

Essential Late Changes to the Individualised Learner Record for 2011/12

Date of issue	28 January 2011
Audience	<i>Information authority</i> board - Special Meeting 28 January 2011
Publication intent	PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Introduction

- 1 This paper is prepared for *the information authority* board (“the board”) to inform it of the essential late changes to the individualised learner record (ILR) for 2011/12 received and to ask it to approve the recommendations made.

Background

- 2 In September 2011 when the board made decisions about changes to the ILR specification for 2011/12 it was aware that it was likely that further changes would be requested. These would be essential to implementing The Skills Investment Strategy (SIS) and Education White Paper in 2011/12. Those documents were published in autumn 2010. It was not possible to accurately predict what changes would be required to the ILR in advance of their publication.
- 3 When the board last met on 1 December 2010 it agreed a timetable for processing late requests to make essential changes to the data collected in the ILR for 2011/12 resulting from the need to support policies described in the SIS and Education White Paper in that year.
- 4 This board meeting is the last opportunity to approve changes to the specification of the ILR for 2011/12 as it is now essential to keep it stable while providers, their MIS suppliers and the Data Service make changes to their processes and software.

Summary of Changes Received

5 By 31 December 2011, the close date for further requests, *the information authority* secretariat (“the secretariat”) received seven requests for late changes to the ILR for 2011/12. These are:

Request Number	Description	Requestor
39	Explicitly identify 16-18 year-old and 19-24 year-old learners with learning difficulties and disabilities initially assessed as requiring high cost support	YPLA
40	Change to data about economic activity	BIS
41	Collect ethnicity data based on classification used in the 2011 UK Census	BIS
42	Identify aspects of foundation learning provision	Skills Funding Agency
43	Identify workplace delivery offer for small and medium enterprises	Skills Funding Agency
44	Add new programme entry routes for progression from advanced level apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship	NAS
45	Allow providers to send data for non-funded apprenticeship provision	NAS

The requests are numbered 39 to 45 consistent with the numbering of the requests previously received for changes to the ILR for 2011/12.

- 6 The secretariat took forward change request 41 separately as it did not result from the need to support policies described in the SIS or Education White Paper in 2011/12. It is described in the other paper for this board meeting.
- 7 The secretariat informed requestors that two of the remaining six requests, requests 44 and 45, failed to meet the change criteria. It worked with requestors to develop proposed solutions to the remaining four requests and consulted with the sector about them between Monday 10 and Monday 17 January 2011 inclusive.
- 8 Each of the seven requests is described below.

Process

- 9 The secretariat ran a truncated form of its published process for ILR change requests.

Change Detail

Change Request 39 – Identify Learners with LLDD Initially Assessed as High Cost

Change Description

- 10 The Young People's Learning Agency (YPLA) requested a change to ensure it was possible to clearly identify learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LLDD) who are aged under 25 and who require high levels of additional learning support (ALS) (defined as projected ALS costs of £5,500 or more). The YPLA has a statutory remit for funding these learners and needs to ensure that they can clearly differentiate between them and other learners with lower levels of additional learning support needs on the ILR.

Business Case for Change – Supplied by the Requestor and Used in Consultation

- 11 The Schools White Paper, published on 24 November 2010, states:
“The forthcoming Green Paper on Special Educational Needs and Disability will explore proposals for funding high cost provision – including exploring questions of how to increase transparency in how decisions about funding and support are made and increasing collaboration between local authorities.”
- 12 The Green Paper referenced above is expected in February/ March 2011 and will cover the changes in approach to funding learners with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities up to the age of 25.
- 13 In order to support the stated policy ‘to increase transparency in how decisions about funding’ are made, the YPLA requires the ability to identify learners that fall into this category – both within their 16-18 and 19-24 budgets.

