



Department
for Education

Review of post-16 qualifications at level 3 in England

**Government consultation response:
impact assessment**

July 2022

Contents

List of tables	3
Introduction	4
Updates to future landscape	5
Updated assessment of impact	6
Scale of market rationalisation	6
Future level 3 capability	7
Impact on awarding organisations	9
Impact on providers	10
Updated equalities impact assessment	12
16 to 19 year olds	13
Adults	14
Consultation responses	15
Conclusion	17
Methodology and data	18

List of tables

Table 1: 16 to 19 Enrolment Characteristics, 2019/20	14
Table 2: Adult Enrolment Characteristics, 2019/20	15
Table 3: Total number of age 16 to 19 enrolments for different level 3 landscape scenarios	20
Table 4: Total number of adult enrolments for different level 3 landscape scenarios	21

Introduction

This impact assessment accompanies the government response¹ to the second stage consultation on review of post-16 qualifications at level 3 in England. This document has three purposes:

- To outline changes to our assessment of the qualifications we expect to be eligible for public funding in future.
- To provide an update of our previous assessment of the likely impact of the proposals of the review², as detailed in the government response³.
- To address responses to the equalities questions within the second stage consultation.

¹ [Review of post-16 qualifications at level 3: second stage - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/review-of-post-16-qualifications-at-level-3-second-stage)

² [DfE \(2020\). Review of post-16 qualifications at level 3 in England: Second Stage. Government consultation – impact assessment](#)

³ [Review of post-16 qualifications at level 3: second stage - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/review-of-post-16-qualifications-at-level-3-second-stage)

Updates to future landscape

After considering feedback from the consultation, we have made a number of changes to the academic and technical qualifications we expect to be eligible for public funding in future. A summary of these changes is outlined below, with further details contained in the full [consultation response](#).

- We will consider funding small qualifications to be taken alongside A levels where there are A levels available in the same broad subject area. This means that there is the potential to have small qualifications in STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and maths) and those which align with the Plan for Growth⁴, such as engineering, IT or applied science. This is a change from the consultation proposals which said that overlap with A levels would not be allowed.
- For a small number of occupations, it may not be possible to deliver competence through a qualification in an education setting. However, where there is clear demand from employers for qualifications in these areas, and specific evidence can be provided that the qualification is high quality and supports progression into a particular industry, then it will be considered for funding approval. This is a change from the consultation, which proposed that all technical qualifications must deliver competence against an employer-led occupational standard.
- Respondents asked for further clarity on how overlap with T Levels would be defined. A separate process will be run to determine whether technical qualifications overlap with T Levels. The tests for determining whether a technical qualification overlaps with a T Level will be based on the following principles:
 - It must be a technical qualification, in that it primarily aims to support entry to employment in a specific occupational area(s).
 - The outcomes that must be attained by a person taking the qualification are similar to those set out in an employer-led occupational standard covered by a T Level.
 - It aims to support entry to the same occupation as a T Level.
- We recognise that there may be circumstances where summative assessment of technical qualifications for adults may not be appropriate. We will therefore work with Ofqual and the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (Institute) to ensure the content of these qualifications is assessed in an appropriate way and engage with relevant stakeholders to ensure qualification

⁴ HM Treasury (2021). [Build Back Better: our plan for growth](#)

design and assessment reflects the requirements of different industries and occupations.

- We are aware that some existing level 3 qualifications which align primarily to employer-led occupational standards that are not at level 3. We will work with the Institute to identify these cases and to gather evidence and develop a set of principles for how such qualifications may be managed. This will include engaging with employers and awarding organisations (AOs) to understand the need or demand for any such qualifications at level 3.

Updated assessment of impact

Since the publication of the consultation, we have revised our assessment of which qualifications that are currently available may fit into the future landscape as described. This update is captured through three changes:

- An update of the baseline list of qualifications. The updated list covers qualifications approved for Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) funding in the 2019/20 funding year, as of May 2020. Qualifications approved for funding in the 2019/20 funding year but not as of May 2020, are not included;
- An update of the enrolment, and associated characteristics, data from the 2018/19 academic year to the 2019/20 academic year; and
- Changes to the policy proposals as set out in the previous section, and a revised assessment of which qualifications currently available best map to our future qualifications groups.

