



Department
for Education

Evaluation of the strengthening of the supported internship programme

Annex 1: Supplementary methodology and data tables

March 2026

**Authors: CooperGibson Research and St. Mary's
University**



Government
Social Research

Contents

Strengthening of the supported internship programme – further details	3
Support to local authorities	3
Engagement and support for employers	3
Testing, developing and roll-out of a supported internships Quality Assurance Framework (SIQAF)	4
Investment in training	4
Communication and engagement activities	4
Evaluation methodological considerations	5
Survey administration	5
Access to participants	5
Survey timings	5
Intern survey administration	5
Response rates	6
Recruitment of case studies	6
Use of secondary data	6
Aim 1 – Quantity of supported internships	7
Aim 2 – Quality of supported internships	7
Aim 3 – Outcomes of supported internships	7
Costings survey administration	8
Supplementary survey sample profile	9
Intern baseline and endline surveys	9
EHCP interns	9
Pilot interns	10
Intern follow-up survey	10
Employer baseline and endline surveys	10
Provider and job coach surveys	11
Survey data tables	12
Secondary data methodology and summary	73
Data management and cleaning	73
Summary of supported internship numbers and intern characteristics	74
Secondary data tables	76

Costing feasibility study approach

109

Costing survey template

112

Strengthening of the supported internship programme – further details

Internships Work was a project funded by the DfE which was designed to support more young people with additional needs to have greater choice and control over their future, opening up opportunities that prepare them for adult life and independent living.

The Internships Work consortium was a partnership of three delivery organisations, including: the National Development Team for Inclusion (NDTi)¹, the British Association of Supported Employment (BASE)², and DFN Project SEARCH³. Between them, these delivery partners aimed to double the number of supported internships by 2025, and to work closely with local authorities, supported internship providers, job coaches and employers, to improve the quantity and quality of supported internship provision across England. There were five key elements to the Internships Work project: (1) support to local authorities; (2) engagement and support for employers; (3) testing, developing and roll-out of a supported internships Quality Assurance Framework (SIQAF); (4) investment in training; and (5) communication and engagement activities.

Support to local authorities

NDTi supported local authorities to establish and develop SEND Employment Forums, and administrated and monitored Section 14 grants to support them with the programme. SEND Employment Forums were intended as vehicles to create sustainable employment pathways for young people with SEND. Strategies to engage employers included: direct invitation to meetings and events, holding employer-specific forums, networking events, employer packs/materials, workplace visits and training, collaboration with partner groups, and digital engagement (e.g. email updates, social media campaigns).

Engagement and support for employers

DFN Project SEARCH led on engaging employers and supporting them to offer high quality work placements by providing information, advice and training that enable growth in internships and job opportunities. Resources and training were offered to SEND Employment Forum members designed to strengthen employer engagement and collaboration within SEND Employment Forums. A network of Employer Ambassadors (previously referred to as Business Champions) was established to work with SEND

¹ NDTi: a not-for-profit organisation promoting inclusion and equality for people who are at risk of exclusion from any part of society.

² BASE: the membership association for organisations that provide, or have an interest in, specialist employment support for people with a disability or other economic disadvantage.

³ DFN Project SEARCH: a one-year transition to work programme for young adults with a learning disability or autism spectrum conditions, or both.

Employment Forums to create employment opportunities for young people with SEND through promoting supported internships and engaging with employers

Testing, developing and roll-out of a supported internships Quality Assurance Framework (SIQAF)

BASE led on establishing a sustainable process to improve the quality of supported internship provision using the SIQAF self-assessment tool which was aimed at supported internship providers to support evaluation of the quality and success of their supported internship programme. It was supported by a voluntary peer review process designed to enhance and offer validation to the self-assessment whereby 2 trained peer reviewers visit the supported internship provision to evaluate their self-assessment score, and provide support for continuous improvement, with recommended actions and best practice examples. To support the peer review process, Internships Work recruited and trained lead and peer reviewers

Investment in training

BASE delivered job coach supported employment techniques and systematic instruction training, which aimed to train over 700 job coaches by 2025. The bespoke training was developed in line with the Supported Employment National Occupational Standards (NOS) and reflected the key principle to train job coaches as set out in the latest [supported internships Guidance](#)

Communication and engagement activities

The consortium developed a range of materials and communication activities to reach a broad audience. This included a 'One-Stop Shop' of information and resources, an annual National Supported Internship Day, close working with the National SEND Employment Forum (NSEF), and multiple social media and communication campaigns

Evaluation methodological considerations

The final report for the [Supported internship programme: evaluation of investment](#) provides a summary of key methodological considerations. The following section provides further details.

Survey administration

Access to participants

In order to gain access to interns, employers and job coaches, the online surveys were administered via providers who were asked to pass the survey invitations on to stakeholders on CGR's behalf. Providers were also asked to engage with the case study interviews and support recruitment of participants. It is therefore possible that some selection or non-response bias may have impacted these findings, as the providers/individuals who engaged with the evaluation may have been those more positive about, or engaged with, supported internships. The findings therefore, may not be representative of all supported internship providers.

Survey timings

Due to the timing of commissioning the evaluation, it was only possible to include cohort 1 in the intern follow-up survey, therefore the majority of the findings are based on cohorts 2 and 3 of the investment period. Timings of the evaluation meant that administration of the intern and employer baseline surveys for cohort 2 was somewhat delayed, which may have affected their responses. However, comparison of cohort 2 and 3 baseline responses showed that their responses were broadly consistent, therefore cohort 2 and 3 baseline data were combined for reporting.

Intern survey administration

A number of challenges were faced when administering the intern surveys.

For interns aged under 18 years old, permission to contact had to first be gained from the interns' parents/carers, however very few parents/carers gave their permission and the response rate from interns was also very low. As a result, intern surveys were subsequently only sent to those aged 18 years or over. Based on ILR figures, this means a small minority of interns were not included in the surveys.⁴ Younger interns were included in the qualitative element of the evaluation.

Initially, interns that had completed the baseline survey were sent the endline survey directly, to the reduce burden on providers supporting administration of the endline

⁴ ILR data estimated that the proportion of interns aged under 18 was around 6-10%, however this may not represent all interns due to data quality issues as outlined in the section, [Use of secondary data](#).

survey. However, the response rate from direct survey invites was extremely low. To maximise the number of responses that could be achieved, provider support was also requested to administer the intern endline surveys. As a result, it was not always possible to identify whether a young person had completed both the baseline and endline surveys. In total, 92 respondents that completed both the baseline and endline surveys were identified, which limited sub-group analysis, therefore, the report has been based on all intern responses. Where questions were asked at both the baseline and endline stages, analysis was also conducted on the 92 matched responses, however no significant differences were identified.

Response rates

There was a large fall in response rate between the baseline and endline surveys for interns and employers. Whilst the profile of those that responded was broadly similar, some differences were evident. Caution should therefore be exercised when comparing baseline and endline data.

Survey response rates were low for the provider and employer surveys and for the intern follow-up surveys. Analysis of this data has therefore been combined and it has not been possible to analyse the cohorts separately to explore change over the course of the investment. A small number of providers (n=15) and employers (n=7) completed a survey in both cohorts 2 and 3. In most cases, all responses have been included in the analysis as the respondents were referring to a different academic year. For a small number of questions, the data has been cleaned so that analysis is based on 1 response from a provider or employer. Where this is the case, this has been identified in the report as 'unique responses'.

Recruitment of case studies

Despite our aim to achieve case study representation across the type of provider, internship model, the level of SEND of the interns, completion of the SIQAF, and geographical region, there would have been a self-selection bias in the final sample. It is unlikely that a provider experiencing many challenges with the programme would have nominated their provision for a case study.

Use of secondary data

There are several issues with secondary data accessible for this evaluation for each of the evaluation aims. The following section summarises these issues and highlights that this data should be treated with caution.

Aim 1 – Quantity of supported internships

To address aim 1, due to limitations with different datasets, a range of data sources were used to explore any change in number and profile of supported interns over the investment period. These limitations are:

- ILR data could be incomplete or inaccurate due to variations in data submissions, including how/when supported internships were recorded. ILR data is also limited to the further education sector, suggesting that some supported internships may not be included. However, this was considered the most comprehensive national dataset available given there were issues with EHCP SEN2 data⁵
- local authority survey data was checked, cleaned and analysed by the evaluation team. However, the surveys were administered by Internships Work and therefore data was not collected independently. There were also potential inaccuracies due to changes in the questions across survey rounds over the investment period, use of open-text (rather than numerical) response options, and local authorities using estimations rather than actual enrolment numbers
- the provider survey was not completed by all supported internship providers, therefore data is not representative of all supported internships. Data on intern numbers was calculated using provider figures that could not be externally validated

Aim 2 – Quality of supported internships

Exploring supported internship quality and use of SIQAF was conducted primarily via surveys and case studies. SIQAF monitoring data could not be used to explore quality due to SIQAF scores not being available for analysis; and providers were encouraged rather than required to complete SIQAF more than once. Sign up to peer reviews (and particularly a follow-up review) was lower than expected which meant that the sample size did not allow for meaningful analysis of change in quality over the investment period. The evaluation surveys were used to fill these gaps, although these have their own limitations due to sample size/representation of the sectors and a self-selecting sample.

Aim 3 – Outcomes of supported internships

Tracking medium term employment outcomes (6 months after completion) through use of LEO was not possible due to lag in data availability within the timeframe of the evaluation. This meant that matching a group of non-supported internship young people to supported interns and comparing their outcomes was not possible. Also, ILR data does

⁵ Data on EHCPs are included in SEN2 data collection and can be accessed on [Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#). 2024/25 data was reported for the academic year. Previous to that, data was reported by calendar year. From the reporting year 2023 (as at January 2023, 2022 calendar year), the data collection changed from aggregated figures at local authority level, to a person level collection. This was a major change in approach and as such there are time series breaks and important data quality caveats.

not record employment outcomes of interns. Alternative sources were used to explore outcomes of interns, including provider, employer and intern surveys, as well as local authority survey data collated by Internships Work. These surveys cannot be considered fully representative however, as they are only a sample of those engaged.

Costings survey administration

There are two main methodological considerations with respect to the costing survey data which highlight that this data should be treated with caution. First, although the findings of the costing feasibility study indicated that the costing survey content was acceptable, response rates remained low. Several factors likely contributed to this outcome:

- financial data challenges - some providers may have been unable to complete the survey because financial information was recorded differently or supported internship programme costs were not ring-fenced but combined with other programmes. For example, tutors often worked across multiple programmes, making cost allocation difficult
- logistical barriers - completing the survey required both financial and programme information, which likely involved at least two professionals within a setting. In large organisations, course leaders may have faced difficulties engaging 'distant' finance teams to undertake a new financial exercise for a relatively small part of their provision
- survey fatigue - providers were subject to multiple data collection activities, which may have reduced their willingness to participate

Second, was the accuracy of the financial and programme data submitted in the surveys. Measures were taken to support accurate submissions by structuring the survey so that spending on individual items, such as staff costs, aligned with overall expenditure. This approach enabled data cleaning processes to identify and remove submissions with inconsistencies or errors. However, some responses contained gaps in the data, which limited the completeness of the dataset and reduced the number of surveys viable for analysis. Therefore, combined with the low response rates, the data is not representative of all providers.

Supplementary survey sample profile

Tables in the section [Survey data tables](#), detail the profile of the survey respondents. The following is a summary of each of the sample profiles.

Intern baseline and endline surveys

EHCP interns

- the majority of respondents were male (baseline 63%, endline 63%) and aged between 18-20 at the time of completing the baseline survey (64%), and 19-22 at the time of completing the endline survey (70%)
- responses were received from across England, however the regions were not represented proportionally. At the baseline stage, the largest proportion of responses were received from the South East (21%), whereas at the endline stage the largest proportion was from London (24%). The fewest responses were received from the South West (baseline 5%, endline 1%) and the East Midlands (baseline 5%, endline 6%) at both stages
- respondents were predominantly of white ethnicity, however the proportion was higher at the baseline stage than at the endline stage (baseline 70%, endline 58%) and lower at both stages than the estimate of 75% for young people aged 18-25 in England from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census 2021.⁶ Conversely, the proportion of interns of black ethnicity was higher at the endline-stage compared to the baseline stage (baseline 8%, endline 12%) and higher at both stages than the ONS Census 2021 estimate of 5%. However, ILR data has comparable proportions to ONS data, which suggests that this difference is a response effect (see [Summary of supported internship numbers and intern characteristics](#) and [Secondary data tables](#))
- the profile of respondents with regards to area of special educational need was similar at both stages, with communication and interaction being the most common (baseline 43%, endline 44%), followed by cognition and learning (18% at both the baseline and endline stages) and social, emotional and mental health (baseline 13%, endline 10%). Physical and/or sensory needs were the least common (baseline 5%, endline 7%)

⁶ Source: Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census 2021; Ethnic Group by age and sex in England and Wales (2023)
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/ethnicity/datasets/ethnicgroupbyageandsexinenglandandwales>.

Pilot interns

- responses were received from across England, with the largest proportion from the North West (baseline 26%, endline 24%) and the South East (baseline 26%, endline 22%) and the fewest from the North West (baseline 3%, endline 0%) and the East of England (baseline 5%, endline 11%), although it should be noted that no local authorities in the East Midlands or London took part in the first two years of the Pilot
- the majority of Pilot interns responding to the surveys were aged 18-20 (baseline 65%, endline 64%), male (baseline 56%, endline 58%), and of white ethnicity (baseline 81%, endline 87%). Their main area of special educational need was also communication and interaction (baseline 36%, endline 40%), followed by social, emotional and mental health (baseline 30%, endline 20%)

Intern follow-up survey⁷

- EHCP intern respondents were again predominantly male (65%), however their ages were relatively evenly spread across ages 19-24+
- responses were spread across England, with the largest proportion from London (26%) and the South East (19%) and the smallest from the North East (2%) and the South West (1%)
- 59% were of white ethnicity, with the remainder mainly of Asian (19%) or Black (14%) ethnicity
- the main area of special educational need was communication and interaction (56%), followed by cognition and learning (16%)

Employer baseline and endline surveys

- the majority of employers responding to the surveys were from large companies (250+ employees baseline 61%, endline 57%) and had been hosting supported internships for 5 years or less (baseline 82%, endline 93%), with a significant proportion being in their first year of hosting supported internships (baseline 37%, endline 28%)
- organisations operated across a wide range of sectors, with the largest being health, care and social services (baseline 22%, endline 24%), followed by catering and hospitality (13%, 7%)
- employer responses were typically received from the intern's line manager (baseline 29%, endline 15%), the supported internship operational lead/

⁷ Profile of Pilot interns that responded to the follow-up survey has not been included due to the low base (n=15).

coordinator (baseline 26%, endline 28%) or someone who had strategic oversight of supported internships (baseline 20%, endline 28%)

Provider and job coach surveys

- provider responses were typically received from the supported internship lead/manager/coordinator (71%) and there was a wide range of experience in providing supported internships, with 6% in their first year, around two-fifths (41%) with 2-5 years' experience, one-third (31%) with 6-9 years' experience, and 16% who had been providing supported internships for 10 years or more
- the supported internship models offered by providers varied; 29% said that most interns stay in one role with one employer in a single placement, 25% that most interns work with a single, large employer and rotate between different placements, and 34% offered a combination of supported internship models. The least common approach was for most interns to have two or more placements with different employers (10%)
- the supported internship model profile was somewhat different amongst the job coaches that responded to the surveys; 41% said that most interns stay in one role with one employer in a single placement, 16% that most interns work with a single, large employer and rotate between different placements, and 15% that most interns to have two or more placements with different employers. Just over one-quarter (28%) offered a combination of supported internship models

Survey data tables

Table 1: Surveys included in analysis

Survey	Fieldwork dates	Number of completed surveys
Intern baseline (cohort 2)	October – December 2023	520
Intern endline (cohort 2)	July – August 2024	85
Intern follow-up survey (cohort 1)	February – April 2024	49
Employer baseline (cohort 2)	November 2023 – January 2024	93
Employer endline (cohort 2)	July – August 2024	26
Job coach survey (cohort 2)	April – May 2024	119
Provider survey (cohort 2)	July – September 2024	64
Intern baseline (cohort 3)	September – November 2024	362
Intern endline (cohort 3)	June – August 2025	262
Intern follow-up survey (cohort 2)	February – March 2025	37
Employer baseline (cohort 3)	November 2024 – January 2025	109
Employer endline (cohort 3)	July – August 2025	20
Provider survey (cohort 3)	June – September 2025	36
Intern follow-up survey (cohort 3)	October – November 2025	47
Pilot intern baseline (year 1)	February – March 2024	29
Pilot intern endline (year 1)	July – October 2024	6
Pilot intern baseline (year 2)	September 2024 – February 2025	59
Pilot intern endline (year 2)	June – August 2025	39
Pilot intern follow-up survey (year 1)	February – March 2025	4
Pilot intern follow-up survey (year 2)	October – November 2025	11

Table 2: Age (baseline and endline surveys) – EHCP interns⁸

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
18	156	23	18%*	7%
19	230	68	26%*	20%
20	175	69	20%	20%
21	100	56	11%	16%*
22	77	49	9%	14%*
23	65	41	7%	12%*
24+	63	34	7%	10%
Prefer not to say	16	7	2%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 3: Gender (baseline and endline surveys) – EHCP interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Male	586	220	66%	63%
Female	265	116	30%	33%
I identify in another way	9	3	1%	1%
Prefer not to say	22	8	2%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

⁸ The symbol * has been used to denote significant differences between baseline and endline data and is shown next to the percentage which is significantly higher.

Table 4: Region (baseline and endline surveys) – EHCP interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
North East	70	29	8%	8%
North West	94	27	11%	8%
Yorkshire and the Humber	74	31	8%	9%
East Midlands	47	21	5%	6%
West Midlands	96	44	11%	13%
East of England	105	39	12%	11%
London	134	85	15%	24%*
South East	188	54	21%*	16%
South West	47	4	5%*	1%
Other/Don't know/Prefer not to say	27	13	3%	4%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 5: Ethnicity (baseline and endline surveys) – EHCP interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Asian, Asian British, Asian Welsh (e.g. Bangladeshi, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani or other Asian)	93	50	11%	14%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh (e.g. Caribbean, African or other Black)	67	41	8%	12%*
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	33	16	4%	5%
White	613	201	70%*	58%
Other ethnic group	10	5	1%	1%
Don't know	22	10	2%	3%
Prefer not to say	44	24	5%	7%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 6: EHCP status (baseline and endline surveys) - EHCP interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Yes – have an EHCP	781	301	89%	87%
No – do not have an EHCP	21	15	2%	4%
Don't know	67	23	8%	7%
Prefer not to say	13	8	1%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 7: Main special educational need (baseline and endline- surveys) - EHCP interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Communication and interaction (e.g. autism, speech, language and communication needs)	382	152	43%	44%
Cognition and learning (e.g. dyslexia, dyscalculia, specific learning need, moderate learning needs)	163	64	18%	18%
Social, emotional and mental health (e.g. anxiety, depression, ADHD)	117	34	13%	10%
Physical and/or sensory (e.g. physical, vision, hearing, multi-sensory needs)	46	23	5%	7%
None	27	12	3%	3%
Don't know	78	26	9%	7%
Prefer not to say	69	36	8%	10%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 8: Age (baseline and endline surveys) – Pilot interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
18	27	9	31%	20%
19	16	7	18%	16%
20	14	13	16%	29%
21	10	4	11%	9%
22	8	3	9%	7%
23	6	3	7%	7%
24+	6	6	7%	13%
Prefer not to say	1	0	1%	0%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 9: Gender (baseline and endline surveys) – Pilot interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Male	49	26	56%	58%
Female	31	18	35%	40%
I identify in another way	4	0	5%	0%
Prefer not to say	4	1	5%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 10: Region (baseline and endline surveys) – Pilot interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
North East	3	0	3%	0%
North West	23	11	26%	24%
Yorkshire and the Humber	10	9	11%	20%
East Midlands	0	0	0%	0%
West Midlands	7	7	8%	16%
East of England	4	5	5%	11%
London	0	0	0%	0%
South East	23	10	26%	22%
South West	13	3	15%	7%
Prefer not to say/Don't know/Other	5	0	6%	0%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 11: Ethnicity (baseline and endline surveys) – Pilot interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Asian, Asian British, Asian Welsh (e.g. Bangladeshi, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani or other Asian)	7	3	8%	7%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh (e.g. Caribbean, African or other Black)	1	1	1%	2%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	6	2	7%	4%
White	71	39	81%	87%
Other ethnic group	0	0	0%	0%
Don't know	1	0	1%	0%
Prefer not to say	2	0	2%	0%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 12: EHCP status (baseline and endline surveys) – Pilot interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Yes – have an EHCP	8	5	9%	11%
No – do not have an EHCP	63	34	72%	76%
Don't know	17	6	19%	13%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 13: Main special educational need (baseline and endline surveys) - Pilot interns

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Communication and interaction (e.g. autism, speech, language and communication needs)	32	18	36%	40%
Social, emotional and mental health (e.g. anxiety, depression, ADHD)	26	9	30%	20%
Cognition and learning (e.g. dyslexia, dyscalculia, specific learning need, moderate learning needs)	13	9	15%	20%
Physical and/or sensory (e.g. physical, vision, hearing, multisensory needs)	3	3	3%	7%
None	6	2	7%	4%
Don't know	8	3	9%	7%
Prefer not to say	0	1	0%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 14: Age (follow-up surveys) – EHCP and Pilot interns

	EHCP interns Number of responses	EHCP interns %	Pilot interns Number of responses
18	2	2%	1
19	22	17%	3
20	22	17%	1
21	23	17%	2
22	20	15%	3
23	23	17%	0
24+	20	15%	5
Prefer not to say	1	1%	0

Base: All respondents EHCP interns (133), Pilot interns (15)

Source: Intern follow-up surveys

Table 15: Gender (follow-up surveys) – EHCP and Pilot interns

	EHCP interns Number of responses	EHCP interns %	Pilot interns Number of responses
Male	87	65%	6
Female	43	32%	7
I identify in another way	2	2%	1
Prefer not to say	1	1%	1

Base: All respondents EHCP interns (133), Pilot interns (15)

Source: Intern follow-up surveys

Table 16: Region (follow-up surveys) – EHCP and Pilot interns

	EHCP interns Number of responses	EHCP interns %	Pilot interns Number of responses
North East	3	2%	0
North West	17	13%	4
Yorkshire and the Humber	11	8%	3
East Midlands	9	7%	0
West Midlands	21	16%	1
East of England	8	6%	2
London	34	26%	0
South East	25	19%	3
South West	1	1%	2
Other/Don't know/Prefer not to say	4	3%	0

Base: All respondents EHCP interns (133), Pilot interns (15)

Source: Intern follow-up surveys

Table 17: Ethnicity (follow-up surveys) – EHCP and Pilot interns

	EHCP interns Number of responses	EHCP interns %	Pilot interns Number of responses
Asian, Asian British, Asian Welsh (e.g. Bangladeshi, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani or other Asian)	25	19%	1
Black, Black British, Black Welsh (e.g. Caribbean, African or other Black)	19	14%	0
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4	3%	0
White	79	59%	14
Other ethnic group	1	1%	0
Don't know	0	0%	0
Prefer not to say	5	4%	0

Base: All respondents EHCP interns (133), Pilot interns (15)

Source: Intern follow-up surveys

Table 18: EHCP status (follow-up surveys) – EHCP and Pilot interns

	EHCP interns Number of responses	EHCP interns %	Pilot interns Number of responses
Yes – have an EHCP	92	69%	1
No – do not have an EHCP	24	18%	11
Don't know	12	9%	2
Prefer not to say	5	4%	1

Base: All respondents EHCP interns (133), Pilot interns (15)

Source: Intern follow-up surveys

Table 19: Main special educational need (follow-up surveys) – EHCP and Pilot interns

	EHCP interns Number of responses	EHCP interns %	Pilot interns Number of responses
Communication and interaction (e.g. autism, speech, language and communication needs)	75	56%	8
Cognition and learning (e.g. dyslexia, dyscalculia, specific learning need, moderate learning needs)	21	16%	2
Social, emotional and mental health (e.g. anxiety, depression, ADHD)	12	9%	3
Physical and/or sensory (e.g. physical, vision, hearing, multi-sensory needs)	7	5%	0
None	6	5%	0
Don't know	6	5%	1
Prefer not to say	6	5%	1

Base: All respondents EHCP interns (133), Pilot interns (15)

Source: Intern follow-up surveys

Table 20: Number of employees (baseline and endline surveys) - employers

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
1 to 9	16	3	8%	7%
10 to 19	15	5	7%	11%
20 to 49	13	2	6%	4%
50 to 249	33	9	16%	20%
250+	123	26	61%	57%
Don't know	2	1	1%	2%

Base: All responses baseline (202), endline (46)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

Table 21: Organisation supported internship tenure (baseline and endline surveys) - employers

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
This is/will be our first year	75	13	37%	28%
2-3 years	64	21	32%	46%
4-5 years	27	9	13%	20%
6-7 years	10	0	5%	0%
8-9 years	3	0	1%	0%
10 years or more	9	2	4%	4%
We haven't hosted any SIs as yet	2	0	1%	0%
Don't know	12	1	6%	2%

Base: All responses baseline (202), endline (46)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

Table 22: Respondent role with regards to supported internships (baseline and endline surveys) - employers

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Line manager to intern	59	7	29%	15%
Operational lead / supported internship coordinator	52	13	26%	28%
Strategic oversight of supported internships	40	13	20%	28%
Human resources support for supported internship	13	4	6%	9%
Buddy / mentor to intern	11	5	5%	11%
Colleague of an intern	4	1	2%	2%
Other ⁹	17	3	8%	7%
Not applicable	6	0	3%	0%

Base: All responses baseline (202), endline (46)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

Table 23: Supported internship model (baseline and endline surveys) - employers

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Stay in the same department	95	13	48%*	29%
Move around different departments/rotations	91	28	46%	62%
Other ¹⁰	6	2	3%	4%
Don't know	2	0	1%	0%
Not answered	2	2	1%	4%

Base: All with current interns baseline (196), endline (45)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

⁹ Other responses: pre, manager/supervisor (n=8), the remaining were individual responses; post, all individual responses.

¹⁰ Other responses: pre, it varies (n=5), placed with different employers (n=1); post, it varies (n=2).

Table 24: Sector (baseline and endline surveys) - employers

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Health, care and social services	45	11	22%	24%
Catering and hospitality	26	3	13%	7%
Education, early years and childcare	21	1	10%	2%
Retail	18	4	9%	9%
Transport, logistics or distribution	15	5	7%	11%
Government	16	5	8%	11%
Sports and recreation	10	3	5%	7%
Agriculture, environmental and animal care	10	6	5%	13%
Construction and the built environment	6	1	3%	2%
Legal, banking and finance	5	1	2%	2%
Creative and design	4	0	2%	0%
Engineering and manufacturing	4	0	2%	0%
Information Technology/Digital	4	1	2%	2%
Business and administration	2	0	1%	0%
Utilities	2	2	1%	4%
Hair and beauty	1	1	<1%	2%
Pharmaceutical	1	0	<1%	0%
Other ¹¹	12	2	6%	4%

Base: All responses baseline (202), endline (46)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

¹¹ Other responses: pre, charity/not-for-profit (n=6), heritage/museums/arts (n=3), faith/religious (n=1), media (n=1), personal services (n=1); post, charity/not-for-profit (n=1), heritage/museums/arts (n=1).

Table 25: Types of placement roles for interns (baseline and endline surveys) - employers

	Baseline Number of responses	Endline Number of responses	Baseline %	Endline %
Office administration or reception	85	24	43%	53%
Catering/food service	67	13	34%	29%
Housekeeping, maintenance or cleaning	59	13	30%	29%
Customer service	58	13	30%	29%
Hospitality/front of house	55	11	28%	24%
Retail/cashier	42	9	21%	20%
Warehousing, packing and distribution	36	13	18%	29%
Health or social caring/support	35	0	18%	0%
Grounds maintenance/landscaping	34	9	17%	20%
IT/technical support or data entry	32	14	16%	31%
Technical/operative	22	4	11%	9%
Sales or marketing	10	2	5%	4%
Agriculture, farming or animal care	9	2	5%	4%
Construction	4	0	2%	0%
Other ¹²	25	5	12%	9%
Don't know	1	0	1%	0%
Not answered	2	2	1%	4%

Base: All with current interns baseline (196), endline (45)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

¹² Other responses: pre, education/enrichment support (n=11), general assistant (n=6), horticulture (n=3), technical (n=3), estates (n=2), creative (n=2), workshops (n=1); post, education/enrichment support (n=2), horticulture (n=2), project management/engineering (n=1).

Table 26: Supported internship tenure - providers

	Number of responses	%
This is/will be our first year	6	6%
2-3 years	22	22%
4-5 years	19	19%
6-7 years	17	17%
8-9 years	14	14%
10 years or more	16	16%
Don't know	6	6%

Base: All responses (100)

Source: Provider survey

Table 27: Supported internship model - providers

	Number of responses	%
Most interns work with a single, large employer and rotate between different placements (e.g. Project Search)	25	25%
Most interns have two or more placements with different employers	10	10%
Most interns stay in one role with one employer in a single placement	29	29%
We offer a combination of work placement models	34	34%
Don't know	2	2%

Base: All responses (100)

Source: Provider survey

Table 28: Project Search contract for current academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25) - providers

	Number of responses	%
Yes	34	34%
No	62	62%
Don't know	4	4%

Base: All responses (100)

Source: Provider survey

Table 29: Respondent role with regards to supported internships - providers

	Number of responses	%
Supported internship lead/supported internship programme manager/supported internship coordinator	71	71%
Tutor/trainer	4	4%
Employer engagement	3	3%
Job Coach	2	2%
Other ¹³	20	20%

Base: All responses (100)

Source: Provider survey

¹³ Other responses: senior leadership (n=14), department head/lead/manager (n=5), administrator (n=1).

Table 30: Number of employers hosting interns this academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25) - providers

	Number of responses	%
1	5	5%
2	7	7%
3	9	9%
4	4	4%
5	5	5%
6 to 10	21	22%
11 to 20	20	21%
21 to 30	9	9%
31 to 40	3	3%
41 to 50	1	1%
51+	6	6%
Don't know	7	7%

Base: All who have provided supported internships this academic year (97)

Source: Provider survey

Table 31: Sectors that supported internship employers work in - providers

	Number of responses	%
Catering, hospitality, cleaning services	72	74%
Retail	59	61%
Health, care and social services (inc NHS)	57	59%
Education, early years and childcare	54	56%
Business and administration	45	46%
Agriculture, horticulture, environmental and animal care	39	40%
Sports and recreation	38	39%
Transport, warehousing, logistics or distribution	37	38%
Information Technology/Digital	23	24%
Engineering and manufacturing (inc automotive services)	20	21%
Government	18	19%
Other public sector	15	15%
Construction and the built environment	14	14%
Creative and design	14	14%
Hair and beauty	8	8%
Pharmaceutical	8	8%
Legal, banking and finance	6	6%
Utilities and energy	3	3%
Protective services (e.g. fire services, police, the armed forces, paramedics)	2	2%

Base: All who have provided supported internships this academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25) (97)

Source: Provider survey

Table 32: Roles that supported interns work in - providers

	Number of responses	%
Catering/food service worker	71	73%
Customer service	68	70%
Office administration or reception	66	68%
Hospitality/front of house	64	66%
Housekeeping, maintenance or cleaning	58	60%
Retail/cashier/shop worker	56	58%
Grounds maintenance/landscaping	48	49%
Warehousing, packing or distribution team	44	45%
Health or social caring/support	42	43%
IT/technical support or data entry	40	41%
Agriculture, farming or animal care	20	21%
Technical/operative/production worker	18	19%
Sales or marketing team	10	10%
Construction worker	7	7%
Other	14	14%

Base: All who have provided supported internships this academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25) (97)

Source: Provider survey

Table 33: Supported internship model – job coaches

	Number of responses	%
Most interns stay in one role with one employer in a single placement	49	41%
We offer a combination of work placement models	33	28%
Most interns work with a single, large employer and rotate between different placements (e.g Project Search)	19	16%
Most interns have two or more placements with different employers	18	15%

Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 34: Number of employers currently supported – job coaches

	Number of responses	%
1	28	24%
2	17	14%
3	11	9%
4	10	8%
5	8	7%
6 to 10	15	13%
11 to 20	16	13%
21 or more	5	4%
Don't know	9	8%

Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 35: Case study regions

Region	Interns with EHCPs (15 case studies)	Region
Yorkshire & Humber	3	1
North West	2	
South West	2	1
West Midlands	2	
East of England	1	1
South East	1	1
East Midlands	1	
London	1	
North East	1	
National	1	

Source: Case studies

Table 36: Number of case study participants

Participants	Interns with EHCPs (15 case studies) Number of participants	Interns without EHCPs (4 case studies) Number of participants
Local authority representatives	17	6
Provider	23	5
Job coach	38	8
Interns in a focus group	25	9
Intern observation & interview	10	3
Employers	17	3
Current interns and parent/carer joint interview	10	1
Parent/carer of current intern	5	3
Current intern interview	N/A	1
Graduate intern and parent/carer joint interview	10	N/A
Graduate intern interview	1	N/A
Parent/carer of graduate intern interview	1	N/A

Source: Case studies

Table 37: Costing surveys sample

Provider type	Survey 1 (May 2024)	Survey 2 (May 2025)
FE college	5	6
Specialist further education college	2	3
Charity/supported employment provider	5	2
Special secondary school	0	1
Local authority	0	1
Provider type	Survey 1 (May 2024)	Survey 2 (May 2025)
South East	5	3
North West	2	4
National	1	2
London	1	2
West Midlands	1	1
East of England	1	0
South West	1	0
Yorkshire & Humber	0	1
North East	0	0
East Midlands	0	0
Internship model delivered	Survey 1 (May 2024)	Survey 2 (May 2025)
3 placement rotations with one employer	3	6
2 or more placements with 2 or more employers	2	3
1 placement with 1 employer	4	2
More than one model	3	2

Source: Costing survey

Table 38: Number of supported interns in the local area – local authorities¹⁴

	Survey 1 (Sept 2022 – March 2023)	Survey 2 (Dec 2023 – Feb 2024)	Survey 3 (Dec 2024 – Feb 2025)
Total number of interns	3206	3428	4379
Range	0 - 200	0 - 109	0 – 142
Average per local authority	23.9	25.3	29.2
Total no. of responses	134	136	150

Base: Survey 1 (134), survey 2 (136), survey 3 (150)

Source: Local authority surveys, Internships Work

Table 39: Whether the local area has a supported internship offer for every young person who needs one – local authorities

	Survey 1 (Sept 2022 – March 2023)	Survey 2 (Dec 2023 – Feb 2024)	Survey 3 (Dec 2024 – Feb 2025)
Yes	40 (26%)	73 (51%)	76 (51%)
No	83 (55%)	52 (36%)	43 (29%)
Don't know	28 (19%)	18 (13%)	31 (21%)

Base: Survey 1 (151), survey 2 (143), survey 3 (150)

Source: LA surveys, Internships Work

¹⁴ Question changed slightly across the three surveys: Survey 1 asked 'How many supported interns do you currently have in your local area?', Survey 2 asked 'How many young people resident in your local authority are on a supported internship this year?', Survey 3 asked 'How many young people (with an EHCP) who are residents in your local authority, are on a supported internship this year? 'Unknown' / unclear responses have been excluded from the data.

Table 40: Awareness and engagement with supported internship activity - providers¹⁵

	Aware	Engaged
Supported Employment training provided by BASE/Internships Work	87%	68%
Local SEND employment forums	82%	75%
Support or engagement from your Local Authority (LA) about SIs	82%	70%
Training in Systematic Instruction provided by BASE/Internships Work	80%	74%
Other support from or engagement with any of the Internships Work delivery partners (NDTi, BASE, DFN Project SEARCH) for SIs	72%	54%
Regional employment network meetings	58%	44%
National SEND Employment Forum (NSEF)	52%	34%
supported internship employer champions/ambassadors	42%	18%
Other activity related to SIs	10%	4%
None	1%	2%

Base: All responses (97)

Source: Provider survey

¹⁵ SIQAF was asked about separately.

Table 41: Usefulness of supported internship activity engaged with - providers

	NET Not useful	Very useful	NET Useful
Training in Systematic Instruction provided by BASE/Internships Work	1%	60%	97%
National SEND Employment Forum (NSEF)	3%	30%	97%
Supported Employment training provided by BASE/Internships Work	3%	58%	94%
Local SEND employment forums	8%	42%	92%
Regional employment network meetings	12%	37%	88%
Other support from or engagement with any of the Internships Work delivery partners (NDTi, BASE, DFN Project SEARCH) for SIs	10%	40%	87%
Support or engagement from your Local Authority (LA) about SIs	15%	50%	85%
Supported internship employer champions/ambassadors ¹⁶	3	3	13

Base: Engaged with activity, (base varies 72, 33, 66, 73, 43, 52, 68, 17)

Source: Provider survey

¹⁶ Counts displayed due to low base (n=17).

Table 42: Awareness and engagement with supported internships activity - employers

	Aware Baseline	Aware Endline	Engaged Baseline	Engaged Endline
DFN Project SEARCH engaging/partnering with employers about supported internships	28%	46%*	20%	35%*
SEND employment forums	23%	43%*	16%	30%*
Supported Internships Quality-Assurance Framework (SIQAF)	17%	33%*	9%	26%*
Regional employment network meetings	19%	37%*	11%	22%
Internships Work website	11%	37%*	5%	22%*
Supported internship employer champion training	24%	26%	12%	20%
Supported internship Job Coach training	29%	37%	12%	11%
NDTI webinars for parents/carers in partnership with Family Fund	5%	9%	2%	7%
Other activity related to SIs	4%	11%	2%	9%
None	31%	26%	9%	17%
Don't know	8%	4%	5%	0%

Base: All responses baseline (202), endline (46)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

Table 43: Plans for sustaining supported internships – local authorities (Survey 3 only)¹⁷

	% of respondents
Hoping to continue (with the same funding model / reduced provision)	61%
Looking to expand provision	19%
Hoping to incorporate/embed within wider provision (or have already)	13%
Seeking / using alternative funding	9%
Exploring financially viable model / business case to continue	7%
Continuing to raise awareness	6%
Creating new provision / new endline	6%
Plans in progress / currently unsure	9%

Base: All respondents (150)

Source: Internships Work consortium LA survey

¹⁷ Question: What are your LA's plans for sustaining supported internships in your local area beyond March 2025, when the Internships Work funding is set to conclude? Qualitative question. Percentages add up to more than 100% as some survey respondents noted more than one challenge.

Table 44: Agreement with statements about supported internships – EHCP interns

I like/have liked being on the supported internship programme	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	86%	87%
Strongly agree	41%	48%*
NET Disagree	4%	5%
I have/had a say about choosing my work placement(s)	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	83%	79%
Strongly agree	35%	37%
NET Disagree	3%	7%*
I get/got enough help and support from my tutor	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	92%	89%
Strongly agree	47%	49%
NET Disagree	3%	5%*
I am happy about the type of work I will be/have been doing on placement	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	85%	86%
Strongly agree	39%	48%*
NET Disagree	3%	5%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 45: Agreement with statements about placement/job coach – EHCP interns

	NET Disagree	Strongly agree	NET Agree
I have learned and developed my job skills	3%	49%	93%
I have enjoyed my work placement(s)	5%	51%	88%
I have felt part of the team at my placement	5%	51%	88%
I am happy with the help I have had from my Job Coach	4%	50%	88%
My Job Coach has been there when I needed them	5%	46%	88%
I am happy with the help I have had from my employer(s)	6%	44%	88%
I felt confident with doing my work placement	4%	44%	88%
I had enough training to do my work placement well	5%	42%	88%
My Job Coach has helped me to learn and develop my skills at my placement	5%	47%	86%
My employer(s) have made changes so that I could do my job	6%	34%	79%

Base: All respondents endline (347)

Source: Intern endline survey

Table 46: Agreement with statements about supported internships – Pilot interns

I like/have liked being on the supported internship programme	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	84%	93%
Strongly agree	40%	40%
NET Disagree	5%	4%
I have/had a say about choosing my work placement(s)	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	92%	87%
Strongly agree	42%	47%
NET Disagree	6%	4%
I get/got enough help and support from my tutor	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	89%	87%
Strongly agree	47%	47%
NET Disagree	7%	2%
I am happy about the type of work I will be/have been doing on placement	Baseline	Endline
NET Agree	76%	87%
Strongly agree	34%	42%
NET Disagree	5%	7%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 47: Agreement with statements about placement/job coach – Pilot interns

	NET Disagree	Strongly agree	NET Agree
My Job Coach has been there when I needed them	2%	58%	91%
I am happy with the help I have had from my Job Coach	4%	56%	91%
My Job Coach has helped me to learn and develop my skills at my placement	9%	44%	89%
I am happy with the help I have had from my employer(s)	4%	47%	87%
I have felt part of the team at my placement	4%	38%	87%
I had enough training to do my work placement well	7%	38%	87%
I felt confident with doing my work placement	9%	38%	87%
I have learned and developed my job skills	4%	47%	84%
I have enjoyed my work placement(s)	7%	40%	84%
My employer(s) have made changes so that I could do my job	9%	27%	67%

Base: Base: All respondents endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern endline survey

Table 48: Agreement with statements by gender – EHCP interns

I have/had a say about choosing my work placement(s)	Male	Male 18-21	Female
NET Agree	82%	82%	75%
Strongly agree	43%	47%	26%
NET Disagree	5%	5%	9%
I am happy about the type of work I will be/have been doing on placement	Male	Male 18-21	Female
NET Agree	89%	89%	83%
Strongly agree	55%	59%	36%
NET Disagree	4%	3%	9%
I have enjoyed my work placement(s)	Male	Male 18-21	Female
NET Agree	90%	91%	86%
Strongly agree	58%	63%	41%
NET Disagree	4%	3%	8%
I have felt part of the team at my placement	Male	Male 18-21	Female
NET Agree	90%	91%	87%
Strongly agree	57%	59%	43%
NET Disagree	5%	5%	5%
I have learned and developed my job skills	Male	Male 18-21	Female
NET Agree	93%	93%	94%
Strongly agree	56%	61%	37%
NET Disagree	3%	3%	3%

Base: All respondents male (220), male 18-21 (148), female (116)

Source: Intern endline survey

Table 49: Agreement with statements by area of SEND need – EHCP interns

Net agree/strongly agree	Communication and interaction	Cognition and learning	Social, emotional and mental health
I have enjoyed my work placement(s)	91%	84%	76%
I am happy with the help I have had from my employer(s)	92%	88%	76%
I have felt part of the team at my placement	92%	83%	76%

Base: Area of SEND need communication and interaction (152), cognition and learning (64), SEMH (34)¹⁸

Source: Intern endline survey

¹⁸ Data for physical and/or sensory needs not shown due to low base (n=23).