Proposal

- 14 *The information authority* consulted on the proposal that the categories in the Additional learning support field, field L29, are sub-divided to differentiate between high-cost and low-cost LLDD. The proposed new categories would be:
 - Learner has been assessed as requiring additional learning support with a projected cost of £5,500 or over and the learner does have a Section 139A Learning Difficulty Assessment
 - Learner has been assessed as requiring additional learning support with a projected cost of £5,500 or over and the learner does not have a Section 139A Learning Difficulty Assessment

- Learner has been assessed as requiring additional learning support with a projected cost of less than £5,500 and the learner does have a Section 139A Learning Difficulty Assessment
- Learner has been assessed as requiring additional learning support with a projected cost of less than £5,500 and the learner does not have a Section 139A Learning Difficulty Assessment

Responses to Consultation

15 Stakeholders were asked:

- Do you think the proposed solution will achieve the YPLA's aim of identifying different types of LLDD?
- Can you suggest a more effective way of implementing this change?
- What level of data quality (accuracy and completeness) would you expect to achieve?
- For any additional comments regarding this change.

16 Responses were received from 63 organisations:

- 44 colleges
- 6 independent providers
- 6 local authorities
- 7 others

17 The most frequent response, 14, was that the information could already be identified using other fields in the ILR. Consequently there was no need to introduce the change. Of these, 12 responses suggested using the Additional learning support field, field L29, and the Additional learning support cost field, field L31.

18 A total of 62 stakeholders responded to the question about data quality, of these:

- 14 (23%) predicted very good data quality
- 33 (52%) predicted good data quality
- 10 (16%) predicted average data quality
- 4 (7%) predicted poor data quality
- 1 (2%) predicted very poor data quality.

Comment on Responses to Consultation

19 The responses about the data being already available show that some providers do not understand what is being requested. The new information the YPLA needs is based on the assessment of additional support cost at the start of the year. Currently support cost in the Additional learning support cost field is updated in-year to reflect the actual cost incurred. Consequently it cannot be used by YPLA to meet the need described in the Schools White Paper.

20 It is likely that data quality will be sufficient to meet the needs of the YPLA.

Recommendation

- 21 The secretariat recommends that the board approves the proposal to sub-divide categories in Additional learning support field, field 29, to differentiate between high-cost and low-cost LLDD additional support, as described in paragraph 14.
- 22 If the board approves the above recommendation about the Additional learning support field the secretariat, with support from the YPLA, would develop and publish guidance to help providers obtain accurate information and make clear why it cannot be obtained using the Additional learning support cost field, field L31.

Change Request 40 – Economic Activity

Background

- 23 The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and the Skills Funding Agency need to be able to justify and prioritise Government investment in skills training, understand the overall journey that learners make from training to employment by linking ILR data to administrative systems for the unemployed and monitor the number of learners eligible for job outcome incentive payments. While the ILR already collects considerable information about learner's economic activity it has been recognised for some time that this fails to provide the information now required.
- 24 At this stage in the development of the ILR specification for 2011/12 it is too late to carry out the detailed work required to develop a solution for 2011/12 that will meet the needs of all stakeholders and consult about it. Instead the solution proposed is an interim one which ensures that data essential to the implementation of the SIS in 2011/12 is collected in 2011/12. This interim solution is pragmatic and inelegant.
- 25 The secretariat, BIS and the Skills Funding Agency will immediately restart work to develop a more coherent and comprehensive solution for implementation in 2012/13. This will be consulted about during summer 2011 and considered by the board along with other ILR changes for 2012/13 at the board meeting in September 2011.

Change Description

- 26 BIS and the Skills Funding Agency made the case for the ILR to collect information about a learner's economic activity and the benefits claimed.
- 27 The data is required to:
- a monitor and justify investment in training provided for people on active benefits;
 - b provide evidence of what the further education (FE) sector is doing to help unemployed people gain new skills and move off benefit into work; and

c monitor numbers of learners eligible for job outcome incentive payments. The new training entitlements will also require providers to identify whether individuals are in receipt of Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) or Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) (work-related activity group (WRAG)). There will be policy and operational demands to be able to compare different entitlement paths to check they are working as intended.

- 28 In combination with other data, this information would also mean BIS could identify and investigate what training is being done by people who were previously Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET).

Business Case for Change – Supplied by the Requestor and Used in Consultation

- 29 As part of the new Skills Offer in the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) Work Programme, BIS will be paying for training provided to DWP customers on JSA and ESA (WRAG). While there will be no ring-fenced budget for this, it is essential that BIS and the Skills Funding Agency can accurately monitor the investment they make by being able to identify the DWP customers doing these training programmes.
- 30 Collecting data on employment status will enable the FE sector to properly demonstrate who it is training and its impact on economic outcomes. At the moment, we do not have good data on whether learners are employed or not, so we cannot tell with confidence that we are providing key population groups with the new skills that the economy needs.

Previous Request and Solution Development

- 31 In June 2010 the BIS and the Skills Funding Agency jointly requested, change request 35, employment status definitions and fields. Currently, there are five fields in the ILR recording information on employment status:
- L37 Employment status on first day of learning
 - L47 Current employment status
 - L48 Date employment status changed
 - A66 Employment status on day before starting learning aim
 - A68 Employment outcome.
- 32 The secretariat took the request forward, developed a solution and consulted about it. Before the September 2010 board meeting the secretariat and BIS agreed that the SIS could change requirements. Consequently the secretariat recommended that this change was deferred for a year, during which time further work would be undertaken to determine what the business requirements are for the collection of employment status data. The board agreed this recommendation.

- 33 The request for essential change, request 40, received from BIS, on behalf of BIS and the Skills Funding Agency, on 23 December 2010 was looking to address all the needs for data about:
- a learner's employment status including unemployment and economic inactivity
 - which benefits an unemployed learner is in receipt
 - the extent of employment, full-time or part-time, for employed learners
 - whether a learner in employment is employed or self-employed.
- 34 BIS proposed to obtain this information by including five new fields in the ILR to hold the answers to five structured questions. Implicit to this approach was the withdrawal of existing fields that collected data about economic activity.
- 35 The secretariat was concerned that there was insufficient time to properly consult about such a radically different approach and to confirm it would meet the needs of all those who currently use employment information. Instead it proposed changes to the existing employment related fields consistent with the needs expressed by BIS for employment data in 2011/12. This would enable the collection of data essential for 2011/12 and give sufficient time to develop a solution that meets the needs of all data users and consult about them ready for implementation in 2012/13. In any case the transition to the single restructured learner record during 2011/12 will make it easier to collect data as proposed by BIS in its change request.

Proposal

- 36 *The information authority* consulted on the proposal that the unemployment categories in the Employment status on first day of learning field, field L37, would be sub-divided to differentiate between learners who are on active benefits (JSA and ESA (WRAG)) and those who are not, and also to record full or part-time employment. The proposed new list of categories would be:
- Employed – full-time
 - Employed – part-time
 - Not employed - unemployed (through redundancy) and in receipt of JSA
 - Not employed - unemployed (through redundancy) and in receipt of ESA (WRAG)
 - Not employed - unemployed (through redundancy) and **not** in receipt of active benefits (JSA/ ESA (WRAG))
 - Not employed - unemployed (for reasons other than redundancy) and in receipt of JSA
 - Not employed - unemployed (for reasons other than redundancy) and in receipt of ESA (WRAG)
 - Not employed - unemployed (for reasons other than redundancy) and **not** in receipt of active benefits (JSA/ ESA (WRAG))

- Not employed - unemployed (reason unknown/ not provided) and in receipt of JSA
 - Not employed - unemployed (reason unknown/ not provided) and in receipt of ESA (WRAG)
 - Not employed - unemployed (reason unknown/ not provided) and **not** in receipt of active benefits
 - Not employed – economically inactive
- 37 For consistency, these changes would also apply to the Current employment status field, field L47.
- 38 In addition to the changes to the Employment Status fields, it is proposed that National Insurance Numbers (NINOs) are additionally collected for any learner in receipt of an active benefit (JSA/ ESA (WRAG)), subject to agreement with DWP/HM Revenue & Customs and the Skills Funding Agency legal team.