While the impact of the above changes does not change the nature of the impacts we previously outlined, they do affect the potential scale of the impact. The below therefore focuses on comparing the updated values to our previous assessment, rather than repeating the full detail of the impacts previously identified.

Scale of market rationalisation

Regarding 16 to 19 year olds, the previous impact assessment concluded:

‘Excluding qualifications removed through separate policies (e.g. pre-existing qualifications and no enrolment qualifications as outlined in the first stage consultation), we estimate that around 60% of Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) funded qualifications currently available at level 3 may not fit into the future landscape for young people, and as such would no longer be available through ESFA funding streams. These qualifications represent 16% of all 16 to 19 enrolments at level 3, and 62% of non-A level enrolments at level 3.’

Based on the revised mapping of current qualifications to the future landscape, we estimate that a slightly smaller proportion (c.54%) of ESFA funded qualifications currently available at level 3, may not fit into the future landscape for young people. These qualifications represent around 12% of all 16 to 19 enrolments at level 3, and 40% of non-A level enrolments at level 3.

Regarding adult learners, the previous impact assessment concluded:

‘Of technical qualifications at level 3 that are available through adult funding streams, we estimate that 31% may not fit into the future landscape for adults, and as such would no longer be available through ESFA funding streams. These qualifications represent 19% of adult enrolments on technical qualifications at level 3.’

Based on the revised mapping of current qualifications to the proposed future landscape, we estimate that 33% of qualifications currently available to adults at level 3, may no longer be available. These represent around 17% of ESFA funded adult enrolments on non-A level qualifications at level 3.

It is important to note that these estimates are based on our assessments of which qualifications are unlikely to fit into the groups as outlined for the future landscape, and which have the potential to fit into these groups. However, AOs could choose not to reform qualifications that we believe could feature in the future landscape, leading to a greater reduction in available qualifications than we highlight here. Conversely, AOs could successfully reform qualifications that we don’t expect to be available in future, leading to a smaller reduction in qualifications. However, given that these qualifications align less closely with our future landscape we consider the latter less likely.

The detail of the requirements of the future approval criteria are not yet developed so it is not possible at this time to assess the extent of reform required to be approved for funding in future.

Future level 3 capability

The previous impact assessment concluded:

‘if we were to assume that the achievement of at least five GCSEs at grade 4 or higher was a benchmark to access a level 3 programme, and applied this to students enrolled on qualifications no longer expected to remain, we estimate that the equivalent of around 4% of 16 to 19 year olds currently studying at level 3 may not be able to progress directly to level 3 study following the reforms. If one were to reduce this benchmark to four GCSEs at grade 4 or higher, the figure would drop to around 3%.’

Repeating the same methodology using the revised mapping of current qualifications to our future landscape, and the updated 2019/20 data, leads to a reduction in this estimate. However, this reduction is relatively small, and is lost within the rounding.

This is due to a forecast smaller reduction in the availability of qualifications in future, as a result of the revised mapping process and additional flexibility on the future landscape for academic qualifications.

However, it is important to repeat the caveats around this number presented in our previous impact assessment:

'It is important to note the uncertainty associated with these estimates and the inherent inaccuracy associated with applying blanket entry requirements to a diversity of qualifications and students.'

This approach has clear limitations, does not account for potential behavioural responses, and is only intended to give an indication of the scale of challenge students may face in achieving level 3 under the future landscape. This is to help understand what mitigations may be required.

The extent to which students may find it difficult to achieve may also be impacted by the approaches taken by Ofqual and the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (the Institute) in their respective roles in the approvals process, as these could have an effect on aspects such as qualification and assessment design and delivery. This could lead to students studying qualifications not expected to be removed, also finding it more difficult to achieve in the future.'

Some consultation respondents raised concerns about the impact of the proposals on students' ability to access level 3 in the future landscape, with some indicating they felt we underestimated the scale of the challenge.

As outlined above, the future challenge in accessing level 3 will depend on a range of factors. Estimates presented are intended to give an indication of the potential scale of the challenge faced. The methodology has limitations, which is unavoidable given the uncertainties around the challenge of T Levels, the impact of the new approval criteria applied by the Institute and Ofqual, and the impact of wider reforms (e.g. transition support).

We recognise that by ensuring the qualifications offer at level 3 is consistently high quality and leads to positive outcomes for all students who take them will inevitably mean that some students may find it more challenging to achieve level 3 in the future.

This is why we will continue to work with providers to explore how we can best prepare students who may otherwise struggle to access A levels and other academic level 3 qualifications for academic study at level 3. This is in addition to the current T Level Transition Programme, which already provides a year of preparatory content for students who want to progress to a T Level.

We also introduced additional flexibility on the future academic landscape at level 3. This is to ensure there are sufficient routes to higher education (HE) in government priority

subjects, while still ensuring students receive a rigorous education. This should improve the accessibility of the future landscape at level 3, particularly for those students for whom a full A level programme may not be achievable.

Students who are able to access level 3 in future will benefit from a more rigorous qualifications landscape, that is more closely aligned with employer-led occupational standards. This should better equip them with skills demanded by employers, and in turn improve their productivity, resulting in improved employability and higher earnings.

For those students that are not able to access level 3 in future, even with additional support, we are working to ensure a high-quality route into employment is available at level 2. Our proposals will aim to better equip individuals for entry into the labour market and provide core transferable skills people need to unlock successful careers or upskill later in life. It is expected that in many cases this will provide better outcomes than those provided by lower quality qualifications currently available at level 3. More detail will follow in the forthcoming consultation on level 2 and below.

Given the significant uncertainty detailed above, this estimate should be treated as indicative, and serves to demonstrate that some students currently studying at level 3, may not be able to do so in the future.

We expect that the benefits and mitigations discussed will help to ensure the overall benefits to students will justify the potential negative impacts for those students no longer able to achieve level 3 in future.

We will continue to consider this risk carefully and develop mitigations as part of the further consultation on qualifications at level 2 and below.

This impact, including related equalities considerations, will remain an important consideration alongside further policy development as part of the review of post-16 qualifications.

Impact on awarding organisations

Regarding 16 to 19 year olds, the previous impact assessment concluded:

‘Based on the indicative mapping exercise described previously, this could reduce up to 7 AOs’ publicly funded 16 to 19 year old enrolments by 80% or more. These affected AOs are relatively small, with less than half having over 1,000 ESFA funded 16 to 19 enrolments in 2018/19, and none having over 15,000.’

Using the same methodology, but with the updates outlined previously, we now find that up to 10 AOs, out of more than 130, could see their publicly funded 16 to 19 year old enrolments at level 3 and below fall by 80% or more. 4 of these AOs have over 500 ESFA funded 16-19 enrolments at these levels.

Regarding adults, the previous impact assessment concluded:

'We estimate up to 5 AOs could lose at least 80% of their adult enrolments.'

Based on the revised mapping, we still estimate that up to 5 AOs could lose at least 80% of their funded adult enrolments, none of which have over 300 ESFA funded adult enrolments.

Looking at the combined impact on 16 to 19 year old and adult enrolments, we estimate that 8 AOs could lose at least 80% of their funded enrolments, of which 4 have over 150 ESFA funded enrolments.

It is important to flag that this impact, as discussed in the [Scale of market rationalisation section](#), focuses specifically on the qualifications that are not expected to be available in the future – i.e. the impact of lost enrolments.

AOs whose qualifications are likely to fit into the future qualifications landscape are still likely to incur costs. This is due to the reform needed to existing qualifications to meet future approval criteria. Estimates around the potential costs associated with these criteria can be found in the recently published Skills Bill Impact Assessment⁵.

In addition, it is important to repeat a key caveat from our previous assessment:

'this is a worst-case scenario, which does not account for AOs' abilities to redistribute enrolments onto remaining qualifications, or growth on remaining or new qualifications.'

AOs will continue to play a critical role in these developments, helping to ensure the market remains vibrant and that students continue to have access to a wide variety of courses whilst reforms are ongoing. In order to help mitigate against risks from the rate of change being too fast, potentially creating resourcing issues for some AOs, we have also opted to pursue a phased approach to reform. More detail on this can be found in the accompanying government response, regarding questions 26 and 27.

Impact on providers

Our previous assessment focused on highlighting which types of providers were most likely to be impacted by the reforms.

We have now aligned our assessment more closely to the method used for considering the impact on AOs, by considering the impact on individual providers. In total there are

⁵ DfE (2021). [Skills and Post-16 Education Bill: Impact Assessment](#)

25 providers who could potentially lose 75% or more of their total funded enrolments^{6 7}. The vast majority of these are private sector public funded providers (23), with the others being a school and an 'other public funded' provider.

As with our assessment for AOs, this represents a 'worst-case scenario' as we would expect the majority of enrolments on qualifications no longer available, to generally switch to other qualifications. This means the cost to providers is likely to relate to selecting and delivering new and adjusted qualifications, rather than lost enrolments.

It is important to note that all providers delivering non-A level post-16 education will be impacted by the reforms. This is because qualifications that are expected to be available in future will still be subject to the new Institute or Ofqual approval criteria, which will require changes in many cases in terms of content and assessment.

Some consultation respondents also highlighted that some providers relied heavily on Applied General qualifications (AGQs) for their provision at level 3, and their ability to handle the scale of change being proposed.

We recognise the scale of change we are introducing is significant and presents potential challenges for providers in terms of adjusting their curriculum. Therefore, we are pursuing a phased approach to the defunding and reform of qualifications, to help mitigate against the risk of introducing change at too fast a pace for providers to deliver.

⁶ Note, this analysis has been completed using 2018/19 academic year data, rather than the 2019/20 academic year data used throughout the rest of this assessment. This is due to issues with data availability at the time of writing. We will update our assessment following the availability of the 2019/20 data for this purpose.

⁷ Total enrolments includes all learning aims across all ESFA funding streams.

Updated equalities impact assessment

This section updates the key equalities issues we assessed in our previous equalities impact assessment (EIA) – for 16 to 19 year olds and adults.

Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Secretary of State has a duty to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The relevant 'protected characteristics' for the purposes of the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race (including ethnicity)
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Where students are identified as being disproportionately likely to be affected, this relates specifically to those who are more likely to be studying qualifications not expected to be available in future.

For those identified, we expect the impact to be generally positive, as those learners will see the biggest improvement in the quality of qualifications they would be studying at level 3, and their outcomes thereafter. As described in the impact assessment above, students are expected to benefit from a more rigorous qualification system, with higher quality qualifications that better equip students with the necessary skills for progression into employment or further study. This in turn should help improve their economic returns and employability.

However, as highlighted in the impact assessment above, we recognise that for a small minority of students, level 3 may not be achievable in future – we aim to help mitigate against this with a higher quality offer at level 2, and the outlined mitigations to support continued progression to level 3.

It is not currently possible to quantify the scale of benefit from these mitigations, given uncertainty around the impact of the future approval criteria, students accessing T Levels, and the efficacy of the outlined mitigations. However, we expect the benefits to students from the proposals and mitigations to justify the potential negative impacts.

Students on qualifications expected to remain in the future are still expected to benefit from the reforms. This is because qualifications that remain will still be subject to the new approval criteria, which should help improve the quality and rigour of the education they provide. However, as the qualifications are already broadly in line with those that we see a place for in the future landscape, we would expect the scale of the benefits, and the risks, to be smaller.

Although we acknowledge that some students with protected characteristics may be disadvantaged by the reforms as they may no longer be able to progress to level 3, we expect this number to be relatively small. We anticipate the majority of students will benefit from, and justify, these changes; as outlined above. We are committed to working with the sector to explore how best to support students to progress to and achieve level 3, or to exit directly to sustained employment at level 2 where this may be a more appropriate pathway.

16 to 19 year olds

Regarding the landscape for 16 to 19 year olds, the previous EIA concluded that students from SEND (special educational needs and disability) backgrounds, Black and Asian ethnic groups, and males could be particularly impacted by the proposals. As mentioned above, we expect these impacts to be generally positive. We also concluded that students from disadvantaged backgrounds could also be particularly affected. This is because students from these backgrounds are disproportionately highly represented on qualifications likely to no longer be available in future.

Based on the revised mapping, this assessment remains broadly the same, with those from SEND backgrounds, Asian ethnic groups, disadvantaged backgrounds, and males disproportionately likely to be affected.

Following the additional flexibility on the future academic landscape, and the accompanying updated mapping and data, students from Black ethnic groups are no longer anticipated to be disproportionately highly affected. However, those from White ethnic groups are now slightly more likely to be impacted.

A full breakdown of the background characteristics of 16 to 19 year old enrolments on qualifications expected to no longer be available and those on qualifications with the potential to be reformed, is presented below.

Note that our assessments are based on comparing the proportion of enrolments with protected characteristics on qualifications likely to no longer be available, against those

on qualifications currently available at level 3, excluding A levels. A levels are out of scope of this review and we have excluded them from the table on this basis, and because the size and characteristics of the cohort would skew our comparison.

	Level 3	Level 3 excl. A levels	Reform	Defund
16 to 19 Enrolments	2,880,000	888,000	386,000	356,000
% Female	54%	50%	53%	46%
% Asian (inc. Chinese)	13%	11%	9%	12%
% Black	6%	6%	6%	6%
% Mixed	5%	4%	5%	4%
% White	69%	72%	74%	71%
% Other ethnic background	2%	2%	2%	2%
% Unknown ethnic background	5%	5%	5%	5%
% SEN (special educational needs) Support	5%	8%	7%	9%
% EHCP (Education, health and care plan)	1%	1%	1%	1%
% FSM (Free School Meal)	8%	11%	9%	12%
% IDACI ⁸ 1 (Most deprived)	17%	22%	19%	25%
% IDACI 2	19%	21%	20%	22%
% IDACI 3	19%	19%	20%	19%
% IDACI 4	21%	19%	20%	18%
% IDACI 5 (Least deprived)	23%	18%	21%	16%

Table 1: 16 to 19 Enrolment Characteristics, 2019/20

Adults

Regarding the landscape for adults, previously we concluded that those from Black and Asian ethnic groups, and female students were likely to be particularly impacted by the proposals. As discussed above, we expect these impacts to be generally positive. Based on our revised assessment, we still anticipate that female students could be particularly impacted by the reforms. We no longer expect students from Black and Asian ethnic groups to be particularly impacted by the reforms. However, we do expect that those from White ethnic groups could be more impacted, as well as those with learning difficulties or disabilities.

⁸ Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index, part of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)

A full breakdown of the background characteristics of adult enrolments on qualifications expected to no longer be available and those on qualifications with the potential to be reformed, is presented below.

	Level 3	Level 3 excl. A levels	Reform	Defund
19+ Enrolments	258,000	254,000	188,000	44,000
% Female	52%	52%	51%	61%
% Asian	7%	7%	6%	6%
% Black	6%	6%	6%	5%
% Mixed	3%	3%	3%	3%
% White	78%	78%	78%	83%
% Other ethnic background	2%	1%	1%	1%
% Unknown ethnic background	5%	5%	6%	2%
% LLDD (Learner with Learning Difficulties or Disabilities)	15%	15%	14%	17%

Table 2: Adult Enrolment Characteristics, 2019/20

Consultation responses

This section considers the responses to the equalities questions asked in the consultation. These were specifically questions 16, 17 and 18.

Respondents commonly indicated that the proposals were likely to disadvantage students with protected characteristics (in particular, those with SEND). Commonly, respondents highlighted the potential removal of AGQs, and the proposed replacement academic and technical routes, as likely to have a negative impact, reducing level 3 attainment and progression to HE.

It is important to note that while A levels and T Levels are seen as the primary routes at level 3 in the future landscape, other alternative qualifications will remain. These will include small qualifications intended to be taken alongside A levels, where they provide complementary support for progression to HE, or practical content aligned to a HE subject that is not provided via A levels. In addition, technical qualifications in specialist areas and in areas not covered by T Levels will continue to be eligible for public funding. For adults an even broader mix is available. More detail can be found in the consultation response.

While the size of a T Level programme precludes it from being part of a mixed study programme, the same is not true for A levels. For students for whom a full A level study

programme may not be suitable, other small qualifications could be paired alongside to create a mixed study programme. This will act as a key mitigation against some of the concerns raised by consultation respondents.

However, as detailed in the consultation response, we will consider setting restrictions over the combinations of qualifications that can be taken together. It will be important to prevent students taking combinations of small qualifications designed to be taken alongside A levels that would effectively replicate large AGQ programmes of study. This would be less likely to give students coherent programmes of study that will open up the best possible progression option.

Regarding access to HE, we recognise that outside of A levels, AGQs are one of the most common routes into HE. It is also true that AGQs have a higher proportion of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, or with SEND.

Whether these students tend to experience better outcomes on AGQ programmes than they would have on an A level programme, is less clear.

Evidence suggests, that after controlling for background characteristics and prior attainment, students who followed an A level only route, *generally* experience better outcomes in terms of attainment and future employment impacts⁹. However, it is important to note that much of the difference in outcomes reduced once additional controls for background characteristics were introduced. The analysis also relates to older style BTEC qualifications, which are not necessarily directly comparable to reformed BTEC qualifications.

Recent analysis considering access to HE and reformed AGQ qualifications found that across different prior attainment bandings, students with A levels were consistently more likely to enter HE than those holding just AGQs. There was some evidence to suggest that amongst those with the lowest prior attainment, mixed A level – AGQ programmes were slightly more likely to lead to HE than for those with a study programme consisting only of A levels¹⁰.

However, we recognise that students have a wide range of specific individual needs, and for a minority of students a move towards the future landscape outlined could present difficulties in terms of level 3 attainment and HE progression. That is why we are committed to exploring with the sector how best we can support these students to progress to level 3 and, where this is not achievable or is not in line with their ambitions, we will provide a higher quality route into employment at level 2.

⁹ CVER (2019). [‘BTECs, higher education and labour market outcomes using the Longitudinal Education Outcome \(LEO\) dataset’](#)

¹⁰ Sixth Form College Association (2019). [‘Chapter 5: Saving General Applied’](#)

Conclusion

Our revised equalities impact assessment concludes that 16 to 19 year olds who are male, from Asian ethnic groups, have a history of SEND support or are from a disadvantaged background are more likely to be impacted. For adults we found that female students, those from White ethnic groups and those with learning difficulties or disabilities were more likely to be affected.

Regarding the nature of the impact, we generally expect students to benefit from a more rigorous qualifications system, that better equips them for progression into employment or further study. We recognise that in some cases some students may be disadvantaged, however believe this will be outweighed by the benefits to students more broadly.

We are committed to working with the sector to ensure the reforms deliver on their aims, and will be developing a robust approach to monitoring and evaluation, to help ensure the reforms are a success for students from all backgrounds.

We will continue to have regard to our legal duties and update our equalities impact assessment, to take any additional impacts into account as we further develop the policy.

Methodology and data

This section outlines the methodology behind the equalities impact assessment and also provides the data underlying the figures shown in the document.

The ESFA approves qualifications for government funding for students aged 14 to 19. The equalities impact assessment is based on a snapshot of qualifications approved for funding at level 3 or below for the 2019/20 academic year, as of May 2020.

Each qualification is linked to enrolment information for the full 2019/20 academic year. Enrolment information is taken from the Individualised Learner Record (ILR)¹¹ and the school census.

The qualifications data is also linked with student characteristic information from ILR and the Young Persons Matched Administrative Dataset (YPMAD)¹² also for 2019/20, to analyse enrolments by age 16 to 19 student characteristics.

For students aged between 16 and 19, enrolments are linked to FSM eligibility, SEN and ethnic background, as recorded in the school census at age 15.

Information on adult (age 19+) enrolment and student characteristics is based solely on the ILR dataset.

Data on level of deprivation is included for all ages. This is based on the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI), part of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). The index gives a score to each postcode area representing the proportion of children under 16 in each area who are income-deprived. Scores for students' home postcode areas are grouped into bands 1 (most deprived) to 5 (least deprived).

Based on a policy proposal outside the scope of this analysis, in line with policy proposals put forward in the second stage consultation, qualifications have been grouped on whether or not they would fit into a future level 3 landscape. This analysis then looks at the 'protected' and other characteristics for young and adult students in each qualification group.

¹¹ This is the information about students and the learning they undertake, in the further education (FE) and skills sector, that publicly funded colleges, training organisations, local authorities and employers (FE providers) must collect and return to the DfE. The ILR data source for this analysis is the final collection of 2019/20 and includes information on provision for the full academic year. More information can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/individualised-learner-record-ilr>.

¹² This records information on the highest level of attainment and qualification studied each academic year matched to individual personal characteristics, as recorded in the school census at age 15.

Total enrolment numbers and percentages for each group are shown in tables in the following section.

	All level 3 qualifications	Level 3 qualifications (excluding A levels)	Level 3 qualifications expected to remain (excluding A levels)	Level 3 qualifications not expected to be available
16 to 19 Enrolments	2,880,000	888,000	386,000	356,000
<i>Female</i>	1,551,000	446,000	205,000	165,000
<i>White</i>	1,982,000	637,000	285,000	254,000
<i>Mixed</i>	140,000	40,000	18,000	15,000
<i>Asian (inc. Chinese)</i>	384,000	96,000	37,000	43,000
<i>Black</i>	169,000	55,000	21,000	22,000
<i>Other ethnic background</i>	54,000	15,000	6,000	6,000
<i>Ethnicity information not known</i>	151,000	46,000	20,000	17,000
<i>SEN</i>	147,000	70,000	27,000	31,000
<i>EHCP</i>	20,000	10,000	4,000	5,000
<i>FSM</i>	225,000	95,000	35,000	42,000
<i>IDACI 1 (Most deprived)</i>	500,000	199,000	74,000	88,000
<i>IDACI 2</i>	543,000	187,000	76,000	80,000
<i>IDACI 3</i>	561,000	171,000	76,000	68,000
<i>IDACI 4</i>	598,000	166,000	78,000	63,000
<i>IDACI 5 (Least deprived)</i>	670,000	161,000	81,000	57,000

Table 3: Total number of age 16 to 19 enrolments for different level 3 landscape scenarios

Sources: ILR, YPMAD; School Census. Enrolments are rounded to the nearest 1000; Qualification counts are rounded to the nearest 10. Due to rounding, sums may not add up to total number of enrolments. IDACI information is only calculated for students where the postcode is known.

	All level 3 qualifications	Level 3 qualifications (excluding A levels)	Level 3 qualifications expected to remain (excluding A levels)	Level 3 qualifications expected to no longer be available
Adult Enrolments	258,000	254,000	188,000	44,000
<i>Female</i>	134,000	132,000	95,000	27,000
<i>White</i>	201,000	199,000	146,000	37,000
<i>Mixed</i>	8,000	7,000	5,000	1,000
<i>Asian (inc. Chinese)</i>	18,000	17,000	12,000	3,000
<i>Black</i>	15,000	15,000	11,000	2,000
<i>Other ethnic background</i>	4,000	4,000	3,000	1,000
<i>Ethnicity information not known</i>	12,000	12,000	11,000	1,000
<i>LLDD</i>	38,000	37,000	26,000	8,000

Table 4: Total number of adult enrolments for different level 3 landscape scenarios

Sources: ILR. Enrolments are rounded to the nearest 1000; Qualification counts are rounded to the nearest 10. Due to rounding, sums may not add up to total number of enrolments.



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2022

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk