment), their school and their IFP provision.

Table 3.2, for example, reveals that a typical student who participated in IFP and took a GCSE in a vocational subject through the programme had a 96 per cent likelihood of continuing into further education or training. A student who was the same in all respects measured, but had chosen to take an other vocational qualification through IFP had a 94 per cent chance of making a positive transition post-16. The nature of the school that a student attended pre-16 also appeared to influence post-16 transition, as attending a comprehensive school without a sixth form decreased the probability that students would continue into further learning after finishing Year 11.

³⁶ Golden, S., O'Donnell, L., Benton, T. and Rudd, P. (2005). *Evaluation of Increased Flexibility for 14 to 16 Year Olds Programme: Outcomes for the First Cohort* (DfES Research Report 668). London: DfES.

Table 3.2 Probabilities of students with particular characteristics continuing into further education or training post-16


Student characteristics	Probability of continuing into further education or training post-16 %
Typical IFP student taking a GCSE in a vocational subject	96
Typical IFP student taking an other vocational qualification	94
Typical IFP student taking a GCSE in a vocational subject at a comprehensive to 16 school	93

A typical student reflects the majority characteristics of the sample.

Source: NFER evaluation of IFP cohort 2: destinations data provided by schools and National Pupil Database

Figure 3.1 presents this data in a chart which illustrates the impact that different factors have on post-16 transition for young people with different levels of key stage 4 achievement. This again reveals that taking an other vocational qualification and attending a comprehensive school without a sixth form were associated with a lower probability of continuing into further education or training. Moreover, this difference was more marked for students with lower achievement at key stage 4.

Figure 3.1 Probability of continuing into further education or training post-16



An additional model, which included only those young people who had continued into further learning post-16 (3289 individuals), was developed in order to explore whether there was an association between the students’

experience pre-16, through the IFP, and the location of their post-16 destination. More specifically, it examined the factors which influenced whether young people took a post-16 course at a college or training provider, rather than in a school sixth form. Again, the model included student-level variables, school-level variables, college-level variables and census variables.³⁷

The following factors were associated with an increased probability that IFP participants who continued into further learning chose a post-16 course at a college or training provider:

- **Lower key stage 3 attainment** – students with lower key stage 3 attainment in English and mathematics were more likely to take a post-16 course at a college or training provider than similar students with higher key stage 3 attainment.
- **Studying an NVQ or other vocational qualification** – students who took these qualifications through the IFP had an increased probability of going on to an FE college or training provider post-16, compared with similar students who took other qualifications.
- **Studying a sports, leisure and tourism related qualification** – students who pursued IFP qualifications in this vocational area had an increased probability of taking a post-16 course at a college or training provider, compared with students who took qualifications in other subject areas, but were similar in all other respects measured.
- **Attending a school without a sixth form** – as might be expected, attending a school with no sixth form pre-16 was positively associated with IFP participants continuing into further education at a college or training provider.
- **Attending a college with higher overall retention rates** – students who studied their IFP course at a college with higher overall retention rates had an increased probability of choosing to study at a college post-16, rather than at school.

3.4 Conclusion

The information provided by schools on post-16 destinations indicates that 87 per cent of young people who participated in the second cohort of the IFP progressed into further education or training after finishing Year 11, which exceeds the target for IFP partnerships of 75 per cent.

A range of factors appeared to have influenced young people's choice of post-16 destination, most notably, achievement at key stage 4; however, the type of qualification that students had taken through the IFP also appeared to

³⁷ See Appendix C for a full list of the variables included in the multi-level analysis.

influence their post-16 destination. Students who had taken other vocational qualifications through the programme had a lower probability of progressing into further learning post-16, compared with similar students who had taken different qualifications.

4. Conclusions

Overall, the majority of participants in the second cohort of IFP had **achieved their qualifications** and had achieved in line with expectations given their prior attainment and other background and school-level characteristics. Indeed, those taking NVQs and GNVQs had achieved more points in total than similar students who had not participated in IFP but who may have been undertaking vocational qualifications. The attainment outcomes for the second cohort of participants were similar to those of the first cohort in many respects. However, IFP participants in the second cohort who took GCSEs in vocational subjects achieved less well compared with similar students taking the same qualifications, whereas this was not the case among students taking these qualifications in the first cohort.

The majority (87 per cent) of the representative sample of young people had **progressed on to further education or training** after completing their involvement in IFP. This proportion exceeded the target for the programme of 75 per cent of participants remaining in learning post-16. While this may suggest that the experience of IFP by students could usefully contribute to engaging them in learning post-16, it is worth noting that it is not possible to know what these young people might have chosen to engage with post-16, had they not participated in IFP in Years 10 and 11. Nevertheless, there are indications of some consistency across the two cohorts of the programme as a similar proportion of young people who participated in the first cohort progressed on to further learning.