Table 50: Agreement with statements employment status – EHCP interns

I had a say about choosing my work placement(s)	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	88%	68%
Strongly agree	38%	32%
NET Disagree	8%	9%
I am happy about the type of work I have been doing on placement	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	93%	80%
Strongly agree	51%	36%
NET Disagree	6%	10%
I have learned and developed my job skills	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	96%	93%
Strongly agree	55%	37%
NET Disagree	4%	4%
My employer(s) have made changes so that I could do my job	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	85%	71%
Strongly agree	40%	26%
NET Disagree	8%	9%
I had enough training to do my work placement well	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	93%	81%
Strongly agree	50%	33%
NET Disagree	6%	7%

Base: All respondents in paid employment (80), not in paid employment (107)

Source: Intern endline survey

Table 51: Agreement with statements employment status – EHCP interns

I am happy with my supported internship experience	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	94%	78%
Strongly agree	59%	31%
NET Disagree	0%	15%
My supported internship helped me to be ready for working	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	98%	84%
Strongly agree	65%	33%
NET Disagree	2%	9%
I would tell other young people like me to do a supported internship	In paid employment	Not in paid employment
NET Agree	91%	75%
Strongly agree	61%	31%
NET Disagree	0%	13%

Base: All respondents in paid employment (54), not in paid employment (55)

Source: Intern follow-up survey

Table 52: Confidence statements – employers

We know what we need to do to support interns well	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	86%	93%
Very confident	54%	56%
NET Not confident	2%	2%
We have the resources and ability to support interns well	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	85%	87%
Very confident	51%	51%
NET Not confident	2%	7%
We know how to make reasonable adjustment for interns	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	86%	91%
Very confident	59%	67%
NET Not confident	2%	2%
We are able to shape the job role/s to meet interns' needs	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	80%	76%
Very confident	46%	47%
NET Not confident	4%	2%
We know how to review the progress of interns	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	84%	91%
Very confident	49%	53%
NET Not confident	3%	2%
We can help interns to develop their job/sector-related knowledge and skills	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	91%	98%
Very confident	60%	67%
NET Not confident	1%	0%

We can help interns to develop their employability-related knowledge & skills (e.g. time keeping, how to behave at work, etc.)	Baseline	Endline
NET confident	91%	100%
Very confident	67%	76%
NET Not confident	1%	0%

Base: All respondents baseline (196), endline (45)

Source: Employer baseline and endline surveys

Table 53: Confidence by supported internship tenure – employers

Very confident	First year	2+ years
We know what we need to do to support interns well	38%	62%
We have the resources and ability to support interns well	40%	57%
We know how to make reasonable adjustment for interns	49%	64%
We know how to review the progress of interns	35%	58%
We can help interns to develop their job/sector-related knowledge and skills	49%	66%
We can help interns to develop their employability-related knowledge & skills (e.g. time keeping, how to behave at work, etc.)	58%	73%

Base: All respondents first year (72), 2+ years (113)

Source: Employer baseline survey

Table 54: Confidence in own knowledge and skills – job coaches

	NET Not confident	Very confident	NET Confident
Tailoring support to meet interns' needs	1%	69%	99%
Enabling interns to be productive and integrated in their workplace	1%	66%	99%
Tailoring support to meet employers' needs	1%	53%	95%
Addressing barriers to participation and progress	3%	52%	94%
Systematic instruction to build interns' skills and learning of complex tasks	5%	51%	93%
Developing the specification of an intern's job to meet their needs and skills	3%	49%	92%
Vocational profiling and matching interns' skills to the types of jobs available	5%	45%	87%
Engaging with employers and helping them to understand how to recruit and retain a diverse workforce	10%	40%	79%
Negotiating job matches with employers	10%	40%	79%
Following the National Occupational standards	8%	18%	73%
Securing sustainable paid permanent positions that match interns' aspirations, skills and employment goals	21%	24%	71%

Base: Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 55: Number of interns currently supported – job coaches

	This academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25)
1	14%
2	7%
3	6%
4	7%
5	7%
6	5%
7	10%
8	7%
9	2%
10	8%
11	6%
12	7%
13-15	7%
16-20	5%
21+	2%
Don't know	2%
Mean	7.7
Mode	1
Median	7
Minimum	1
Maximum	46

Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 56: Perceptions of SIQAF – providers

	NET Disagree	Agree strongly	NET Agree
Self-assessment is the right approach to improving the quality of supported internship programmes	6%	31%	86%
A peer review will help us to improve the quality and consistency of our provision	6%	35%	82%
The SIQAF will help us to improve the quality and consistency of our provision	6%	37%	80%
The SIQAF fits with our context	9%	26%	72%

Base: Base: All reviewed or engaged with SIQAF (unique respondents) (65)

Source: Provider survey

Table 57: Usefulness of SIQAF – providers

	%
NET: Useful	88%
Very useful	44%
Quite useful	44%
Not very useful	7%
Not at all useful	0%
Don't know	5%

Base: Base: All reviewed or engaged with SIQAF (unique respondents) (43)

Source: Provider survey

Table 58: Impact of SIQAF on quality of provision - providers

	It's too early to say/ Don't know	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent	NET: To a great/ moderate extent
Sharing effective practice of the supported internship programme	12%	5%	19%	37%	28%	65%
Leadership culture and strategy	21%	7%	14%	33%	26%	58%
Engaging and supporting interns	14%	14%	19%	40%	14%	53%
Understanding of the benefits of SIs across all staff	19%	12%	19%	19%	33%	51%
Course planning and the ambition of your curriculum	16%	9%	30%	23%	21%	44%
Training and support for Job Coaches and other staff	14%	14%	28%	26%	19%	44%
Resourcing/capacity of staff	23%	26%	16%	33%	2%	35%
Engaging and supporting employers	26%	19%	23%	21%	12%	33%
Ability to access appropriate funding to ensure interns are fully supported	21%	35%	14%	16%	14%	30%
Interns gaining sustained employment	37%	19%	21%	23%	0%	23%

Base: Engaged with SIQAF (unique respondents) (43)

Source: Provider survey

Table 59: Job coach training feedback – percentage agreeing¹⁹

Evaluation statement	SET	TSI
I have used the information provided in the course in my practice since the course concluded	98%	85%
The information I learnt in the course has improved my practice	98%	94%
I have used the course materials since the course concluded	88%	80%
The service offered by my organisation has improved based on the changes in my practice from the course information provided	90%	78%
I have become more aspirational about my client/student/intern's potential since completing my course	92%	87%
My client/student/intern's outcomes have improved since I implemented the knowledge I learnt on my course	90%	75%

Base: Training respondents providing feedback SET (425), TSI (505)

Source: Job Coach Training Feedback - Impact Evaluation Summary March 2025, BASE, Internships Work

Table 60: Improvement in knowledge and/or skills due to SET training – job coaches

	NET Small extent/ none	Great extent	NET Great/ moderate extent
The core values of supported employment	18%	64%	82%
The principles of vocational profiling	12%	55%	82%
In-work support and career development	15%	48%	82%
Job matching	12%	42%	79%
Employer engagement	18%	36%	79%
Jobseeker engagement	24%	30%	67%

Base: Participated in BASE SET training (33)

Source: Job coach survey

¹⁹ Percentage agreeing includes responses Agree, Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree.

Table 61: Improvement in knowledge and/or skills due to TSI training – job coaches

	NET Small extent/ none	Great extent	NET Great/ moderate extent
The principles of Systematic Instruction and its application in supported employment for people who have learning disabilities	7%	57%	91%
Philosophy behind helping people with disabilities to develop competencies	11%	59%	88%
Roles and responsibilities of trainers	9%	57%	88%
Approaches to training and learning	11%	59%	86%
Using systematic instruction in a teaching environment	13%	46%	80%

Base: Participated in BASE TSI training (56)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 62: Impact of TSI/SET training – job coaches

	NET Small extent/ none	Great extent	NET Great/ moderate extent
Knowledge and skills in supporting interns' needs	16%	50%	80%
Confidence in your role	20%	51%	76%
Knowledge and understanding of supported internships	19%	49%	76%
Knowledge and skills in supporting employers' needs	23%	43%	71%

Base: Participated in BASE TSI/SET training (70)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 63: Impact of TSI/SET training – job coaches

	NET Disagree	Agree strongly	NET Agree
I have gained a new perspective and fresh ideas from the training	7%	26%	77%
The information I learnt from the training has improved my practice	6%	23%	77%
The training has helped to improve the quality of SIs provided by my organisation	7%	24%	70%
I have become more aspirational about my interns' potential	7%	26%	67%

Base: Participated in BASE TSI/SET training (70)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 64: Impact of TSI/SET training on interns – job coaches

	NET Worsened	Much improved	NET Improved
The confidence of interns	0%	27%	73%
Interns' preparedness for work	0%	29%	70%
Interns' preparedness for adulthood	0%	21%	66%
Sustained employment outcomes for interns	0%	23%	59%

Base: Participated in BASE TSI/SET training (70)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 65: Plans after internship (baseline survey) – EHCP interns

	Baseline
Get a paid job in my work placement	63%
Find a new paid job in a different company	31%
Go on to further study or training	9%
Do an apprenticeship	15%
Do voluntary, unpaid work	7%
Stop working	1%
Other ²⁰	3%
Don't know	12%
Prefer not to say	3%
NET Find a job	76%

Base: All respondents (882)

Source: Intern baseline survey

Table 66: Employment intend to offer at the end of internship (baseline) – employers

	Baseline
Offer a job	8%
Offer a job – if there are any vacancies	55%
Voluntary work	7%
Temporary work	1%
Other ²¹	2%
No/none	4%
Don't know/not sure	23%
NET Offer a job	63%
Not answered	1%

Base: All responses (196)

Source: Employer baseline survey

²⁰ Other responses: further study (n=2), travel (n=1), other training/work (n=1).

²¹ Other responses: Find them a job elsewhere (n=2), further training (n=1).

Table 67: EHCP intern employment outcomes towards the end/shortly after supported internship – providers

	This academic year (2022/23 or 2023/24)
Number of providers	96
Total number of interns	2,277
Mean number of interns per provider	23.7
Total number of interns in paid work	1,084
Percentage of total interns in permanent paid work	48%
Mean number of interns in permanent paid work per provider	11.3
Number working 16+ hours per week	733
Number working 15 hours or less per week	351
Percentage working 16+ hours per week	32%
Percentage working 15 hours or less per week	15%

Base: All responses for this academic year (96)

Source: Provider survey

Table 68: Employment outcomes/intentions towards the end/shortly after supported internship – EHCP interns

	Number of interns	% of interns
Total in employment	80	23%
Waiting to find out about a job	119	34%
Applied/will apply for a job	57	16%
Voluntary/unpaid work	35	10%
Apprenticeship	21	6%
Further study/training	19	5%
Stop working	3	1%
Other ²²	5	1%
Don't know	29	8%
Prefer not to say	19	5%

Base: All interns (347)

Source: Intern endline survey

²² Other responses: further study (n=2), work on mental health (n=1), nothing (n=1), unsure (n=1).

Table 69: Summary of EHCP intern employment outcomes towards the end/shortly after supported internship – employers

	This academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25)
Total number of interns in placement	394
Total number of interns in/offered employment	63
Total number of employers offered/would offer job to interns	25
Percentage of total interns in/offered employment	16%
Percentage of employers had/would offer a job to interns	56%

Base: All employer responses (45)

Source: Employer endline survey

Table 70: EHCP intern all destinations towards the end/shortly after supported internship – employers

	This academic year (2023/24 or 2024/25)
Offer/ed a job	56%
Voluntary work	38%
Temporary work	13%
Apprenticeship	2%
Other ²³	4%
No/none	24%
Don't know/not sure	4%

Base: All employer responses endline (45)

Source: Employer endline survey

²³ Other responses: support with further study (n=1), support with job searching (n=1).

Table 71: Reasons that EHCP interns left earlier than planned – job coaches

	% of respondents
Gained paid employment	42%
Difficulty developing the right skills/attributes for work	23%
Ill health	23%
Started other training / course	19%
Parent/carer decision	19%
Didn't like the type of work placements offered	10%
Found internship too tiring	8%
We couldn't support them as they needed	8%
The employer(s) couldn't support them as they needed	8%
Concerns around losing benefits	6%
We couldn't find a placement that matched their job aspirations	2%
Other ²⁴	25%
Don't know	4%

Base: All who had interns leave earlier than planned (48)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 72: Number of young people securing paid employment following a supported internship last year – local authorities²⁵

	Survey 2 (Dec 2023 – Feb 2024)	Survey 3 (Dec 2024 – Feb 2025)
Number of interns	1,024	1,480
Range	0 - 44	0 - 121
Average per LA	9.3	9.9
Total no. of responses	110	150

Base: All respondents Survey 2 (110), survey 3 (150)

Source: Local authority surveys, Internships Work

²⁴ Other responses: mental health issues (n=3), behaviour issues (n=3), too far to travel (n=2), moved away (n=2), personal circumstances (n=1), transferred (n=1).

²⁵ Unknown / unclear responses have been excluded from the data. LA surveys, Internships Work.

Table 73: Employment outcomes/intentions towards the end/shortly after supported internship – Pilot interns

	Number of interns	% of interns
Total in employment	6	13%
Waiting to find out about a job	12	27%
Applied/will apply for a job	15	33%
Apprenticeship	7	16%
Voluntary/unpaid work	4	9%
Further study/training	3	7%
Don't know	6	13%
Prefer not to say/not answered	3	7%

Base: All Pilot interns (45)

Source: Pilot intern endline survey

Table 74: EHCP intern employment outcomes for previous academic year (2022/23 and 2023/24) – providers

	Previous academic year
Number of providers	83
Total number of interns	1,758
Mean number of interns per provider	21.2
Total number of interns in paid work	799
Percentage of total interns in permanent paid work	45%
Mean number of interns in permanent paid work per provider	10.7
Number working 16+ hours per week	593
Number working 15 hours or less per week	206
Percentage working 16+ hours per week	34%
Percentage working 15 hours or less per week	12%

Base: All responses for the previous academic year (83)

Source: Provider survey

Table 75: Sustained outcomes 3-9 months after supported internship - EHCP interns

	% of interns
Total in employment	41%
Working 16+ hours per week	26%
Working 15 hours or less per week	8%
Waiting to find out about a job	15%
Looking for employment	26%
Voluntary/unpaid work	17%
Further study/training	10%
Other ²⁶	2%
Don't know/ Prefer not to say	5%

Base: All respondents (133)

Source: Intern follow-up survey

²⁶ Other responses: working for/supporting family (n=2).

