

# Evaluation of the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree: Statistical Profile of Students and Institutions (Report of the Wave 2 Survey)

Dawn Snape, Emily Tanner, Helen MacKenzie  
National Centre for Social Research

Research Report  
No 804

---

*Evaluation of the Early Years  
Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree:  
Statistical Profile of Students and Institutions  
(Report of the Wave 2 Survey)*

---

*Dawn Snape, Emily Tanner, Helen MacKenzie  
National Centre for Social Research*

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© National Centre for Social Research 2006  
ISBN 978 1 84478 836 1



## **Acknowledgements**

We are particularly grateful to the Course Co-ordinators who took time out of their busy schedules to fill in and return the questionnaires to us. We would also like to thank colleagues at NatCen who played an important role in the project, particularly Gursharanjit Gill who provided computing support and Sandra Laver and other members of the Pink Team in the Operations Department.

At the DfES, we would also like to thank Cheow-lay Wee and Bichelle Masrani who provided guidance throughout the project.



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	Background and aims of the administrative database .....	7
1.2	Research methods.....	7
1.3	The responding institutions.....	8
1.4	Subject coverage .....	9
1.5	Guidance for interpretation.....	10
1.6	Structure of the report .....	10
<b>2</b>	<b>INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	Types of institutions offering the degree .....	12
2.2	Proportions of lead HEIs and affiliated colleges offering the EYSEFD.....	12
2.3	Distribution of students across institutions.....	14
2.4	Number of institutions with no students during one or more intake period and reason why.....	14
2.5	When institutions first offered the degree .....	16
<b>3</b>	<b>DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT STUDENTS .</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Gender .....	18
3.2	Ethnicity .....	20
3.3	Disability and learning support needs .....	20
<b>4</b>	<b>DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER STUDENTS....</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1	Student retention, achievement and loss .....	22
4.1.1	Reasons for leaving the course.....	22
4.2	Characteristics of former students .....	24
4.2.1	Gender of former students.....	24
4.2.2	Age of former students.....	25
4.2.3	Ethnicity of former students.....	26
4.2.4	Learning support needs of former students.....	27
<b>5</b>	<b>MODE OF ATTENDANCE AND RECEIPT OF APL / APEL CREDIT .</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1	Percentages of current full-time and part-time students .....	29
5.2	Receipt of APL and APEL credit .....	31
5.2.1	Receipt of APL credit.....	32
5.2.2	Receipt of APEL credit.....	33
<b>6</b>	<b>ROUTES THROUGH THE DEGREE .....</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1	The routes offered by the institutions.....	35
6.1	Students following each route .....	37
<b>7</b>	<b>FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>39</b>
7.1	Receipt of fee waivers .....	39
7.2	Receipt of help with childcare costs.....	41
7.3	Financial support by type of institution.....	42
<b>8</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>45</b>
8.1	Institutional settings .....	45
8.2	Demographic characteristics of all students.....	46
8.3	Demographic characteristics of former students.....	46
8.4	Mode of attendance and receipt of APL/ APEL .....	48

8.5	Routes through the Foundation Degree.....	48
8.6	Financial assistance for students .....	49

## Executive summary

### *Introduction and background*

As part of the wider programme of research which comprises the evaluation of the introduction of the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree (EYSEFD), the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned the *National Centre for Social Research* (NatCen) to compile an administrative database of statistical information. This involved the collection of aggregate statistical information on students taking the EYSEFD at all DfES recognised institutions and their affiliated partners during the first two academic years in which the course was run (2003/4 and 2004/5).

Key aims of the database were:

- to provide an updated source of statistical information about student take-up of the EYSEFD, retention throughout the course and achievement of the Foundation Degree;
- to enable monitoring of student participation in the Foundation Degree according to a variety of individual characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, disability and learning support needs; and
- to provide aggregate information about how the EYSEFD is being delivered across institutions (e.g. types of institutions offering the Foundation Degree, proportions of institutions offering various 'routes' through the Foundation Degree).

This report provides the findings of the second annual administrative database data collection exercise. Data were collected from course co-ordinators via a postal survey which took place between April and June of 2005. The findings relate to students who began the course for the first time from September 2003 onwards.

The intention was that the administrative database would include **all** institutions and their affiliated partners that had received DfES recognition by the end of February 2005. In the event, a response was obtained from 100 institutions, representing a response rate of 71%.

Among the responding institutions, a total of 2,590 students were enrolled and started the EYSEFD course between September 2003 and February 2005. According to DfES data, a total of 6,662 students are thought to have started the course during this period, suggesting that the database provides information on 39% of students who began the course between September 2003 and February 2005 (inclusive).



### ***Institutional settings***

Two-thirds of responding institutions at Wave 2 are FE colleges (65%) while most of the remaining third are higher education institutions (34%). This was a similar picture to that obtained at Wave 1.

Also consistent with the Wave 1 profile of institutions is that 14% of institutions at Wave 2 are lead HEIs that confer the Foundation Degree but are not directly involved in course delivery on site.

In terms of where students are based, just under two-thirds (63%) of all students who started the course at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 were based at FE colleges. Most of the remaining 37% were based at HE institutions, with 1% based at some other type of institution.

Three-quarters (74%) of responding institutions offered the course for the first time between September 2003 and February 2005, that is in the first two years since the course was widely introduced. The remaining 26% of the responding institutions first offered the course during the pre-pilot or pilot phases (from 2001 until the spring of 2003). This is different to the profile of institutions at Wave 1 in which the pilot and pre-pilot institutions constituted a much larger proportion of responding institutions (41%). The implication of this is that the Wave 2 responding institutions include more of those that have fairly recently started the course and fewer institutions with longer term experience of delivering it.

Across each intake period in the two academic years of 2003-4 and 2004-5, many more students started the course in the autumn rather than the spring intake periods.

Just over half (54%) of students at responding institutions started the course in 2003-4 while the remaining 46% began the course in 2004-5.

### ***Demographic characteristics of all students***

Similar to the findings at Wave 1, students at responding institutions at Wave 2 were almost exclusively female (99%).

Overall, the age profile of students who have started the EYSEFD course at responding institutions was normally distributed around the most common age group of 36-40 years. This was similar to the findings at Wave 1.

Comparing the ages of students who started the course in the 2003-4 academic year to those who started in the following year suggests that the most experienced practitioners may have been among the first intake to the course, while the subsequent intake attracted younger and less senior members of the early years education and childcare workforce. Those starting more recently were more likely to be in the youngest age group and

less likely to be in the oldest age group than those who started the course in 2003-4.

Over nine-tenths of students at responding institutions were White (91%). This is a broadly similar picture to that obtained at Wave 1.

Overall, the number of students identified as having learning support needs among responding institutions at Wave 2 was small (3%). This was a similar proportion to that reported at Wave 1. Also similar to Wave 1 is that students most commonly required learning support because of 'learning difficulties' such as dyslexia.

### ***Demographic characteristics of former students***

Overall, approximately 16% of students who started the course at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 had left the course by the time of the survey. Of these, nearly four-fifths (79%) were described as taking a 'temporary break' from the course and were expected to return to it at some future point. Most of the remaining fifth (17%) had completed the course already and only a small proportion (4%) were described as having left the course without finishing it (and are not expected to return to it).

There were no notable findings in relation to the ages of former students except that those in their early twenties were most likely to leave the course and those aged 51 and older were least likely to do so.

The ethnicity of those who left the course at Wave 2 is similar to the ethnic profile of all those starting the course during the reference period at responding institutions. The base sizes of students from minority ethnic groups are too small to enable meaningful sub-group analysis.

Those with learning support needs did not appear to be more likely than students without learning support needs to leave the course, but the base size of former students with learning support needs was very small.

### ***Mode of attendance and receipt of APL/ APEL***

Among the responding institutions, just over two-thirds (69%) of students were registered part-time, while just under a third (31%) were registered full-time. These proportions are quite different to the Wave 1 findings in which 82% of students were registered part-time and 18% full-time. This suggests that it may be becoming more common for students to take-up the course on a full-time basis.

Among responding institutions, part-time students are fairly evenly distributed between FE colleges and higher education institutions (54% based at FE colleges and 44% at HEIs). By contrast, most full-time students (85%) are based at FE colleges, with a much smaller proportion (16%) based at higher education institutions. This may suggest that among responding institutions, FE colleges offer a full-time course mode more often than do HEIs.

Only a small minority (4%) of students at responding institutions received either APL or APEL credit towards the course in the two academic years covered by the Wave 2 survey. Most of those receiving this type of credit were based at higher education institutions rather than FE colleges.

### ***Routes through the Foundation Degree***

Responding institutions at Wave 2 offered a broader range of routes through the EYSEFD course than was the case among the Wave 1 institutions. Particularly notable was the increased number of institutions offering the playwork option (75% of institutions offered this at Wave 2 compared to only 22% of the Wave 1 institutions). The most frequently offered course route was the general Senior Practitioner (Foundation Stage) route, offered by 82% of the Wave 2 institutions, but all routes were offered by at least three-quarters of the Wave 2 institutions.

Take-up of the playwork option was extremely low among responding institutions with less than 1% of students following this route.

### ***Financial assistance for students***

A small minority of students (4%) at responding institutions were reported to have received help with childcare costs. This was a similar picture to Wave 1.

There has been a notable decline in the proportion of students receiving fee waivers from 82% of students in 2003-4 to 32% in 2004-5. This decline can largely be accounted for by the changing role of DfES as a provider of financial support.

Similar to Wave 1, there was a marked difference in the likelihood of receiving fee waivers according to the type of institution attended. In the academic year 2003-4, 99% of Foundation degree students at higher education institutions received fee waivers compared to 73% of students at FE colleges. This pattern changed in the following academic year, when the proportion of students receiving fee waivers dropped to approximately one-third. The differences between higher and further education institutions in 2004-5 was less marked, with 30% of students at the former receiving fee waivers compared to 34% of students at FE institutions.

# 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

## 1.1 Background and aims of the administrative database

As part of the wider programme of research which comprises the evaluation of the introduction of the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree (EYSEFD), the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned the *National Centre for Social Research* (NatCen) to compile an administrative database of statistical information. This involved the collection of aggregate statistical information on students taking the EYSEFD at all DfES recognised institutions and their affiliated partners during the first two academic years in which the course was run (2003/4 and 2004/5).

A key aim of the database was to provide an updated source of statistical information about student take-up of the EYSEFD, retention throughout the course and achievement of the Foundation Degree.

The database also provides the opportunity to monitor student participation in the Foundation Degree according to a variety of individual characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, disability and learning support needs. Data have also been collected on student receipt of various types of assistance, both from the DfES and other sources.

Finally, the database provides aggregate information about how the EYSEFD is being delivered across institutions (e.g. types of institutions offering the Foundation Degree, proportions of institutions offering various 'routes' through the Foundation Degree).

## 1.2 Research methods

This report provides the findings of the second annual administrative database data collection exercise. Data were collected from course co-ordinators via a postal survey which took place between April and June of 2005. Course co-ordinators at each institution were asked to complete and return the questionnaire focusing only on students based at their institution for teaching purposes. This was done in order to minimise the potential of 'double counting' students who, for example, are registered at a lead institution that confers the Foundation Degree but are regularly based at a local affiliate college for teaching purposes. An explanatory letter accompanying the questionnaire asked course co-ordinators to consult with other colleagues (such as a registrar) if they did not have access to all the student information required to complete the questionnaire. In order to maximise the response rate, two reminders were sent to course co-ordinators who did not respond.

The findings reported here relate to students who began the course for the first time from September 2003 onwards. Data have been collected for each intake of students who began the course since that point, providing information on students who began the course in four separate cohorts (i.e., autumn 2003, spring 2004, autumn 2005, spring 2005). To provide a clear picture of trends over time, the findings are reported in terms of students starting the course in each academic year (i.e. 2003-4 and 2004-5).

Finally, although the first administrative database survey provided findings relating to the autumn 2003 intake period, data from this cohort was obtained again during this second annual survey. The findings reported here relate to the 2003-4 academic year overall (including both the autumn and spring intakes) and are based upon data provided in this year's survey. Discrepancies between the picture obtained of the autumn 2003 intake from last year's survey and this year's may therefore arise because: (1) the spring 2004 intake period is also included in the 2003-4 academic year figures, unlike last year's survey which related only to the autumn 2003 intake, or (2) course co-ordinators have provided figures of the autumn 2003 intake this year which vary slightly from those they provided last year.

### **1.3 The responding institutions**

The intention was that the administrative database would include **all** institutions and their affiliated partners that had received DfES recognition by the end of February 2005. Questionnaires were therefore sent to 146<sup>1</sup> institutions but completed questionnaires were received from only 100. Among these were two institutions that submitted forms including figures of students based at 'satellite institutions'. In these cases, the satellite institutions provide a venue only with no administrative support for the EYSEFD on site and no teachers permanently based there. Therefore, while completed questionnaires were returned by 100 institutions, the figures reported refer to students based at 103 separate sites for teaching purposes.

This represents a response rate of 71%. Among the responding institutions, a total of 2,590 students were enrolled and started the EYSEFD course between September 2003 and February 2005. According to the data on profiled student enrolment collected by the DfES a total of 6,662 students are thought to have started the course during this time period. The database therefore provides information on 39% of students who began the course between September 2003 and February 2005 (inclusive).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Questionnaires were sent originally to 147 institutions, but one of these had not received DfES recognition and should not therefore have been included in the data collection exercise. The overall response rate should therefore be calculated on a base of 146 institutions.

<sup>2</sup> The database does not include students undertaking the course at the Open University as there were a number of practical difficulties in gathering the required information in a standard format from the OU.

## 1.4 Subject coverage

Similar to the first questionnaire, the second annual administrative database survey included questions about the students themselves as well as the responding institution. The following subjects were included:

- Total number of students based at the institution who started the course in:
  - September-October 2003
  - January-February 2004
  - September- October 2004
  - January- February 2005
- If no students were recorded as having started during any intake period, reasons for this
- Total number of students starting during each intake period who were still on the course at the time of the survey
- Number of students who left the course for various reasons, according to intake period
- Characteristics of students who started the course and of those who left the course according to intake period, focusing on:
  - Gender
  - Ethnicity
  - Age
  - Learning support needs
- Number of current students registered as full or part-time students, by intake period
- Course routes (i.e. early years birth to 3, early years foundation stage, teaching assistants, playwork) offered at the institution
- Number of full-time and part-time students following each route
- Number of students receiving APL and APEL credit towards the Foundation Degree, according to intake period.
- Financial and other assistance for students, according to intake period
  - Number of full-time and part-time students receiving fee waivers from the DfES or another source
- Number of full and part-time students receiving assistance with childcare costs from the DfES or another source
- Institutional information
  - Type of institution (e.g. university, further education college, etc.)

- Whether institution confers the Foundation Degree and if not, the institution through which the Foundation Degree is conferred
  - When the EYSEFD was first offered at the institution
  - When regular student intake is planned
- Respondent's contact information (for follow-up purposes).

## **1.5 Guidance for interpretation**

The percentages presented in the tables have been calculated from the responding bases. Base sizes and descriptions are shown at the bottom of the table, along with any notes appropriate for guiding interpretation. Institutions with missing data because respondents did not answer a question have been excluded from the calculations, unless stated otherwise.

Due to rounding, percentage figures may not add up to exactly 100%, but may total between 98% and 102%.

In some tables, particularly where base sizes are small, the number of cases to which percentages relate is provided in parentheses next to the percentage in order to aid interpretation.

The following symbols have been used in the tables:

- \* to indicate a percentage value of less than 0.5%
- to indicate a percentage value of zero

## **1.6 Structure of the report**

The report has eight chapters. Chapter 2 focuses on the institutional settings where the EYSEFD is offered. It explores the proportion of lead institutions and affiliated partners and the different types of institutions offering the Foundation Degree. The distribution of students across institutions is also considered as is the length of time institutions have been offering the EYSEFD.

Chapter 3 explores the characteristics of students who began the Foundation Degree during the two academic years covered in the survey (i.e. 2003-4 and 2004-5). It focuses on a range of demographic characteristics to provide an aggregate profile of students from these cohorts who enrolled on the course. Chapter 4 goes on to consider the demographic characteristics of those students who have left the course and highlights any implications the profile of leavers may have for student retention.

Chapter 5 focuses on mode of student attendance, both in terms of the number of students taking the course on a full or part-time basis as well as the number and type of institutions offering each mode. Receipt of APL and APEL credit is also examined here.

Chapter 6 presents the findings about routes available through the EYSEFD. It considers both the number of institutions offering each different route and the numbers of full and part-time students taking each route.

Chapter 7 looks at financial assistance received by students in the form of fee waivers and help with childcare costs. For all students, the source of the assistance is specifically explored, particularly the extent to which students received help from the DfES versus other sources.

Chapter 8 provides overall conclusions from the findings.



## 2 INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS

This chapter focuses on the institutional settings where the EYSEFD is offered and the distribution of students at different types of institutions. Of the 146 recognised institutions that were sent a questionnaire, 100 completed and returned the statistical profile forms.

### 2.1 Types of institutions offering the degree

As Table 2.1 shows, two-thirds (65%) of responding institutions are further education colleges. Most of the remaining third are higher education institutions – universities (22%), university colleges (6%) or higher education colleges (6%). This is virtually unchanged from the Wave 1 administrative database findings.

**Table 2.1**      **Types of institutions offering the EYSEFD**

Type of institution	Proportion of institutions
	%
College of further education	65
University	22
University college	6
College of higher education	6
Other	1
<i>Base</i>	<i>100</i>

Base: All responding institutions

### 2.2 Proportions of lead HEIs and affiliated colleges offering the EYSEFD

Table 2.2 shows that half of the responding institutions conferred the Foundation Degree, while the remaining half said that they did not confer the degree – i.e. that another institution conferred the degree on their behalf. A higher proportion of the responding institutions therefore confer the EYSEFD at Wave 2 than at Wave 1 (50% at Wave 2 compared to 30% at Wave 1).



### 2.3 Distribution of students across institutions

Just over half (52%) of all students who started the EYSEFD course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions were based at lead HEIs while the remaining 48% were based at affiliated colleges.

Focusing only on those students who were still on the course at the time of the survey, 51% attended a lead HEI and 49% attended an affiliated college.

In terms of the types of institutions where students were based, Table 2.4 shows that students most commonly attended a further education college with just under two-thirds (63%) of all students who started the EYSEFD between September 2003 and February 2005 based at FE colleges. The remaining 37% attended Higher Education institutions – universities (20%), university colleges (7%), or higher education colleges (9%), or other types of institutions (1%). Comparing these findings to those in the second column of Table 2.4, which focuses only on current students at the time of the survey, there are no notable differences to observe in terms of where current students were based. This suggests that students did not tend to leave the course more if they were based at particular types of institutions.

**Table 2.4 Proportions of EYSEFD students based at different types of institutions**

Type of institution	All students who started the course	Students still on the course at the time of survey
	%	%
College of further education	63	64
University	20	19
College of higher education	9	8
University college	7	8
Other	1	1
<i>Base</i>	2590	2179

Base: All students at responding institutions

### 2.4 Number of institutions with no students during one or more intake period and reason why

The EYSEFD was piloted in 2001 and 2002 with the first post-pilot intake in the autumn of 2003. The survey covered two possible student intake periods per academic year since the autumn of 2003 (i.e. September-October and January-February) and asked whether there was any student intake during each of these periods. Institutions recording no student intake during one of the four periods<sup>3</sup> were asked to state why this was the case.