An interesting area of investigation would be to explore the extent to which these transitions are sustained and that the young people remain in learning until the completion of their course or programme of study, or indeed, continue into further learning in the longer term.

It appears that studying **other vocational qualifications** through IFP may lead to different outcomes for young people than studying NVQs, GNVQs and GCSEs in vocational subjects. Young people who had undertaken other vocational qualifications had a lower probability of continuing into further learning post-16 compared with their peers who participated in IFP but undertook alternative qualifications.

The analysis also revealed that key stage 3 attainment was a less effective predictor of achievement of other vocational qualifications than was the case in relation to the other types of qualifications that a young person could pursue through IFP. Moreover, young people with higher attainment at key stage 3 (level 5 and above) who had undertaken other vocational qualifications had

gained fewer points at key stage 4 than similar students who had not undertaken any vocational qualifications. While it is worth noting that the evidence indicates that other vocational qualifications may provide an assessment of different skills and knowledge to those examined through key stage 3 assessments, partnerships may wish to more carefully scrutinise the types of qualifications that their students are undertaking in order to ensure that they are appropriate for their needs.

The analysis indicated that young people who participated in the second cohort of IFP had a lower probability of achieving the **level 2 threshold** of five GCSE passes at grades A* to C, or equivalent. This was also the case when their achievement of level 2 including English and mathematics was examined. Moreover, on average, they achieved lower grades than similar students who had not participated in the programme in their English and mathematics GCSEs. Partnerships may wish to investigate the extent to which they offer support to IFP participants in relation to the core subjects, of English and mathematics, especially where lessons in these subjects are missed as a consequence of IFP participation, and whether, and in what way, achievements in English and mathematics could be enhanced. Moreover, there may be value in examining approaches to timetabling and identifying good practice which enable young people to participate in such provision without missing core subjects.

A notable minority of young people appeared to have **discontinued** their involvement in IFP before the end of Year 11. Such discontinuation was associated with students achieving significantly fewer points at key stage 4 than similar students who had either not embarked upon IFP, or had sustained their involvement. It appears that young people who had lower attainment, were eligible for free school meals or were recognised for action on the register of SEN were over-represented among those who discontinued. Partnerships may wish to identify young people with these characteristics early in the programme and consider any ways in which they might be able to target additional support at them with the aim of minimising the risk of their discontinuing their involvement.

Appendix A: Representativeness of respondents

Representativeness of young people for whom details of the achievement of NVQs and other vocational qualifications were provided

Table A1 presents the profile of the young people for whom details of the achievement of NVQs and other vocational qualifications were provided by schools. It shows that the responding sample were broadly representative of the cohort as a whole who were engaged with undertaking these types of qualifications. However, the respondents had slightly lower attainment than the cohort as a whole.

Table A1. Background characteristics of students participating in IFP taking NVQs and other vocational qualifications: young people whose details were provided by schools in 2005 and all IFP students taking these qualifications

Characteristic	Young people whose details were provided by schools 2005 %	All IFP students in cohort 2 taking NVQs and other VQs %
Sex		
Male	59	61
Female	41	39
N=	1835	14,456
Ethnicity		
White	91	92
Asian or Asian British	2	2
Black or Black British	1	2
Mixed	1	2
Prefer not to say	5	2
N=	1737	13,808
Mother tongue		
English	97	96
Other than English	3	4
N=	1835	14,456
Free school meals		
Receives free school meals	23	24
Does not receive free school meals	77	76
N=	1832	14,402
SEN		
No special provision	54	55
School action/ plus	33	35
Statement or assessment	13	10
N=	1832	14,404
KS3 English		
Level 4 and below	71	68
Level 5 and above	29	32
N=	1670	13,020
KS3 Maths		
Level 4 and below	67	63
Level 5 and above	33	37
N=	1753	13,597
KS3 Science		
Level 4 and below	70	66
Level 5 and above	30	34
N=	1747	13,560

All those for whom data was available on NPD

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Source: NFER evaluation of Increased Flexibility Programme cohort 2 – end of Year 11 data, baseline data and NPD

Representativeness of young people for whom post-16 destinations data was provided

Details of the post-16 destinations of a total of 3789 young people were provided by schools in autumn 2005. Table A2 presents the representativeness of these young people, compared with all IFP students in cohort 2. As this table illustrates, the sample of students for whom details of their destinations and achievements at the end of Year 11 were provided were broadly representative of all students in cohort 2 of the IFP, in terms of their background characteristics.

Table A2. Background characteristics of students participating in IFP: young people whose destination details were provided by schools in 2005, and all IFP students

Characteristic	Young people whose details were provided by schools 2005 %	All IFP students in cohort 2 %
Sex		
Male	54	56
Female	46	44
N=	3649	34,363
Ethnicity		
White	91	91
Asian or Asian British	4	3
Black or Black British	1	2
Mixed	1	2
Chinese	<1	<1
Other	1	<1
Prefer not to say	3	2
N=	3396	33,165
Mother tongue		
English	95	95
Other than English	5	5
N=	3649	34,363
Free school meals		
Receives free school meals	20	21
Does not receive free school meals	80	79
N=	3639	34,243
SEN		
No special provision	69	70
School action/ plus	24	24
Statement or assessment	7	6
N=	3639	34,247
KS3 English		
Level 4 and below	47	47
Level 5 and below	53	53
N=	3416	31,898
KS3 Maths		
Level 4 and below	45	44
Level 5 and above	55	56
N=	3504	32,823
KS3 Science		
Level 4 and below	48	47
Level 5 and above	52	53
N=	3505	32,742

All those for whom data was available on NPD

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Source: NFER evaluation of Increased Flexibility Programme – end of Year 11 data, baseline data and NPD

Details of the type of school attended by young people for whom post-16 destinations data was provided are presented in Table A3. As can be seen, these young people were more likely than all IFP students in cohort 2 to have attended a comprehensive school with a sixth form. However, analysis revealed that this had no significant impact on post-16 destinations overall, therefore, this is unlikely to affect the overall findings in the report.

Table A3. Type of school attended pre-16: young people whose details were provided by schools in 2005, and all IFP students

	Young people whose details were provided by schools 2005 %	All IFP students in cohort 2 %
Type of school		
Comprehensive to 16	43	50
Comprehensive to 18	51	46
Secondary modern	3	3
Other secondary school	0	<1
City Technology College (CTC) school	0	<1
Special school	3	1
Pupil referral unit	<1	<1
N=	3752	36,026

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Source: NFER evaluation of Increased Flexibility Programme – baseline data

Table A4 presents details of the qualifications that young people for whom post-16 destinations information was provided were reported to have taken through the IFP. This shows that a higher proportion of young people for whom data was provided by schools had taken GNVQs through the IFP, compared with all IFP students in cohort 2. However, further analysis revealed that studying a GNVQ through the IFP did not have a significant influence on post-16 destinations.

Table A4. Qualifications studied through IFP: young people whose details were provided by schools in 2005, and all IFP students

	Young people whose details were provided by schools 2005 %	All IFP students in cohort 2 %
Qualification		
New GCSE	53	50
NVQ	17	18
GNVQ	5	10
Other vocational qualification	28	25
Non-qualification	2	2
Qualification unknown	0	<1
N=	3789	36,116

More than one answer could be given so percentages do not sum to 100

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100

Source: NFER evaluation of Increased Flexibility Programme – baseline data

Appendix B: Points scores for qualifications

To calculate the points scored by students, QCA scores were used. In this system, a **GCSE** at each of the following grades is worth the following points:

	GCSE	VGCSE
A*	58	116
A	52	104
B	46	92
C	40	80
D	34	68
E	28	56
F	22	44
G	16	32
U	0	0

GNVQs are worth the following points:

	GNVQ full intermediate	GNVQ Part 1 Int.	GNVQ Full Foundation	GNVQ part 1 Foundation
Distinction	220	110	136	68
Merit	196	98	112	56
Pass	160	80	76	38

The points assigned to **NVQs** and **other vocational qualifications** vary according to the individual qualification. Details of the points for each type of qualifications were drawn from the QCA website (www.openquals.org.uk)

Some examples of the points assigned to **NVQs** and **other vocational qualifications** are provided below.

Qualification Title	Level	Points
NVQ Performing Engineering Operations	1	168
NVQ Hairdressing	1	140
NVQ Preparing and Serving Food	1	140
CACHE Award in Caring for Children	1	140 (merit)
CITB/C&G Building Craft Occupations	1	75