Responses to Consultation

- 39 Stakeholders were asked:
- As data quality is key for this change, what are the obstacles that stand in the way of almost-perfect data quality?
 - Can you suggest a more effective way of implementing this change?
 - For any additional comments regarding this change.
- 40 Responses were received from 62 organisations:
- 45 colleges
 - 7 independent providers
 - 10 others.
- 41 The responses indicated:
- it would be difficult to obtain almost perfectly accurate and/or complete employment data and NI numbers because learners are resistant or unable to do so or not engaged – 23 responses
 - concern that the employment status codes are complex and/or extensive – 18 responses
 - concern about the burden of collection – 12 responses
 - concern that data provided will not be complete and/or accurate – seven responses
 - no concerns or confirmation that accurate data can be supplied – three responses
 - training and or extra guidance is required to support collection of robust data – six responses
 - concern about keeping the Current employment status field, field L47, accurate – eight responses
 - concern about evidence that is required and/or the need to keep it – four responses

Other solutions suggested:

- using other fields (for example A14, A71, L37) – 16 responses
- using only/making better use of NINO or asking job centres to collect the Unique Learner Number (ULN) issued by the Learner Registration Service – nine responses

Comment on Responses to Consultation

- 42 Providers have considerable concerns about providing accurate data about employment status and NINOs particularly where a learner may not be forthcoming with information.
- 43 Where a learner is referred to a provider for training and/or is in receipt of benefits providers should have few difficulties in obtaining the NINO and accurate information about economic activity from documentation the learner holds. BIS and the Skills Funding Agency recognise that for other learners collecting this information from learners on a voluntary basis may result in incomplete or inaccurate data.

Recommendation

- 44 The secretariat recommends that the board approves:
- a the unemployment categories in the Employment status on first day of learning field, field L37, would be sub-divided to differentiate between learners who are on active benefits (JSA and ESA (WRAG)) and those who are not, and also to record full or part-time employment, as described in paragraph 36 above;
 - b the same change, see the first bullet, is applied to the Current Employment status field, field L47, to keep the two fields consistent;
 - c NINOs are additionally collected for any learner in receipt of an active benefit (JSA/ ESA (WRAG)), subject to agreement with DWP/HM Revenue & Customs and the Skills Funding Agency legal team.
- 45 If the board approves the above recommendations about the employment status fields the secretariat, with support from BIS and the Skills Funding Agency, would start work to develop and publish guidance to help providers obtain accurate information in these fields.
- 46 The secretariat would also continue to work with all stakeholders in BIS and the Skills Funding Agency to agree a change to the way employment status and related information is gathered so that it is fit for purpose and more coherent. The secretariat would aim to implement this in 2012/13 having developed a solution and consulted about it during the normal change process and timetable for that year.

Change Request 41 - Ethnicity Classification

- 47 This change request is considered in a separate paper.

Change Request 42 - Foundation Learning Provision

Background

- 48 The Skills Investment Strategy (SIS) announced that from the 2012/13 academic year, when the statutory entitlements are reformed, full funding will be available for those with an entitlement to a Level 2 qualification who need help to take the step up from basic skills. Currently full funding is available for basic literacy and numeracy and the first full Level 2 entitlement but for other pre level 2 learning it is only available where a learner is in receipt of income related benefits.
- 49 While this change was announced in respect of the 2012/13 academic year, consideration is being given as to whether this may be brought forward in line with wider changes to learners who qualify for fee remission. This work remains under consideration and no final decision has been made. However if a change is required the appropriate ILR field would need to be in place.