<sup>3</sup> Period 1: September-October 2003; Period 2: January-February 2004; Period 3: September-October 2004; Period 4: January-February 2005.

Of the 100 institutions that returned completed questionnaires, 78 reported having no student intake for at least one of the two enrolment periods in 2003-4 and 76 reported no student intake for at least one of the two enrolment periods in 2004-5. Just under three quarters (74%) of the institutions reporting no students during one or more intake period in the academic year 2003-4 attributed this to the fact that there were simply no students (Table 2.5). For the remaining 26%, the reason for no students was that the course was not yet running. As might be expected, in the following academic year (2004-5), there were fewer institutions reporting that the course was not yet running. For nearly all the institutions reporting no students during one or more intake period (93%), the reason given was that there were simply no students.

**Table 2.5 Reasons for no EYSEFD students during one or more intake period**

Reason	2003-4		2004-5)	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
The course was not running yet	26	(20)	7	(5)
No student intake during this period	74	(58)	93	(71)
<i>Base</i>	78		76	

Base: All responding institutions with no students during one or more intake period between September 2003 and February 2005.

Table 2.6 provides an overview of student intake patterns across the responding institutions. The table includes data from the 82 institutions where the degree is taught on site and which may have had a student intake during each of the relevant periods. Not included in this table are the 14 institutions that are lead HEIs only (i.e. that confer the Foundation Degree on behalf of other institutions but do not deliver the course on site) and a further four institutions that have never yet taught the degree on site and do not confer it (i.e. affiliated colleges that had not yet run the course by the time of the survey).

The table illustrates that among responding institutions, an autumn intake of students is more common than a spring intake. For example, 70% of these institutions recorded an autumn intake in the autumn of 2003 and a higher proportion (83%) reported an intake in autumn 2004. By contrast, only 12% of institutions recorded a spring intake in 2004 and this remained fairly constant in the spring of 2005 (13%).

**Table 2.6 Institutional student intake, by intake period**

	Sept/Oct 2003		Jan/Feb 2004		Sept/Oct 2004		Jan/Feb 2005	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Student intake recorded	70	(57)	12	(10)	83	(68)	13	(11)
No student intake	31	(25)	88	(72)	17	(14)	87	(71)
<i>Base</i>	82		82		82		82	

Base: All responding institutions where the course is taught on site (82).

Table 2.7 shows the reasons why institutions recorded no students during each intake period. Looking at the first row of the table, it is clear that among responding institutions, the actual number of institutions indicating that the course is not yet running is declining. This is to be expected given that the course is becoming more established over time and an increasing number of institutions are offering and delivering it on site.

The second row of the table again reflects the popularity of the autumn intake period, with many more institutions having no student intake in the spring than in the autumn. However, it is unclear from this data whether a lack of student intake is due to a lack of interest on the part of prospective students in starting the course in the spring or whether it is a function of institutions being less inclined to offer a spring course start as an option.

**Table 2.7 Reason for institutions recording no students, by intake period**

Reason	Sept/Oct 2003		Jan/Feb 2004		Sept/Oct 2004		Jan/Feb 2005	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Course not running yet	72	(18)	22	(16)	21	(3)	4	(3)
No student intake	28	(7)	78	(56)	79	(11)	96	(68)
<i>Base</i>	25		72		14		71	

Base: All responding institutions in each cohort that recorded no students starting the course during that period

## 2.5 When institutions first offered the degree

Almost three-quarters (74% or 60 institutions) of the responding institutions that deliver the Foundation Degree on site first offered the EYSEFD course between the autumn of 2003 and the spring of 2005 (53% in 2003-4 and 21% in 2004-5). The remaining 26% (21 institutions) offered the degree for the first time between the autumn of 2001 and the spring of 2003, that is during the pre-pilot or pilot phases.

**Table 2.8 When institutions first offered the EYSEFD**

Date EYSEFD first offered	Proportion of institutions
	%
Autumn 2001	6
Spring 2002	1
Autumn 2002	11
Spring 2003	7
Autumn 2003	49
Spring 2004	4
Autumn 2004	19
Spring 2005	2
<i>Base</i>	<i>81</i>

Base: All responding institutions where the course is delivered on site.

Note: This information was not provided by 1 institution which has been excluded from the base and the percentages in the table.

### 3 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT STUDENTS

This chapter describes the demographic characteristics of students who started the EYSEFD course at responding institutions between the autumn of 2003 and the spring of 2005. The demographic information is broken down by intake period in order to illuminate any patterns in take up of the course during the first two (post-pilot) years in which it has run.

As of spring 2005, two and a half thousand students had commenced the EYSEFD course at the responding institutions, most of them beginning in the autumn terms. There has been a slight decrease in enrolment numbers at the responding institutions over these two academic years, from 1,396 in the 2003-4 academic year to 1,194 in 2004-5.

**Table 3.1 Percentage of students by year of intake**

Start date	Percentage of students
	%
2003-4	54
2004-5	46
<i>Base</i>	2590

Base: All students starting the course at responding institutions

#### 3.1 Gender

Women constituted the vast majority of the students at responding institutions. There has been no change in the proportion of men joining the course during the two academic years covered by the survey.

**Table 3.2 Gender of students by year of intake**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Females	99	(1383)	99	(1180)
Males	1	(13)	1	(14)
<i>Base</i>	1396		1194	

Base: All students listed by responding institutions

Table 3.3 and Figure 3.1 show a fairly normal distribution of ages of students around the most common category of 36-40 years. Only 5% of the students were in the 18 to 21 age category as would be expected given the entrance requirements to the course of an NVQ level 3 qualification and two years of

practical work experience in an early years education or childcare setting. The distribution also tailed off at the upper end, with 6% of students aged 46-50 and 3% aged 51 or older.

Comparing the ages of students who began the course in 2003-4 and in 2004-5 (Table 3.3), those starting in 2004-5 were more likely to be in the younger age groups than those starting in 2003-4. For example, 17% of those starting the course in 2003-4 at responding institutions were aged 25 or younger compared to 22% of those starting in 2004-5. A similar difference appears at the older end of the age spectrum as well where 28% of those starting the course in 2003-4 were aged 41 or older compared to 23% of those starting in 2004-5. Both of these differences were statistically significant, possibly suggesting that the most experienced early years practitioners were among the first cohort of students while subsequent cohorts may increasingly attract practitioners who are younger and perhaps less senior in their workplaces.


**Table 3.3** Age of students by start date

	2003-4	2004-5	Total
	%	%	%
18-21	5	7	5
22-25	12	15	13
26-30	14	16	15
31-35	20	17	19
36-40	22	21	22
41-45	20	14	17
46-50	6	5	6
51+	2	4	3
<i>Base</i>	<i>1352</i>	<i>1161</i>	<i>2513</i>

Base: All students who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions which also provided data on student ages (2,513).



**Figure 3.1 Age distribution of EYSEFD students**



Base: All students that started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions which also provided data on student ages (2,513).

### 3.2 Ethnicity

The overwhelming majority of the students (91%) at responding institutions were White. Of the remaining 9%, 4% were Asian, 2% were Black and the remainder were of mixed or other ethnicity<sup>4</sup>.

**Table 3.4 Ethnicity of students by start date**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
White	93	(1295)	90	(1063)
Black	2	(31)	2	(29)
Asian	3	(41)	5	(61)
Mixed	1	(12)	1	(11)
Other	1	(17)	2	(18)
Declined	*	(1)	-	(0)
<b>Base</b>		<b>1397</b>		<b>1183</b>

Base: All students starting at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 and for whom ethnicity information was provided (2,580).

### 3.3 Disability and learning support needs

The survey also collected information about the number of students requiring learning support because of a physical illness or disability or learning difficulties (such as dyslexia) or both. Overall, the number of students

<sup>4</sup> Information about ethnicity was not provided for 11 students (0.4% of the total).

identified as having learning support needs among the responding institutions was small (3%).

Most commonly, students required learning support because of 'learning difficulties'. This was the case both among those who started the course in 2003-4 and in 2004-5. A higher proportion of students in 2004-5 were identified as having learning support needs related to a physical illness or disability than among those who started the course in 2003-4. However, as the base sizes are very small a doubling in the proportion of students identified as having a physical illness or disability between the two intake years still only equates to a small number of individuals (15 students in 2004-5 compared to 6 in 2003-4).

**Table 3.5**      **Number of students requiring learning support by intake year**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Physical illness/disability	19	(6)	38	(15)
Learning difficulties	75	(24)	60	(24)
Both	6	(2)	3	(1)
<i>Base</i>	32		40	

Base: All students listed by responding institutions with learning support needs (72).

## 4 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FORMER STUDENTS

The previous chapter described the characteristics of students starting the EYSEFD course at responding institutions. This chapter moves on to addresses the issue of retention and loss, by exploring the demographic characteristics of students who have left the course. Throughout this chapter, analysis focuses on all students who have left the course as the data does not allow for differentiation between those who left the course early and those who may have completed the course.

### 4.1 Student retention, achievement and loss

Table 4.1 shows the proportion of students who started the course in each intake period at responding institutions who were still on the course at the time of data collection (i.e. spring of 2005). As would be expected, the retention rate increases in accordance with the start date. Therefore those students who began the course most recently (in 2004-5) are most likely to still be on the course (89% of those who started in 2004-5 compared to 80% of those who started in 2003-4). A fifth of those who started the course in 2003-4 at responding institutions were no longer on the course by the spring of 2005.

**Table 4.1** Number of students leaving the course by intake period

	2003-4	2004-5	Total
	%	%	%
Students still on course	80	89	84
Students who have left course	20	11	16
<i>Base</i>	1396	1194	2590

Base: All students starting the course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions (2,590).

