

Publication of Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 5 Destination Measures 2012

Evaluation Report

1. Introduction

Education Destination Measures were published for the first time on 17th July 2012. The Measures show the percentage of students continuing their education in school, Further Education or 6th form college or Higher Education Institution, and the percentage training through an apprenticeship or work-based learning.

Destination Measures form part of the Government's transparency agenda and our aim to put more information into the public domain. They provide clear and comparable information on what young people do when they leave school or college.

Two Destination Measures were published. These show the destinations of young people the year after Key Stage 4 (KS4) or taking A level or equivalent qualifications.

- The KS4 Measure is based on activity at academic age 16 (i.e. the year after the young person left compulsory schooling).
- The Key Stage 5 (KS5) Measure is based on activity in the year after the young person took A level or equivalent qualifications.

The data were published as a Statistical First Release (experimental statistics), available at: <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STA/t001076/index.shtml>

The experimental badge means that the Measures can be developed further in response to user's requirements. We encouraged users to fill in a survey and email the Destination Measures mailbox to give feedback on the Measures. This feedback is being taken into account as we develop the Measures for next year.

2. Overview of the report

This report summarises the feedback received following publication of Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 5 Destination Measures in July 2012. It includes the detailed responses to the survey evaluation form which users were encouraged to complete. The survey ran from the middle of July to early October and received a total of 51 responses. In addition, 28 messages containing feedback were received via the dedicated Destination Measures mailbox in the same period. In general the Destination Measures were positively received by respondents. The report has been grouped into the following themes:-

- Section 3: Who responded to the survey?
- Section 4: Content/presentation of the tables
- Section 5: Methodology
- Section 6: Understanding and accuracy of the data
- Section 7: Technical note
- Section 8: Policy related comments
- Section 9: How we will take this forward
- Section 10: Note on Annexes
- Annex 1 – 5 including all detailed responses to the survey

A summary of the comments received is shown under each heading. Where appropriate we have also included details of the action we will take to address these comments. The detailed responses to the survey evaluation questions are shown in the annexes.

3. Who responded to the survey?

We received survey feedback from a variety of sources. These included Local Authorities, school leaders, teachers and parents:

Who are you (please tick one only)

Response	Number of respondents
LA Officer	18
Deputy/ Assistant Head/ Vice Principal	7
Parent/ Student	4
Teacher/ Lecturer	3
Headteacher/ Principal	4
School or College Administrator	1
No response	14
Total number of respondents	51

The table below shows that the majority of respondents were made aware of the Destination Measures publication through the Press, the BBC website and through direct contact with the DfE:

How did you find out that the data was being/had been published? Please tick all that apply

Response	Number of respondents
Information in the press/BBC website	14
Direct contact with DfE	13
DfE Research and Statistics website	11
Representative body	9
Colleagues	8
Google search	1
AOC briefing alert	1
No response	7

4. Content/Presentation of the tables

The survey evaluation form included a number of questions on the content and presentation of the Destination Measure tables. The detailed responses can be found in Annex 1 of this paper.

Just under two thirds of the respondents were happy with the way the data had been presented.

Did you like the way the data were presented?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	26
No	16
No response	9

A number of suggestions on how the content and presentation of the tables could be improved were made, several of which we agreed with and will take forward.

Actions we will take for the 2013 Publication:

- Allow the tables to be manipulated to give users different cuts of the data
- Expand the column heading of “Data not captured” so that the explanation of what this heading covers is clearer
- Include the admissions policy (selective, comprehensive etc.) and/or the type of institution (e.g. Community school, Academy etc.)
- Include characteristic breakdowns such as gender, ethnicity and free school meals. Include regional figures in the tables
- Consider including charts in the next Measure - Although we do not intend to include charts, we will ensure our data are easier to manipulate so that users can produce them themselves

Actions we are considering further for the 2013 Publication:

- Include employment destinations - We are testing and evaluating data on employment destinations for inclusion in the 2013 publication
- Two respondents disagreed with the Russell Group breakdown of universities in the tables and a further two respondents suggested that the 1994 group of Universities should be included in the tables. We are considering how we will show destinations to HE in the 2013 publication;
- Include a breakdown of students with Special Educational Needs – we are exploring this for the 2013 publication.