Appendix C: Variables included in the multi-level model analyses

Table C1 Variables included in achievement of IFP qualification analysis

variable	label
totscore	Total KS4 points score
best8	Capped KS4 points score
ifscore	Points Scored in IF subject
contact	Contact_ID
pupid	Pupil ID
cons	Constant Term
gcse	Pupil began studying GCSE through IF
gnvq	Pupil began studying GNVQ through IF
nvq	Pupil began studying NVQ through IF
othqual	Pupil began studying VRQ through IF
k3av	Key stage 3 Average
k3eng	Key stage 3 English
k3math	Key stage 3 Maths
k3sci	Key stage 3 Science
lowks3	Pupil has KS3 average below level 4
lowkint	Interaction – $KS3AV * LOWKS3$
age	Total age in months (when took exam)
female	Female pupil
sensa	SEN – School Action/Plus
senstat	SEN – Statement
fsm	Eligible for free school meals
eal	English as an additional language
whitoth	Ethnicity – White Non-UK
gypsy	Ethnicity – Gypsy/Roma
ethmix	Ethnicity – Mixed
asiani	Ethnicity – Asian Indian
asianp	Ethnicity – Asian Pakistani
asianb	Ethnicity – Asian Bangladeshi
asiano	Ethnicity – Asian Other
blackc	Ethnicity – Black Caribbean
blacka	Ethnicity – Black African
blacko	Ethnicity – Black Other
Chinese	Ethnicity – Chinese
ethoth	Ethnicity – Other
ethrefu	Ethnicity – Refused
ethmiss	Ethnicity – Unknown
pupmob	Pupil changed school between KS3 and KS4
semod	Secondary modern school
comp16	Comprehensive to 16
specs	Special school
prusch	Pupil Referral Unit
othsch	Other non Comp-18 secondary school
faith	Faith school
boysch	Boys' school
girlsch	Girls' school
pcfsm	% entitled to FSM
pceal	% EAL pupils
pcsen	% of pupils with special needs with statements
ptr	pupil: teacher ratio

variable	label
n16	No. of pupils aged 16
spec	Active specialist school during year before exams
spectech	Technology Specialist School
specarts	Arts Specialist School
specsci	Science Specialist School
specspor	Sports Specialist School
speclang	Language Specialist School
specmath	Maths and Computing Specialist School
specbusi	Business and Enterprise Specialist School
specoth	Other Specialist School
census measure – deprivation index	High unemployment, high population with no qualifications, in routine occupations, in council housing, lone parents and poor health
census measure – overcrowding/ethnic minority	overcrowded dense with low White population
census measure – migration index	area of high migration
nocensus	No matching census information
atcolleg	Location – College
atcollms	Location – College with no performance info
atschool	Location – School
atother	Location – Other (not college or school)
atunkn	Location – Unknown
retrate	Average post-16 retention rate of college
passrate	Average post-16 qualification pass rate of college
area1	Admin/business
area2	Land-based
area3	Animals
area4	Construction
area5	Catering
area6	Care and childcare
area7	Engineering and motor
area8	Hair and beauty
area9	ICT
area10	Arts
area11	Sports, leisure and tourism
area12	Retail
area13	Manufacturing
area14	Science
area16	Other
noarea	Area Unknown
gcseint	Interaction – GCSE*K3AV
gcsefem	Interaction – GCSE*FEMALE
gnvqint	Interaction – GNVQ*K3AV
gnvqfem	Interaction – GNVQ*FEMALE
nvqint	Interaction – NVQ*K3AV
nvqfem	Interaction – NVQ*FEMALE
othint	Interaction – OTHQUAL*K3AV
othfem	Interaction – OTHQUAL*FEMALE
gcsesch	Interaction – GCSE*ATSCHOOL
othlowki	Interaction – OTHQUAL*LOWKINT
othatoh	Interaction – OTHQUAL*ATOTHER
otharea1	Interaction – OTHQUAL*AREA1
othare10	Interaction – OTHQUAL*AREA10
nvqeng	Interaction – NVQ*K3ENG

Table C2 Variables included in overall achievement analysis

variable	label
totscore	Total KS4 points score
best8	Capped KS4 points score
level1	Achieved at least 5 A*-G grades or equivalent
level2	Achieved at least 5 A*-C grades or equivalent
high_eng	Highest English Grade
high_mat	Highest Maths Grade
fiveagem	Achieved 5 A*-G including English and Maths
fiveacem	Achieved 5 A*-C including English and Maths
lea	LEA ID
school	School ID
pupid	Pupil ID
cons	Constant Term
ifpsch	IFP school
base	Pupil in Baseline of IF
gcse	Pupil began studying GCSE through IF
gnvq	Pupil began studying GNVQ through IF
nvq	Pupil began studying NVQ through IF
othqual	Pupil began studying VRQ through IF
k3av	Key stage 3 Average
k3eng	Key stage 3 English
k3math	Key stage 3 Maths
k3sci	Key stage 3 Science
lowks3	Pupil has KS3 average below level 4
lowkint	Interaction – KS3AV*LOWKS3
age	Age in months at start of year
female	Female
sensa	SEN – School Action/Plus
senstat	SEN – Statement or assessment
fsm	FSM
eal	English as an additional language
whitoth	White Other
gypsy	Gypsy/Roma
ethmix	Mixed race
asiani	Asian – Indian
asianp	Asian – Pakistani
asianb	Asian – Bangladeshi
asiano	Asian – Other
blackc	Black – Caribbean
blacka	Black – African
blacko	Black – Other
Chinese	Chinese
ethoth	Ethnicity – Other
ethrefu	Ethnicity – Refused
ethmiss	Ethnicity – No Information
pupmob	Pupil mobility KS3-KS4
secmod	Secondary modern school
comp16	Comprehensive to 16
grammar	Selective school
ctsch	CTC school
spesch	Special school
prusch	Pupil Referral Unit
othsch	Other non Comp-18 secondary school
faith	Faith school

variable	label
boysch	Boys' school
girlsch	Girls' school
pcfsm	% entitled to FSM
pceal	% EAL pupils (ASC 04)
pcsen	% of pupils with special needs with statements
ptr	pupil:teacher ratio
n99	headcount of total No. of pupils
n16	No. of pupils aged 16
spec	Active specialist school during year before exams
spectech	Technology Specialist School
specarts	Arts Specialist School
specsci	Science Specialist School
specspor	Sports Specialist School
speclang	Language Specialist School
specmath	Maths and Computing Specialist School
specbusi	Business and Enterprise Specialist School
specoth	Other Specialist School
census measure – deprivation index	High unemployment, high population with no qualifications, in routine occupations, in council housing, lone parents and poor health
census measure – overcrowding/ethnic minority	overcrowded dense with low White
census measure – migration index	area of high migration
nocensus	No matching census information
vgcseent	VGCSE recorded on NPD
gnvqent	GNVQ recorded on NPD
gcse dis	Began but did not enter VGCSE
gnvqdis	Began but did not finish GNVQ
yr04	Took Exam in 2004
yrint	Interaction – YR04*K3AV
yrfem	Interaction – YR04*FEMALE
yrbase	Interaction – YR04*BASE
yrgcse	Interaction – YR04*GCSE
yrgnvq	Interaction – YR04*GNVQ
yrmvq	Interaction – YR04*NVQ
yrothq	Interaction – YR04*OTHQUAL
yrfsm	Interaction – YR04*FSM
yrspec	Interaction – YR04*SPEC
yrvgent	Interaction – YR04*VGCSEENT
yrgnent	Interaction – YR04*GNVQENT
yrgedis	Interaction – YR04*GCSEDIS
yrgndis	Interaction – YR04*GNVQDIS
yrnongc	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGC
yrnongn	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGN
ealint	Interaction – EAL*K3AV
gramint	Interaction – GRAMMAR*K3AV
pcfsmint	Interaction – PCFSM*K3AV
pcsenint	Interaction – PCSEN*K3AV
vgcseint	Interaction – VGCSEENT*K3AV
gnvqint	Interaction – GNVQENT*K3AV
ifgcint	Interaction – GCSE*K3AV
ifgnint	Interaction – GNVQ*K3AV
vgcsefem	Interaction – VGCSEENT*FEMALE
gnvqfem	Interaction – GNVQENT*FEMALE

variable	label
ifgcfem	Interaction – GCSE*FEMALE
ifgnfem	Interaction – GNVQ*FEMALE
nonifgc	Entered at least one VGCSE not through IF
nonifgn	Entered at least one GNVQ not through IF
ifgcasia	Interaction – GCSE*Asian
ifgcbiac	Interaction – GCSE*Black
ifgnasia	Interaction – GNVQ*Asian
ifgnblac	Interaction – GNVQ*Black
vgcseasi	Interaction – VGCSEENT*Asian
vgcsebla	Interaction – VGCSEENT*Black
gnvqasi	Interaction – GNVQENT*Asian
gnvqbla	Interaction – GNVQENT*Black
nfgcint	Interaction – NONIFGC*K3AV
nfgcfem	Interaction – NONIFGC*FEMALE
nfgcasi	Interaction – NONIFGC*Asian
nfgcbia	Interaction – NONIFGC*Black
nfgnint	Interaction – NONIFGN*K3AV
nfgnfem	Interaction – NONIFGN*FEMALE
nfgnasi	Interaction – NONIFGN*Asian
nfgnbla	Interaction – NONIFGN*Black
nvqint	Interaction – NVQ*K3AV
nvqfem	Interaction – NVQ*FEMALE
othint	Interaction – OTHQUAL*K3AV
othfem	Interaction – OTHQUAL*FEMALE
yrnvqint	Interaction – YR04*NVQ*K3AV
yrnvqfem	Interaction – YR04*NVQ*FEMALE
yrothint	Interaction – YR04*VRQ*K3AV
yrothfem	Interaction – YR04*VRQ*FEMALE
yrvgint	Interaction – YR04*VGCSEENT*K3AV
yrgnint	Interaction – YR04*GNVQENT*K3AV
yrivgint	Interaction – YR04*GCSE*K3AV
yrignint	Interaction – YR04*GNVQ*K3AV
yrvgfem	Interaction – YR04*VGCSEENT*FEMALE
yrgnfem	Interaction – YR04*GNVQENT*FEMALE
yrivgfem	Interaction – YR04*GCSE*FEMALE
yrignfem	Interaction – YR04*GNVQ*FEMALE
yrivgasi	Interaction – YR04*GCSE*(Asian Pupil)
yrivgbla	Interaction – YR04*GCSE*(Black Pupil)
yrignasi	Interaction – YR04*GNVQ*(Asian Pupil)
yrignbla	Interaction – YR04*GNVQ*(Black Pupil)
yrvgasi	Interaction – YR04*VGCSEENT*(Asian Pupil)
yrvgbla	Interaction – YR04*VGCSEENT*(Black Pupil)
yrgnasi	Interaction – YR04*GNVQENT*(Asian Pupil)
yrgnbla	Interaction – YR04*GNVQENT*(Black Pupil)
yrngcint	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGC*K3AV
yrngcfem	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGC*FEMALE
yrngcasi	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGC*(Asian Pupil)
yrngcbia	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGC*(Black Pupil)
yrngnint	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGN*K3AV
yrngnfem	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGN*FEMALE
yrngnasi	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGN*(Asian Pupil)
yrngnbla	Interaction – YR04*NONIFGN*(Black Pupil)
yrifpsch	Interaction – YR04*IFPSCH

Table C3 Variables included in destinations analysis

variable	label
posdest	Destination in further education/training
colsixth	Chose college rather than sixth form at school
lea	LEA ID
contact	School ID
pupid	Pupil ID
cons	Constant Term
gcse	New GCSE
nvq	NVQ
gnvq	GNVQ
othqual	Other qualification
nonqual	Non qualification
area1	Subject – Admin/business
area2	Subject – Land-based
area3	Subject – Animals
area4	Subject – Construction
area5	Subject – Catering
area6	Subject – Care and childcare
area7	Subject – Engineering and motor
area8	Subject – Hair and beauty
area9	Subject – ICT
area10	Subject – Arts
area11	Subject – Sports, leisure and tourism
area12	Subject – Retail
area13	Subject – Manufacturing
area14	Subject – Science
area15	Subject – Key Skills
area16	Subject – Other
noarea	Subject – Unknown
k3av	Key stage 3 Average
k3eng	Key stage 3 English
k3math	Key stage 3 Maths
k3sci	Key stage 3 Science
lowks3	Pupil has KS3 average below level 4
lowkint	Interaction – KS3AV*LOWKS3
age	Total age in months (when took exam)
female	Female pupil
sensa	SEN – School Action/Plus
senstat	SEN – Statement
fsm	Eligible for free school meals
eal	English as an additional language
whituk	Ethnicity – White UK
whith	Ethnicity – White Non-UK
gypsy	Ethnicity – Gypsy/Roma
ethmix	Ethnicity – Mixed
asiani	Ethnicity – Asian Indian
asianp	Ethnicity – Asian Pakistani
asianb	Ethnicity – Asian Bangladeshi
asiano	Ethnicity – Asian Other
blackc	Ethnicity – Black Caribbean
blacka	Ethnicity – Black African
blacko	Ethnicity – Black Other
chinese	Ethnicity – Chinese
ethoth	Ethnicity – Other

variable	label
ethrefu	Ethnicity – Refused
ethmiss	Ethnicity – Unknown
pupmob	Pupil changed school between KS3 and KS4
secmod	Secondary modern school
comp16	Comprehensive to 16
specscho	Special school
prusch	Pupil Referral Unit
faith	Faith school
boyscho	Boys' school
girlscho	Girls' school
pcfsm	% entitled to FSM
pceal	% EAL pupils (ASC 04)
pcsen	% of pupils with special needs with statements
ptr	pupil:teacher ratio
n16	No. of pupils aged 16
spec	Active specialist school during year before exams
spectech	Technology Specialist School
specarts	Arts Specialist School
specsci	Science Specialist School
specspor	Sports Specialist School
speclang	Language Specialist School
specmath	Maths and Computing Specialist School
specbusi	Business and Enterprise Specialist School
specoth	Other Specialist School
atlead	Studies at lead partner
atschool	Studies at school
atcolleg	Studies at non-lead college
atother	Studies at other
census measure – deprivation index	High unemployment, high population with no qualifications, in routine occupations, in council housing, lone parents and poor health
census measure – overcrowding/ethnic minority	overcrowded dense with low White
census measure – migration index	area of high migration
nocensus	Missing census information
eic1	Excellence in cities
totscore	Total points score at KS4
best8	Capped points score at KS4
ifscore	KS4 points achieved in IF qualification
ifach	Achieved IF qualification