#### 4.1.1 Reasons for leaving the course


In order to understand the rate of retention, it is important to consider the different reasons why students have left the course. The survey asked for information about how many students who started during each intake period had left the course because: (1) they had completed it; (2) they had left without completing it (and were not expected to return); or (3) they had taken a temporary break from the course (and were expected to return). The answers to this question indicated that a total of 414<sup>5</sup> students had left the

---

<sup>5</sup> Responses to this question indicated that 414 students left the course for one of the reasons given. However, elsewhere in the survey, respondents were asked to indicate the total number of students who started the course during each intake period and the number from each intake period still on the course.

course by the spring of 2005, representing 16% of all those who had started the course at responding institutions between the autumn of 2003 and spring of 2005. Figure 4.1 shows the proportions of students who left the course for each of the reasons outlined.

**Figure 4.1** Reasons for leaving the course



Base: All students leaving the course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions (414).

Most commonly, students who had left the course were recorded as taking a temporary break from it and were expected to return (79% of all those who left the course; 80% of those who have left from the 2003-4 intake and 75% of those who have left from the 2004-5 intake, as shown in Table 4.2).

A total of eighteen students who started the course at responding institutions were described as leaving the course without completing it and they were not expected to return (6% of those who started with the 2003-4 intake and had subsequently left). This constitutes 4% of all those who left the course and 1% of the total student intake at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005.

Finally, those who had already completed the course accounted for 17% of all leavers at responding institutions. In terms of intake year, 13% of those who had left from the 2003-4 intake had completed the course and (somewhat unexpectedly) 25% of those who had left from the 2004-5 intake had completed the course. The latter suggests that some students are completing the course in a year or less. Overall, about 3% of those who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions had completed it by the spring of 2005.

---

The responses to this question indicate that 436 of those who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 had left the course by the spring of 2005 (or 17% of all those who started the course during this period). It is likely that the actual number of former students is 436 and that the 414 for whom information was given about reasons for leaving the course does not include those for whom the reason for leaving was not known or not recorded.

These early data look promising in terms of retention to the course, but it is unclear whether those who have taken a break from the course will in fact return to it. At one extreme, if none of these students returned to the course, then the rate of student loss from the course would be approximately 13% of the overall intake among the responding institutions. At the other extreme, if all of these students returned to the course, then the rate of loss could be very small indeed (less than 1%). It is likely that the actual rate of loss will lie somewhere in between these two figures, but this implies that the student retention rate will be fairly high.

**Table 4.2** Reasons for leaving the course, by intake year

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Left without completing course	6	(18)	-	(0)
Temporary break	80	(227)	75	(98)
Completed the course	13	(38)	25	(33)
<i>Base</i>	283		131	

Base: All students leaving the course between September 2003 and February 2005 at responding institutions (414).

## 4.2 Characteristics of former students

The following tables describe the demographic characteristics of the students who have left the course at responding institutions (including those who have completed the course). The data about course leavers are presented in two ways for each type of demographic characteristic. First, the total of leavers is broken down to show the proportions in each category (e.g. the proportion of leavers who are male and female). This approach informs us about the characteristics of leavers but does not take into account the profile of those starting the course. Therefore, the second approach is to show what proportion of students enrolling in each category left the course (e.g. what proportion of females and males starting the course have since left). This second approach provides a better indication of whether students with particular characteristics were more or less likely than others to leave the course.

### 4.2.1 Gender of former students

A far greater proportion of those leaving the course were females than males (Table 4.3) which simply reflects the high proportion of women among students enrolling. Table 4.4 suggests that men were more likely to leave the course than women since 30% of men enrolling left compared to 17%, but comparing men and women is not statistically meaningful since the numbers of men on the course are so small. Since the data were collected at the level of institution rather than student, it is not possible to determine the reasons why one-third of the men left the course. It may be the case that retention

problems are greater for male students, but student-level data is required to explore this type of issue.

**Table 4.3 Gender of former students**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Females	98	(295)	98	(133)
Males	2	(5)	2	(3)
<i>Base</i>	300		136	

Base: All leaving students at responding institutions who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 and had left it by Spring of 2005 (436).

**Table 4.4 Comparing course status by gender**

	Females		Males	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Still on course	83	(2135)	70	(19)
Left course	17	(428)	30	(8)
<i>Base</i>	2563		27	

Base: All students leaving responding institutions who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 and left it by Spring of 2005 (436).

#### **4.2.2 Age of former students**

Table 4.5 provides an overview of the age profile of students who have left the course at responding institutions. Caution needs to be exercised in comparing the figures since the numbers are small for some categories. The proportion of leavers is fairly evenly spread across the age groups. The smaller proportions at each end of the age distribution reflects the overall age profile of the student intake (as discussed in Chapter 3).

**Table 4.5 Age of former students**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
18-21	5	(13)	5	(7)
22-25	13	(33)	23	(32)
26-30	16	(39)	12	(17)
31-35	18	(46)	18	(25)
36-40	19	(48)	17	(24)
41-45	21	(52)	19	(26)
46-50	6	(14)	3	(4)
51+	2	(5)	3	(4)
<i>Base</i>	250		139	

Base: All students leaving responding institutions who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 and left it by Spring of 2005 and for whom age information was provided (389).

A different way to examine the age data is to determine what proportion of those enrolled in each category left the course (Table 4.6). The age group with the highest proportion of leavers was those in their early twenties and the group with the smallest proportion of leavers was those aged 51 and over. However, from the data it is not possible to determine for each age category whether people left because they finished the course, took a break or left without completing and therefore, conclusions cannot be drawn about retention rates by age.

**Table 4.6 Comparing course status by age group**

	18-21	22-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51+
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Still on course	86	80	85	85	87	82	88	88
Left course	15	20	15	15	13	18	13	12
<i>Base</i>	138	332	367	467	551	439	144	75

Base: All students starting the course at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 and for whom age information was provided (2,513).

Note: Percentages may total more than 100 due to rounding.

### 4.2.3 Ethnicity of former students

Of the course leavers, the highest proportion was of White ethnicity (Table 4.7) and the numbers for the other categories were too small to warrant individual comparison. As was the case with gender, this distribution reflects the ethnic profile of the overall student intake to the course. Table 4.8 shows that White and Black students were equally likely to leave the course. A

slightly higher proportion of students in the other ethnic categories left the course, but again caution needs to be exercised in interpreting small numbers.

**Table 4.7 Ethnicity of former students**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
White	91	(271)	87	(128)
Black	3	(8)	1	(2)
Asian	4	(11)	8	(12)
Mixed	1	(3)	1	(2)
Other	2	(6)	2	(3)
<i>Base</i>	299		147	

Base: All students leaving responding institutions who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 and left it by Spring of 2005 and for whom ethnicity information was provided (446).

**Table 4.8 Comparing course status by ethnicity**

	White		Black		Asian		Mixed		Other	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
Still on course	83	(1959)	83	(50)	77	(79)	78	(18)	74	(26)
Left course	17	(399)	17	(10)	23	(23)	22	(5)	26	(9)
<i>Base</i>	2358		60		102		23		35	

Base: All students at responding institutions who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 and for whom information on ethnicity was provided (2,578).

#### **4.2.4 Learning support needs of former students**

Finally, former students can be described with reference to their learning support needs. Of the 72 students who were reported to have such needs among all those who began the course at responding institutions, 14 % (or 10 students) left the course. This is a similar proportion to leavers among the student intake as a whole among the responding institutions. Students with a physical illness or disability and those with learning difficulties were similarly likely to be counted among the former students.



**Table 4.9 Breakdown of course leavers by learning support needs**

	<b>2003-4</b>	<b>2004-5</b>
	(n)	(n)
Physical illness/disability	2	1
Learning difficulties	5	2
Both	0	0
<i>Base</i>	7	3

Base: All leaving students with learning support needs listed by responding institutions

**Table 4.10 Comparison of course status by learning support needs**

	<b>Physical illness/disability</b>	<b>Learning difficulties</b>	<b>Both</b>
	(n)	(n)	(n)
Still on course	18	41	3
Left course	3	7	0
<i>Base</i>	21	48	3

Base: All leaving students with learning support needs listed by responding institutions


## 5 MODE OF ATTENDANCE AND RECEIPT OF APL / APEL CREDIT

This chapter focuses on the proportions of students taking up full and part-time study modes and compares the proportions taking up each mode at each institution type. This chapter also reports on the proportions of students who received accreditation of prior learning (APL) or accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) towards the EYSEFD.

### 5.1 Percentages of current full-time and part-time students

Among the responding institutions, the part-time mode of attendance for the EYSEFD course was more common than the full-time mode. This is illustrated by Figure 5.1 which shows that just over two-thirds (69%) of students were registered for the EYSEFD course on a part-time basis, while just under a third (31%) were registered as full-time students.

**Figure 5.1** Proportions of full-time and part-time students



Base: All students still on the course in spring of 2005 at responding institutions (2,179).

There is little variation in the proportions of full and part-time students between each of the two academic years (2003-4 and 2004-5) although there was a slight increase in the number of full-time students and a slight decrease in the number of part-time students in 2004-5 (Table 5.1).

**Table 5.1 Proportions of institutions with full-time students and part-time students, overall and by intake year**

<b>Mode of attendance</b>	<b>2003-4</b>	<b>2004-5</b>	<b>Total</b>
	%	%	%
Full-time	29	33	31
Part-time	71	66	68
<i>Base</i>	100	100	100

Base: All responding institutions

Having ascertained that there are far more part-time than full-time students overall, it is important to establish at what types of institutions students are enrolled. The majority of both full-time and part-time students were studying at colleges of further education. Only 16% of full-time students were studying at higher education institutions (including universities, university colleges and colleges of higher education), while there was a more even spread for the part-time students (Table 5.2). Just over half (54%) of part-time students were based at further education colleges and most of the remainder are based at one of the three types of higher education institutions (44%).