Actions we are unable to take for the 2013 Publication:

- Include breakdowns of young people with autism, or who are disabled or asylum seekers – we cannot identify these pupils in the cohort from the data used to produce the Measures. However, we agree that providing more information on the characteristics of students is important and we do intend to provide data broken

down by student characteristics, including ethnicity and eligibility for Free School Meals.

5. Methodology

Just under a quarter of respondents thought improvements were needed to the methodology used to create the Measure, see table below. The detailed responses can be found in Annex 2 of this paper.

Was there any aspect of the methodology used to produce the Measure that you did not agree with?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	6
No	19
No response	26

Again, a number of suggestions on how the methodology of the Measures could be improved were received:

Actions we will take for the 2013 Publication:

- Give schools the ability to check the underlying data – we are planning to share the Key Stage 4 data with schools prior to publication of the data in Performance Tables in 2013.
- Identify more young people under “Data not captured” as there are too many young people omitted from the Measure – this category should be reduced in future years as we are exploring including employment data to refine the Measures further
- Include gap year students – we are exploring this for inclusion in the Measures

Actions we are unable to take for the 2013 Publication:

- Base the Measure on the residency of the pupil rather than on the location of the institution - We will not investigate this, as the purpose of Destination Measures is to provide information about the institution and their success in helping their pupils to progress to a sustained education destination after they left the institution. This also fits with our plans to include the Destination Measures in the Performance Tables, which are based on the location of the institution

Actions we will consider taking for future Publications:

- Include independent schools in the cohort – we are considering including independent schools for future publications
- Expand the Key Stage 5 cohort so that it isn’t limited to young people who have completed A and AS levels – we will also consider this for Phase 3
- Improve the timeliness of the data - We are working with the data matching contractors to try and make the data more timely for Phase 3.

6. Understanding and accuracy of the data

Respondents were asked whether they understood what the data told them about the destinations of students/former students. The detailed responses to questions on the data can be found in Annex 3 of this paper.

The vast majority had understood the data, as shown below:

Did you understand what the data tell you about the destinations of students/former students in the year after KS4 or in the year after taking A level or equivalent qualifications?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	40
No	1
No response	10

Similarly, almost all of the respondents understood which group of students the data applied to:

Did you understand which group of students the data applied to?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	39
No	3
No response	9

Suggestions on how the understanding and accuracy of the data could be improved included:

Actions we will take for the 2013 Publication:

- Due to the small numbers in some of the Destination Measure breakdowns, suppression rules were used to ensure no individual could be identified. It was suggested that we should clarify the suppression rules - explanations of small numbers and symbols have been further clarified in the published tables. We are also considering the suppression rules we will use in the 2013 publication
- Include a section in the Technical Note on the accuracy of the data, the Quality Assurance and the verification process of testing the data

Actions we are unable to take for the 2013 Publication:

- Include international comparisons – we will not investigate this for the next set of Destination Measures but may consider it for later phases of development

7. Technical Note

The detailed responses to questions asked about the Technical note can be found in Annex 4 of this paper. Additional feedback was also provided under “General Comments”, see Annex 5. Just under 70% of those who responded to the question read the Technical Note included in the publication:

Did you read the Technical Notes provided with the data?

Response	Number of respondents
----------	-----------------------

Yes	25
No	11
No response	15

Two thirds of respondents to the question found the explanation of the methodology easy to understand and the level of detail in the Technical Note 'About right'.

Did you find the explanation of the methodology used to produce the Destination Measures as set out in the Technical note of the publication easy to understand?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	17
No	8
No response	26

Respondents made the following suggestions which we will action for next year's publication.

Actions we will take for the 2013 Publication:

- Explain more clearly that the Local Authority figures are based on the location of the school and not on the residency of the pupil
- Include a FAQ section and a user guide for schools and colleges to show them how they could use the data
- Ensure explanations are as concise as possible
- Include a section to discuss the next steps for developing the Measures
- Expand the explanation of those pupils who appear to be counted twice in the tables and in the Technical Note to make this clearer

8. Policy related comments

Though the survey questionnaire focused on the data aspects of the Measures, a number of comments on Destination Measures policy were received via the Destination Measures dedicated mailbox.

Almost all the correspondents who commented on the policy aspects of the Measures were positive about the decision to publish Destination Measures. Two careers tutors commented that publication of the Measures would prove helpful in their roles and one correspondent asked about publication of destinations information beyond KS5. They were put in touch with colleagues in the Department for Business Innovation and Skills who are responsible for adult and higher education. One correspondent was unsure whether part time students were captured in the Measure. We will make it clear for next year that part time students are included.

