



Department
for Education

Youth Contract for 16-17 year olds: an evaluation Technical report: Tables from the surveys of local authorities

Research Report

June 2014

**Rosa Marvell and Becci Newton - Institute for
Employment Studies**

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Peter Sellen and Ravinder Athwal for their support throughout this evaluation. The support of LAs who completed the surveys was also greatly appreciated. Finally, we thank the research and support teams at IES: Jonathan Buzzeo, Martin Culliney, Gill Brown, Louise Laing, Stefanie Ledermaier, Sarah McCann and Karen Patient.

Institute for Employment Studies

The Institute for Employment Studies is an independent, apolitical, international centre of research and consultancy in public employment policy and organisational human resource issues. It works closely with employers, government departments, agencies, and professional and employee bodies. For more than 40 years the Institute has been a focus of knowledge and practical experience in employment and training policy, the operation of labour markets, and human resource planning and development. IES is a not-for-profit organisation which has over 35 multidisciplinary staff and international associates. IES expertise is available to all organisations through research, consultancy, publications and the Internet.

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Institute for Employment Studies	2
Contents	3
List of tables	5
1.1 2013 YC Survey of Local Authorities	9
1.1.1 LA Teams respondents were part of	9
1.1.2 Whether LA was a subcontractor for YC delivery	9
1.1.3 Views of the rate (percentage) of participation among local young people aged 16-18 that would be achieved in LAs by 2015	9
1.1.4 Data quality pre-YC	10
1.1.5 Fit of the YC within the LA context	10
1.1.6 Novelty or innovation introduced by the YC locally	11
1.1.7 Topics of early discussions with LAs	12
1.1.8 Effectiveness of YC arrangements	12
1.1.9 Benefits and added value of the YC	14
1.1.10 Expectations and early outcomes	15
1.2 2014 YC Survey of Local Authorities	17
1.2.1 LA Teams respondents were part of	17
1.2.2 Whether LA was subcontractor in YC delivery	18
1.2.3 Changes in subcontractors and prime providers	18
1.2.4 Changes in delivery arrangements	19
1.2.5 Quality of data since the Youth Contract has been operating	20
1.2.6 Fit of YC with existing activities and support	21
1.2.7 Novelty and innovation in delivery	24
1.2.8 Views of the delivery of the YC	25

1.2.9	Benefits and added value of the YC for 16-17 year olds	28
1.2.10	Outcomes and impacts	29

List of tables

Table 1: LA Teams in which survey respondent is located	9
Table 2: The extent to which LA are subcontractors for YC delivery	9
Table 3: Estimate of likely rate of participation in 2015	9
Table 4: Currency of data pre-YC	10
Table 5: Completeness of data pre-YC.....	10
Table 6: YC in competition with existing local provision	10
Table 7: YC is complementary with existing local provision	10
Table 8: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people	11
Table 9: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people	11
Table 10: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people by whether LA is autonomous	11
Table 11: Topics of early discussions held between LAs and YC providers.....	12
Table 12: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support	12
Table 13: Effectiveness of arrangements for young people to the YC.....	12
Table 14: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about young people recruited	13
Table 15: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about young people recruited to the YC by whether LA is autonomous for YC	13
Table 16: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information on the progress of participants.....	13
Table 17: Effectiveness of sharing information on the progress of young people supported by the YC by whether the LA is autonomous for YC	14
Table 18: Value added by the YC to existing services for eligible young people	14
Table 19: Value added to your LA arising from the operation of the YC.....	14
Table 20: The key needs of young people eligible for the YC	15
Table 21: Challenges LA anticipated in achieving positive outcomes for young people eligible for the YC	16

Table 22: 'Are changes to IAG arrangements a challenge?' by whether LA is autonomous for YC.....	16
Table 23: Overall satisfaction with the YC among LA	17
Table 24: LA Teams in which survey respondent is located	17
Table 25: The extent to which LA are subcontractors for YC delivery	18
Table 26: Whether there been any change(s) in the provider(s) delivering the YC in your LA since June 2013	18
Table 27: The nature of change in provider	18
Table 28: Any changes to YC delivery since June 2013	19
Table 29: Aspects of delivery that have changed.....	19
Table 30: Whether changes to the nature of delivery resulted from the change in provider locally	19
Table 31: Changes to delivery that resulted from provider changes	20
Table 32: Currency of data	20
Table 33: Currency of data: LAs who responded to both surveys	20
Table 34: Completeness of data	21
Table 35: Completeness of data from LAs who responded to both surveys.....	21
Table 36: How well has the YC for 16-17 year olds fitted within local actions:	21
Table 37: Increasing rates of participation by autonomy 2014	22
Table 38: Reducing rates of NEET by autonomy 2014	22
Table 39: Reducing rates of unknown destinations by autonomy 2014.....	22
Table 40: Supporting vulnerable and disadvantaged groups by autonomy 2014	23
Table 41: YC Competing or complementary with local provision	23
Table 42: Degree to which the YC complements local provision.....	23
Table 43: Degree to which the YC competes with local provision	23
Table 44: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people	24
Table 45: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people	24

Table 46: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people from LAs responding to both surveys.....	24
Table 47: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people from LAs responding to both surveys.....	24
Table 48: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people by whether LA is autonomous	25
Table 49: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support	25
Table 50: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support by whether LA is autonomous for the YC	25
Table 51: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support from LAs that responded to both surveys	26
Table 52: Effectiveness of arrangements for referring young people to the YC	26
Table 53: Effectiveness of arrangements for referring young people to the YC from LAs that responded to both surveys	26
Table 54: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about participants.....	26
Table 55: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about young people recruited to the YC from LAs responding to both surveys	27
Table 56: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information on the progress of participants.....	27
Table 57: Effectiveness of sharing information on the progress of participants by whether the LA is autonomous.....	27
Table 58: Value added by the YC to existing services for eligible young people	28
Table 59: Value added to your LA arising from the operation of the YC.....	28
Table 60: Extent to which the YC targeted and supported the most vulnerable people...29	29
Table 61: Extent to which the YC achieved sustainable EET outcomes for eligible young people	29
Table 62: Extent to which the YC achieved sustainable EET outcomes for eligible young people in the LA by whether the LA is autonomous for YC	29
Table 63: Overall satisfaction with the YC among LA	30

Table 64: Extent to which the YC achieved sustainable EET outcomes for eligible young people in the LA by whether the LA is autonomous for YC30

Table 65: Overall satisfaction among LA from LAs responding to both surveys30

1.1 2013 YC Survey of Local Authorities

1.1.1 LA Teams respondents were part of

Table 1: LA Teams in which survey respondent is located

	%
Children's Services	66
14-19 team	52
Education	45
Economic Development	7
Other	7
N	89

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.2 Whether LA was a subcontractor for YC delivery

Table 2: The extent to which LA are subcontractors¹ for YC delivery

	%
Yes	24
No	76
N	84

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.3 Views of the rate (percentage) of participation among local young people aged 16-18 that would be achieved in LAs by 2015

Table 3: Estimate of likely rate of participation in 2015

N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
23	85	100	93.45	4.042

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

¹ Subcontractors were combined with respondents from core city areas to provide information based on LAs who were able to determine (to a lesser or greater extent) the shape and nature of YC delivery. This grouping is subsequently referred to as 'LAs with autonomy'.

1.1.4 Data quality pre-YC

Table 4: Currency of data pre-YC

	%
Very poor	1
Poor	6
Good	36
Very good	56
Don't know	1
Total	86

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 5: Completeness of data pre-YC

	%
Very poor	1
Poor	7
Good	39
Very good	51
Don't know	1
Total	82

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.5 Fit of the YC within the LA context

Table 6: YC in competition with existing local provision

	%
Significant competition	19
Some competition	81
Total	63

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 7: YC is complementary with existing local provision

	%
Complementary	78
Highly complementary	22
Total	63

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.6 Novelty or innovation introduced by the YC locally

Table 8: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people

	%
No novelty or innovation	67
Some novelty or innovation	29
Significant novelty or innovation	1
Don't know	2
Total	86

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 9: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people

	%
No novelty or innovation	55
Some novelty or innovation	39
Significant novelty or innovation	4
Don't know	2
Total	85

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 10: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people by whether LA is autonomous²

	LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
No novelty or innovation	45	78
Some novelty or innovation	50	22
Significant novelty or innovation	5	0
Total	20	63

Chi square= 9.535, df= 2, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

² Autonomous was a shorthand used to denote whether LAs were able to determine (to some extent) the shape and nature of YC delivery through being a subcontractor or part of a core city area.