**Table 5.2 Proportions of full and part-time students, by type of institution**

<b>Type of institution</b>	<b>Full-time students</b>		<b>Part-time students</b>	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
University	7	(47)	25	(373)
University college	3	(18)	10	(153)
College of higher education	6	(39)	9	(139)
College of further education	85	(572)	54	(801)
Other	-	(0)	2	(23)
<i>Base</i>	676		1489	

Base: All students at responding institutions (2,165).

The proportions of students at each institution type were broadly similar for part-time students across the two academic years. However, there was a decrease in the proportion of full-time students at universities in the academic year 2004-5 and an increase in those attending university colleges (Table 5.3).

**Table 5.3 Proportions of full and part-time students, by type of institution and intake year**

Type of institution	2003-4		2004-5	
	Full-time students	Part-time students	Full-time students	Part-time students
	%	%	%	%
University	12	24	2	26
University college	0	8	5	13
College of higher education	5	11	6	8
College of further education	83	56	86	52
Other	0	1	0	2
<i>Base</i>	326	792	350	697

Base: All students who started the course at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 and who were still on the course in Spring 2005 (2,165).<sup>6</sup>


## 5.2 Receipt of APL and APEL credit

One of the key aspects of the design of the EYSEFD was that students could be accredited for prior learning as well as prior experiential learning. This was detailed in the Statement of Requirement, the DfES guidance issued to institutions for use when designing the EYSEFD. Through accreditation of prior learning (APL) students have the opportunity to gain credits for courses taken in the past whereas APEL credit may be awarded for prior practical experience of relevance to the course.

Overall a very small minority of students at responding institutions had received APL credit or APEL credit in the two academic years between 2003 and 2005. Together, only 4% of students received APL or APEL credit. Figure 5.2 illustrates that 3% of students had received APL credit, and only 1% had received APEL credit at responding institutions.

<sup>6</sup> Institutions were asked to record how many full-time students and how many part-time students were currently registered on the course during each intake period. Responses to this question indicate that, in total, 2165 students were registered on the course. However, elsewhere in the survey respondents were asked to indicate the total number of students who started the course during each intake period and the number from each intake period still on the course. Responses to this question indicate that, in total, 2179 students were currently on the course. It is likely that the actual number of current students is 2179 and that the 2165 for whom information was given about whether they were registered full or part-time does not include those for whom the mode of attendance was not known or not recorded.

**Figure 5.2**      **Receipt of APL / APEL**



Base: All students at responding institutions who started the course between September 2003 and February 2005 and were still on it in spring of 2005 (2,179).

### **5.2.1 Receipt of APL credit**

Of the three per cent (76 students) who received APL credit, almost three-quarters (73%) were based at a higher education institution (including universities, university colleges, and HE colleges) and the remaining 28% were based at further education colleges. Given that most students among the responding institutions were based at FE colleges, this would appear to indicate that a disproportionately high number of those receiving APL credit were based at higher education institutions. Conversely, it could also be said that a lower than expected proportion of those based at FE institutions received this type of accreditation. However, due to low base sizes, the differences in receipt of APL credit between students based at FE colleges and HE institutions are not statistically significant.

**Table 5.4 Proportions of students who received APL credit, by type of institution**

Type of institution	Students receiving APL credit	
	%	(n)
University	58	(44)
College of further education	28	(21)
University college	12	(9)
College of higher education	3	(2)
Other	-	(0)
<i>Base</i>	76	

Base: Students at responding institutions who received APL credit (76).

When considered as proportion of students starting the course in each academic year, there are only slight differences between the two academic years (Table 5.5). In both years, the largest group of students receiving APL credit were at universities. Among the responding institutions, fewer students received APL in 2004-5 than in 2003-4, but base sizes are too small for these differences to reach statistical significance.

**Table 5.5 Proportions of students who receive APL credit, by type of institution and intake year**

Type of institution	Receives APL 2003-4		Receives APL 2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
University	66	(31)	45	(13)
University college	9	(4)	17	(5)
College of higher education	2	(1)	3	(1)
College of further education	23	(11)	34	(10)
Other	0	(0)	0	(0)
<i>Base</i>	47		29	

Base: All students at responding institutions

### 5.2.2 Receipt of APEL credit

Only 24 students at responding institutions received APEL credit (which equates to 1%). Of these, most (18 students) were based at a college of further education, 5 students were based at a university and one student was based in another type of setting. Therefore, in contrast to APL credit, APEL was most likely to be received by students at further education colleges (albeit in very small numbers).

**Table 5.6** Numbers of students who receive APEL credit, by type of institution

Type of institution	Receives APEL credit
	(n)
College of further education	18
University	5
Other	1
University college	0
College of higher education	0
<i>Base</i>	24

Base: All students at responding institutions

The majority of students who started the course in both academic years and received APEL were based at a college of further education. However, as Table 5.7 shows, the numbers are too small for meaningful comparisons to be made between the two academic years.

**Table 5.7** Numbers of students who receive APEL credit, by type of institution and by cohort

Type of institution	Receives APEL – 2003-4	Receives APEL – 2004-5
	(n)	(n)
University	3	2
University college	0	0
College of higher education	0	0
College of further education	10	8
Other	0	1
<i>Base</i>	13	11

Base: All students at responding institutions

## 6 ROUTES THROUGH THE DEGREE

The EYSEFD course is designed to offer four routes through the Foundation Degree. These are:

- Senior practitioner in early years working with children from birth to three years
- Senior practitioner in early years working with Foundation Stage children
- Teaching assistant
- Playwork (ages four to eight)

Not all routes are offered at each institution. Furthermore, at some institutions, students had not yet been asked to choose a route as this happens at a later stage in the course. This chapter reports on the number of institutions offering each route, the amount of time the course has been offered at the institution and whether this has a bearing on the number of routes available, and the number of students on each of the routes.

### 6.1 The routes offered by the institutions

Among the 100 institutions indicating which routes through the degree they offered, the most common route was that of Senior Practitioner (Foundation Stage) (Table 6.1) and the least common route was Playwork (4 – 8). However, the variation was fairly narrow. For each of the four routes, at least three-quarters of the responding institutions offered the route. This stands in contrast to the findings of the first evaluation report when only 22% of institutions offered the playwork route, indicating how the EYSEFD has expanded as it has bedded down.

**Table 6.1 Percentage of institutions offering each route**

Percentage of institutions offering each route	
	route
	%
Senior practitioner (0 – 3)	80
Senior practitioner (foundation stage)	82
Teaching assistant	79
Playwork (4 – 8)	76
<i>Base</i>	<i>100</i>

Base: All responding institutions offering the Foundation Degree at their site (100).

Note: Percentages add up to more than 100 because institutions could offer more than one route.



There is some evidence to suggest that the amount of time that an institution has offered the Foundation Degree is related to the number of course routes offered (Table 6.2). All the institutions that started in the first two academic years offer all four course routes, whereas some of the institutions starting to offer the degree in the most recent two academic years offer a smaller number of courses.

**Table 6.2** Number of course routes offered by start date

	Number of routes offered				Total
	1	2	3	4	
	n	n	n	n	n
2001-2	0	0	0	6	6
2002-3	0	0	0	15	15
2003-4	1	3	3	36	43
2004-5	1	0	0	16	17
<i>Base</i>	2	3	3	73	81

Base: All responding institutions that reported both the course start date and the course routes offered

Data were collected on the different types of institutions offering the EYSEFD and Table 6.3 demonstrates the variation in course routes offered. Further education colleges (which were most numerous among the responding institutions), were most likely to offer each of the routes and lead higher education institutions least likely. (The base sizes for university colleges and higher education colleges are too small to be statistically meaningful.)

**Table 6.3** Percentage of institutions offering each route

	University		University college		HE college		FE college	
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)
SP (0 – 3)	50	(11)	83	(5)	100	(6)	89	(58)
SP (foundation stage)	55	(12)	83	(5)	83	(5)	91	(59)
Teaching assistant	50	(11)	67	(4)	67	(4)	91	(59)
Playwork (4 – 8)	50	(11)	50	(3)	67	(4)	89	(58)
<i>Base</i>	22		6		6		65	

Base: All responding institutions offering the Foundation Degree at their site

Note: Percentages add up to more than 100 because institutions could offer more than one route.

## 6.1 Students following each route

A little over half of the students in the responding institutions were following the route leading to senior practitioner at foundation stage. One-quarter were training to be teaching assistants and one-fifth to be a senior practitioner with children aged 0 – 3. Only 8 students were following the playwork route. This distribution is not related to the routes offered by the institutions; over three-quarters of them offered each of the course routes. As demonstrated in Table 6.5, there was little change in the distribution of students by course route between the two most recent intake years.

**Table 6.4** Percentage of students following each route

Percentage of students following each route		
	%	(n)
Senior practitioner (0 – 3)	19	(412)
Senior practitioner (foundation stage)	54	(1134)
Teaching assistant	26	(558)
Playwork (4 – 8)	*	(8)
<i>Base</i>		2112

Base: Students at the responding institutions

**Table 6.5** Percentage of students following each route by intake year

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Senior practitioner (0 – 3)	19	(211)	20	(201)
Senior practitioner (foundation stage)	54	(608)	53	(526)
Teaching assistant	27	(298)	26	(260)
Playwork (4 – 8)	*	(2)	1	(6)
<i>Base</i>		1119		993

Base: Students at the responding institutions

The majority of students were registered part-time reflecting the targeting of the course at experienced professionals who study alongside their paid job. For both the full-time and part-time students, a little over half were following the foundation stage course route. For the other routes, there were variations between the full and part-time students. The part-time students were twice as likely to be training as a senior practitioner with the youngest age group and the full-time students were more likely to be following the teaching assistant route.

Again, there was little change between the two academic years in the distribution of full-time and part-time students across the course routes (Tables 6.7 and 6.8).

**Table 6.6 Percentage of full-time and part-time students following each route**

	Full-time		Part-time	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Senior practitioner (0 – 3)	11	(70)	23	(342)
Senior practitioner (foundation stage)	55	(338)	53	(796)
Teaching assistant	33	(205)	24	(353)
Playwork (4 – 8)	*	(3)	*	(5)
<i>Base</i>	616		1496	

Base: Students on the course in the responding institutions

**Table 6.7 Percentage of full-time students following each route by intake year**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Senior practitioner (0 – 3)	10	(30)	13	(40)
Senior practitioner (foundation stage)	56	(167)	54	(171)
Teaching assistant	34	(103)	32	(102)
Playwork (4 – 8)	-	(0)	1	(3)
<i>Base</i>	300		316	

Base: Full-time students at the responding institutions

**Table 6.8 Percentage of part-time students following each route by intake year**

	2003-4		2004-5	
	%	(n)	%	(n)
Senior practitioner (0 – 3)	22	(181)	24	(161)
Senior practitioner (foundation stage)	54	(441)	52	(355)
Teaching assistant	24	(195)	23	(158)
Playwork (4 – 8)	*	(2)	*	(3)
<i>Base</i>	819		677	

Base: Part-time students at the responding institutions

## 7 FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS

Students on the EYSEFD course may receive financial assistance to help defray the costs of their studies from various sources. These include national student support measures, support provided by the institution attended and support provided by the DfES specifically to students on the EYSEFD course. Two types of support were specifically explored in the administrative database survey. These were the provision of fee waivers and financial help with the costs of childcare.

### 7.1 Receipt of fee waivers

Since the first post-pilot student intake to the EYSEFD course in September 2003, two key changes have taken place in funding arrangements for students on the course. Firstly, as part of an initial attempt to attract students to the course, the DfES offered full fee waivers to part-time students starting the course in 2003-4. Initially, the fee waivers were only available to part-time students as it was thought that full-time students would be able to access funding via national student support measures. However, by the spring of 2004, access to the DfES fee waivers was widened to include full-time students as well. The new arrangements were in response to perceived inequities between full and part-time students, as highlighted in the first report in the EYSEFD evaluation program<sup>7</sup>.

Secondly, although the fee waivers from the DfES were still available in the 2004-5 academic year for those who started the course the year before, this source of assistance was not available to those starting the course from September 2004 onwards. Although full or partial fee waivers are still available from individual institutions and from national student support measures, it was expected that the proportion of students from the 2004-5 intake receiving a fee waiver would be lower than that receiving such assistance from the 2003-4 intake for the reasons outlined.

The findings here show that this is the case. Among the responding institutions at Wave 2, a total of 1,259 students were reported to have received a fee waiver for the 2004-5 academic year. This represents 58% of current students at the responding institutions.

Table 7.1 shows the proportions of students receiving fee waivers according to their mode of study (i.e. full-time or part-time) and the year in which they joined the course. As the table highlights, the number of students receiving fee waivers was substantially lower for students who joined the course in

---

<sup>7</sup> Mowlam, A., Murphy, J., and Arthur, S., Evaluating the Introduction of the Early Years Foundation Degree, London: NatCen (2004).

2004-5. Indeed, taken as a proportion of those still on the course from each intake year, 82% of students in the 2003-4 intake period received a fee waiver last year, compared to 32% of students from the 2004-5 intake period.

Although a much smaller proportion of students in the 2004-5 intake group among responding institutions received a fee waiver, full-time students were almost twice as likely to have done so among the 2004-5 intake group than among the 2003-4 group (37% of those receiving fee waivers in the 2004-5 intake were full-time students compared to 19% of those receiving fee waivers in the 2003-4 intake)<sup>8</sup>. That notwithstanding, across both intake groups, the majority of fee waivers were received by part-time students.

**Table 7.1 Receipt of fee waivers in 2004-5, by mode of study and year of intake**

	2003-4	2004-5	Total
	%	%	%
Full-time	19	37	23
Part-time	81	63	76
<i>Base</i>	917	342	1,259

Base: All students receiving fee waivers at responding institutions in the 2004-5 academic year (1,259).

Table 7.2 provides a more detailed picture, focusing on mode of study and sources of fee waivers for students who began the course in each year.

**Table 7.2 Sources of fee waivers, by mode of study and intake year**

	2003-4		2004-5		Total
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	
	%	%	%	%	%
DfES	65	90	-	-	62
Another source	35	10	100	100	38
<i>Base</i>	171	746	127	215	1,259

Base: All students receiving fee waivers at responding institutions in the 2004-5 academic year (1,259).

Among those starting the course in 2003-4 at the responding institutions, the principal source of fee waivers has been the DfES. Indeed, the DfES provided fee waivers for two-thirds (65%) of full-time students and nine-tenths (90%) of part-time students who received such assistance.

<sup>8</sup> This increase cannot be accounted for by the overall proportions of full-time and part-time students as there was little change across the two years, as shown in Table 5.1.

The picture for the 2004-5 intake year clearly looks very different and reflects the withdrawal of the DfES from the provision of fee waivers for this cohort. Among the third (32%) of students from this intake group who received fee waivers last year, they were provided entirely by non-DfES sources. Details of these other sources of fee waivers were not obtained but would be expected to include assistance from the institution attended and national student support measures, as noted earlier.

In terms of the extent to which other sources of funding have been accessed by students in the 2004-5 intake group, 32% of those still on the course from the 2004-5 intake received a fee waiver from a non-DfES source last year. The equivalent figure for the 2003-4 intake year is 12%.

## 7.2 Receipt of help with childcare costs

Another aspect of the DfES special funding arrangements available to students who started the course before September 2004 was help in meeting the costs of childcare. As with fee waivers, this form of assistance continued to be available last year for students who began the course in 2003-4, but was not available to those starting the course from September 2004 onwards.

Overall, only a small proportion of students at responding institutions have received this form of assistance. Indeed, only 94 students who are still on the course were reported to have received such funding, representing approximately 4% of students at responding institutions<sup>9</sup>.

Although the number of students accessing this type of assistance among the 2003-4 intake group is not very high (91 students), only 3 students were reported to have received such help among the 2004-5 intake group. Put another way, 8% of current students from the 2003-4 intake group received help with childcare costs last year, compared to less than 1% of those in the 2004-5 intake group.

**Table 7.3** Receipt of help with childcare costs, by mode of study and intake year

	2003-4	2004-5	Total
	(n)	(n)	(n)
Full-time	23	1	24
Part-time	68	2	70
<i>Base</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>94</i>

Base: All students receiving help with childcare costs at responding institutions in the 2004-5 academic year (94).

Note: Due to small base sizes, figures shown are whole numbers rather than percentages.

<sup>9</sup> Ninety-four students received funding from among the 2,179 students still on the course- this is equivalent to 4%.

The reasons for the observed curtailment of this form of support among the 2004-5 intake group become clear when the sources of help with childcare costs are taken into account. Table 7.4 shows that the DfES is the primary source of this type of support among students at responding institutions. Those who are not eligible to receive DfES assistance generally have not accessed alternative forms of assistance with childcare costs.

**Table 7.4 Sources of assistance with childcare costs, by mode of study and intake year**

	2003-4		2004-5		Total
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	
DfES	(n) 23	(n) 66	(n) -	(n) -	(n) 89
Another source	-	2	1	2	5
<i>Base</i>	23	68	1	2	94


Base: All students receiving help with childcare costs at responding institutions in the 2004-5 academic year (94).

Note: Due to small base sizes, figures shown are whole numbers rather than percentages.

### 7.3 Financial support by type of institution

The following figures demonstrate that the receipt of the kinds of financial support described above is not evenly distributed across types of institution. It appears that students attending higher education institutions were more likely to receive financial help than those at further education institutions, particularly in relation to fee waivers (Figure 7.1).

**Figure 7.1 Percentages of students receiving fee waivers and help with childcare costs by type of institution**




Base: All students in responding institutions receiving fee waivers (1259) and help with childcare costs (94).

When these figures are broken down by cohort, further patterns emerge. A far greater proportion of students received fee waivers in 2003-4 than in 2004-5 and it was in the first year that higher education-based students received more help than those in further education institutions (Figure 7.2). When help with childcare costs is broken down by cohort, it becomes clear that such help was almost negligible in the second year. Only 3 students actually received help with childcare costs in 2004-5 and these were all studying in further education institutions<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Since the numbers are so small, a bar chart is not included.



**Figure 7.2 Percentages of students receiving fee waivers by type of institution and academic year**



Base: All students in responding institutions receiving fee waivers (1259).

## **8 CONCLUSIONS**

As noted in the introduction, the key emphasis in gathering the aggregate statistical information reported here is to monitor student intake to the EYSEFD course, ongoing participation in the course, and the numbers of students who ultimately achieve the Foundation Degree. This second report focuses on student retention and achievement, as well as providing an overview of the characteristics of the responding institutions and students based there. The extent to which these findings can be generalised to the wider population of institutions offering the course and students taking may however be somewhat limited. While approximately 71% of recognised institutions responded to the Wave 2 questionnaire, only an estimated 39% of the overall student intake during the first two post-pilot years of the course are included in the data.

Key findings highlighted throughout the report are summarised in this chapter and provide an overview of the progress of the course and students at responding institutions.

### **8.1 Institutional settings**

Similar to the findings at Wave 1, two-thirds of responding institutions at Wave 2 are FE colleges (65%) while most of the remaining third are higher education institutions (34%).

Also consistent with the Wave 1 profile of institutions is that 14% of institutions at Wave 2 are lead HEIs that confer the Foundation Degree but are not directly involved in course delivery on site.

In terms of where students are based, just under two-thirds (63%) of all students who started the course at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 were based at FE colleges. Most of the remaining 37% were based at HE institutions, with 1% based at some other type of institution. Again, this was a very similar picture to that obtained at Wave 1.

Among the responding institutions, approximately three-quarters (74%) first offered the course for the first time between September 2003 and February 2005, that is in the first two years since the course was widely introduced. The remaining 26% of the responding institutions first offered the course during the pre-pilot or pilot phases (from 2001 until the spring of 2003). This is different to the profile of institutions at Wave 1 in which the pilot and pre-pilot institutions constituted a much larger proportion of responding institutions (41%). The implication of this is that the Wave 2 responding institutions include more of those that have fairly recently started the course and fewer institutions with longer term experience of delivering it.

Across each intake period in the two academic years of 2003-4 and 2004-5, many more students started the course in the autumn rather than the spring intake periods.

Just over half of students (54%) based at responding institutions started the course in 2003-4 while the remaining 46% began the course in 2004-5.

## **8.2 Demographic characteristics of all students**

Similar to the findings at Wave 1, students at responding institutions at Wave 2 were almost exclusively female (99%).

Overall, the age profile of students who have started the EYSEFD course at responding institutions was normally distributed around the most common age group of 36-40 years. This was similar to the findings at Wave 1.

Interestingly, when comparing the students who started the course in the 2003-4 academic year to those who started in the following year, those starting more recently were more likely to be in the youngest age group and less likely to be in the oldest age group than those who started the course in 2003-4. These differences were statistically significant and suggest that the most experienced practitioners may have been among the first intake to the course, while subsequent intakes may attract younger and less senior members of the early years education and childcare workforce.

In terms of ethnicity, over nine-tenths of students at responding institutions were White (91%). The remaining 9% of students were of Asian (4%), Black (3%), mixed or other ethnicity (2%). This is a similar picture to that obtained at Wave 1, though there was a lower proportion of White students (85%), a higher proportion of Black students (6%) and a higher proportion of students whose ethnic origin was not known (8%).

Overall, the number of students identified as having learning support needs at Wave 2 responding institutions was small (3%). This was a similar proportion to that reported at Wave 1. Also similar to Wave 1 is that students most commonly required learning support because of 'learning difficulties' such as dyslexia.

## **8.3 Demographic characteristics of former students**

This is the first year that the administrative data has been able to provide information about students who have left the course, including both those who have completed it and those who have left for other reasons. However, it is not possible to create a profile of early leavers and a profile of completers as the data was provided in terms of those who started the course and those still on it. Disaggregation according to different types of course leavers was generally not sought from course co-ordinators, though they were asked for the numbers of students overall who left the course for various reasons.

Overall, approximately 16% of students who started the course at responding institutions between September 2003 and February 2005 had left the course by the time of the survey. Of these, nearly four-fifths (79%) were described as taking a 'temporary break' from the course and were expected to return to it at some future point. Most of the remaining fifth (17%) had completed the course already and only a small proportion (4%) were described as having left the course without finishing it (and are not expected to return to it).

These findings look promising in terms of student retention to the course, but the actual rate of student retention will depend upon the behaviour of those who have left the course temporarily with the intention of returning to it. If these students are included among the early leavers (i.e. non-completers), then the rate of loss from the course would be approximately 13% of the overall intake of responding institutions. If these students actually do return to the course, then the retention rate would be higher, but these findings do indicate an element of 'churning' whereby a sizeable minority of students need to leave the course fairly soon after starting it - either temporarily or permanently. This may indicate that students are experiencing some difficulty in accommodating work, family and study schedules, as highlighted for certain groups in the Wave 2 student survey report.

There are indications that the course is not attracting men (only 1% of students at responding institutions were male) and those that do join the course appear to be more likely to leave it than women. However, due to the small base size of men on the course, it is not possible to provide very robust findings on this issue. Also, it is unclear whether those men who have left the course at responding institutions (approximately 30% of the men starting it during the reference period) actually left without completing it. If men are simply more likely to complete the course sooner than women, this presumably would not be considered problematic. By contrast, if men are difficult to attract to the course and once there, tend to leave it without completing, then this would require more careful consideration. Unfortunately, it is not possible to provide further clarification of these issues from the data available.

There were no notable findings in relation to the ages of former students except that those in their early twenties were most likely to leave the course and those aged 51 and older were least likely to do so.

The ethnicity of those who left the course at Wave 2 is similar to the ethnic profile of all those starting the course during the reference period at responding institutions. The base sizes of students from minority ethnic groups are too small to enable meaningful sub-group analysis.

Those with learning support needs did not appear to be more likely than students without learning support needs to leave the course, but again, the base size of former students with learning support needs was very small.

#### **8.4 Mode of attendance and receipt of APL/ APEL**

At responding institutions, just over two-thirds (69%) of students were registered part-time, while just under a third (31%) were registered full-time. These proportions are quite different to the Wave 1 findings in which 82% of students were registered part-time and 18% full-time. This suggests that it may be becoming more common for students to take-up the course on a full-time basis. It is unclear whether this is because more students want to do the course on a full-time basis, or whether more institutions are making this option available to students (that previously were not) or both.

Among responding institutions, part-time students are fairly evenly distributed between FE colleges and HEIs (54% based at FE colleges and 44% at HEIs). By contrast, most full-time students (85%) are based at FE colleges, with a much smaller proportion (16%) based at HEIs. This may suggest that among responding institutions, FE colleges offer a full-time course mode more often than do HEIs.

Overall, only a small minority (4%) of students at responding institutions received either APL or APEL credit towards the course in the two academic years covered by the Wave 2 survey. Of this small group who had received one of these types of accreditation, APL was more commonly received. Students who received APL credit were largely based at HEIs (73%) of those who received this form of accreditation. Given that most students are based at FE colleges, it is surprising that most of those receiving APL credit are based at HEIs rather than FE colleges. However, due to low base sizes, differences between students based at HEIs and FE colleges in relation to APL credit do not reach the level of statistical significance. This is, however, an issue which has been raised in other reports in the EYSEFD evaluation series.

#### **8.5 Routes through the Foundation Degree**

Responding institutions at Wave 2 were offering a broader range of routes through the EYSEFD course than was the case among the Wave 1 institutions. Particularly notable was the increased number of institutions offering the Playwork option (75% of institutions offered this at Wave 2 compared to only 22% of the Wave 1 institutions). The most frequently offered course route was the general Senior Practitioner (Foundation Stage) route, offered by 82% of the Wave 2 institutions, but all routes were offered by at least three-quarters of the Wave 2 institutions.

Interestingly, despite the fact that many more responding institutions at Wave 2 were offering the Playwork option, take-up of this option was extremely small with less than 1% of students following this route. Playwork may be an option which appeals particularly to males and the findings in relation to low male intake generally and more difficulty in retaining males may be linked to the low take-up of the playwork option. This is something which would need

to be pursued in another form, however, as these data do not allow exploration of this issue.

## **8.6 Financial assistance for students**

Institutions provided information about two particular forms of financial support for students – fee waivers and help with childcare costs. While the students on this course who are in receipt of help with paying for childcare have always been a small minority (4%), there has been a notable decline in the proportion of students receiving fee waivers from 82% of students in 2003-4 to 32% in 2004-5. This decline can largely be accounted for by the changing role of DfES as a provider of financial support.

Similar to Wave 1, there was a marked difference in the likelihood of receiving fee waivers according to the type of institution attended. In the academic year 2003-4, for example, 99% of Foundation degree students at higher education institutions received fee waivers compared to 73% of students at FE colleges. However, this pattern changed in the following academic year, when the proportion of students receiving fee waivers dropped to approximately one-third. The differences between higher and further education institutions in 2004-5 was less marked, with 30% of students at the former receiving fee waivers compared to 34% of students at FE institutions.

## APPENDIX A ADVANCE LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

### *Advance Letter*

Our ref: P2450/3 digit institution id  
2005

4 April

Dear

### **Re: Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree Evaluation**

I am writing to ask for your help with the evaluation of the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree. The evaluation is being carried out by the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), an independent research organisation, on behalf of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). An important part of the evaluation involves the collection of administrative statistical information on the characteristics of students taking the course. In order to gather this information, NatCen are conducting an annual postal survey of all DfES recognised institutions offering the Early Years Foundation Degree and their affiliated colleges.

Please find enclosed your copy of this year's survey. We would be very grateful if you would either fill in the questionnaire yourself or forward it to another colleague at your institution that will be able to complete it. Given that the QAA is currently reviewing Foundation Degrees, we expect that most of the information requested will be readily available through the Registrar at your institution (see '*Handbook for the review of Foundation Degrees in England*', QAA 2004-05).

A questionnaire will be sent to each recognised institution and to all of their affiliated colleges. To avoid double-counting students, **each institution should fill in the form only for those students based at their site for teaching purposes** (see the address label on the top left corner of the form for the specified institution). If the course is not taught at your site, you still need to complete Section E of the form and return it to us. This is also explained on the front page of the questionnaire.

Please return your completed questionnaire to NatCen by **Friday, 15<sup>th</sup> April 2005** in the reply-paid envelope provided. This survey is very important in ensuring that we have an accurate profile of students taking the EYSEFD course and your co-operation is greatly appreciated. For more information or further assistance, please see the 'Frequently Asked Questions' on the back of this letter or contact Carol Bell at NatCen on 01277 200600 or send her an e-mail message at [eyfd@natcen.ac.uk](mailto:eyfd@natcen.ac.uk).

Yours sincerely,



Cheow-Lay Wee (Team Leader, Children's Workforce Unit)  
Department for Education and Skills

department for  
**education and skills**  
creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence

 **NatCen**  
National Centre for Social Research

Institutional ID: Affix label here

Our reference: P2450

## Evaluation of the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree Statistical Profile of Students and Institutions 2005

Please fill in this form using black ink. If you have any queries or require further information or assistance, please contact Carol Bell at NatCen on 01277 200600 or send an e-mail message to the research team at [eyfd@natcen.ac.uk](mailto:eyfd@natcen.ac.uk).

**To find out which part(s) of the questionnaire you should answer, please tick the box which best describes your institution. Please tick one only.**

- a) This institution confers the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree (EYSEFD) **AND** the course is taught entirely at this site.  → **Please start at Q1, Section A.**
- b) This institution confers the EYSEFD **BUT** the course is taught entirely at one or more other institutions.  → **Please start at Q19, Section E. Skip Sections A-D.**
- c) This institution confers the EYSEFD **AND** also teaches some students on site. Please fill in the questionnaire only for those students based at the institution specified on the label in the top left corner of this form).  → **Please start at Q1, Section A. Provide information *only* for students based at this site.**
- d) This institution does not confer the EYSEFD **BUT** the course is taught on this site (see the institution specified on the label in the top left corner of this form).  → **Please fill in the box below, then go to Question 1, Section A.**
- e) This institution does not confer the EYSEFD **AND** the course has never been taught on this site yet.  → **Please fill in the box below, then go to Q18, Section D. Skip Sections A-C.**

### **Through which institution is the Foundation Degree conferred?**

*If you ticked box d or e above, please print the full name of the institution that confers the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree on behalf of your institution.*



<b>Section A: Total Number of Students</b>
--

**1. How many students started the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree at your institution in each of the following periods?**

Please fill in the total number of students who registered for the Foundation Degree for the first time and started their studies at your institution in each of the following periods. **Only include those students who are based at your institution for teaching purposes.**

a) September- October 2003	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	→	<b>If you entered 0 for any of these, please go to Q2. Otherwise, skip to Q3.</b>
b) January- February 2004	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	→	
c) September- October 2004	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	→	
d) January- February 2005	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	→	

**2. Please say why there were no students at your institution during the period(s) indicated. Please tick one box only in each row.**

	The course was not running yet	No student intake during this period
a) September- October 2003	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) January- February 2004	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) September- October 2004	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) January- February 2005	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3. How many of the total number of students who started the course during each time period are still on the course?**

Please fill in a number for each row. Please enter 0 if there was no student intake during the relevant period.

Of the students who started the course in...	Total number still on the course now
a) September- October 2003	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
b) January- February 2004	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
c) September- October 2004	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
d) January- February 2005	<input style="width: 80%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

4. Of those who started the course during each time period, how many left the course for each of the following reasons?

Of the students who started the course in...	Completed the course	Finished without completing (and are not expected to return)	Taken a temporary break from their studies (and are expected to return)
a) Sept. - Oct. 2003			
b) Jan. - Feb. 2004			
c) Sept. - Oct. 2004			
d) Jan. - Feb. 2005			

5. How many students of each gender started the course during each time period and how many are still on the course to date?

	Started the course		Still on the course	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
a) September- October 2003				
b) January- February 2004				
c) September- October 2004				
d) January- February 2005				

6. How many students of each ethnic group started the course during each time period?

	White	Black (Caribbean, African, Other Black)	Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Other Asian)	Mixed race	Other
a) Sept. - Oct. 2003					
b) Jan. - Feb. 2004					
c) Sept. - Oct. 2004					
d) Jan. - Feb. 2005					

**7. How many students from each ethnic group are still on the course?**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b> (Caribbean, African, Other Black)	<b>Asian</b> (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Other Asian)	<b>Mixed ethnicity</b>	<b>Other</b>
e) Sept. - Oct. 2003					
f) Jan. - Feb. 2004					
g) Sept. - Oct. 2004					
h) Jan. - Feb. 2005					

**8. How many students in each age group started the course during each time period?**

<b>Students who started in...</b>	<b>18- 21 years</b>	<b>22-25 years</b>	<b>26-30 years</b>	<b>31-35 years</b>	<b>36-40 years</b>	<b>41-45 years</b>	<b>46-50 years</b>	<b>51+ years</b>
Sept- Oct 2003								
Jan- Feb 2004								
Sept- Oct 2004								
Jan- Feb 2005								

**9. How many students in each age group are still on the course now?**

<b>Students who started in...</b>	<b>18- 21 years</b>	<b>22-25 years</b>	<b>26-30 years</b>	<b>31-35 years</b>	<b>36-40 years</b>	<b>41-45 years</b>	<b>46-50 years</b>	<b>51+ years</b>
Sept- Oct 2003								
Jan- Feb 2004								
Sept- Oct 2004								
Jan- Feb 2005								

**10. How many students with learning support needs started the course during each time period?**

Please indicate the number requiring learning support for each different reason in the appropriate columns.

Students who started in...	<i>Learning support was required because of...</i>		
	<b>...physical illness or disability (only)</b>	<b>...learning difficulties (only)</b>	<b>...both of these reasons</b>
Sept.-Oct 2003			
Jan-Feb 2004			
Sept-Oct 2004			
Jan-Feb 2005			

**11. And how many students with learning support needs are still on the course now?**

Students who started in...	<i>Learning support was required because of...</i>		
	<b>...physical illness or disability (only)</b>	<b>...learning difficulties (only)</b>	<b>...both of these reasons</b>
Sept.-Oct 2003			
Jan-Feb 2004			
Sept-Oct 2004			
Jan-Feb 2005			

Section B: Status of Students
-------------------------------

**12. What routes through the Foundation Degree are students at your institution taking?** Please fill in referring only to students who are still on the course.

a) How many students who started the course during each time period are currently specialising in early years working with *children from 0 to 3*?

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students	Number of part-time students	Option not offered (tick if appropriate)
Sept.- Oct. 2003			
Jan.- Feb. 2004			
Sept.- Oct. 2004			
Jan.- Feb. 2005			

b) And how many are currently specialising in early years working with *Foundation Stage children*?

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students	Number of part-time students	Option not offered (tick if appropriate)
Sept.- Oct. 2003			
Jan.- Feb. 2004			
Sept.- Oct. 2004			
Jan.- Feb. 2005			

c) How many are currently following the *teaching assistant* route?

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students	Number of part-time students	Option not offered (tick if appropriate)
Sept.- Oct. 2003			
Jan.- Feb. 2004			
Sept.- Oct. 2004			
Jan.- Feb. 2005			

d) And how many are following the *playwork route*?

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students	Number of part-time students	Option not offered (tick if appropriate)
Sept.- Oct. 2003			
Jan.- Feb. 2004			
Sept.- Oct. 2004			
Jan.- Feb. 2005			

13. How many students who started the course during each time period are currently registered as full-time or part-time students?

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students	Number of part-time students
Sept-Oct. 2003		
Jan- Feb 2004		
Sept- Oct 2004		
Jan- Feb 2005		

14. How many students who started the course during each time period received accreditation of prior learning (APL) or accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) towards the Foundation Degree?

Students who started in...	Number awarded APL credit	Number awarded APEL credit
Sept-Oct. 2003		
Jan-Feb. 2004		
Sept-Oct. 2004		
Jan- Feb. 2005		

<b>Section C: Financial and Other Assistance for Students</b>
---

**15. How many students who started the course in each time period have received or are expected to receive a fee waiver for the 2004/5 academic year?** The fee waiver may be either from the DfES special funding arrangements (for students who started before September 2004) or from another source (for all students). Please record all students who received a fee waiver this academic year, indicating the source of the funding.

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students receiving a fee waiver		Number of part-time students receiving a fee waiver...	
	...from the DfES	...from another source	...from the DfES	...from another source
Sept.- Oct. 2003				
Jan.- Feb. 2004				
Sept.- Oct. 2004	Do not use.		Do not use.	
Jan.- Feb. 2005	Do not use.		Do not use.	

**16. How many students who started the course in each time period have received (or are expected to receive) assistance with childcare costs?** The assistance with childcare costs may be either from the DfES special funding arrangements (for students who started before September 2004) or from another source (for all students). Please record all students who received assistance with childcare costs this academic year, indicating the source of the funding.

Students who started in...	Number of full-time students receiving assistance with childcare costs...		Number of part-time students receiving assistance with childcare costs...	
	...from the DfES	...from another source	...from the DfES	...from another source
Sept.- Oct. 2003				
Jan.- Feb. 2004				
Sept.- Oct. 2004	Do not use.		Do not use.	
Jan.- Feb. 2005	Do not use.		Do not use.	

Section D: Information about Course Delivery
--

**17. In which month and year did your institution first offer the Foundation Degree course? (i.e., when was the first intake of students?)**

Please use two digits for the month and four digits for the year.

**Month**

--	--

**Year**

--	--	--	--

**18. In which month or months does your institution plan to have a regular intake of students to the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree course? Please tick each month that applies.**

Sept. Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. March April May June July Aug.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



## Section E: Institutional and Respondent Details

19. Please tick the box which best describes your institution.

Please tick one only.

- A university
- A university college
- A college of higher education
- A college of further education

20. Please print your name and title (Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss/Dr.):

21. What is your job title?

22. What is your e-mail address?

23. What is your work telephone number? (please include your extension)

A similar questionnaire will be sent to you in about a year to help us monitor changes over time. In the event that we cannot contact you directly, please give the name and contact details of someone else at your institution who is also involved with the Early Years Sector-Endorsed Foundation Degree.

24. Name and title (Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss/Dr.) of alternative contact:

25. E-mail address of alternative contact:

**26. Work telephone number of alternative contact (including extension):**

**Thank you for your help.**

**Please return this form to NatCen in the reply-paid envelope provided by  
15<sup>th</sup> April 2005.**

Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications  
P.O. Box 5050  
Sherwood Park  
Annesley  
Nottingham  
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60  
Fax: 0845 60 333 60  
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60  
Online: [www.dfespublications.gov.uk](http://www.dfespublications.gov.uk)

© National Centre for Social Research 2006

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN 978 1 84478 836 1  
Ref No: RR804  
[www.dfes.go.uk/research](http://www.dfes.go.uk/research)