9. Priorities for publication in 2013

Throughout this report, we have set out the actions we will take to address the feedback we received following publication of the Destination Measures in July 2012. All actions and commitments are subject to testing and evaluation of the data and compliance with appropriate Data Protection provisions and Government protocols. We will also assess their compatibility with development of the policy on Destination Measures. Where, following the

testing of the data and policy consideration, a suggestion cannot be actioned, we will make users aware of the reasons for this.

Our headline priorities for development of the Measures due to be published in 2013 are:

- Developing education **and employment** destinations for both KS4 and KS5 students
- Developing the Measures to include detail on the characteristics of students, including those eligible for Free School Meals
- Developing the KS4 Measures for publication in Performance Tables next year.

10. Note on Annexes

The following annexes contain the detailed responses to the questions asked in the survey evaluation questionnaire. The answers respondents gave are included verbatim in the majority of cases and, as we felt it important to include all responses, there is a certain amount of repetition.

The questions and responses are included in the annexes according to the sections of this report and are therefore not presented chronologically.

Annex 1

Detailed responses to the survey questions on content/presentation of the tables (Section 4 of this Report)

Question 6: Did you like the way the data were presented?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	26
No	16
No response	9

Question 7: How could the presentation of the data be improved?

Add percentages (i.e. % of students going to Russell group) and rankings in the tables themselves.
It is not immediately clear that the LA data level data is not showing destinations of LA residents but is an aggregation of the destinations measures of schools in the LA area.
Much greater clarity about those pupils in our LA area who have gone onto to KS5 out of the LA area and into the neighbouring county.
Data could be presented more visually rather than in reams and reams of XL files.
We would like the category of school/college included so we can compare against the same type quickly.
The underlying data tables could be presented to the same formatting standard as the main tables. Volume data could be included in the main tables.
Regional averages could be included in the main tables (these currently need to be calculated manually which creates a risk of erroneous figures being used).
Data is now 4 years old and therefore of little constructive use.
I think the first set of data is about transfer from year 12 to 13 - it is not clear.
Data points in middle of columns rather than right of column.
To have numbers as well as percentages.
To have back up information to explain student data and colour to help distinguish groups and data sets as per 'Central London Connexions' reports.
Also to provide a comparison between national and local authority in the form of 'at-a-glance' charts and graphs to help interpret the statistics and information.
Presentation is good, but more up-to-date data would be better.
It is essential that there is data tracking outcomes for disabled young people. Currently there is no regular data that sets out the destinations of young people when they finish school. Unless Government is able to analyse what young people with disabilities do when they leave school we are not able to measure how well schools are equipping young people for further education or training. Nor are we able to understand the services and support young people need. Without this data it is very difficult to commission services or budget effectively. This will become increasingly important with the raising of the participation age. In order to have the best possible understanding of how our education system supports young people with disabilities we also need to break down data by disability. This would enable colleges, universities, employers, government and charities such as us to have a better understanding of how best to provide the support that young people with autism need to learn, thrive and achieve.
Graphical format.
Access to institution level data through alphabetical sections for easier searching.

Much greater prominence to the figure in post 18 of "missing" which can include gap year etc.
Graphs would be good as a government we need to support guide school and to do this we need to represent the data in a simplified format to share with parents and government. By giving some idea of the implications of the information, ie. what do high figures and low figures mean?
Produce comparative charts. Let person choose what to compare e.g. schools across boroughs or within boroughs.
It could be complemented by bar charts, as in other DfE data.
Expand on the data sheets what not included means. In a rural community it can look like a number of students 'disappeared' but in fact went to work in profitable family owned farms.
A pivot chart to allow more straightforward comparisons to be made between the data sets.
If secure destinations need to be guaranteed for every recruit some potentially good students risk rejection over uncertainty if they have had problems in the past.
More timely (time to speak to HESA?), in more detail.
Provision of comparison data in graph format to allow for comparisons.
In excel, the headings should be frozen.

Question 9: Are there any specific breakdowns that you would like to see for these data (e.g. destinations of SEN students)

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	25
No	12
No response	14

Question 9 contd.: Please list the breakdowns you would like:

It would be interesting to know the social background of those who go to the Russell group university and of those who don't.
Destinations of SEN students.
Those on FSM or other identifiable vulnerable groups.
Children in care, asylum seekers, other vulnerable learner criteria, deprivation index, widening participation criteria, free school meals etc.
All vulnerable groups and smaller groups e.g. SEN, LAC, FSM, BME.
The data set only details education destinations but work is also a valuable analysis. We would also like a breakdown of the FE section to include continued at the same institution.
Please see Q.24 as not enough space here.
Gender, Ethnicity, FSM, SEN, EAL.
SEN and pupil premium funded pupils.
SEN Students / Special Schools / Alternative Provision / ISPs / Private and Voluntary Sector Providers.
All vulnerable groups inc. SEN, G&T, FSM, ethnicity.
Attainment above and below grade 'C'/Level 1; SEN; ethnicity and gender; types of school including UTC's and Free schools.
SEN including school action / school action plus, FSM, perm exc. Non-attenders.
Figures on the destinations of young people with autism.
Analysis of destination according to level of qualification.
SEN, exclusions.
SEN pupils, Looked after children, FSM and non-FSM split.
SEN and FSM destinations would be very welcomes.
FSM would be good.
Would be good to see each destination as an option only.
SEN, FSM, Low, middle and high ability.

Sample sizes become so small that they are meaningless at school level unless three year running totals are used.

Details of non-educational destinations.

FSM, CLA.

Destinations of students who do not achieve 5 A-C at GCSE.

Question 20: How do you intend to use THESE data?

To decide which school would be good for my children.

Adapt RPA strategy to highlight issues – e.g. follow up on unsustainable educational destinations by school.

We shall not use these data.

See above.

We will be checking the validity of our data and this (if done accurately) will close the loop between the data we have gathered on our leavers and the data the local authority continues to gather (which isn't UCAS based).

To support our overall 16-19 partnership in its planning and to support the RPA project.

Support the internally collated data set.

To provide a pan-London overview of performance in relation to young people's progression. To inform the development of resources to support schools in delivering their responsibilities in relation to careers guidance.

To help gauge the distance travelled toward achieving aspects of Raising the Participation Age in London.

These will be circulated to schools and advisors during the autumn term for discussion and awareness purposes.

As benchmark data.

I don't - we've highlighted a potential problem using [xx] data and this is no more up to date.

They are so old and inaccurate that we won't.

Support within localities; IAG and relevance to curriculum offer.

As a tool for schools to help them understand their role in supporting pupil progression.

Different methodology as our data looks at progression and achievement.

As a planning tool e.g. monitoring the schools which are more likely to generate growth in apprenticeship take-up, trends over time to see if patterns change, as part of the overall education landscape to inform the Local Authority priorities in increasing participation and shaping provision to meet the needs of young people.

Personal/commercial.

The 'sustained destination' indicator will be useful to inform IAG service about the appropriateness of some offers to young people.

Quick overview for senior management.

Not at all - far too much missing and out of date.

Respond to questions from MPs/their staff.

To plan ahead to better predict and support young people in our school and area, a very local response to a national issue.

Better assess schools when choosing for my children.

I write about 14-19 qualifications, so these data are background material.

Similar to Q17.

To better inform advice and guidance offered to our KS4 students regarding their proposed post-16 choices; we see this as critical information to be used alongside performance tables to provide objective information.

I do not intend to use your data although I may provide a link to it from our website for parents to look at.

It is unlikely that we will.

To look at the numbers of learners across the areas we operate to look at apprenticeship uptake and where the feeder schools in our areas are seeing their pupils move to.

Question 21: Is there anything that would help you to use the data more effectively?

More information about the young people in destinations not sustained, in particular the numbers as well as the percentages. Data for the independent schools to be included.
Accuracy.
Having all the census data for our residents in schools and academies available to us in October each year so we can eliminate unknowns and make our data more accurate.
As previously better visual interpretation of the data.
No.
Regional summary and analysis would be useful.
Greater clarity around KS5 data and the difference between course provision. This is all predicated on participation in A levels.
If it were more up to date.
Greater accuracy and more recent.
See earlier comments: 'at-a-glance' charts to support visual impact and understanding; RAG rating for statistics with benchmarks to give data relevance and comparisons to national figures for expected percentage destinations.
Times series, trends and more timely data would be welcomed.
Clarity of definitions.
CSV format.
Historical data would be very welcome to look at trends and predict outcomes.
Inclusion of (former) independent school pupils.
I think as described earlier in feedback but we could help if you need us to.
Easy charting and comparison tools.
It would be much more powerful for parents and students to be able to see this information as part of the performance tables data already published to encourage parents to have a much fuller picture of the schools they are looking at. It would also be helpful to include independent school data.
If you were going to provide value added data in league tables it would properly reflect the job providers were actually doing for the students they take in.

Annex 2

Detailed responses to the survey questions on methodology (Section 5)

Question 13: Would you have wanted to make any corrections or amendments to the data shown in this SFR or corresponding underlying data?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	10
No	21
No response	20

Question 14: If yes, to enable us to consider how this might be introduced for future publications of Destination Measures, please give a brief description of the corrections or amendments you would like to have made.

Need breakdown by learner for the institution so we can check against UCAS and other records.
See answer to Question number 12.
It would have been good to get the data in advance by residency and cross reference against our IYSS data.
When we compared ourselves with a College in our area, the % progressing to FE was significantly different. We would like the FE section to include continued to same institution. Curriculum structure may also have an influence on the statistics. For example: If a College runs two 1yr level 3 programmes the learners would then progress back into FE opposed to a College which runs a 2yr level 3 where the main destination is work this will impact positively for the first College but gives a negative picture for the second due to work being excluded from the report.
The numbers are too low - need some sort of positive checking system.
Need robust employment data. Could you link learner numbers to national insurance data?
It would be good for the LA to be able to review the data before publication to check for anomalies against CCIS before the data goes into the public domain.
Strongly believe unacceptable that info is published on schools when schools cannot see let alone check the underlying data.
I would wish to see NEET and some way of FE needing to come back to the schools with updated information as we seem to lose a lot at 17 when the college 6th form or young person sees it as not being for them.
The not counted column -we should be able to identify those in work, so NEET students are shown.
It does not properly allow for gap year or false start students. Also the Russell group has changed its membership over the years - now our local top HEI is but it was not then, skewing data for the whole county.

Question 24: Was there any aspect of the methodology used to produce the measure that you did not agree with?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	6
No	19
No response	26

Question 24 contd.: If yes, please specify:

Only using A levels and AS in KS5 data.
As previously the issue of only gathering data from 6th form providers within the LA area where a large number of pupils go outside the LA boundary to access 6th form provision.

Exclusion of work as a valid destination.

Too many gaps and too high a proportion of young people left out. Omission of training providers underlines the attitude towards this provision. The data needs to be more inclusive!

Gap year etc.

Annex 3

Detailed responses to the survey questions on understanding and accuracy of the data (Section 6)

Question 4: Did you understand what the data tell you about the destinations of students/former students in the year after KS4 or in the year after taking A level or equivalent qualifications?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	40
No	1
No response	10

Question 5: Did you understand which group of students the data applied to?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	39
No	3
No response	9

Question 8: Do you need anything else to enable you to interpret the data more fully?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	17
No	20
No response	14

Question 8 contd.: What would enable you to interpret the data more fully?

Information re gap year, also ,employment data.
The data must be accurate - there are significant inaccuracies in the data that undermine their usefulness.
Set up in easily printable form.
Further explanation of the methodology used to calculate the figures.
As above.
Student data set to reconcile and challenge.
Please see Q.24 as not enough space here.
Year on year comparisons.
More detail regarding situation of individuals not in sustained participation (specifically unemployed / NEET).
More up to date data required.
See comments above.
Employment and NEET data in same release.
Breakdown of academic/vocational route i.e. A-Level / BTEC and Level 2 Level 3 split according to highest qualification undertaken.
More complete data.
As above some clear understanding of the implications, we seem to be boxing and valuing more and more qualifications as the only outcome of a school education, not sure this is the best use of 5 or now 7 years of secondary schooling.
How many pupils from feeding year were excluded to ensure better results and how many additional students not taught in feeding year were taken on.
Include other HE destinations, such as the 1994 group.
An indication of accuracy, uniformity of collection methods.

Question 10: Do you have access to any other data that you can use for comparison purposes?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	19
No	20
No response	12

Question 10 contd.: If yes, what?

UCAS data -indicates a higher % progression to university than the DfE data.
NCCIS for ks4; nothing for ks5.
We have confidence in the accuracy of our own College data and are unsure why there is such a discrepancy between those and the published data. How and when were these data gathered and from what sources?
Our IYSS data.
We have our own college data to compare, which doesn't tally with your data.
Through the learning gateway portal through the former Connexions service now in house within the LA.
Internally we captured intended destinations in 2008/09. We were able to reconcile the HE destinations in the report but not the FE which equated to approximately a 16% difference. With 2011/12 we have specifically targeted actual destinations with the hope of reconciling the FE figures to a more acceptable threshold.
Through historic familiarity with CCIS data.
E.g. ALPS data, RAISE on-line etc. but nothing else that compares HE destinations. The xx report 2011 was extremely useful.
Data collected by school e.g. leavers' forms.
Connexions data for destinations and other local authority led data.
CCIS.
Activity Survey using CCIS data.
LA xx used CCIS data from IAG provider to match year 11 learner destinations. Whilst this is not a direct comparison given the Destination Measures use of the 'sustained education' period it does give an immediate picture of next destination upon completing year 11 in terms of targeting NEET and Not Known activity.
Other sources are DfE LAIT tool but nothing else.
LSYPE figures -which don't exclude independent sector students.
It would be useful to show a more international comparison with the outcomes reached elsewhere.
Local consortium of schools share data.
The data discards those students not directly continuing - gap year students should be included but lagged - UCAS and HEFCE have this data.
LA data.

Question 11: How did the data compare to the other sources you have access to?

Response	Number of respondents
OK	6
Close match	4
Poor	5
No comparison data available	2
No response	34

Question 12: If the comparison was poor, please provide details below on how the data differed.

Below our UCAS destination data percentage.
Number of students was lower by a couple of hundred (approx. 5%).
It is difficult to do this without knowing exactly which cohort of students is included, the timing of the data collection and the sources used. For example, the table does not appear to take full account of students who take a gap year having made a deferred application to HE.
FE was 16% out but this was comparing intended to actual. Not record in measure was 30% which must include students that have gone into work. We only had 2 learners without a destination for the same data set which equates to 0.4%. Without the student level data set it is difficult to challenge.
Data for continuing into year 13 (if that is what it is) is far too low.
Comparison data is available, however we have not had the opportunity to process and make comparisons at the time of completing this survey.
Our first destination from year 11 analysis tended to be a lot higher for 'Any education destination' by institution, which would be expected.

Question 15: The data contains information on a group of students whose destinations are not captured in the data. Is it clear which former students are included in this category?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	15
No	20
No response	16

Question 16: Do you have any comments on the data covered in the 'Not captured in the data' category?

Why is progression to employment not seen as a positive outcome?
It seems very high!
We are unsure why this figure is so high. This is once again at odds with our own data.
It is unhelpful that it included those on gaps years, employed together with those who are NEET.
There are a wide range of reasons for students to be uncertain about their progression before the end of an academic year, in addition to this many students may be economically inactive whilst on gap years - it is imperative that the data reflects the true picture of A level students' destinations 2-3 years after completion.
As previous comment those pupils within the LA who still live within the LA but study over the border in the neighbouring LA at sixth form.
Please see 13.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This category currently captures destinations that could be both positive and negative – from someone who has gone onto employment through to somebody who is NEET. This is consequently not providing a true reflection of an institution's effectiveness in helping young people move to certain destinations. •Existing data sources (such as CCIS data) would allow this category to be broken down further. It would be helpful to have this level of detail in future releases, especially in regard to NEET young people. •The fact that employment destinations are not captured as a separate category creates an implicit bias towards academic/non-vocational destinations which is discordant with current policy •The fact that over a quarter of the cohort falls into this category for the KS5 Destination Measure limits the understanding of the progression routes of young people in this category. Greater appreciation of whether young people are going on to a positive destination in this category is required – especially in light of the current high unemployment rate for this age bracket.
I think it could be made more clear about NEET status. Would it not be possible to distinguish between those who are in employment, NEET and Not known?
Are these what would have been called unknowns under Connexions?

No.
This percentage seems very high and includes a huge range of people e.g. gap year to unemployed.
This category is too large and therefore creates massive gaps in meaning. Capturing those who are in education and training in private providers is very important particularly for the benefit of preparing for and measuring impact of RPA.
I think this will become less of an issue once the CCIS data is used to capture employment status.
Would like to include as a defined destination those leaving to jobs without training and alternative provision for those at Foundation Learning level, for example.
Supplement with NEET data for LA level.
Inclusion of NCCIS data for NEET?
Far too broad especially gap year.
It would help to have an estimated breakdown of their destinations at a national level, however rough.
Need to understand the term better and what its actually telling us or not.
See above.
The fact I can work it out is not a recommendation.

Question 17: Do you have any further comments about the quality or accuracy of the data?

No.
The quality of the data is difficult to measure as London Councils does not use pupil level data. School feedback on this will provide a useful contribution in terms of validating the data It would be reassuring to have a specific note about data quality assurance and the validation that has taken place.
What is the expected level of performance?
No.
The numbers are too low and it is years old.
Information about the source of the data would be helpful.
I think some may challenge the accuracy, given that the totals do not tie up in many cases, more detail required on why this may be so those of us using the data can adequately explain if challenged.
Whilst the publication by provider at KS5 is useful, there is undoubtedly a much larger cohort of young people in each LA who are not being included within the measure. E.g. XX providers EoKS figure is only 430 young people where a single year cohort of learners would be much larger.
How accurate can it continue to be if establishment and job centres don't track and follow up and share data with those who need to use it. The data captured at Job centre and FE level needs to be visible by schools if they need to track and support young people past 16/17.
Destinations of level 1 and level 2 students post-18 would be interesting and informative as well.
Sad though it is this may be the best mechanism which avoids inconsistent game playing by institutions.
The data are inaccurate and therefore unreliable.
Methods of capturing destinations vary so much. The effort to understand the data seems to outweigh its value. How would this data be of use to my College other than as a vague benchmark?

Question 18: Do you already use information on the destinations/progression of your former students?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	19

No	13
No response	19

Question 19: If yes, what data do you use and how do you use it?

UCAS data and try to collect progression data to analyse effectiveness and relevance of course provision etc.
KS4 destination data for provision planning.
College produced destination data are used to inform the College's self-assessment process and to inform our partner schools of the destinations of their students who transferred to this College at the age of 16.
We have analysed it to produce our RONI. We share our RONI NEET churn data with our schools to encourage them to focus on who is at risk.
Categorise and record destinations of all leavers including those students who leave without completing their courses - this informs the pastoral guidance we give and CEIAG.
Intended and actual destinations captured internally. UCAS placement list. Destinations forms part of the College SAR report and is analysed on an annual basis.
Destinations data is sent to schools on an annual basis.
Not specifically but it is important when looking at quality of careers provision to have these national figures in mind.
The xx data was used to identify potential underachievement in terms of progression to selective universities.
Leavers' forms. Use it to target e.g. careers education and support for entry to competitive courses.
September Guarantee; NEET data from LEA and Connexions. Nothing at present on those moving on to employment and these figures would help when developing IAG.
CCIS.
LA has used progression data and developed work on this.
CCIS data - Informs September Offer and strategic planning.
Connexions NCCIS data, Activity Survey data, September Guarantee data. September Guarantee data is used with Operational leads in Schools to target young people at risk of not progressing into positive post-16 destinations throughout the academic year. Activity Survey data is used with Senior Leadership teams in Schools to monitor performance. NCCIS data used with Schools to monitor their former pupils (i.e. 17/18 year olds).
Personally I don't but members within the 14-19 Team do.
We use the up to date info from the most recent academic year to review the effectiveness of our provision.
We would like to, we have an informal system on paper work when pupil leaves saying we are here and to stay in touch, but it's not enough for those who really need to on-going contact.
Inspire others. To refine our Information and Guidance systems.
UCAS destinations plus our own survey and contacts with students. Reported to governors and staff in detail. Some specific points used in open evenings and on website for applicants.
A combination of on-line and telephone surveys. This year we have started looking at ways to combine student aspirations with destinations.

Annex 4

Detailed responses to the survey questions on the Technical Note (Section 7)

Question 22: Did you read the Technical Notes provided with the data?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	25
No	11
No response	15

Question 23: Did you find the explanation of the methodology used to produce the Destination Measures as set out in the Technical Note of the publication easy to understand?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	17
No	8
No response	26

Question 25: How did you find the level of detail included in the Technical Notes of the publication?

Response	Number of respondents
About right	15
Too detailed	2
Not enough detail	2
No opinion	5
No response	27

Question 26: Are there any aspects of the Technical Notes you would like improved?

Response	Number of respondents
Yes	8
No	14
No response	29

Question 26 contd.: If yes, please give details:

It needs to be clear that KS4 data for LAs is not based on residency - or it needs to be changed so it is.
Local Authority partnership group of which I am a member will be feeding back on this.
See Q.24 - not enough space to answer here.
Clarity.
Too much repetition. Needs to be more concise with more explanation in the form of charts on the actual data for users to make sense of it.
More explanation of why some pupils apparently counted twice. I can anticipate some of the reasons, but better if they come from the source.

Question 27: What additional information would you like to see included in the Technical Notes?

An easier to understand summary.
Greater clarity about the next steps for developing the measure.
Direct links to data that could compliment the Destination Measures.
None.
As 22.
Details of other available data fields within the 3 datasets.
Statisticians have made the best of an impossible task.

Annex 5

General comments included at the end of the survey form

Question 28: Please use the space below for any general comments you wish to make on any area of the Destination Measures or the experimental statistics:

Figures take no account of the nature of the programme followed, many of which being more vocationally orientated are likely to lead to employment as a positive outcome at age of 19.
Please continue publishing these data every year as they are very meaningful for a parent.
The KS5 measures are confusing and difficult to draw any useful conclusions from because of it being limited to those studying L3 - If Oxbridge is to be picked out so should leading specialist institutions in other fields e.g. RCA. Publishing data of those who left two years previously make it less likely to be taken seriously and therefore less likely to act as a lever for change as schools are likely to say they have moved on from then. Travel to learn patterns in areas such as London make the data of little use at LA level - unless it was based on residency.
Unfortunately for us the data is almost meaningless when so many students go over the border to access further provision and the data only relates to the two providers within the city.
ANSWER TO QUESTION 8 •Maps showing regional figures (as is included in some Statistical First Releases (SFRs)) •Summary graphs, charts and visualisations (as is included in some SFRs) •Colour formatting and other formatting that makes it easier to extract headline data ANSWER TO QUESTION 9 •Destinations of SEN students is essential in light of the significant reforms taking place for young people with SEN •Other categories used to group young people statistics (such as ethnicity, young people in care, teenage parents etc.) •Residency breakdown (i.e. students home borough) •Other HE categories than Russell Group Universities and Oxbridge (e.g. Universities with technical specialities or top ranked Universities) •Course/subject breakdown in the underlying data ANSWER TO QUESTION 22 •Add a link to the frequently asked questions •Add a user guide section/explain how the measures can be employed by schools and local authorities •Break-up the text and use more visual methods to present how the data was created GENERAL COMMENT The Destination Measures are welcomed as they help to create greater accountability and incentive for institutions to effectively steer their students on to positive post 16-destinations and fulfil their statutory duty in relation to careers guidance.
Couldn't see a link for Technical Notes - if they are important then they need to be obvious!
At present they don't seem particularly useful either in terms of accuracy or timeliness.
What is the intended use of this data? Will it be used to influence OfSTED inspections? Will benchmarks for education, apprenticeships, employment and other training be created from it and those that fall 'below' these supported in some way?
Great start and a strong basis for future development. Speaking to our schools the only real issue they have is that they would like to see more timely data and be able to look at trends across years.
Timeliness is an issue, the data relates to 2008/09 leavers and whilst I recognise this is experimental, it will only assume real value over the years. That said it should allow schools with poor sustained education destination records to focus on their impartial IAG strategy. It would be useful to know how seriously the destination measures will be applied as I feel this could be an important lever in getting schools to address this important issue with vigour.
Reiterate that schools should be able to see / check the underlying data. Needs to be much more up to date to have any validity or use.
It came as a surprise that the data was captured and from where it came from and how will it be kept up to date for older pupils this is the easy bit direct from schools the difficult bit is joining up this data and following your own Star chamber and IRU guidance. Collect it once, well and share it appropriately, without constantly going back to schools time and time again. Good luck.

Definitely need how many pupils from feeder year were excluded. This could highlight were schools are creaming off the brighter students to ensure better results without taking risks to the detriment of the more risky students and vice versa.

Please include destinations for level 1 and 2 students post-18. Please include other HE groups in destination data such as the 1994 Group.

A very welcome step forward in providing open and transparent data that will aid the school improvement process and give parents better quality information, well done.

I think this is a really valuable measure - particularly given how much else is being sabotaged. I have indicated some possible improvements. The use of Oxbridge figures is less useful statistically (we look great) but smaller centres and those with weaker intakes suffer. A rolling three year data set would be better.