Table 76: Agreement with statements about job – employed EHCP interns

	NET Disagree	Agree strongly	NET Agree
My supported internship helped me to be ready for working	2%	65%	98%
supported internships really help young people like me to get a job	2%	65%	96%
I feel part of the team at my job	0%	61%	96%
I am confident with doing my job	0%	52%	96%
I am happy with the help I get from my employer	0%	61%	94%
I am happy with my supported internship experience	0%	59%	94%
I enjoy my job	0%	52%	94%
I am learning and developing my job skills	0%	52%	93%
I would tell other young people like me to do a supported internship	0%	61%	91%
I have had enough training to do my job well	0%	44%	91%
My employer makes changes so that I can do my job	2%	54%	81%

Base: Interns in paid employment (54)

Source: Intern follow-up survey

Table 77: Impact of participating in a supported internship on ECHP interns – job coaches

	NET Worsened	Much improved	NET Improved
The confidence of interns	0%	93%	99%
Interns' preparedness for work	0%	86%	98%
Interns' preparedness for adulthood	0%	77%	97%
Sustained employment outcomes for interns	0%	63%	91%

Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 78: Impact of participating in a supported internship – EHCP interns

	NET Worsened	Much improved	NET Improved
Confidence at work	3%	64%	84%
Skills and knowledge about working	2%	56%	84%
Understanding of the workplace rules	2%	62%	83%
How to work in a team	3%	62%	81%
How to talk to people	3%	54%	78%
Working on my own without support	3%	51%	78%
Feeling ready to get a job	5%	53%	76%
Knowing how to get a job	3%	47%	76%
Feeling ready for adulthood	4%	42%	70%

Base: All respondents (347)

Source: Intern endline survey

Table 79: Impact of participating in a supported internship on interns – employers

	NET Worsened	Much improved	NET Improved
Job skills and knowledge	0%	91%	100%
Preparedness for the world of work	0%	84%	98%
Ability to find employment	0%	76%	96%

Base: All respondents (45)

Source: Employer endline survey

Table 80: Impact of participating in a supported internship – Pilot interns

	NET Worsened	Much improved	NET Improved
Skills and knowledge about working	2%	51%	91%
How to talk to people	2%	49%	82%
Working on my own without support	2%	42%	82%
Understanding of the workplace rules	0%	51%	80%
Feeling ready to get a job	4%	49%	80%
How to work in a team	0%	42%	80%
Confidence at work	4%	44%	78%
Knowing how to get a job	9%	36%	71%
Feeling ready for adulthood	7%	31%	71%

Base: All respondents (45)

Source: Pilot intern endline survey

Table 81: Challenges or barriers to providing high quality supported internships – providers

	% of respondents
Lack of paid employment opportunities at the end of supported internship placements	70%
Difficulty accessing new employers to host interns	61%
Accessing Access to Work funding from the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)	53%
Staffing/Job Coach recruitment	47%
Lack of supported internship work placements	45%
Difficulty engaging with employers	42%
Capacity for training Job Coaches	31%
Delivering SIs within the available public funding	28%
Cost of training Job Coaches	23%
Lack of communication or support from the local authority	22%
Accessing high needs funding from the local authority	20%
Complexity of the supported internship system	8%
Other (individual mentions)	3%

Base: All respondents (97)

Source: Provider survey

Table 82: Challenges or barriers to providing supported internships for young people who do not have an EHCP, but have SEND or LDD – providers

	% of respondents
Cost of extending the supported internship programme	89%
Navigating the different funding sources is difficult	81%
Young people’s concerns around losing benefits	65%
Staffing/capacity	61%
Lack of employer placements	56%
Young people’s lack of confidence/anxiety about working	44%
Young people’s readiness for work	43%
Resistance from parents	37%
Young people’s disengagement from the system	30%
Employers’ concerns about behaviour/attitude	28%
Young people’s SEND or health	28%
It would be unclear how/difficult to determine which young people would benefit from an supported internship	11%
Access to funding/funding rules	7%

Base: Non-Pilot providers (unique responses) (54)

Source: Provider survey

Table 83: Barriers preventing young people with EHCPs from participating in a supported internship – job coaches

	% of respondents
Finding the right job match/placement	60%
Young people's lack of confidence/anxiety about working	58%
Concerns around losing benefits	58%
Lack of supported internship placements/employers	54%
Resistance from parents	50%
Travelling to/from work	49%
Lack of awareness/understanding of SIs amongst parents/carers	45%
Lack of awareness/ understanding of SIs amongst young people	42%
Lack of awareness/understanding of SIs amongst schools/careers advisers	38%
Young people's SEND or health	37%
Travelling to/from college/training	34%
The cost of going to work (for example, travel costs or buying uniform)	29%
Not enough education providers offering SIs	25%
Suitability of the supported internship model on offer	17%
Other ²⁷	6%
Don't know	6%

Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

²⁷ Other responses: young people's motivation (n=2), the remaining were individual responses.

Table 84: Barriers preventing employers from hosting supported internships – job coaches

	% of respondents
Lack of understanding of young people with SEND	83%
Lack of awareness/understanding of SIs amongst employers	72%
Concerns about the time and capacity required to support interns well	67%
Belief that they do not have any job roles that a young person with SEND could do	61%
Concerns about impact on productivity/workforce	52%
Concerns over level of support offered to employers	45%
Unwillingness of staff to support/engage with interns	40%
Concerns about/costs of making workplace adjustments for interns or providing equipment to support interns	40%
Concerns about impact on perceptions of the company/reputation	13%
Other (individual mentions)	2%
Don't know	5%

Base: All respondents (119)

Source: Job coach survey

Table 85: Barriers to participating in a supported internship – EHCP interns

	Baseline	Endline
Anxiety about working	23%	23%
Travel to/from work	19%	15%
Making friends at work	16%	15%
Unsure how to do the job	9%	10%
My health	12%	9%
The cost of going to work (for example, travel costs or buying uniform)	10%	9%
Travel to/from college/training	8%	5%
Poor support from my job coach	2%	4%
Poor support from my employer	2%	4%
Poor support from my tutor	1%	3%
Losing my benefits	3%	2%
My parents/carers losing benefits	5%*	1%
Other	3%	4%
Nothing	31%	33%
Don't know	12%	10%
Prefer not to say	5%	7%
NET Travel barriers	23%	18%
NET Poor support	4%	7%
NET Losing benefits	6%*	3%

Base: All respondents baseline (882), endline (347)

Source: Intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 86: Barriers to participating in a supported internship – Pilot interns

	Baseline	Endline
Anxiety about working	41%	36%
Travel to/from work	26%	11%
Making friends at work	20%	13%
My health	15%	11%
The cost of going to work (for example, travel costs or buying uniform)	25%	16%
Unsure how to do the job	15%	7%
Travel to/from college/training	18%	13%
My parents/carers losing benefits	5%	2%
Losing my benefits	5%	0%
Poor support from my employer	3%	4%
Poor support from my job coach	2%	4%
Poor support from my tutor	2%	0%
Other	3%	4%
Nothing	24%	42%*
Don't know	8%	4%
Prefer not to say	1%	0%
NET Travel barriers	34%*	16%
NET Poor support	5%	7%
NET Losing benefits	7%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (88), endline (45)

Source: Pilot intern baseline and endline surveys

Table 87: Barriers to participating in the supported internship programme – employers

	Baseline	Endline
Having the time and capacity to support interns well	46%	56%
Apprehension about how to support interns additional needs	23%	44%*
Willingness of staff to support/engage with interns	18%	29%
Our ability to adapt to suit interns needs	15%	29%*
Knowing how to get the best out of interns	19%	22%
Knowing how to communicate effectively with interns	17%	18%
Lack of support from leadership at my organisation	4%	18%*
Knowing how to provide feedback to interns	12%	16%
The cost of making workplace adjustments or providing equipment to support interns	10%	11%
Lack of support from college/training provider	7%	11%
Providing the specialist/necessary equipment	8%	7%
Other	4%	4%
None	25%	11%
Don't know/NA	3%	2%

Base: All respondents baseline (196), endline (45)

Source: Employer baseline and endline survey

Table 88: Impact of hosting interns on organisation – employers

	NET Worsened	Much improved	NET Improved
Your organisation's disability awareness and confidence	0%	51%	87%
Your organisation's ability to support employees with SEND	0%	53%	84%
Your organisation's culture	0%	58%	80%
Staff morale	0%	51%	80%
Ability to provide secure, sustained employment for young people with SEND	0%	38%	71%
Productivity	2%	18%	51%

Base: All responses (45)

Source: Employer endline survey

Table 89: Costing survey - provider characteristics

Number of interns	Survey 1	Survey 2
Total	452	439
Range	3-178	6-179
Mean	38	34
Median	18	10
Supported internship model	Survey 1	Survey 2
Rotation within an employer (up to 3 placements)	3	6
2 or more placements with 2 or more employers	2	3
1 employer and 1 placement	4	2
Combination	3	2
Type of provider	Survey 1	Survey 2
Specialist further education college	2	3
Charity/supported employer	5	2
Special school	0	1
Local authority provider	0	1
Specialist further education college	2	3
Region	Survey 1	Survey 2
South East	5	3
North West	2	4
National	1	2
London	1	2
West Midlands	1	1
East of England	1	0
South West	1	0
South East	5	3
North West	2	4
National	1	2

Location type	Survey 1	Survey 2
Urban	11	7
Rural	1	3
Mix	0	3

Base: Survey 1 (12 providers), survey 2 (13 providers)

Source: Costings surveys

Table 90: Follow-on support for interns who do not secure employment – local authorities (qualitative)

	% of local authorities Survey 2	% of local authorities Survey 3
General employment support / local offer	51%	48%
Long-term follow-up support / transition support	38%	51%
Training / coaching / advice	23%	16%
Additional programs / skills development	18%	13%
To be determined / in progress	17%	13%
Work placements / voluntary work / apprenticeships	16%	11%
Help with CV and job applications	13%	16%

Base: All respondents survey 2 (143), survey 3 (150)

Source: Local authority survey, Internships Work

Table 91: Follow-on support for interns who do not secure employment (qualitative) – Pilot local authorities

	Number of responses
General employment support / local offer / careers advice / signposting other services	9
Long-term follow-up support / transition support	8
Additional programs / skills development	4
Work placements / voluntary work / apprenticeships	3
Help with CV and job applications	3

Base: All respondents (12)

Source: Pilot local authority survey, Internships Work

Secondary data methodology and summary

As part of the evaluation, administrative datasets were used to explore the number and characteristics of those taking part in a supported internship across the Internships Work investment period.

The Department for Education (DfE) granted permission to access Individualised Learner Record (ILR) data to explore the number of supported internships, demographic characteristics, outcomes (programme completion, learning outcome, reasons for withdrawal) and achievement of participants (for example, prior attainment and achievement status).

This data was matched with the National Pupil Database (NPD) key stage data and Spring School Census data with fields relating to type of establishment, prior attainment and some further demographics. Data were matched using a pupil reference number.

To explore if there has been an increase in the number and range of supported interns over the investment period, a baseline was taken from academic year 2018/19 (prior to the COVID-19 pandemic) with all following years of available data analysed up to 2023/24.

Data were analysed within the Office for National Statistics Secure Research Service and approved for external publication.²⁸

Data management and cleaning

Data files for ILR Learner and Learning Aims data were joined and cleaned to produce one file relating specifically to supported internships. supported internships were flagged within the ILR Learning Aims file. This meant that there are multiple instances of supported internship Aims which relate to the same individual. For example, an intern can withdraw, move to another provider, or withdraw and start again with same provider - sometimes in same year. When interrogating the data and exploring cases individually, it was not always possible to conclusively establish an intern's pathway. There could be a number of reasons for this, such as, inconsistent data monitoring and management within provider monitoring systems, and different approaches by different personnel to data submission on ILR returns.

After reviewing the data, the evaluation team agreed with DfE the following 'rules' for cleaning the dataset:

- if interns are registered for a supported internship with 2 providers (in the same or a different academic year), then both instances are included in analysis

²⁸ This work was undertaken in the Office for National Statistics Secure Research Service using data from ONS and other owners and does not imply the endorsement of the ONS or other data owners.

- if interns start a supported internship, withdraw and start again with the same provider in a different year, then both instances are included in analysis
- if interns start a supported internship, withdraw and start again with the same provider in the same year, then the second/latest enrolment is included in analysis

This means that analysis reports on the number of ‘internships’ rather than number of ‘interns’ because the same individual can appear more than once in the dataset given the rules above. This decision was made to maximise the sample for analysis and to encompass enrolments to start an internship where there might be legitimate reasons for withdrawing and starting again.

The cleaned ILR dataset was then matched to the Spring School Census. Where duplicates occurred, the ‘main record’ was used (as identified by The Record Status SPR18 variable).

The cleaned ILR dataset was also matched to the National Pupil Database (NPD) using the latest academic year for a record where there were duplicates. Any duplicates that were not removed using this approach were excluded from analysis since there was no obvious consistent logic that could be ascertained for their existence.

Statistical Disclosure Control (SDC) has been applied to the analysis outputs to ensure that interns are not identifiable. Suppression or perturbation has been used where counts were less than 10 (as is the accepted threshold of the Secure Research Service). However, there were some examples of tables with several low counts or where only 2 or 3 codes were present and suppression or perturbation to the threshold of 10 was not possible. Permission was therefore sought and granted by DfE and the Secure Research Service team to reduce the threshold to 3. A threshold of 10 was used where possible. Any suppressed values are denoted by 'SUPP'.

Summary of supported internship numbers and intern characteristics

The following presents a brief summary of the profile of those involved in supported internships between 2018/19 and 2024/25.²⁹ Further detail can be found in the following data tables.

- Age (at start of aim): the majority (around three-fifths) were aged between 18-20, with small fluctuations year on year
- Sex: 68-70% were males and 30-32% females
- Ethnicity: predominantly White (76-81%), with small fluctuations year on year

²⁹ This analysis does not differentiate supported interns involved in the Pilot. However, with the introduction of a flag for the Pilot in ILR data, analysis of Pilot internships will be included in the 2027 Pilot evaluation report.

- Prior attainment level (2018-2021): around one-fifth had achieved below Level 1 and a similar proportion achieved level 1. Less than 10% achieved above Level 1. The proportion with no qualifications rose from 8% in 2018/2019 to 15% in 2020/2022. However, the largest proportion was NA/not known/other (35-43%)
- High needs student: increase in the proportion of high needs students from 64% in 2018/2019 to around three-quarters in 2022/2023 and 2023/2024
- Source of funding: all/almost all ESFA 16-19
- Receipt of benefits: typically, less than 10% were in receipt of benefits, however a large proportion were unknown (30-41%)
- Completion status of learning aim: around four-fifths had completed learning activities leading to the learning aim each year
- Withdrawal: between 8-12% withdrawn from the programme with fluctuations year-on-year
- Achievement of learning outcome: typically 75% or above achieved the learning aim, with a dip to 64% in 2019/2020 and 70% in 2020/2021
- English and maths achievement: 18-24% achieved English and 11%-24% achieved maths GCSE A*-C by end yr 11, with fluctuations year-on-year
- Attainment: overall, 6% achieved grade 4 and above in English at key stage 4 and 8% maths, with a general trend of increasing proportions from 2014/15 to 2021/22
- Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI): higher proportions of learners were found in lower deciles (most deprived decile 1-2 and deprived decile 3-4, 23-29%) compared to higher deciles (less deprived deciles 7-8 and least deprived deciles 9-10, 13-17%)

Secondary data tables

Table 92: Number of supported internships by year

Year	Count
2018/19	1,975
2019/20	2,270
2020/21	2,501
2021/22	2,707
2022/23	2,456
2023/24	2,861

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 93: Age at start of Aim by year

Year	Age band	Count	% within year
2018/2019	15-17	207	10%
2018/2019	18-20	1,149	58%
2018/2019	21-26	619	31%
2019/2020	15-17	191	8%
2019/2020	18-20	1,395	61%
2019/2020	21-26	684	30%
2020/2021	15-17	180	7%
2020/2021	18-20	1,363	54%
2020/2021	21-26	958	38%
2021/2022	15-17	158	6%
2021/2022	18-20	1,481	55%
2021/2022	21-26	1,068	39%
2022/2023	15-17	161	7%
2022/2023	18-20	1,444	59%
2022/2023	21-26	851	35%
2023/2024	15-17	227	8%
2023/2024	18-20	1,670	58%
2023/2024	21-26	964	34%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 94: Sex by year

Year	Sex	Count	% within year
2018/2019	Female	609	31%
2018/2019	Male	1,366	69%
2019/2020	Female	726	32%
2019/2020	Male	1,544	68%
2020/2021	Female	747	30%
2020/2021	Male	1,754	70%
2021/2022	Female	803	30%
2021/2022	Male	1,904	70%
2022/2023	Female	763	31%
2022/2023	Male	1,693	69%
2023/2024	Female	851	30%
2023/2024	Male	2,010	70%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 95: Ethnicity by year

Year	Ethnicity	Count	% within year
2018/2019	Any other ethnic group	22	1%
2018/2019	Asian / Asian British	139	7%
2018/2019	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	72	4%
2018/2019	Mixed / Multiple ethnic group	68	3%
2018/2019	Not provided/missing	80	4%
2018/2019	White	1,594	81%
2019/2020	Any other ethnic group	36	2%
2019/2020	Asian / Asian British	147	7%
2019/2020	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	92	4%
2019/2020	Mixed / Multiple ethnic group	55	2%
2019/2020	Not provided/missing	88	4%
2019/2020	White	1,852	82%
2020/2021	Any other ethnic group	53	2%
2020/2021	Asian / Asian British	172	7%
2020/2021	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	128	5%
2020/2021	Mixed / Multiple ethnic group	91	4%
2020/2021	Not provided/missing	106	4%
2020/2021	White	1,951	78%
2021/2022	Any other ethnic group	46	2%
2021/2022	Asian / Asian British	239	9%
2021/2022	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	125	5%
2021/2022	Mixed / Multiple ethnic group	110	4%
2021/2022	Not provided/missing	85	3%
2021/2022	White	2,102	78%
2022/2023	Any other ethnic group	45	2%
2022/2023	Asian / Asian British	195	8%
2022/2023	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	149	6%
2022/2023	Mixed / Multiple ethnic group	100	4%
2022/2023	Not provided/missing	95	4%
2022/2023	White	1,872	76%
2023/2024	Any other ethnic group	51	2%

Year	Ethnicity	Count	% within year
2023/2024	Asian / Asian British	233	8%
2023/2024	Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	166	6%
2023/2024	Mixed / Multiple ethnic group	112	4%
2023/2024	Not provided/missing	86	3%
2023/2024	White	2,213	77%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 96: Prior attainment level by year

Year	Prior attainment level	Count	% within year
2018/2019	Below Level 1	433	22%
2018/2019	Full Level 2	76	4%
2018/2019	Full Level 3	15	1%
2018/2019	Level 1	362	18%
2018/2019	NA/Not known/other qualification level now known	843	43%
2018/2019	No qualifications	166	8%
2018/2019	Other qualifications	80	4%
2019/2020	Below Level 1	500	22%
2019/2020	Full Level 2	103	5%
2019/2020	Full Level 3	28	1%
2019/2020	Level 1	452	20%
2019/2020	NA/Not known/other qualification level now known	824	36%
2019/2020	No qualifications	270	12%
2019/2020	Other qualifications	93	4%
2020/2021	Below Level 1	532	21%
2020/2021	Full Level 2	126	5%
2020/2021	Full Level 3	33	1%
2020/2021	Level 1	482	19%
2020/2021	NA/Not known/other qualification level now known	878	35%
2020/2021	No qualifications	382	15%
2020/2021	Other qualifications	68	3%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501)

Source: ILR

Table 97: High needs students in receipt of element 3 top up funding from local authority by year

Year	In receipt of element 3 top up funding from local authority	Count	% within year
2018/2019	No	711	36%
2018/2019	Yes	1,264	64%
2019/2020	No	793	35%
2019/2020	Yes	1,477	65%
2020/2021	No	817	33%
2020/2021	Yes	1,684	67%
2021/2022	No	920	34%
2021/2022	Yes	1,787	66%
2022/2023	No	594	24%
2022/2023	Yes	1,862	76%
2023/2024	No	731	26%
2023/2024	Yes	2,130	74%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 98: High needs students by year – by age

Year	In receipt of element 3 top up funding from local authority	Age band	Count	% within year
2018/2019	No	15-17	90	5%
2018/2019	No	18-20	410	21%
2018/2019	No	21-26	211	11%
2018/2019	Yes	15-17	118	6%
2018/2019	Yes	18-20	734	37%
2018/2019	Yes	21-26	412	21%
2019/2020	No	15-17	70	3%
2019/2020	No	18-20	502	22%
2019/2020	No	21-26	221	10%
2019/2020	Yes	15-17	124	5%
2019/2020	Yes	18-20	887	39%
2019/2020	Yes	21-26	466	21%
2020/2021	No	15-17	54	2%
2020/2021	No	18-20	471	19%
2020/2021	No	21-26	292	12%
2020/2021	Yes	15-17	108	4%
2020/2021	Yes	18-20	877	35%
2020/2021	Yes	21-26	699	28%
2021/2022	No	15-17	65	2%
2021/2022	No	18-20	499	18%
2021/2022	No	21-26	356	13%
2021/2022	Yes	15-17	89	3%
2021/2022	Yes	18-20	988	36%
2021/2022	Yes	21-26	710	26%
2022/2023	No	15-17	46	2%
2022/2023	No	18-20	359	15%
2022/2023	No	21-26	189	8%
2022/2023	Yes	15-17	118	5%
2022/2023	Yes	18-20	1,092	44%
2022/2023	Yes	21-26	652	27%

Year	In receipt of element 3 top up funding from local authority	Age band	Count	% within year
2023/2024	No	15-17	65	2%
2023/2024	No	18-20	453	16%
2023/2024	No	21-26	213	7%
2023/2024	Yes	15-17	178	6%
2023/2024	Yes	18-20	1,217	43%
2023/2024	Yes	21-26	735	26%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 99: High needs students by year – by sex

Year	In receipt of element 3 top up funding from local authority	Sex	Count	% within year
2018/2019	No	Female	214	11%
2018/2019	No	Male	497	25%
2018/2019	Yes	Female	395	20%
2018/2019	Yes	Male	869	44%
2019/2020	No	Female	247	11%
2019/2020	No	Male	546	24%
2019/2020	Yes	Female	479	21%
2019/2020	Yes	Male	998	44%
2020/2021	No	Female	237	9%
2020/2021	No	Male	580	23%
2020/2021	Yes	Female	510	20%
2020/2021	Yes	Male	1,174	47%
2021/2022	No	Female	265	10%
2021/2022	No	Male	655	24%
2021/2022	Yes	Female	538	20%
2021/2022	Yes	Male	1,249	46%
2022/2023	No	Female	189	8%
2022/2023	No	Male	405	16%
2022/2023	Yes	Female	574	23%
2022/2023	Yes	Male	1,288	52%
2023/2024	No	Female	225	8%
2023/2024	No	Male	506	18%
2023/2024	Yes	Female	626	22%
2023/2024	Yes	Male	1,504	53%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 100: Source of funding by year

Year	Source of funding	Count	% within year
2018/2019	ESFA 16-19	1,947	99%
2018/2019	Other/None/ESFA-Adult	28	1%
2019/2020	ESFA 16-19	2,261	100%
2019/2020	Other/None/ESFA-Adult	9	0%
2020/2021	ESFA 16-19	2,493	100%
2020/2021	Other/None/ESFA-Adult	8	0%
2021/2022	ESFA 16-19	2,698	100%
2021/2022	Other/None/ESFA-Adult	9	0%
2022/2023	ESFA 16-19	2,446	100%
2022/2023	Other/None/ESFA-Adult	10	0%
2023/2024	ESFA 16-19	2,837	99%
2023/2024	Other/None/ESFA-Adult	24	1%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 101: English achievement by year

Year	Achieved an English GCSE grade A*-C by the end of year 11	Count	% within year
2018/2019	No	1,382	70%
2018/2019	Yes	367	19%
2018/2019	Not known/NA	226	11%
2019/2020	No	1,849	82%
2019/2020	Yes	417	18%
2019/2020	Not known/NA	SUPP ³⁰	SUPP
2020/2021	No	1,206	48%
2020/2021	Yes	604	24%
2020/2021	Not known/NA	691	28%
2021/2022	No	1,443	53%
2021/2022	Yes	528	20%
2021/2022	Not known/NA	736	27%
2022/2023	No	1,255	51%
2022/2023	Yes	609	25%
2022/2023	Not known/NA	592	24%
2023/2024	No	2,207	77%
2023/2024	Yes	638	22%
2023/2024	Not known/NA	16	1%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,266), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

³⁰ Indicates that the data was suppressed due to low counts.

Table 102: Maths achievement by year

Year	Achieved a maths GCSE grade A*-C by the end of year 11	Count (including missing)	Percent	% (excluding missing)
2018/2019	No	1,449	73%	86%
2018/2019	Yes	230	12%	14%
2018/2019	Not known/NA	296	15%	N/A
2019/2020	No	1,946	86%	89%
2019/2020	Yes	245	11%	11%
2019/2020	Not known/NA	79	3%	N/A
2020/2021	No	1,312	52%	76%
2020/2021	Yes	425	17%	24%
2020/2021	Not known/NA	764	31%	N/A
2021/2022	No	1,554	57%	82%
2021/2022	Yes	341	13%	18%
2021/2022	Not known/NA	812	30%	N/A
2022/2023	No	1,395	57%	79%
2022/2023	Yes	377	15%	21%
2022/2023	Not known/NA	684	28%	N/A
2023/2024	No	2,254	79%	79%
2023/2024	Yes	591	21%	21%
2023/2024	Not known/NA	16	1%	N/A

Base: 2018/2019 (1,679), 2019/2020 (2,191), 2020/2021 (1,737), 2021/2022 (1,895), 2022/2023 (1,772), 2023/2024 (2,845)

Source: ILR

Table 103: Benefit status by year

Year	Benefit status	Count	% within year
2018/2019	In receipt of benefits	137	7%
2018/2019	Not in receipt of benefits	1,137	58%
2018/2019	Not known/NA	701	35%
2019/2020	In receipt of benefits	140	6%
2019/2020	Not in receipt of benefits	1,210	53%
2019/2020	Not known/NA	920	41%
2020/2021	In receipt of benefits	174	7%
2020/2021	Not in receipt of benefits	1,420	57%
2020/2021	Not known/NA	907	36%
2021/2022	In receipt of benefits	312	12%
2021/2022	Not in receipt of benefits	1,596	59%
2021/2022	Not known/NA	799	30%
2022/2023	In receipt of benefits	184	7%
2022/2023	Not in receipt of benefits	1,377	56%
2022/2023	Not known/NA	895	36%
2023/2024	In receipt of benefits	230	8%
2023/2024	Not in receipt of benefits	1,522	53%
2023/2024	Not known/NA	1,109	39%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 104: Completion status³¹ by year

Year	Completion status	Count	% within year
2018/2019	Completed	1,678	85%
2018/2019	Not completed	297	15%
2019/2020	Completed	1,766	78%
2019/2020	Not completed	504	22%
2020/2021	Completed	2,052	82%
2020/2021	Not completed	449	18%
2021/2022	Completed	2,308	85%
2021/2022	Not completed	399	15%
2022/2023	Completed	2,028	83%
2022/2023	Not completed	428	17%
2023/2024	Completed	2,403	84%
2023/2024	Not completed	458	16%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

³¹ Did not complete includes: 'the learner is continuing or intending to continue the learning activities leading to the learning aim', 'the learner has withdrawn from the learning activities leading to the learning aim', 'the learner has withdrawn from this learning aim and as a direct result has at the same time started studying for another learning aim within the same provider (up to 2023/24)', 'changes in learning within the same programme type and sector subject area/funding category and remaining with the existing provider', 'learner has temporarily withdrawn from the aim due to an agreed break in learning'.

Table 105: Learning outcome³² by year

Year	Outcome	Count	% within year
2018/2019	Achieved	1,596	81%
2018/2019	Not Achieved	379	19%
2019/2020	Achieved	1,463	64%
2019/2020	Not Achieved	807	36%
2020/2021	Achieved	1,754	70%
2020/2021	Not Achieved	747	30%
2021/2022	Achieved	2,114	78%
2021/2022	Not Achieved	593	22%
2022/2023	Achieved	1,832	75%
2022/2023	Not Achieved	624	25%
2023/2024	Achieved	2,267	79%
2023/2024	Not Achieved	594	21%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

³² Not achieved includes: 'partial achievement', 'no achievement', 'learning activities are complete but the outcome is not yet known', 'study continuing'.

Table 106: Withdrawn by year

Year	Withdrawn status	Count	% within year
2018/2019	Not Withdrawn	1,812	92%
2018/2019	Withdrawn	163	8%
2019/2020	Not Withdrawn	1,999	88%
2019/2020	Withdrawn	271	12%
2020/2021	Not Withdrawn	2,280	91%
2020/2021	Withdrawn	221	9%
2021/2022	Not Withdrawn	2,485	92%
2021/2022	Withdrawn	222	8%
2022/2023	Not Withdrawn	2,199	90%
2022/2023	Withdrawn	257	10%
2023/2024	Not Withdrawn	2,535	89%
2023/2024	Withdrawn	326	11%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,975), 2019/2020 (2,270), 2020/2021 (2,501), 2021/2022 (2,707), 2022/2023 (2,456), 2023/2024 (2,861)

Source: ILR

Table 107: Type of establishment at key stage 2 (all years)

Type of establishment ³³	Count	% within year
Special school	3,614	23%
Maintained school	11,268	71%
Academy & free school	1,011	6%
Independent school	10	1%

Base: 15,903

Source: ILR/NPD

³³ Special school (foundation special school, pupil referral unit, academy – special school, special free school, community special school, non-maintained special school, other independent special school. Maintained school includes); Maintained school (community school, voluntary aided school, voluntary controlled school, foundation school); Academy & free school (academy sponsor led, academy converter, free school); Independent school (other independent school, independent School approved for SEN pupils).

Table 108: Achieved level 2 or below (low attainment) in key stage 2 English

KS2_LEVLENG	Count	%
Not provided/missing	7,931	50%
Not achieved	2,055	13%
Achieved	5,917	37%

Base: 15,903

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 109: Achieved level 2 or below (low attainment) in key stage 2 maths

KS2_LEVLMAT	Count	%
Not provided/missing	1,795	11%
Not achieved	4,649	29%
Achieved	9,459	59%

Base: 15,903

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 110: Achieved level 4 or above in key stage 2 English

KS2_LEVXENG	Count	%
Not provided/missing	7,728	49%
Not achieved	7,422	47%
Achieved	753	5%

Base: 15,903

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 111: Achieved level 4 or above in key stage 2 maths

KS2_LEVXMAT	Count	%
Not provided/missing	1,592	10%
Not achieved	12,453	78%
Achieved	1,858	12%

Base: 15,903

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 112: Achieved level 4 or above (expected level) in key stage 2 English and maths

KS2_LEVXENGMAT	Count	%
Not provided/missing	8,233	52%
Not achieved	7,256	46%
Achieved	414	3%

Base: 15,903

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 113: Prior attainment at key stage 4 – number of passes at grades 9 to 4 (equivalents included)

Year³⁴	KS4_PASS_94 Number of passes	Count	% within year
2017/2018	0	1,276	74%
2017/2018	1 TO 2	306	18%
2017/2018	3 TO 6	116	7%
2017/2018	7+	27	2%
2018/2019	0	1,038	74%
2018/2019	1 TO 2	242	17%
2018/2019	3 TO 6	98	7%
2018/2019	7+	24	2%
2019/2020	0	824	64%
2019/2020	1 TO 2	280	22%
2019/2020	3 TO 6	136	11%
2019/2020	7+	39	3%
2020/2021	0	362	52%
2020/2021	1 TO 2	198	28%
2020/2021	3 TO 6	106	15%
2020/2021	7+	34	5%
2021/2022	0	152	69%
2021/2022	1 TO 2	49	22%
2021/2022	3 TO 6	18	8%
2021/2022	7+	SUPP	SUPP

Base: 2017/2018 (1,725), 2018/2019 (1,402), 2019/2020 (1,279), 2020/2021 (700), 2021/2022 (219)

Source: ILR/NPD

³⁴ 22/23 data excluded due to low counts.

Table 114: Prior attainment at key stage 4 – achieved grade 4 and above English³⁵

Achieved Grade 4 and above English	Count	%
Not achieved	15,720	94%
Achieved	950	6%

Base: 16,670

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 115: Prior attainment at key stage 4 – achieved grade 4 and above English by year³⁶

Year	Achieved Grade 4 and above English	Count	% within year
2014/2015	Not achieved	1,984	96%
2014/2015	Achieved	76	3%
2015/2016	Not achieved	2,271	96%
2015/2016	Achieved	89	4%
2016/2017	Not achieved	2,936	67%
2016/2017	Achieved	98	3%
2017/2018	Not achieved	2,679	95 %
2017/2018	Achieved	133	5%
2018/2019	Not achieved	2,291	95%
2018/2019	Achieved	132	5%
2019/2020	Not achieved	2,051	91%
2019/2020	Achieved	206	9%
2020/2021	Not achieved	1,127	86%
2020/2021	Achieved	183	14%
2021/2022	Not achieved	381	92%
2021/2022	Achieved	33	8%

Base: 2014/2015 (2,060), 2015/2016 (2,360), 2016/2017 (3,034), 2017/2018 (2,812), 2018/2019 (2,423), 2019/2020 (2,257), 2020/2021 (1,310), 2021/2022 (414)

Source: ILR/NPD

³⁵ For English and maths key stage 4 attainment, several variables were joined as data were collected using different fields and codes at different timepoints. This also includes the change from a grading system to a scoring system.

³⁶ For English and maths key stage 4 attainment, several variables were joined as data were collected using different fields and codes at different timepoints. This also includes the change from a grading system to a scoring system.

Table 116: Prior attainment at key stage 4 – achieved grade 4 and above maths³⁷

Achieved Grade 4 and above maths	Count	%
Not achieved	15,538	92%
Achieved	1,318	8%

Base: 16,856

Source: ILR/NPD

³⁷ For English and maths key stage 4 attainment, several variables were joined as data were collected using different fields and codes at different timepoints. This also includes the change from a grading system to a scoring system.

Table 117: Prior attainment at key stage 4 – achieved grade 4 and above maths by year³⁸

Year	Achieved Grade 4 and above maths	Count	%
2013/2014	Not achieved	175	94%
2013/2014	Achieved	11	6%
2014/2015	Not achieved	1,966	95 %
2014/2015	Achieved	94	5%
2015/2016	Not achieved	2,228	94%
2015/2016	Achieved	132	6%
2016/2017	Not achieved	2,862	94%
2016/2017	Achieved	172	6%
2017/2018	Not achieved	2,600	92%
2017/2018	Achieved	212	8%
2018/2019	Not achieved	2,252	93%
2018/2019	Achieved	171	7%
2019/2020	Not achieved	1,984	88%
2019/2020	Achieved	273	12%
2020/2021	Not achieved	1,098	84%
2020/2021	Achieved	212	16%
2021/2022	Not achieved	373	90%
2021/2022	Achieved	41	10%

Base: 2013/2014 (186), 2014/2015 (2,060), 2015/2016 (2,360), 2016/2017 (3,034), 2017/2018 (2,812), 2018/2019 (2,423), 2019/2020 (2,257), 2020/2021 (1,310), 2021/2022 (414)

Source: ILR/NPD

³⁸ For English and maths key stage 4 attainment, several variables were joined as data were collected using different fields and codes at different timepoints. This also includes the change from a grading system to a scoring system. 2011/12-2013/14 and 22/23-23/24 excluded due to low counts.

Table 118: Progress 8 score by year³⁹

Year	Progress 8 score band	Count	% within year
2015/2016	-3 OR LESS	40	2%
2015/2016	-2.5 to -2.999	27	2%
2015/2016	-2 to -2.499	293	17%
2015/2016	-1.5 to -1.999	172	10%
2015/2016	-1 to -1.499	473	28%
2015/2016	-0.5 to -0.999	169	10%
2015/2016	<0 to -0.499	137	8%
2015/2016	0 to 0.499	310	18%
2015/2016	0.5 to 0.999	56	3%
2015/2016	1 to 1.499	27	2%
2015/2016	1.5 OR MORE	16	1%
2016/2017	-3 OR LESS	49	3%
2016/2017	-2.5 to -2.999	44	2%
2016/2017	-2 to -2.499	77	4 %
2016/2017	-1.5 to -1.999	432	24%
2016/2017	-1 to -1.499	439	25%
2016/2017	-0.5 to -0.999	198	11%
2016/2017	<0 to -0.499	153	9%
2016/2017	0 to 0.499	297	17%
2016/2017	0.5 to 0.999	54	3 %
2016/2017	1 to 1.499	29	2%
2016/2017	1.5 OR MORE	10	1%

³⁹ 2014/15, 2022/23, 2023/24 excluded due to low counts. Data not collected during COVID-19.

Year	Progress 8 score band	Count	% within year
2017/2018	-3 OR LESS	60	4%
2017/2018	-2.5 to -2.999	44	3%
2017/2018	-2 to -2.499	93	5%
2017/2018	-1.5 to -1.999	335	19 %
2017/2018	-1 to -1.499	420	24%
2017/2018	-0.5 to -0.999	182	11%
2017/2018	<0 to -0.499	157	9%
2017/2018	0 to 0.499	357	21%
2017/2018	0.5 to 0.999	40	2%
2017/2018	1 to 1.499	19	1%
2017/2018	1.5 OR MORE	18	1%
2018/2019	-3 OR LESS	62	4%
2018/2019	-2.5 to -2.999	44	3%
2018/2019	-2 to -2.499	52	4%
2018/2019	-1.5 to -1.999	419	30%
2018/2019	-1 to -1.499	198	14%
2018/2019	-0.5 to -0.999	153	11%
2018/2019	<0 to -0.499	130	9%
2018/2019	0 to 0.499	273	20%
2018/2019	0.5 to 0.999	46	3%
2018/2019	1 to 1.499	16	1%
2018/2019	1.5 OR MORE	SUPP	SUPP
2021/2022	-3 OR LESS	26	12%
2021/2022	-2.5 to -2.999	SUPP	SUPP
2021/2022	-2 to -2.499	12	6%
2021/2022	-1.5 to -1.999	33	15%
2021/2022	-1 to -1.499	17	8%
2021/2022	-0.5 to -0.999	26	12%
2021/2022	<0 to -0.499	16	7%
2021/2022	0 to 0.499	74	34%
2021/2022	0.5 OR MORE	14	6%

Base: 2015/2016 (1,720), 2016/2017 (1,782), 2017/2018 (1,725), 2018/2019 (1,393), 2021/2022 (218)

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 119: Progress 8 score - English - by year⁴⁰

Year	Progress 8 score band	Count	% within year
2015/2016	-3 or less	91	5 %
2015/2016	-2.5 to -2.999	402	23%
2015/2016	-2 to -2.499	28	2%
2015/2016	-1.5 to -1.999	418	24%
2015/2016	-1 to -1.499	81	5%
2015/2016	-0.5 to -0.999	162	9%
2015/2016	<0 to -0.499	66	4%
2015/2016	0 to 0.499	356	21%
2015/2016	0.5 to 0.999	27	2%
2015/2016	1 to 1.499	67	4%
2015/2016	1.5 or more	22	1%
2016/2017	-3 or less	94	5%
2016/2017	-2.5 to -2.999	73	4 %
2016/2017	-2 to -2.499	365	20%
2016/2017	-1.5 to -1.999	215	12%
2016/2017	-1 to -1.499	425	24%
2016/2017	-0.5 to -0.999	87	5%
2016/2017	<0 to -0.499	146	8 %
2016/2017	0 to 0.499	251	14 %
2016/2017	0.5 to 0.999	68	4%
2016/2017	1 to 1.499	27	2%
2016/2017	1.5 or more	31	2%
2017/2018	-3 or less	106	6%

⁴⁰ 2014/15, 2022/23, 2023/24 removed due to low counts. Data not collected during COVID-19.

Year	Progress 8 score band	Count	% within year
2017/2018	-2.5 to -2.999	81	5%
2017/2018	-2 to -2.499	334	19%
2017/2018	-1.5 to -1.999	178	10%
2017/2018	-1 to -1.499	369	21%
2017/2018	-0.5 to -0.999	83	5%
2017/2018	<0 to -0.499	135	8%
2017/2018	0 to 0.499	311	18%
2017/2018	0.5 to 0.999	66	4%
2017/2018	1 to 1.499	21	1%
2017/2018	1.5 or more	41	2 %
2018/2019	-3 or less	93	7%
2018/2019	-2.5 to -2.999	51	4%
2018/2019	-2 to -2.499	261	19%
2018/2019	-1.5 to -1.999	270	19%
2018/2019	-1 to -1.499	153	11%
2018/2019	-0.5 to -0.999	69	5%
2018/2019	<0 to -0.499	140	10%
2018/2019	0 to 0.499	245	17%
2018/2019	0.5 to 0.999	75	5 %
2018/2019	1 to 1.499	18	1%
2018/2019	1.5 or more	27	2%
2021/2022	-3 or less	29	13 %
2021/2022	-2.5 to -2.999	10	5%
2021/2022	-2 to -2.499	33	15 %
2021/2022	-1.5 to -1.999	13	6%
2021/2022	-1 to -1.499	23	11%
2021/2022	-0.5 to -0.999	SUPP	SUPP
2021/2022	<0 to -0.499	25	11%
2021/2022	0 to 0.499	64	29%
2021/2022	0.5 or more	21	10%

Base: 2015/2016 (1,720), 2016/2017 (1,782), 2017/2018 (1,725), 2018/2019 (1,393), 2021/2022 (218)

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 120: Progress 8 score – maths - by year⁴¹

Year	Progress 8 score band	Count	% within year
2015/2016	-3 or less	34	2%
2015/2016	-2.5 to -2.999	28	2%
2015/2016	-2 to -2.499	40	2 %
2015/2016	-1.5 to -1.999	86	5%
2015/2016	-1 to -1.499	543	32%
2015/2016	-0.5 to -0.999	429	25%
2015/2016	<0 to -0.499	126	7%
2015/2016	0 to 0.499	262	15%
2015/2016	0.5 to 0.999	67	4%
2015/2016	1 to 1.499	36	2%
2015/2016	1.5 or more	69	4%
2016/2017	-3 or less	42	2 %
2016/2017	-2.5 to -2.999	20	1 %
2016/2017	-2 to -2.499	72	4%
2016/2017	-1.5 to -1.999	74	4%
2016/2017	-1 to -1.499	630	35%
2016/2017	-0.5 to -0.999	341	19%
2016/2017	<0 to -0.499	189	11%
2016/2017	0 to 0.499	255	14%
2016/2017	0.5 to 0.999	79	4%
2016/2017	1 to 1.499	17	1%
2016/2017	1.5 or more	63	4%

⁴¹ 2014/15, 2022/23, 2023/24 excluded due to low counts. Data not collected during COVID-19.

Year	Progress 8 score band	Count	% within year
2017/2018	-3 or less	42	2%
2017/2018	-2.5 to -2.999	23	1 %
2017/2018	-2 to -2.499	74	4%
2017/2018	-1.5 to -1.999	101	6%
2017/2018	-1 to -1.499	535	31%
2017/2018	-0.5 to -0.999	293	17%
2017/2018	<0 to -0.499	181	10%
2017/2018	0 to 0.499	320	19%
2017/2018	0.5 to 0.999	76	4%
2017/2018	1 to 1.499	29	2%
2017/2018	1.5 or more	51	3%
2018/2019	-3 or less	38	3%
2018/2019	-2.5 to -2.999	27	2%
2018/2019	-2 to -2.499	57	4%
2018/2019	-1.5 to -1.999	89	6%
2018/2019	-1 to -1.499	584	42%
2018/2019	-0.5 to -0.999	87	6%
2018/2019	<0 to -0.499	149	11%
2018/2019	0 to 0.499	265	19%
2018/2019	0.5 to 0.999	48	3%
2018/2019	1 to 1.499	27	2%
2018/2019	1.5 or more	31	2%
2021/2022	-3 or less	19	9%
2021/2022	-2.5 to -2.999	SUPP	SUPP
2021/2022	-2 to -2.499	SUPP	SUPP
2021/2022	-1.5 to -1.999	10	5%
2021/2022	-1 to -1.499	57	27%
2021/2022	-0.5 to -0.999	14	7%
2021/2022	<0 to -0.499	31	14%
2021/2022	0 to 0.499	63	29 %
2021/2022	0.5 or more	20	9%

Base: 2015/2016 (1,720), 2016/2017 (1,782), 2017/2018 (1,725), 2018/2019 (1,402), 2021/2022 (214)

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 121: Attainment 8 score by year⁴²

Year	Attainment 8 score band	Count	% within year
2015/2016	0 - 9.999	1,044	61%
2015/2016	10 - 19.999	275	16%
2015/2016	20 - 29.999	206	12%
2015/2016	30 - 39.999	117	7%
2015/2016	40 - 49.999	54	3%
2015/2016	50 or more	24	1%
2016/2017	0 - 9.999	1,125	63%
2016/2017	10 - 19.999	321	18%
2016/2017	20 - 29.999	201	11 %
2016/2017	30 - 39.999	102	6%
2016/2017	40 or more	33	2%
2017/2018	0 - 9.999	1,056	61 %
2017/2018	10 - 19.999	340	20%
2017/2018	20 - 29.999	188	11%
2017/2018	30 - 39.999	87	5 %
2017/2018	40 - 49.999	39	2 %
2017/2018	50 or more	15	1%
2018/2019	0 - 9.999	839	60%
2018/2019	10 - 19.999	287	21%
2018/2019	20 - 29.999	172	12%
2018/2019	30 - 39.999	56	4%
2018/2019	40 - 49.999	29	2 %
2018/2019	50 or more	19	1%
2019/2020	0 - 9.999	648	51%
2019/2020	10 - 19.999	233	18%
2019/2020	20 - 29.999	235	18 %
2019/2020	30 - 39.999	100	8%
2019/2020	40 - 49.999	34	3%
2019/2020	50 or more	29	3%

⁴² 2014/15, 2022/23 and 23/24 excluded due to low counts.

Year	Attainment 8 score band	Count	% within year
2020/2021	0 - 9.999	288	41%
2020/2021	10 - 19.999	147	21%
2020/2021	20 - 29.999	136	19%
2020/2021	30 - 39.999	75	11%
2020/2021	40 - 49.999	31	4%
2020/2021	50 or more	23	3%
2021/2022	0 - 9.999	118	%
2021/2022	10 - 19.999	47	21%
2021/2022	20 - 29.999	38	17%
2021/2022	30 - 39.999	12	5%
2021/2022	40 or more	10	4%

Base: 2015/2016 (1,720), 2016/2017 (2,838), 2017/2018 (1,725), 2018/2019 (1,402), 2019/2020 (1,279), 2020/2021 (700), 2021/2022 (225)

Source: ILR/NPD

Table 122: Deprivation decile (Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index - IDACI) by year

Year	Decile	Count	% within year
2018/2019	1	286	14%
2018/2019	2	247	13%
2018/2019	3	237	12%
2018/2019	4	207	10%
2018/2019	5	185	9%
2018/2019	6	174	9%
2018/2019	7	177	9%
2018/2019	8	162	8%
2018/2019	9	148	7%
2018/2019	10	147	7%
2019/2020	1	323	14%
2019/2020	2	299	13%
2019/2020	3	284	13%
2019/2020	4	287	13%
2019/2020	5	220	10%
2019/2020	6	187	8%
2019/2020	7	195	9%
2019/2020	8	167	7%
2019/2020	9	162	7%
2019/2020	10	140	6%
2020/2021	1	372	15%
2020/2021	2	322	13%
2020/2021	3	321	13%
2020/2021	4	287	11%
2020/2021	5	226	9%
2020/2021	6	225	9%
2020/2021	7	206	8%
2020/2021	8	192	8%
2020/2021	9	173	7%
2020/2021	10	170	7%

Year	Decile	Count	% within year
2021/2022	1	397	15%
2021/2022	2	355	13%
2021/2022	3	341	13%
2021/2022	4	305	11%
2021/2022	5	246	9%
2021/2022	6	216	8%
2021/2022	7	245	9%
2021/2022	8	203	7%
2021/2022	9	197	7%
2021/2022	10	196	7%
2022/2023	1	351	14%
2022/2023	2	346	14%
2022/2023	3	282	11%
2022/2023	4	275	11%
2022/2023	5	252	10%
2022/2023	6	204	8%
2022/2023	7	190	8%
2022/2023	8	191	8%
2022/2023	9	179	7%
2022/2023	10	184	7%
2023/2024	1	434	15%
2023/2024	2	384	13%
2023/2024	3	331	12%
2023/2024	4	335	12%
2023/2024	5	264	9%
2023/2024	6	236	8%
2023/2024	7	238	8%
2023/2024	8	235	8%
2023/2024	9	203	7%
2023/2024	10	196	7%

Base: 2018/2019 (1,970), 2019/2020 (2,264), 2020/2021 (2,494), 2021/2022 (2,701), 2022/2023 (2,454), 2023/2024 (2,856)

Source: ILR

Costing feasibility study approach

Table 1 presents a summary of the five phases of data collection and costing tool development. Phase 1 focused on the evaluation team creating a first draft of the tool based on one previously written by CooperGibson Research, a brief review of the literature, similar costing tools such as those used for apprenticeships, and content that would be needed to contribute to the value for money element of the evaluation at a later stage.

Before sharing the tool as part of the originally proposed focus groups and interviews, it was decided to test the tool 'live' with the Advisory Panel (Phase 2). The members of the Panel were informed that they would be completing the costing tool but that the information they inputted would be fictitious. The purpose of the exercise was twofold: to get feedback on the structure and content of the questions and to test if the costing tool would work using Microsoft Office forms. The findings were that minor revisions were needed to the tool, but major concerns were raised as to the potential of the sector to have the necessary data available to complete the tool and the logistics of completion if delivered in a survey format.

At this point the approach to data collection was revised by the evaluation team. It was considered that the content of the costing tool was close to agreement but that investigating whether providers were able to complete the tool was the priority. Therefore, through the Advisory Panel and the National SEND Employment Forum (NSEF), providers were invited to take part in a two-step focus group process (Phase 3). In the first round of focus groups (n=2), participants were 'walked through' the costing tool and their initial feedback on the content was sought. At this stage, important suggestions were made to add questions to the costing tool and clarify the wording on other questions. The tool was revised and participants were allocated two weeks to complete the tool. Participants could complete the costing tool online or on paper with an emphasis on how easy or not was their experience of the process rather than complete accuracy of the actual information provided. Two weeks later the same focus groups were reconvened to gather their experiences.

Although not part of the original brief, it was decided at the end of Phase 3 to test a response rate to the costing tool being sent out 'cold' as a survey to education providers. A member of the Advisory Panel sent the tool out on behalf of the evaluation team to 21 providers (Phase 4). Finally, due to the findings of Phase 4, meetings were held with the Advisory Panel and the Delivery Partners to discuss ways forward within the sector to support and promote the completion of the costing tool (Phase 5).

Table 123: Phases of data collection and costing tool development

Phase	Tool development/data collection	Participants
1	Tool development based on previous costing tools and relevant literature	Evaluation team
2	Live 'test' of the costing tool in a meeting (not based on accurate data input)	Advisory Panel (n=15)
3	Two step focus group	Round 1: 10 providers Round 2: 3/10 providers
3	Interviews with those who could not attend any or one of the focus groups and written feedback	3 providers
4	Costing tool sent out as a survey	Sent to 21 providers 4 responses
5	Meeting with the Advisory Panel and the Delivery Partners to discuss dissemination of the costing tool	SI Advisory Panel (n=7) Two of the three Delivery Partners

Source: Costings feasibility study - focus groups, interviews and survey

The meetings, focus groups and interviews were conducted by telephone or virtually via Microsoft Teams and lasted from 15 minutes to 1 hour.

Snowball sampling was used to recruit participants to the focus groups and the survey. The two main sources of recruitment were through the membership of the Advisory Panel and the NSEF who took part and/or forwarded the email invitation to their contacts. In total, 4 focus groups were held with 10 providers; also interviews with two providers (one who also took part in a focus group) and a survey was completed by 4 providers. The participants represented all the main types of providers including further education colleges, specialist schools/ colleges, social enterprises and supported employment providers (Table 2). The providers were delivering the main model including interns working with a single, large employer rotating between different placements and interns having two or more placements with different employers.

Table 124: Costing feasibility provider sample

Type of provider	Number of participants – focus groups	Number of participants – interviews	Number of survey responses
Further education college	3	1	2
Social enterprise	3		
Specialist further education provider	1		1
Special school	1		1
Supported employment provider	1		
National charity	1		
Representative from an inclusive employment local authority team		1	

Source: Costings feasibility study - Focus groups, interviews and survey

Costing survey template

A resource for providers

The supported internship (SI) Costing Resource is divided into three main sections:

- Part 1: Provision and intern information for the academic year
- Part 2: Income - breakdown of income sources
- Part 3: Expenditure - breakdown of all the potential costs associated with SI delivery in any one year

Completion of the Costing Resource will help providers to:

- Understand the typical costs of delivering a SI programme in their setting
- Understand the typical costs of a SI for an individual intern
- Understand the detail of how costs are made up from different elements of the programme
- Understand the key factors or variables that produce any significant differences in either the overall or granular costs

You can use the resource in two ways:

1. To record the costs for your current cohort of interns. (Questions 6 - 15 will not be relevant)
2. Use for a previous cohort to look at costs, with intern destination outcomes - complete all the questions

To complete parts of the form, the following information will be required beforehand:

1. Intern information including numbers, sectors and their destinations
2. The sources (e.g., Education and Skills Funding Agency, Access to Work, Elements 2 and 3 funding/High Needs Block, other sources) and the amount of income from those sources for the cohort
3. The programme expenditure including salaries, overheads and resources costs

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of colleagues from over 30 supported internship providers who gave generously of their time in the design of this resource.

Part 1: Nature of supported internship provision and intern information

This section asks about the nature of your SI programme and the interns in the current/previous cohort.

1. What work placement model is offered to interns?

Most interns work with a single, large employer and rotate between different placements

Most interns have two or more placements with different employers

Most interns stay in one role with one employer in a single placement

We offer a combination of work placement models

Other

2. What is the average length of the SI programme?

6 months

9 months

1 year

Don't know

Other

3. What is/were the total number of interns enrolled on the current/previous cohort?

4. What are/were the main employment sectors that interns are/were placed in?

- Agriculture, horticulture, environmental and animal care

- Business and administration

- Catering, hospitality cleaning services

- Construction and the built environment

- Creative and design

- Education, early years and child care

- Engineering and manufacturing (including automotive services)

- Government

- Hair and beauty

- Health, care and social services (inc the NHS)

- Information technology / Digital

- Legal, banking and finance

- Pharmaceutical

- Protective services (e.g. Fire Service, police, the armed forces and paramedics)

- Retail

- Sports and recreation

- Transport, warehousing, logistics or distribution

- Utilities and energy

- Other Public Sector

- Other

5. In what type of location do/did the majority (over half) of the interns on the programme live?

Rural village or town

Urban town

Urban city

Complete mix of rural and urban

Don't know

Other

Only answer Q 6 - 15 if you are completing the form for the previous financial year.

6. Number of interns who completed the programme.

7. Number of interns who have moved into permanent paid employment of 16 hours per week or more after completing the SI.

8. Number of interns who moved into permanent paid employment of 15 hours per week or less after completing the SI.

9. Number of interns in temporary employment after completing the SI.

10. Number of interns on an apprenticeship after completing the SI.

11. Number of interns in further education or training after completing the SI.

12. Number of interns in voluntary or unpaid work after completing the SI.

13. Number of interns who are still looking for work/further study since completing the SI.

14. Number of interns where destination pathways are not known.

15. Number of interns out of work/other.

Please make sure the numbers in Q7 to 15 add up to the total you entered in question 3.

Part 2: Overall income

Insert your actual or best estimated annual costs under each cost category for the current/previous cohort.

16. How much was spent on total salary costs (including oncosts and partial salaries if appropriate)?

E.g. programme manager, tutors, job coaches, learning support assistants, administrators, employer engagement, follow-up support, other staff.

17. How much income came from...

Access to Work?

18. How much income came from...

Elements 2 and 3/High Needs Block Grant?

19. How much income came from a service level agreement with another provider?

20. What was the overall income for the SI programme for this cohort? (Please make sure your answers to Q16 – 19 make up the overall income.)

Part 3: Overall expenditure

Insert your actual or best estimated annual costs under each cost category for the current/previous cohort.

21. How much was spent on total salary costs (including oncosts and partial salaries if appropriate)?

E.g. programme manager, tutors, job coaches, learning support assistants, administrators, employer engagement, follow-up support, other staff.

22. How much was spent overall on resources for the programme?

E.g. staff travel, staff training, intern travel, materials and printing, travel training, equipment for interns or staff (IT, assistive technology), PPE, uniforms, facilities/venue booking, DBS for interns/staff.

23. How much was spent on overheads?

E.g. energy, buildings, careers support, student services, administration, marketing/recruitment?

24. How much was spent on any service level agreement with a partner provider to support the delivery of the SI?

25. Please add here any expenditure not covered in the above questions.

26. What was the overall expenditure of delivering the SI programme for the current/previous cohort? (Please make sure your answers to Q21 – 25 make up the overall income.)

27. Please enter any shortfall amount between the overall income and overall expenditure.

28. If there was a shortfall between income and costs, how was the programme subsidised? (E.g. charity, college hardship fund, surplus from other courses/activities).

29. Based on your total expenditure, what was the average cost per intern? (See question 3 for total number of interns).

30. Tick any additional/unique factors that might play a part in contributing to the average cost per intern on the programme? You can tick more than one box.

Most interns have very high needs e.g. they require one to one support throughout the work placement

Most interns have far to travel incurring high travel costs

Most interns have to buy equipment to use in their job

Most interns have to complete a health and safety and/or food preparation training course

Not applicable

Other



Department
for Education

© Department for Education copyright 2026

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0, except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Reference: RR1609

ISBN: 978-1-83870-766-8

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact www.education.gov.uk/contactus.

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