## Learner Satisfaction Equality and Diversity Data Report, 2011 to 2012

## Executive summary

## Introduction

1. The Learner Satisfaction Survey Version 4 took place from November 2011 to May 2012. The survey was open to all in-scope ${ }^{1}$ learners and 365,514 learners submitted a valid response. $94.6 \%$ of survey responses were submitted online and the remainder on paper questionnaires.
2. The Learner Satisfaction survey has 9 questions and learners are asked to rate various aspects of their course, learning programme or training programme on a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 equals very bad and 10 equals very good. This report analyses responses to the nine scoring questions of the 2011/12 Learner Satisfaction survey and includes breakdowns by age, gender, ethnicity, learning difficulties and or disabilities, level of deprivation and level of study. For each of the different learner groups, the report compares the average (mean) scores for the nine questions and the percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or higher.
[^0]
## Participation in the Learner Satisfaction Survey

3. 16 - to18-year-olds were over-represented in the sample of responses. $55.2 \%$ of the sample population was within the 16 - to18- year-old age band compared to $35.8 \%$ of the overall learner population. All other age bands were under-represented in the sample, particularly those within the range 25 and over. With each increasing age band, learners were increasingly under represented within the sample of learners taking part in the survey. Females were slightly under-represented in the sample compared to the overall population and males were slightly over-represented.
4. In terms of ethnic groups, white learners were slightly over-represented in the sample of responses compared to the overall population. All other ethnic groups were under-represented. Learners with a declared learning difficulty or disability were over-represented in the sample. $18.0 \%$ of the sample population had learning difficulties and or disabilities compared to $14.4 \%$ of the overall learner population.
5. Learners who lived in areas of high deprivation were less likely to complete the survey than learners who lived in areas of lower deprivation. There was a clear correlation between survey participation and deprivation band with higher levels of deprivation being associated with lower survey participation rates.

Summary Chart: Survey Participation Rate by Deprivation


## Findings from the Learner Satisfaction Survey

6. The summary chart below shows the average (mean) score for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by age band, gender, ethnicity and learning difficulties and or disabilities. The breakdown by age band produced the greatest variation in scores.

Summary Chart: Average (mean) Learner Satisfaction Score by Equality and Diversity Categories


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012, Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Age band

7. For all 9 questions, there was a pattern of increasing average scores with age band, from the lowest within the $16-18$ age band and the highest within the 60 plus age band. The percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or above also demonstrated the same age band related pattern. Over half the learners aged 35 and over gave a maximum score of 10, compared to less than a quarter of 16- to18-yearolds.
8. The average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) increased with age band from a low of 7.94 for those aged 16-18 to a high of 9.07 for those aged 60 and over. The percentage of learners who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 increased with age band from a low of $66.5 \%$ for those aged $16-18$ to a high of $88.8 \%$ for those aged 60 and over.
9. For learners aged 16-18 there was a pattern of decreasing average (mean) scores with higher levels of study. The pattern was similar but less well defined for learners aged 19 and over.

## Gender

10. For all 9 questions, females gave higher average scores than males. The percentage of females who gave a score of 8,9 or 10 (where 0 equals very bad and 10 equals very good) was also higher for all questions.
11. Females and males gave the highest rating to Q4 (How good or bad is the respect staff show you?). Females gave the lowest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what to do after the course?) and males gave the lowest rating to Q8 (How good or bad is the college at acting on the views of learners?)
12. The average (mean) score for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) was higher for females, as was the percentage giving a score of 8,9 or $10.36 .2 \%$ of females gave a maximum score of 10 compared to $30.0 \%$ of males.

## Ethnicity

13. For all 9 questions the average (mean) scores were highest for Asian/Asian British learners and lowest for Mixed/Multiple ethnic group learners. Average (mean) scores given by Black/Black British learners were lower than those given by White learners for 7 of the 9 questions.
14. All ethnic groups gave the highest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the respect staff show you?) White learners and those belonging to other ethnic groups gave the lowest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what to do after the course?)

However, Asian/Asian British learners, Black/Black British learners and those belonging to Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups gave the lowest rating to Q8 (How good or bad is the college at acting on the views of learners?).
15. For Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) Asian/Asian British learners gave the highest average (mean) score (8.36) and Mixed/ Multiple ethnic group learners the lowest (8.07). There was a small difference between Black/Black British and White learners with Black/Black British learners having a slightly lower average mean score.
16. The percentage who gave a score of 8 or above for Q9 was highest among Asian/Asian British learners and lowest among Mixed/Multiple ethnic group learners.
17. For White learners there was a clear correlation between average (mean) scores and levels of deprivation with higher levels of deprivation being associated with higher average (mean) scores and lower deprivation associated with lower average (mean) scores. However, the pattern for the other ethnic groups was less well defined. Average (mean) scores were more erratic and there was no clear correlation between average (mean) scores and deprivation.
18. Average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) were higher for females across all ethnic groups. The greatest difference was among Asian/Asian British learners where the average (mean) for females was 8.52 and the average (mean) for males was 8.17 (difference $=0.35$ ).

## Learners with Learning Difficulties and or Disabilities and or health problems

19. The average (mean) scores for learners with learning difficulties and or disabilities were very similar to other learners and showed only a slight variation for most questions. The largest variation in scores was for Q6. ( How good or bad is the support you get on this course?), where learners with learning difficulties and or disabilities (learners withLDD) scored more highly than other learners meaning they were more satisfied.
20. The average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) was the same for learners who have learning difficulties and or disabilities and those who do not (average score 8.30). However, the percentage who gave a score of 8 or above for Q9 was slightly lower for learners with LDD compared to other learners (72.8\% compared to 73.7\%).

## Disability

21. The average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) varied depending on the type of disability. Learners with profound complex disabilities gave the highest average (mean) score (8.94).Those with Asperger's Syndrome and emotional/behavioural difficulties gave the lowest scores ( 8.12 and 8.13 respectively).
22. The percentage of learners who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 also varied depending on the type of disability. Learners with profound complex disabilities had the highest percentage ( $84.2 \%$ ) and those with Asperger's Syndrome and emotional/behavioural difficulties the lowest ( $69.4 \%$ and $69.7 \%$ respectively). The number of respondents with profound complex disabilities was relatively small ( 175 from a population of 945 ), but this was sufficient to be within tolerance for the Learner Satisfaction Survey confidence interval quality test and therefore the results can be regarded as sufficiently robust.

## Learning difficulty

23. Average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) varied depending on the type of learning difficulty Learners with severe learning disabilities gave the highest average (mean) score (8.92) and those with Dyslexia (8.06) the lowest.
24. There were also differences in the percentage of learners who gave a score of 8 or above for Q9 depending on the type of learning difficulty. Learners with severe learning disabilities had the highest percentage (84.8\%) and those with Dyslexia (68.3\%) the lowest.
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## Introduction

25. This report presents the results of the Learner Satisfaction Survey 2011 to 2012 and analyses the data by age group, gender, ethnicity, learning difficulties and/or disabilities and level of deprivation. In order to carry out this analysis, survey respondents were matched to their learning record on the ILR from which individuals' learner characteristics could be established. The Learner Satisfaction Survey 2011 to 2012 took place from November 2011 to May 2012. The survey was open to all in-scope ${ }^{2}$ learners and 365,514 learners submitted a valid response.
26. The learner satisfaction score analysed in this report is derived from a questionnaire that captures learners' perceptions about their course, learning programme or training programme on a rating scale of 0 to 10 where 0 equals very bad and 10 equals very good. There are 9 scoring questions covering the following aspects of the respondent's experience of their learning and learning provider:

- information given at the start of the learning programme.
- help staff gave in the first few weeks.
- how good the teaching was.
- respect staff show to the learner.
- advice learners have been given about what they can do after they have finished their learning programme.
- support they got whilst learning.
- their view of how good the organisation is at listening to the views of learners and then acting on those views; and
- how good their organisation is overall

27. The overall average (mean) scores for the 9 questions are compared for different learner groups along with the percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or higher.
28. The report also analyses the breakdown of learner characteristics of those who took part in the survey (referred to as 'respondents') against the characteristics of the in-scope learner population as a whole (referred to as 'population"') in order to generate participation rates for different learner groups. In-scope learners are those who were on programmes funded by the Skills Funding Agency (excluding Offenders' Learning and Skills Service provision) between 14 November 2011 and 25 May 2012.
[^1]
## Notes on Data

29. Survey data has been taken from the Learner Satisfaction Survey Version 4, 2011 to 2012 and includes only responses which have been matched to the national Individualised Learner Record (ILR) 2011 to 2012.
30. Tables with bases with less than 5 respondents have been suppressed and indicated with ' $<5$ '.
31. Age, gender, learning difficulties and or disabilities and ethnicity are based upon self-declaration by the learner as recorded on the ILR.
32. Deprivation has been calculated using the Indices of Deprivation 2010, linking the deprivation score within a super output area to the home postcode of the learner. Deprivation bands are based on the national rank of super output area by indices of deprivation (2010). There are 32,482 super output areas in the country ranked from 1 (most deprived) to 32,482 (least deprived). Band 1 includes the most deprived $10 \%$ super output areas in the country $(1-3,248)$.
33. Tables in the analysis of participation rates and also in the Appendix include confidence intervals. The confidence interval is calculated from the respondent and population numbers and is included as a measure of robustness. Confidence intervals between 0 and $3 \%$ can be regarded as very robust. Those between $3 \%$ and $5 \%$ (highlighted in amber) are less robust but still within tolerance for the Learner Satisfaction survey. Confidence intervals above $5 \%$ (highlighted in red) reflect relatively low respondent numbers and therefore should be viewed with some caution.
34. A description of the learner satisfaction survey and the methodology for calculating provider scores can be found in the learner satisfaction technical report ${ }^{3}$.

## Analysis of Participation in the Survey

## Age Band

35. Table 1A and Chart 1A show that 16- to 18 -year-olds were over-represented in the sample. $55.2 \%$ of the sample population was within the 16-18 year old age band compared to $35.8 \%$ of the overall learner population. All other age bands were under-represented in the sample, particularly those within the range 25 and over. A further breakdown of participation rates by age band and gender is included in the Appendix.
[^2]Table 1A and Chart 1A: participation by age band



Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
36. Females were slightly under-represented in the sample compared to the overall population and males were slightly over-represented. A further breakdown of participation rates by age band, gender and level of study is included in the Appendix.

Table 2A and Chart 2A: Participation by Sex



Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Ethnicity

37. Table 3A shows the survey participation breakdown by ethnicity compared to the overall learner population. Further breakdowns of participation rates by age band and ethnicity and by sex and ethnicity are included in the Appendix. The table shows that the sample is a good representation of the overall population.

Table 3A and Chart 3A: Participation by Ethnicity



[^3]
## Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities

38. Table 4A shows the survey participation breakdown by learning difficulties and/or disabilities compared to the overall learner population. A further breakdown of participation rates by learning difficulties and/or disabilities and age band is included in the Appendix. Learners with a declared learning difficulty or disability were over-represented in the sample. $18.0 \%$ of the sample population had a Learning Difficulty or Disability (LDD) compared to $14.4 \%$ of the overall learner population.

Table 4A and Chart 4A: Participation by Learning Difficulty/Disability



Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Deprivation

39. Table 5A shows the survey participation breakdown by deprivation level compared to the overall learner population. Tables showing participation rates by deprivation further broken down by sex and deprivation are included in the Appendix. The majority of learners within the learner population fall into the lower 5 deprivation bands. However, there was a clear correlation between survey participation and deprivation band with lower levels of deprivation being associated with higher participation rates.

Table 5A: Participation by Deprivation


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012, Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010

Chart 5A: participation by deprivation band


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012, Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010

## Analysis of Satisfaction Scores

## Age Band

40. Tables $6 A$ and $6 B$, below, show average (mean) scores and the percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or above for each of the 9 scoring questions broken down by age band. For all 9 questions, there was a pattern of increasing average scores with age band, from the lowest within the 16-18 age band and the highest within the 60 plus age band. The percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or above also demonstrated the same age band related pattern.

Table 6A: Average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by age band and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
41. The percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or above also demonstrated the same age band related pattern.

Table 6B: percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above by age band and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction Version 4; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
42. Chart 6A illustrates the pattern of increasing average scores by age band. Learners of all ages tended to give the highest rating to Q4 (How good or bad is the respect staff show you?) and the lowest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what to do after the course?)

Chart 6A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by age band and question
-


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
43. Table 6C shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q 9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by age band. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also included. Over half the learners aged 35 and over gave a maximum score of 10 compared to less than a quarter of 16 - to18-year-olds.


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
44. The average (mean) scores for Q 9 also increased with age band from a low of 7.94 for those aged 16-18 to a high of 9.07 for those aged 60 and over as Chart 6B illustrates.

Summary chart 6B: age band by Q9 - average (Mean) score (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
45. The percentage of learners who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 increased with age band from a low of $66.5 \%$ for those aged $16-18$ to a high of $88.8 \%$ for those aged 60 and over, as Chart 6C illustrates.

Summary Chart 6C: Age band by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
Sex
46. Tables 7A and 7B below show the average (mean) scores and the percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or above for each of the 9 scoring questions broken down by gender. For all questions, females gave higher average scores than males. The percentage of females who gave a score of 8,9 or 10 was also higher for all questions.

Table 7A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by sex and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Table 7B: percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above by gender and question

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Q2. How good or bad was the hel |  |
|  |  |
| Q3. How good or bad is the teaching on your |  |
| Q4. How good or bad is the respect staff show to you? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - |  |
| Q5. How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what you can do after this course? $-65.2 \%-6$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012 and Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
47. Chart 7A illustrates the average scores for each question broken down by age and gender. Females and males gave the highest rating to Q4 (How good or bad is the respect staff show you?). Females gave the lowest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what to do after the course?) and males gave the lowest rating to Q8 (How good or bad is the college at acting on the views of learners?).

Chart 7A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by gender and question
-


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
48. Table 7C shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q 9 Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is? broken down by sex. The average (mean) score was higher for females as was the percentage giving a score of 8,9 or 10 . $36.2 \%$ of females gave a maximum score of 10 compared to $30.0 \%$ of males. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are illustrated in Charts $7 B$ and $7 C$.

## Summary Table 7C: breakdown of responses by gender for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Summary Chart 7B: Q9 by gender - average (mean) score

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: for Chart 7B and 7C Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Summary Chart 7C: Q9 by gender- percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


## Ethnicity

49. Tables 8 A and 8 B below show average (mean) scores and percentages of learners giving a score of 8 or above, for each of the 9 scoring questions broken down by ethnicity. For all questions the average (mean) scores were highest for Asian/Asian British learners and lowest for Mixed/Multiple ethnic group learners. Average (mean) scores given by Black/Black British learners were lower than those given by White learners for 7 of the 9 questions.

Table 8A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by ethnicity and question

| Mean Scores |  Black / <br> Asian / African / <br> Asian Caribbean / <br> British Black <br>  British | Mixed / <br> Multiple ethnic group | Other ethnic group | White |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base | 28,089 19,818 | 9,255 | 10,614 | 297,738 |
| Q1. How good or bad was the information you were given when you were choosing your course? | 8.10 _ _ 8.09 | 7.82 | 7.99 |  |
| Q2. How good or bad was the help staff gave you in the first few weeks? | $8.31-1-8.20$ | 8.12 |  | 8.38 |
| Q3. How good or bad is the teaching on your course? | 8.49 । 8.42 | 8.24 | 8.48 | 8.41 |
| Q4. How good or bad is the respect staff show to you? | 8.72 _ _ _ 8.60 | 8.47 | 8.72 | 8.69 |
| Q5. How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what you can do after this course? |  | 7.62 |  | 7.83 |
| Q6. How good or bad is the support you get on this course? | 8.49 _ - _ - 8.37 | 8.22 |  | 8.44 |
| Q7. How good or bad are the college staff at listening to the views of learners? | 8.12 | 7.77 |  |  |
| Q8. How good or bad is the college at acting on the views of learners? | 8.01 _ _ 7.83 | 7.60 | $\underline{7 .} 93$ | 7.88 |
| Q9. Overall, how good or bad do you think the college is? | 8.36 \| 8.25 | 8.07 । | 8.30 | 8.30 |

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Table 8B: percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above by ethnicity and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
50. Chart 8A illustrates the average scores for each question broken down by ethnicity. All ethnic groups gave the highest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the respect staff show you?). White learners and those belonging to other ethnic groups gave the lowest rating to Q5 (How good or bad is the advice you have been given about what to do after the course?). Asian/Asian British, Black/Black British and those belonging to Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups gave the lowest rating to Q8 (How good or bad is the college at acting on the views of learners?).

Chart 8A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by ethnicity and question
-


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
51. Table 8C shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q 9 Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is? broken down by ethnicity. The average (mean) score was highest for Asian/Asian British learners as was the percentage giving a score of 8,9 or 10 .

Summary Table 8C: breakdown of responses by ethnicity for Q9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

|  | Black / <br> African / <br> Caribbean / <br> Black British <br> 19,818 | Mixed / Multiple thnic group $-\overline{9,255}-1$ | Other ethnic | White $297,7 \overline{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{2}{3}-----0.5 \%$ | $\frac{0.6 \%}{1.1 \%}$ | $\frac{0.5 \%}{1.1 \%}$ - | - $\frac{0.6 \%}{1.0 \%}$ | -1.5 |
| 5\% | .9\% | 0\% | \% |  |
|  | 5.8\% | 2\% | 5.1\% | 4. |
| Scale $\quad$ - - - - - - - - - $5.3 \%$ | 5.9\% | 6.9\% | 5.6\% | 5.6 |
| 7 l | 11.7\% | 13.9\% | 12.2\% |  |
| 17.5\% | 17.2\% | 20.2\% | 18.8\% | 19.8 |
| . $2 \%$ | .6 | , | - 19.6\% |  |
| 36.4\% | 36.0\% | 28.5\% | 34.6\% | 32. |
| N/A or No Responses 1 0.1\% |  | 0.1\% | 0.2\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
52. Asian/Asian British learners gave the highest average (mean) score (8.36) and Mixed/Multiple ethnic group learners the lowest (8.07). There was a small difference between Black/Black British and White learners with Black/Black British learners having a slightly lower average (mean).

Summary Chart 8B: ethnicity by Q9 - average (mean) score (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
53. The percentage who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 was highest among Asian/Asian British learners and lowest among Mixed/Multiple ethnic group learners. Chart 8C shows a stronger positive response from White learners compared to Black/Black British learners which was less evident from the average (mean) scores.

Summary Chart 8C: ethnicity by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Learners with Learning Difficulties and or Disabilities

54. Tables 9A and 9B below show average (mean) scores and the percentage of learners giving a score of 8 or above for each of the 9 scoring questions broken down by declared/not declared learning difficulties and/or disabilities.

Table 9A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by LDD and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Table 9B: percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above by LDD and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012 ; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
55. The average (mean) scores for those with learning difficulties and/or disabilities were very similar to those without learning difficulties and/or disabilities and show only a slight variation for most questions. The largest variation in scores was for Q6. (How good or bad is the support you get on this course?) with those with learning difficulties and or disabilities scoring higher.

Chart 9A: average (mean) learner satisfaction scores by LDD and question


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
56. Table 9C shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by declared/not declared with learning difficulties and/or disabilities.

Summary Table 9C: breakdown of responses by LDD for Q9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\overline{\mathrm{N}} / \overline{\mathrm{A}}$ or $\overline{\mathrm{No}} \mathrm{R}$ Responses $-\overline{10}-\frac{36.0 \%}{0.1 \%}-1-\frac{32.8 \%}{0.1 \%}--\frac{30}{30.0 \%}-$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| dents Scoring 8 or more |  |  |  |

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
57. The average (mean) scores for Q 9 show no variation at all between learners who are declared LDD and those who are not.

Summary Chart 9B: LLDD by Q 9 - average (mean) score (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
58. The percentage who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 was slightly lower for declared LDD learners.

Summary Chart 9C: LDD by Q 9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Breakdown by Disability

59. Table 10A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by disability. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also included.

Summary Table 10A: breakdown of responses by disability for Q9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
60. The average (mean) scores for Q9 varied depending on the type of disability. Learners with profound complex disabilities gave the highest average (mean) score (8.94) and those with Asperger's Syndrome (8.12) and emotional/behavioural difficulties (8.13) the lowest. The number of respondents with profound complex disabilities was relatively small (175) but sufficient to be within tolerance for the learner satisfaction survey and therefore the results can be regarded as relatively robust.

Summary chart 10A: disability by Q9 - average (mean) score (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
61. The percentage of learners who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 varied depending on the type of disability. Learners with profound complex disabilities had the highest percentage (84.2\%) and those with Asperger's Syndrome (69.4\%) and emotional/behavioural difficulties (69.7\%) the lowest.

Summary Chart 10B: disability by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Breakdown by Learning Difficulty

62. Table 11A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by learning difficulty. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown.
63. 

## Summary Table 11A: breakdown of responses by disability for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
64. The average (mean) scores for Q9 varied depending on the type of learning difficulty. Learners with severe learning difficulties gave the highest average (mean) score (8.92) and those with Dyslexia (8.06) the lowest.

Summary Chart 11A: learning difficulty by Q9 - average (mean) score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
65. The percentage of learners who gave a score of 8 or above for Q 9 varied depending on the type of learning difficulty. Learners with severe learning difficulties had the highest percentage (84.8\%) and those with Dyslexia (68.3\%) the lowest.

Summary Chart 11B: learning difficulty by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Age and gender

66. Table 12A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by age band and gender. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown.

Summary table 12A: breakdown of responses by age band and gender for Q9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012 ;Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures
67. Among learners aged under 35, average (mean) scores for females were higher than those for males, with the greatest difference within the 19-24 age band. Males within the 35-44 and 45-59 age bands gave slightly higher average (mean) scores than females but among those aged 60 and over, males gave a slightly lower average (mean) score than females.

Summary chart 12A: age band and gender by Q9 average (mean) score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
68. For learners aged under 25, the percentage of females giving a score of 8,9 or 10 was higher than that of males, particularly among those aged 19-24. A slightly higher proportion of males than females in each of the age bands above 25 gave scores of 8 or above.

Summary chart 12B: age band and gender by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


[^4]
## Age and ethnicity

69. Table 13A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by age band and ethnicity. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown.

## Summary table 13A (part 1): breakdown of responses by age band and ethnicity for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012 \& Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures
70. The base numbers of responses within the 60+ age group are comparatively low and therefore less robust. The number of responses within the age $60+$ Mixed/Multiple ethnic group is too low to produce reliable results.

## Summary table 13A (part 2): breakdown of responses by age band and ethnicity for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures
71. There was some variation in average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) within each age band according to ethnic group. Within most age bands, Asian/Asian British and White learners tended to give higher average (mean) scores than other ethnic groups. Among those aged under 25, Black/Black British learners were the least positive whereas among those aged over 25 , it was those belonging to other ethnic groups who gave the lowest scores.

Summary chart 13A: age band and ethnicity by Q9 - average (mean) score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
72. Within most age bands, Asian/Asian British and White learners tended to have the highest percentage giving a score of 8 or above. For those age under 35 , Black/Black British learners were the least likely to give a score of 8 or above and White learners the most likely. For age groups over 25 , those belonging to other ethnic groups had the lowest percentage giving a score of 8 or above.

Summary chart 13B: age band and ethnicity by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Age and Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities

73. Table 14A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by age band and LDD. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown.

Summary table 14A (part 1): breakdown of responses by age band and LLDD for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures

Summary table 14A (part 2): breakdown of responses by age band and LLDD for Q9
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures
74. Average (mean) scores were higher among learners with learning difficulties and or disabilities within most age bands, the exception being the 25-34 age group where the average (mean) score for declared LDD learners was equal to the average (mean) for those who do not have learning difficulties and or disabilities.

Summary chart 14A: age band and LDD by Q9 - average (mean) score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
75. The percentage giving a score of 8 or above for Q 9 showed a slightly different pattern to the average (mean) score breakdowns. The percentages for learners without learning difficulties and/or disabilities in the 19-24 and 25-34 age bands were higher than those for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities.

# Summary chart 14B: age band and LDD by Q9 - Percentage of Respondents Scoring 8 or above 

 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Sex and ethnicity

76. Table 15A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by gender and ethnicity. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown.

Summary table 15A: breakdown of responses by gender and ethnicity for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures
77. Average (mean) scores for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) were higher for females across all ethnic groups. The greatest difference was among Asian/Asian British learners where the average (mean) for females was 8.52 and the average (mean) for males was 8.17 (difference $=0.35$ ).

Summary chart 15A: ethnicity and gender by Q9 - average (mean) score (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
78. As with average (mean) scores, the percentage who gave a score of 8 or above was higher for females across all ethnic groups.

# Summary chart 15B: ethnicity and gender by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above 

 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Sex and deprivation

79. Table 16A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by gender and deprivation. The deprivation levels run from 1 to 10 where 1 is the most deprived and 10 is the least deprived. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown.

## Summary Table 16A: breakdown of responses by gender and deprivation for Q9

 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)
## Summary table 16B: breakdown of responses by gender and deprivation for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010
80. There was a clear correlation between average (mean) scores and levels of deprivation. Higher deprivation levels were associated with higher average (mean) scores and lower deprivation levels associated with lower average (mean) scores. Average (mean) scores were also higher for females across all deprivation bands.

Summary chart 16A: gender and deprivation by Q9 - average (mean) score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010
81. As with average (mean) scores, there is a clear correlation between the percentage giving a score of 8 or above and levels of deprivation with higher percentages being associated with higher levels of deprivation and lower percentages being associated with lower levels of deprivation. Percentages were also higher for females across all deprivation bands.

Summary chart 16B: gender and deprivation by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010

## Ethnicity and deprivation

82. Table 17A shows the average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above to Q9 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?) broken down by ethnicity and deprivation band.

## Summary table 17A: breakdown of responses by ethnicity and deprivation for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010
83. For White learners there was a clear correlation between average (mean) scores and levels of deprivation with higher levels of deprivation being associated with higher average (mean) scores and lower deprivation associated with lower average (mean) scores. However, the pattern for the other ethnic groups is less well defined. Average (mean) scores are more erratic and there is no clear correlation between average (mean) scores and deprivation bands.

Summary chart 17A: ethnicity and deprivation by Q9 - average (mean) score (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010
84. For White learners there is a clear correlation between the percentages of learners giving scores of 8 and above and deprivation band with higher levels of deprivation being associated with higher percentages. However, this pattern is not apparent for any of the other ethnic groups.


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010

## Age, gender and level of study

85. Table 18A shows the percentage of learners who gave each score on the scale of 0 to 10 for $Q 9$ Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is? broken down by age, gender and level of study. The overall average (mean) scores and percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above are also shown. For $16-18$ learners there was a pattern of decreasing average (mean) scores with higher levels of study. This pattern was true for male and female learners. The pattern was similar but less well defined for learners aged 19+

## Summary table 18A: breakdown of responses by age band/gender/level for Q9

(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
*Figures suppressed due to low numbers in accordance with data protection procedures

Summary chart 18A: age band/gender/level by Q9 - average (mean) score
(Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
86. For learners aged 16-18 there was a general trend of falling percentages of learners giving scores of 8 and above as level of study increases although there was very little difference between level 1 and level 2.
87. For learners aged 19 and over the trend is less well defined with learners at level 2 having higher percentages of males and females giving scores of 8 and above than learners at level 1.

# Summary chart 18B: age band/gender/level by Q9 - percentage of respondents scoring 8 or above 

 (Overall, how good or bad do you think the provider is?)

Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Appendix: base populations

88. The following table gives the base numbers for the sample sizes (number of respondents) and population sizes (total number of learners) on which the tables and charts in this report are based.

Base Populations: Overall


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Base populations: gender and age band



Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

Base populations: age band and ethnicity


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Base populations: Age Band and LLDD



Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012

## Base populations: gender and ethnicity



Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012; Indices of Deprivation 2010

Base populations: ethnicity and deprivation


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012, Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012 and Indices of Deprivation 2010

Base populations: Learner group (age/gender/level)


Source: Learner Satisfaction 2011 to 2012; Individualised Learner Record 2011 to 2012
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