Appendix D: Numbers of young people included in the analysis

Table D.1a Numbers of young people included in the achievement of IFP qualification analysis

	Number of IFP participants
Pupil originally studying VGCSE through IFP	11,928
Pupil originally studying GNVQ through IFP	2450
Pupil began studying NVQ through IF	543
Pupil began studying VRQ through IF	662
Ethnicity – White UK	13,619
Ethnicity – White Non-UK	216
Ethnicity – Gypsy/Roma	10
Ethnicity – Mixed	228
Ethnicity – Asian Indian	223
Ethnicity – Asian Pakistani	221
Ethnicity – Asian Bangladeshi	94
Ethnicity – Asian Other	52
Ethnicity – Black Caribbean	134
Ethnicity – Black African	135
Ethnicity – Black Other	41
Ethnicity – Chinese	43
Ethnicity – Other	95
Ethnicity – Refused	193
Ethnicity – Unknown	279
Female pupil	7450
Eligible for free school meals	2315
English as an additional language	859
No SEN	12,663
SEN – School Action/Plus	2434
SEN – Statement	486
Pupil changed school between KS3 and KS4	184
Admin/business	1283
Land-based	47
Animals	11
Construction	294
Catering	224
Care and childcare	2871
Engineering and motor	2331
Hair and beauty	293
ICT	4211
Arts	865

	Number of IFP participants
Sports, leisure and tourism	1603
Retail	1
Manufacturing	486
Science	863
Key Skills	0
Other	163
Area Unknown	37
Location – College	8443
Location – School	5702
Location – Other (not college or school)	218
Location – Unknown	1220
N =	15,583

Table D.1b Numbers of young people included in the achievement of IFP qualification analysis

	Number of IFP participants
Boys' school	589
Girls' school	465
Faith school	2299
Comprehensive to 18	6675
Comprehensive to 16	8262
Secondary modern school	513
Selective school	0
CTC school	0
Special school	79
Pupil Referral Unit	4
Other non Comp-18 secondary school	50
Active specialist school during year before exams	9738
Technology Specialist School	2690
Arts Specialist School	1506
Science Specialist School	808
Sports Specialist School	1703
Language Specialist School	718
Maths and Computing Specialist School	713
Business and Enterprise Specialist School	742
Other Specialist School	858
N =	15,583

Table D.1c Numbers of schools included in the achievement of IFP qualification analysis

	Number of IFP schools
Boys' school	24
Girls' school	15
Faith school	117
Comprehensive to 18	327
Comprehensive to 16	353
Secondary modern school	33
Selective school	0
CTC school	0
Special school	12
Pupil Referral Unit	3
Other non Comp-18 secondary school	4
Active specialist school during year before exams	469
Technology Specialist School	121
Arts Specialist School	74
Science Specialist School	47
Sports Specialist School	86
Language Specialist School	41
Maths and Computing Specialist School	35
Business and Enterprise Specialist School	44
Other Specialist School	21
N =	732

Table D.2a Numbers of young people included in the overall destination analysis

	Number of IFP participants
Pupil originally studying VGCSE through IFP	1815
Pupil originally studying GNVQ through IFP	181
NVQ	616
Other qualification	991
Non qualification	59
Ethnicity – White UK	3060
Ethnicity – White Non-UK	34
Ethnicity – Gypsy/Roma	2
Ethnicity – Mixed	42
Ethnicity – Asian Indian	24
Ethnicity – Asian Pakistani	66
Ethnicity – Asian Bangladeshi	23
Ethnicity – Asian Other	12
Ethnicity – Black Caribbean	16
Ethnicity – Black African	19
Ethnicity – Black Other	4
Ethnicity – Chinese	6
Ethnicity – Other	17
Ethnicity – Refused	76
Ethnicity – Unknown	88
Female pupil	1589
Eligible for free school meals	567
English as an additional language	163
No SEN	2425
SEN – School Action/Plus	813
SEN – Statement	251
Pupil changed school between KS3 and KS4	15
Admin/business	278
Land-based	38
Animals	25
Construction	292
Catering	149
Care and childcare	470
Engineering and motor	724
Hair and beauty	303
ICT	480
Arts	240
Sports, leisure and tourism	248
Retail	11
Manufacturing	99

	Number of IFP participants
Science	124
Key Skills	4
Other	252
Area Unknown	66
Location – College	2506
Location – School	992
Location – Other (not college or school)	58
N =	3489

Table D.2b Numbers of young people included in the overall destination analysis

	Number of IFP participants
Boys' school	42
Girls' school	85
Faith school	413
Comprehensive to 18	1701
Comprehensive to 16	1589
Secondary modern school	116
Special school	81
Pupil Referral Unit	2
Active specialist school during year before exams	2092
Technology Specialist School	457
Arts Specialist School	369
Science Specialist School	253
Sports Specialist School	285
Language Specialist School	237
Maths and Computing Specialist School	212
Business and Enterprise Specialist School	182
Other Specialist School	97
N =	3489

Table D.2c Numbers of schools included in the overall destination analysis

	Number of IFP schools
Boys' school	5
Girls' school	5
Faith school	37
Comprehensive to 18	126
Comprehensive to 16	83
Secondary modern school	8
Special school	9
Pupil Referral Unit	2
Active specialist school during year before exams	140
Technology Specialist School	31
Arts Specialist School	23
Science Specialist School	21
Sports Specialist School	23
Language Specialist School	12
Maths and Computing Specialist School	7
Business and Enterprise Specialist School	16
Other Specialist School	7
N =	228

Table D.3a Numbers of young people included in the achievement analysis

	Number of IFP participants	Number of students nationally
Pupil listed on IF Baseline	19,337	19,337
Pupil attending school involved in IF	19,337	223,090
Pupil originally studying VGCSE through IFP	15,009	15,009
Pupil originally studying GNVQ through IFP	3228	3228
NVQ	679	679
Other vocational qualification	966	966
Ethnicity – White UK	16,891	355,439
Ethnicity – White Non-UK	271	9213
Ethnicity – Gypsy/Roma	11	153
Ethnicity – Mixed	289	8560
Ethnicity – Asian Indian	264	9892
Ethnicity – Asian Pakistani	279	9832
Ethnicity – Asian Bangladeshi	144	3914
Ethnicity – Asian Other	62	2405
Ethnicity – Black Caribbean	167	5679
Ethnicity – Black African	151	5546
Ethnicity – Black Other	54	1621
Ethnicity – Chinese	47	1688
Ethnicity – Other	103	3243
Ethnicity – Refused	284	6442
Ethnicity – Unknown	320	8134
Female pupil	9273	215,717
Eligible for free school meals	2893	52,817
English as an additional language	1039	35,235
No SEN	15,639	367,971
SEN – School Action/Plus	3104	49,914
SEN – Statement	594	13,876
Pupil changed school between KS3 and KS4	228	18,200
N	19,337	431,761

Table D.3b Numbers of young people included in the achievement analysis

	Number of IFP participants	Number of students nationally
Boys' school	691	21,774
Girls' school	519	30,980
Faith school	2753	89,631
Comprehensive to 18	8029	235,568
Comprehensive to 16	10,640	150,234
Secondary modern school	525	12,563
Selective school	0	21,911
CTC school	0	1836
Special school	89	5134
Pupil Referral Unit	4	465
Other non Comp-18 secondary school	50	4050
Active specialist school during year before exams	12,597	290,160
Technology Specialist School	3740	81,022
Arts Specialist School	1632	46,484
Science Specialist School	1014	32,648
Sports Specialist School	2576	41,916
Language Specialist School	829	31,960
Maths and Computing Specialist School	823	22,623
Business and Enterprise Specialist School	1031	18,729
Other Specialist School	952	14,778
N =	19,337	431,761

Table D.3c Numbers of schools included in the achievement analysis

	Number of IFP schools	Number of schools nationally
Boys' school	50	226
Girls' school	48	220
Faith school	206	616
Comprehensive to 18	673	1238
Comprehensive to 16	589	985
Secondary modern school	49	93
Selective school	0	163
CTC school	0	11
Special school	43	504
Pupil Referral Unit	4	121
Other non Comp-18 secondary school	9	99
Active specialist school during year before exams	871	1619
Technology Specialist School	240	439
Arts Specialist School	133	251
Science Specialist School	96	186
Sports Specialist School	146	236
Language Specialist School	76	174
Maths and Computing Specialist School	68	133
Business and Enterprise Specialist School	70	114
Other Specialist School	42	86
N =	1367	3214

Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications
P.O. Box 5050
Sherwood Park
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60
Fax: 0845 60 333 60
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60
Online: www.dfespublications.gov.uk

© National Foundation for Educational Research 2006

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN 1 84478 786 9
Ref No: RR786
www.dfes.go.uk/research