Change Description

- 50 The Skills Funding Agency has identified a potential requirement to identify aspects of foundation learning curriculum provision to monitor the number of learners claiming full funding for this reason.

Business Case for Change – Supplied by the Requestor and Used in Consultation

- 51 The SIS announced a reduction in 2011/12 in the number of fee remission categories, as a way of focussing fully-funded provision on unemployed people on Jobseeker's Allowance and Employment and Support Allowance (work-related activity group). There is a concern that this will lead to a disproportionate number of foundation level learners being required to co-fund their learning in order to enable them to access their first full level 2 entitlement. There is a timing issue as, in 2012/13, with the reform to the level 2 entitlement, those 19-23 year olds with an entitlement to a level 2 qualification that require a step up from basic skills will be fully-funded (SIS November 2010).
- 52 This change will bridge the gap for those who lose fee remission as a result of the change in remission for income-based benefits in 2011/12. If this change is not implemented, progression routes will be removed for 1 year and be put back in 2012/13.

Proposal

- 53 *The information authority* consulted on the proposal to add a new code in the National learning aim monitoring field, field A46, to record learners who are fully-funded and undertaking foundation level provision as a progression route to a level 2 qualification.

Responses to Consultation

54 Stakeholders were asked:

- Can you think of a more effective way of implementing this change?
- What level of data quality (accuracy and completeness) would you expect to achieve?
- For any additional comments regarding this change.

55 A total of 34 stakeholders; 28 colleges, one independent providers and five local authorities, responded to the question about data quality, of these:

- 11 (32%) predicted very good data quality
- 12 (35%) predicted good data quality
- 6 (18%) predicted average data quality
- 5 (15%) predicted poor data quality
- 0 (0%) predicted very poor data quality.

56 Fourteen providers suggested that the required data should be collected in a re-instated Reason for full-funding/co-funding of learning field, field A14. This field is withdrawn for 2011/12.

Comment on Responses to Consultation

57 The secretariat recognises that the board agreed to remove the Reason for full-funding/co-funding of learning field and that had it remained it would have proposed using that field to meet the current requirement. However given that 2011/12 is an interim year and that it is likely that even more changes may be needed to implement the SIS in the ILR for 2012/13 the secretariat judges that the proposed solution is an adequate interim solution. Once future requirements are more fully understood it may be appropriate to develop a more robust solution for implementation in 2012/13.

Change

58 During consultation the Skills Funding Agency agreed that it was still not certain how the policy would actually be implemented. Consequently it was unable to confirm that the change requested would meet its need.

59 Given that the National learning aim monitoring field, field A46, is implemented so that it can cope with late or in-year changes the secretariat agreed with BIS and the Skills Funding Agency that the board would be asked to agree to the change or a similar one, in principle. Once the requirement was fully understood the change would be implemented.

Recommendation

60 The secretariat recommends that the board approves in principle the addition of a new code in the National learning aim monitoring field, field A46, to meet the need to monitor learners undertaking Foundation Learning as a progression route to a full level 2 or some similar need when that need is fully understood.

- 61 When the Skills Funding Agency is certain of its requirement then if it is appropriate it would be implemented using a new code in the National learning aim monitoring field, field A46.

Change Request 43 – Identify Workplace Delivery Offer for SMEs

Change Description

- 62 The Skills Funding Agency has identified a requirement to reflect the changes to the wider workplace learning offer, alongside Apprenticeships, that are to be implemented in 2011/12. That is:
- a Identify the Small and Medium-sized Enterprise (SME) offer for workplace delivery;
 - b Remove any reference to Train to Gain in the ILR; and
 - c Retain the capability to fund carry over Train to Gain learners.

Business Case for Change – Supplied by the Requestor and Used in Consultation

- 63 The Comprehensive Spending Review 2010 set out the abolition of Train to Gain to, among other reasons, generate necessary savings. The Skills Investment Strategy stated that, with reduced public investment, future workplace funding would be prioritised on SMEs. The Skills Funding Agency's Guidance Note 6 clarified that changes to funding eligibility will be applied only to new learners, thus enabling any carryover Train to Gain learners to continue to be funded, in order that they can complete and achieve their learning aims.

Proposal

- 64 The Skills Funding Agency confirmed its requirement was to identify learners who are employed by an SME and that are undertaking a qualification at level 2 when they have already achieved one at that level or higher.
- 65 *The information authority* consulted on the proposal to add a code in the National learning aim monitoring field, field A46, to record learners who are employed by an SME and are undertaking a repeat level 2 qualification.

Responses to Consultation

- 66 Stakeholders were asked:
- Can you think of a more effective way of implementing this change?
 - What level of data quality (accuracy and completeness) would you expect to achieve?
 - For any additional comments regarding this change.

- 67 A total of 36 stakeholders; 27 colleges, five independent providers and four local authorities, responded to the question about data quality, of these:
- 6 (17%) predicted very good data quality
 - 13 (36%) predicted good data quality
 - 8 (22%) predicted average data quality
 - 7 (19%) predicted poor data quality
 - 2 (6%) predicted very poor data quality.
- 68 Ten providers suggested that the Skills Funding Agency should identify SMEs by providing a list of employer identifiers in the same way it identifies large employers to which the large employer discount applies. This was considered and rejected because the Skills Funding Agency would not be able to manage centrally a list that would be constantly changing and this extent of change would in itself prove difficult to implement in an automated way.
- 69 Providers expressed concerns about how they would identify SMEs in both the private and public sector given the sometimes complex internal company structures of subsidiaries and franchises and the difficulty in obtaining reliable and topical information about them.

Comment on Consultation

- 70 The secretariat discussed providers' concerns about identifying SMEs with BIS and the Skills Funding Agency. The organisations agreed to work together to address these concerns.

Recommendation

- 71 The secretariat recommends that the board approves the introduction of a new code in the National learning aim monitoring field, field A46, to record learners who are employed by an SME and are undertaking a repeat level 2 qualification.

Change Request 44 – Apprenticeship Progression Routes

Change Description

- 72 The National Apprenticeship Service (NAS) asked for a change that would greatly increase the reporting of apprenticeships and better demonstrate progression within the apprenticeship framework.

Business Case for Change – Supplied by the Requestor and Used in Consultation

- 73 This is a minor change that would greatly increase the reporting of apprenticeships and better demonstrate progression within the apprenticeship framework. The change would allow providers and NAS to accurately report progression between apprenticeship levels and better demonstrate the effectiveness of the apprenticeship programme.

- 74 The impact of the ASCL Act is the removal of funding for Programme-led Apprenticeships, which is a phased approach from August 2010. Therefore all traditional PLAs will have to undertake some 'pre-apprenticeship' training before they can undertake a fully funded Apprenticeship. Therefore another new code would be required to measure this. This could be multiple codes although this is not yet known as the Department has yet to identify what pre-provision will be. However we know we will need at least one new code.

Evaluation

- 75 The secretariat considered the request against the assessment criteria and wrote to the requestor to decline this change request for the following reasons:
- a it was previously sent to *the information authority* as part of the change request process in June 2010 and was considered by the board at its meeting in September 2010;
 - b on 30 September 2010 the board approved the secretariat's recommendation to add a new code to the Programme entry route field, field A16, for 'Progression from an Advanced Level Apprenticeship'. This code was included in the ILR Specification for 2011/12 and can be used to record progression from an Advanced Level Apprenticeship to a Higher Apprenticeship;
 - c on 30 September 2010 the board approved the inclusion of a new code for 'pre-Apprenticeship' training subject to a robust definition for this training being available by 31 October 2010. As the definition was not available by this date, and was still not confirmed by 6 January 2011 the secretariat wrote to the requestor to say it was unable to take this proposal forward to consultation.

Recommendation

- 76 The secretariat asks the board to confirm it is content that this change is rejected because the requestor failed to provide sufficient information to take it to consultation. That is it fails the first part of assessment criterion three; "Change request is well-defined with a robust business rationale".

Change Request 45 - Data for Non-funded Apprenticeship

Change Description

- 77 NAS asked that all providers that wish to be allowed to send data for all eligible provision whether funded or unfunded.

Business Case for Change – Supplied by the Requestor and Used in Consultation

- 78 A number of learning providers within employer responsive wish to submit more activity through the ILR than they are funded for. This is particularly true in relation to apprenticeships. This would support the reporting of apprenticeships and allow a simplified reporting mechanism for the organisations involved. The supply of data would be voluntary and based on

qualifications and programmes that we could fund but don't, and not all unfunded activity.

- 79 The strategy for Apprenticeship expansion is about co-investment opportunities with employers which aligns to the current NAS approach. Specifically NAS has a co-funded model in the Public Sector, such as Health, where they are striving to maximise public investment in Apprenticeships.
- 80 There is a wide interest from both NAS and Ministers in being able to capture the full return from Public Investment, in particular an announcement in March about a £50m joint investment scheme where the employers fund 50% of the Apprenticeship. The government is interested in the number of Apprenticeships not just the number of publicly funded Apprenticeships.
- 81 Other reasons for this request relate to large employers and ESF funding where NAS introduce businesses to Apprenticeships i.e. do all the work but then it is not even recorded. Also deals are sometimes brokered with larger employers where we will fund a certain volume if the employer solely funds an additional amount.
- 82 NAS are interested in their added value and that is currently being under recorded. There is therefore a false picture about the value for money of a public body and its work. Also providers wish to be able to confirm the full range of their delivery to our National Policy and Strategy goals.
- 83 NAS also have large volumes of investment within large employers. Being able to view apprenticeships across these organisations, whether funded or not, would enable us to see the added value of the service.
- 84 Government recently approved plans to support the theme of "Celebrating Success" which involves publishing rolls of honours, both via providers and centrally from NAS. The latter is dependent upon ILR data, and the former would be simpler if aligned with a providers ILR data. It should be noted that the ASCL Act makes no distinction between publicly-funded and non-publicly-funded apprentices. Therefore we should provide the means to celebrate the success of non-publicly funded apprentices, too.
- 85 Finally, under the ASCL Act, the Chief Executive of Skills Funding has responsibility for issuing completion certificates. Whilst it is likely that this will be fulfilled through third parties, it would be prudent to have a contingency methodology should arrangements be disrupted, and ILR data may support this. Again, this duty covers non-publicly funded apprentices.
- 86 In the longer term, the introduction of loans for adult learners may significantly increase the number of learners supported by providers/employers who are not receiving funding directly in the same way as now.

Evaluation

- 87 This change request was previously sent in June 2010, change request 3, and was declined by the board at its meeting in September 2010.

- 88 The board had a number of concerns about the scope of the original request, but did recognise that there might be some cases where it would be valid to collect data for non-funded apprenticeships such as those associated with a Skills Funding Agency contract, for example 2 for 1 offers. The board was prepared to re-consider a revised request with a narrower scope so it asked the secretariat to work on this with the National Apprenticeship Service for consideration as part of the 2012/13 ILR change process
- 89 The change request has not changed from that previously sent and consequently was not taken forward. In particular, no attempt has been made to narrow the scope of the request.

Recommendation

- 90 The secretariat asks the board to confirm it is content that this change is rejected because the requestor has previously sent the same request. That is it fails assessment criterion 2; "Change request has not been rejected previously" and the first part of criterion 3 "Change request is well-defined with a robust business rationale".

Author Peter Ashton
Date created 17 January 2011
Publication no.
Document ref. D:\the information authority-essentiallatechangestotheindividualisedlearnerrecordfor201112-publicpaper-28jan2011.doc
Version 0.1