1.1.7 Topics of early discussions with LAs

Table 11: Topics of early discussions held between LAs and YC providers

	Yes	No	Don't know
Design of the YC	64	29	7
Size of the eligible population	90	7	2
Needs of the eligible population	76	19	5
Approach to targeting young people	84	11	5

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.8 Effectiveness of YC arrangements

Table 12: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support

Effectiveness	%
Highly ineffective	5
Ineffective	27
Effective	45
Highly effective	20
Don't know	4
Total	82

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 13: Effectiveness of arrangements for young people to the YC

Effectiveness	%
Highly ineffective	4
Ineffective	25
Effective	51
Highly effective	16
Don't know	5
Total	83

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 14: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about young people recruited

	%
Highly ineffective	12
Ineffective	24
Effective	40
Highly effective	19
Don't know	6
Total	85

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 15: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about young people recruited to the YC by whether LA is autonomous for YC

	LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Highly ineffective	10	14
Ineffective	5	33
Effective	45	41
Highly effective	40	12
Total	20	58

Chi square= 10.715, df= 3, p<.05

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 16: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information on the progress of participants

Effectiveness	%
Highly ineffective	16
Ineffective	32
Effective	25
Highly effective	17
Don't know	11
Total	84

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 17: Effectiveness of sharing information on the progress of young people supported by the YC by whether the LA is autonomous for YC

	LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Highly ineffective	15	19
Ineffective	10	47
Effective	35	25
Highly effective	40	9
Total	20	53

Chi-square= 13.745, df= 3, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.9 Benefits and added value of the YC

Table 18: Value added by the YC to existing services for eligible young people

	%
Assistance to navigate post-16 provision	28
Support not otherwise available	52
Intensive specialist services tailored to needs	34
Flexible provision to support re-engagement	42
Action planning to achieve progression	31
Other	30

Base: 64 respondents

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 19: Value added to your LA arising from the operation of the YC

	%
More up-to-date information about young people's status	22
Cleaner, higher quality data on young people	9
Boost to resources available to support young people	81
Other	21

Base: 58 respondents

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.1.10 Expectations and early outcomes

Table 20: The key needs of young people eligible for the YC

	%
Confidence and Self-Esteem	84
Support to Develop Aspirations	77
Soft skills	73
Aligning Careers and Labour Market	71
Realistic Expectations	67
Social Skills	66
Discipline and Behaviour	58
Better Labour Market Understanding	55
Wider Geography	40
Social Networks	31
Agency about the Future	30
Removal from Gang Culture	16
Other	11

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 21: Challenges LA anticipated in achieving positive outcomes for young people eligible for the YC

Challenges	%
Provision Appropriate for Vulnerable Groups	62
Lack of Bridging Provision	54
Changes to IAG arrangements	49
Cost of Public Transport	45
Lack of Apprenticeship places	33
Lack of public transport	31
Lack of Vocational Opportunities	28
Tracking Young People	23
Lack of local resources	22
Sharing Data	21
Lack of Collaboration among local partners	19
Competing 16-19 bursary offers	15
Identifying Young People	15
Lack of 16-19 study programme interaction	14
Lack of engagement among local partners	14
Lack of Academic Opportunities	2
Other	17

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

Table 22: 'Are changes to IAG arrangements a challenge?' by whether LA is autonomous for YC

	LA is autonomous	LA is not autonomous
	%	%
No	25	59
Yes	75	41
Total	20	61

Chi square = 6.972, df= 1, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013.

Table 23: Overall satisfaction with the YC among LA

	%
Very dissatisfied	13
Dissatisfied	34
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	27
Satisfied	19
Very satisfied	7
Total	83

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013

1.2 2014 YC Survey of Local Authorities

1.2.1 LA Teams respondents were part of

Table 24: LA Teams in which survey respondent is located

	2014
Teams	%
14-19 team	51
Children's Services	49
Youth Support Services	43
Education	30
Skills	29
Early Intervention	27
School Improvement	20
Employment	20
Partnerships	20
Commissioning	14
Inclusion	11
Economic Development	10
Special Educational Needs	9
Family Support Services	7
Planning and Regeneration	3
Other	4
N	70

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.2 Whether LA was subcontractor in YC delivery

Table 25: The extent to which LA are subcontractors for YC delivery

	%
Yes	35
No	65
N	70

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.3 Changes in subcontractors and prime providers

Table 26: Whether there been any change(s) in the provider(s) delivering the YC in your LA since June 2013

	%
Yes	54
No	46
N	70

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 27: The nature of change in provider

	%
Additional provider(s) (prime provider or subcontractors) now deliver the YC alongside the original provider	32
This LA took on all/some part of delivery in this area	29
Provider for this LA was replaced by another provider (the providers do not work alongside each other)	29
A new prime provider took over the YC in this region	18
The prime provider took over delivery in this LA	3
This LA withdrew from all/some part of delivery in this area	3
Other	29
N	38

Note: responses sum to more than 100 per cent as respondents could give more than one response

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.4 Changes in delivery arrangements

Table 28: Any changes to YC delivery since June 2013

	%
Yes	54
No	46
N	68

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 29: Aspects of delivery that have changed

	%
Targeting young people for support (N=33)	85
Referring young people for support (N=33)	70
Activities delivered to help young people progress towards EET (N=28)	57
Keyworker/mentor model of support (N=27)	56
How data on take-up and/or outcomes are shared (N=31)	55
The action planning process (N=20)	35

Note: responses sum to more than 100 per cent as respondents could give more than one response

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 30: Whether changes to the nature of delivery resulted from the change in provider locally

	%
Yes	91
No	9
N	23

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 31: Changes to delivery that resulted from provider changes

	Respondents noting a change in provider %	All respondents %
Targeting young people for support	90	85
Referring young people for support	85	70
Activities delivered to help young people progress towards EET	76	57
Keyworker/mentor model of support	75	56
How data on take-up and/or outcomes are shared	68	55
The action planning process	60	35

Note: responses sum to more than 100 per cent as respondents could give more than one response

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.5 Quality of data since the Youth Contract has been operating

Table 32: Currency of data

	%
Very good quality	49
Good quality	49
Poor quality	2
Very poor quality	0
N	69

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 33: Currency of data: LAs who responded to both surveys

	%
Very good quality	52
Good quality	48
Poor quality	0
Very poor quality	0
N	42

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 34: Completeness of data

	%
Very good quality	49
Good quality	48
Poor quality	3
Very poor quality	0
N	69

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 35: Completeness of data from LAs who responded to both surveys

	%
Very good quality	49
Good quality	49
Poor quality	2
Very poor quality	0
N	43

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.6 Fit of YC with existing activities and support

Table 36: How well has the YC for 16-17 year olds fitted within local actions:

	Very close fit %	Partial fit %	Does not fit %
Increasing rates of participation	42	46	12
Reducing rates of NEET	37	53	10
Reducing rates of unknown destinations	19	49	33
Supporting vulnerable and disadvantaged groups	42	59	9

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 37: Increasing rates of participation by autonomy³ 2014

		LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Increasing rates of participation	Very close fit	61	28
	Partial fit	39	51
	Does not fit	0	21
N		28	39

Chi square= 10.372, df= 2, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014.

Table 38: Reducing rates of NEET by autonomy 2014

		LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Reducing rates of NEET	Very close fit	55	24
	Partial fit	45	59
	Does not fit	0	17
N		29	41

Chi square= 9.888, df= 2, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014.

Table 39: Reducing rates of unknown destinations by autonomy 2014

		LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Reducing rates of unknown destinations	Very close fit	28	12
	Partial fit	55	44
	Does not fit	17	44
N		29	41

Chi square= 6.285, df= 2, p<.05

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014.

³ As in 2013, autonomous was a shorthand used to denote whether LAs were able to determine (to a lesser or greater degree) the shape and nature of YC delivery through being a subcontractor or part of a core city area

Table 40: Supporting vulnerable and disadvantaged groups by autonomy 2014

		LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Supporting vulnerable and disadvantaged groups	Very close fit	59	32
	Partial fit	41	54
	Does not fit	0	15
N		29	41

Chi square= 7.642, df= 2, p=<.05

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014.

Table 41: YC Competing or complementary with local provision

	%
Complemented	57
Competed with	24
Neither	19
N	70

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 42: Degree to which the YC complements local provision

	%
Complementary	69
Highly complementary	31
N	42

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 43: Degree to which the YC competes with local provision

	%
Some competition	83
Significant competition	17
N	18

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.7 Novelty and innovation in delivery

Table 44: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people

	%
No novelty or innovation	56
Some novelty or innovation	43
Significant novelty or innovation	1
N	69

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 45: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people

	%
No novelty or innovation	46
Some novelty or innovation	41
Significant novelty or innovation	13
N	69

Source: IES survey of local authorities 2014

Table 46: Novelty of the YC in targeting eligible young people from LAs responding to both surveys

	%
No novelty or innovation	52
Some novelty or innovation	45
Significant novelty or innovation	2
N	42

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 47: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people from LAs responding to both surveys

	%
No novelty or innovation	42
Some novelty or innovation	44
Significant novelty or innovation	14
N	43

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 48: Novelty of the YC in supporting eligible young people by whether LA is autonomous

	LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
No novelty or innovation	29	56
Some novelty or innovation	39	41
Significant novelty or innovation	32	3
N	28	41

Chi square= 10.789, df= 2, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.8 Views of the delivery of the YC

Table 49: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support

	%
Highly effective	28
Effective	58
Ineffective	14
Highly ineffective	0
N	65

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013, 2014

Table 50: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support by whether LA is autonomous for the YC

	LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Highly effective	44	16
Effective	48	66
Ineffective	8	18
Highly Ineffective	0	0
N	27	38

Chi square= 6.903, df= 2, p<.05

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 51: Effectiveness of arrangements for targeting young people for YC support from LAs that responded to both surveys

	%
Highly effective	34
Effective	49
Ineffective	17
Highly ineffective	0
N	41

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 52: Effectiveness of arrangements for referring young people to the YC

	%
Highly effective	22
Effective	66
Ineffective	12
Highly ineffective	0
N	65

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 53: Effectiveness of arrangements for referring young people to the YC from LAs that responded to both surveys

	%
Highly effective	26
Effective	64
Ineffective	10
Highly ineffective	0
N	42

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 54: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about participants

	%
Highly effective	25
Effective	56
Ineffective	16
Highly ineffective	3
N	68

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2013, 2014

Table 55: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information about young people recruited to the YC from LAs responding to both surveys

	%
Highly effective	26
Effective	57
Ineffective	17
Highly ineffective	0
N	42

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 56: Effectiveness of arrangements for sharing information on the progress of participants

	%
Highly effective	20
Effective	55
Ineffective	17
Highly ineffective	8
N	65

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 57: Effectiveness of sharing information on the progress of participants by whether the LA is autonomous

	LA is autonomous	LA is not autonomous
	%	%
Highly effective	36	8
Effective	54	57
Ineffective	10	21
Highly ineffective	0	14
N	28	37

2014 - Chi square= 11.007, df= 3, p<.05; 2013 - Chi-square= 13.745, df= 3, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.9 Benefits and added value of the YC for 16-17 year olds

Table 58: Value added by the YC to existing services for eligible young people

	%
Flexible support to assist in re-engagement	67
One-to-one mentoring and tracking	48
Support that would not otherwise be available	46
Support to be retained in education and training	46
Action planning to achieve progression	34
Assistance to navigate post-16 provision	28
Intensive specialist services tailored to their needs	25
Other	4
Clearer/improved mapping of post-16 provision	3
No additional value	19
N	67

Note: responses sum to more than 100 per cent as respondents could give more than one response

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 59: Value added to your LA arising from the operation of the YC

	%
Boost to resources available to support young people	63
Enabling LA resources to focus on other groups of young people NEET	39
Supporting young people at risk of drop-out from post-16 learning or training	39
Improved tracking of young people	25
Improved data sharing	22
Supporting young people at risk of NEET in schools	21
More up-to-date information about young peoples' status	15
Cleaner, higher quality data on young people	12
Other	1
No additional value	24
N	67

Note: responses sum to more than 100 per cent as respondents could give more than one response

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

1.2.10 Outcomes and impacts

Table 60: Extent to which the YC targeted and supported the most vulnerable people

	%
To a great extent	19
To some extent	69
Not at all	12
N	67

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 61: Extent to which the YC achieved sustainable EET outcomes for eligible young people

	%
To a great extent	9
To some extent	55
Not at all	17
I don't know	19
N	69

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 62: Extent to which the YC achieved sustainable EET outcomes for eligible young people in the LA by whether the LA is autonomous for YC

	LA is autonomous	LA is not autonomous
	%	%
To a great extent	20	0
To some extent	52	58
Not at all	7	24
I don't know	21	18
N	29	40

Chi square= 11.637, df= 3, p<.01

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 63: Overall satisfaction with the YC among LA

	%
Very satisfied	14
Satisfied	29
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	29
Dissatisfied	16
Very dissatisfied	12
N	69

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 64: Extent to which the YC achieved sustainable EET outcomes for eligible young people in the LA by whether the LA is autonomous for YC

	LA is autonomous %	LA is not autonomous %
Very satisfied	28	5
Satisfied	34	25
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	21	35
Dissatisfied	7	23
Very dissatisfied	10	12
N	29	40

Chi square= 10.262, df= 3, p<.05

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014

Table 65: Overall satisfaction among LA from LAs responding to both surveys

	%
Satisfied	30
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	23
Dissatisfied	19
Very satisfied	16
Very dissatisfied	12
N	43

Source: IES survey of local authorities, 2014



Department
for Education

© Institute for Employment Studies 2014

Reference: DFE- RR318C

ISBN:

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

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Peter.Sellen@education.gsi.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications