ystadegau ar gyfer cymru statistics for wales

STATISTICAL ARTICLE
ERTHYGL YSTADEGOL

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

Provider-led learner voice survey for post-16 learning, 2010: pilot results[1]

This statistical article provides key points about the background, methodology and summary results from the 2010 pilot provider-led learner voice survey for post-16 learning (excluding Higher Education).

This article is an interim report, presenting high level results only. The survey contractors, GfK-NOP, will produce a more detailed technical report on the survey incorporating feedback from the providers who took part, to be published on the Welsh Assembly Government web pages during summer 2010. A report examining the findings of the survey (based on the combined data from providers) will be released by the end of 2010.

It is envisaged that evaluation of the pilot will inform an option appraisal for the mainstreaming of the provider-led approach. Any Wales-wide learner voice survey will start in 2011 at the earliest, this data being used to establish benchmarks which can be used in the future. It should be emphasised that the 2010 summary figures presented in this article and in subsequent publications are based on pilot data and will not represent the baseline going forward.

Contents	Page

1 Notes on the use of statistical articles can be found at the end of this document.

1   Introduction

The Quality and Effectiveness Framework for post-16 learning in Wales (excluding Higher Education) places an emphasis on responsiveness to learners' needs and the active inclusion of learners in this process. The Welsh Assembly Government has led and commissioned work to develop an effective approach towards engagement with learners and providers, so that the learner voice can be heard and considered when looking at the quality of provision.

Prior to this, national surveys of learners have used a 'top down' approach conducting interviews with participants sampled using learner records. However, the aim of the study described in this article is to develop a 'provider facilitated' approach whereby providers themselves administer a core set of survey questions to learners, enabling providers to use the results to benchmark and compare, as well as to inform their own internal processes.

In 2009, an initial pilot survey was conducted with seven Further Education Institutions (FEIs), the results of which fed into the development of a larger-scale pilot survey in 2010. All FEIs, twelve[2] Work-Based Learning (WBL) providers and one Welsh for Adults centre[3] were invited to take part in this second pilot of the provider-led approach, which involved a combination of paper and online data collection against a core set of questions. The resulting pilot provider-led learner voice survey, conducted between January and March 2010, is described in more detail in the remainder of this article.

2   Methodology

2.1   Scope of the survey

Institutions were asked to include all active learners within the survey period (Monday 25 January to Monday 8 March). They were asked to exclude any learners who finished their course/programme before this period or any that started afterwards. Learners would of course be at various stages in their course – providers were told that the survey was designed to be a snapshot of all learners in this period.

The following other exclusions also applied:

- Learners on higher education courses;

- Learners on Adult and Community Learning (ACL) courses which are not government-funded or who are in provision contracted from local authorities to the institution;

- Learners who are registered at another provider but who come into the institution for part of their learning.

There were three broad learner groups in FEIs: full-time Further Education (FE) learners, part-time FE learners and work-based learners. Part-time learners were defined as those with less than 450 guided contact hours on a learning programme in a year. In other WBL providers all learners were work-based learners by default. Table 6 in Appendix A shows the providers who took part and the learner groups involved. Due to other research

---

[2] Out of a total of around 70 other WBL providers, these 12 were chosen to provide a good spread in terms of size and type of learning provision.
[3] Included under FEIs for the purpose of reporting results in this article.

commitments which directly clashed with the survey, one institution engaged in the survey process for their work-based learners but not their full-time and part-time learners.

2.2   Questionnaire design

A set of core questions was developed by the Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills at the Welsh Assembly Government, Estyn (Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales), and with help from the survey contractors GfK NOP. This process drew on the knowledge gleaned from earlier surveys on key issues in relation to learner satisfaction/dissatisfaction and the outcome of the initial pilot survey (2009) and cognitive testing of questions conducted with learners in autumn 2009. The questions ask about various aspects of the learner's experience with their learning provider, and are shown in Table 7 at Appendix A.

Efforts were made to make the core questions as comprehensible as possible but it has been accepted that learners with the more acute learning difficulties and disabilities would need a different version of the questions, which were not part of the pilot but will need to be investigated further. Providers were given guidance that teachers/tutors could help learners with learning difficulties and disabilities when needed (a question at the end of the survey would identify if this had happened).

As previously mentioned, the survey included both FE and work-based learners in FEIs, and work-based learners at other WBL providers. There was a set of core questions for learners in FE, and another set for work-based learners in FEIs and other WBL providers. The questions are more or less the same, except for slight differences in wording in order to tailor questions towards particular types of learner (for instance WBL will specify 'training' in the question text and FE will specify 'course').

2.3   Sampling

Providers were asked to aim for the following:

- Further Education Institutions:
    - A census of all full-time FE learners;
    - A sample of part-time FE learners (sample 1 in 4);
    - A census of Work-Based Learners.
- Other Work-Based Learning providers:
    - A census of Work-Based Learners.

All providers were instructed to aim for a 40 per cent response rate across all groups. The 40 per cent was selected to allow for reliable data at the analysis stage and, although ambitious (reflecting the first stage of the pilot), it seemed achievable based on other survey work carried out by providers themselves.

Due to the volume of part-time learners a sample was necessary. Ideally providers would stratify all individuals by a range of variables and then go down the list of individuals and include every 1 in 4 in the survey. However since this survey was to be done in class/session/tutorials, providers were asked to operate the sampling procedure in a similar way, but selecting classes rather than individuals. Guidance was given as follows:

1. List all part-time classes within the institution that meet eligibility criteria

2. Stratify or sort these classes on the following variables:

   a. Sector/Subject area;

   b. Academic vs vocational or other;

   c. Class size.

3. Once the list of classes has been stratified or sorted, count down the list and take every fourth class as being part of the sample for part-time learners.

2.4   Administration of the survey

Providers were offered the option for a stand alone approach (where the survey contractors would deliver survey materials and process all returns), and a more integrated approach whereby the core questions could be incorporated into other questionnaires the provider was administering in the same fieldwork period. At the time of fieldwork in 2010 most providers were happy to proceed with the survey as a stand alone approach. Some institutions however were conducting other learner surveys in the same fieldwork period, and so the pilot survey trialled strategies to minimise survey fatigue and burden. Details are given below:

- In one institution the learner voice survey coincided with a census survey in the institution which had already been set up and resourced. In this instance the provider-led learner voice core questions were integrated into the institution's own learner survey. The survey contractors discussed question comparability with the institution and outlined guidelines relating to timing of the survey and order effect of the questions. The contractors also needed data in a specific format by a particular deadline for incorporation into the larger dataset. Top line results were then sent back to the provider to check these matched their own dataset. In 2010 this process worked very well. Full details relating to integration will be made available in the full technical report.

- The 2010 pilot also tested an exercise of linking two separate questionnaires in an online environment via hyperlinks. In this case, for the online questionnaire, the learner would log into the learner voice for Wales pilot survey and answer the core questions before going into the separate survey via a hyperlink. The switch between the two questionnaires was seamless and did not require the respondent coming out of one URL and into another. Although the single exercise to complete two surveys was of course longer on average, this strategy means that the learner is not contacted twice in a short space of time and asked to complete two surveys. Four colleges took up this option in the pilot. Full details relating to this exercise including the practical issues will be discussed in the full technical report.

2.4.1   Paper versus online completion

Through consultation with providers and learners the survey contractors identified a need to offer both online and paper completion of the survey. Although online questionnaire completion is preferable due to the lower associated costs, in certain circumstances paper questionnaires are required to ensure good response rates, for example, in cases of:

- Learners with little access to ICT at college/provision (specifically those in part-time learning in community settings);

- Learners with learning difficulties and disabilities, or those with low basic skills levels;

- Work-based learners in employer settings.

Providers were given responsibility to target the best mode for their learners in order to maximise response rates, and to inform the survey contractors of how many paper questionnaires they would need in order to meet the selection criteria. Just over 17,000 paper questionnaires were printed. Seven providers distributed the survey to all learners on paper, four conducted the survey completely online and the remainder used a mixed mode approach for learner groups.

Two online links per provider were sent out (one for FE full and part-time and one for WBL for each institution). Providers were asked to test their links to ensure that they got past firewalls. The online survey had an option for respondents to increase text size and change the background colour. These mechanisms were designed to help learners with specific disabilities or learning difficulties.

The survey contractors were responsible for printing and processing all paper forms. Paper questionnaires (pre-printed with provider codes) with blank envelopes were sent to providers before fieldwork. Providers were instructed to ask learners to complete the questionnaire and enclose it in an envelope. The survey co-ordinator in each provider was responsible for organising paper questionnaires to be sent back to a central point, where they were later picked up by courier and delivered to GfK NOP's offices. They were then scanned and merged with online data for each provider.

The online survey was live from midday Wednesday 27th January to midnight Wednesday 10th March. In terms of the paper self completion option, the start day was Monday 25th January and returns were parcelled up and ready to be collected by a courier on Monday 8th March.

The technical report will examine any differences in the online and paper generated data that may be due to survey mode rather than profile of learners/learning.

2.4.2 Administering the survey to learners

Guidelines given to providers outlined the following methods for the survey:

- In class/session/tutorial completion, where the teachers/tutors/trainers are all given instructions and asked to oversee the completion of questionnaires, one group at a time:
  - This method will ensure the best response rate. It is also one of the best methods in terms of control.
  - However, given that the project requests a majority of completions to be online, it does require a substantial amount of time in ICT suites to be booked for this purpose.
  - Paper self completion is obviously more flexible for this method if learners are in satellite centres or premises away from the main institution.

- Intranet: some providers will have the link on the intranet and ask the learner to visit the provider intranet page to complete the survey.

- Email: some providers will have email addresses for learners and could send links to the online questionnaire out to these individuals:

  o An email to an individual containing an embedded link to the survey usually yields a better response rate than just directing learners to a link on the intranet.

  o However, the individual email method only works well if the learner checks and uses the specific email account regularly.

Early indications are that most learners were asked to complete the survey in class/sessions but this will be verified in the technical report.

Learners were asked to provide either learner or course identifiers, which would help providers to target/chase non or low returns, and allow derivation of more meaningful survey results. The contractors worked with providers to develop code frames for their chosen approach and to validate the data entered.

Providers had the responsibility of chasing non response and motivating teachers/trainers and heads of faculty to get a good response rate. Where providers were using paper self completion, the survey contractors relied on providers to monitor their own progress. Where providers were using the online links to the survey sent out by the survey contractors, providers were able to see their response rates online via a secure online portal. They were given a detailed breakdown of response by all personal demographics within each of the three learner types and also the volume of response by faculty. The survey contractors called providers half way through fieldwork and monitored online response as work progressed. Any providers who seemed to show a low online response were called to check that there were no technical issues.

3   Response to the survey

At the end of the full scale pilot in 2010 just over 30,000 completed questionnaires were returned. The summary response tables below show response by mode (online and paper) compared to provider populations (as a percentage). A full break down by provider and learner type will be provided in the detailed technical report.

Table 1: Response online and on paper

	Further Education Institutions (a)				WBL providers (b)	Overall total
	Total	Full-time	Part-time	WBL		
Online	20,788	17,238	1,725	1,410	1,000	21,788
Paper	7,934	2,425	3,872	1,411	2,295	10,229
Not known (c)	1,389	739	556	64	.	1,389
Total	30,111	20,402	6,153	2,885	3,295	33,406

(a) Not all FE learners specified whether they were full-time or part-time learners so are not included in those breakdowns. However, they have been included in the figures for total responses from FEIs.

(b) Pilot sample of 12 "other" WBL providers

(c) For one institution (which integrated the learner voice survey into their own and processed the data) we do not have information about how many learners completed the survey by mode of response.

The highest volume of online responses from any one provider was 2,837 interviews. Three FEIs concentrated solely on the use of paper questionnaires (they facilitated part-

time learning in community settings or at external providers) and one provider only used the online survey. The remainder used mixed mode, usually concentrating on online methods for full-time learners and introducing more paper facilitation for part-time and WBL groups. Within WBL providers, four providers administered the survey solely using paper and three providers administered the survey completely online. The remainder used a mixed mode approach.

A review of response rates per provider was undertaken once the questionnaires had been processed. Before fieldwork began, each provider reported their learner populations by learner type. Table 2 shows the survey responses against the population profiles, along with response rates.

Table 2: Population profiles and response rates

	Further Education Institutions (a)				WBL providers (b)	Overall total
	Total	Full-time	Part-time	WBL		
Survey response	30,111	20,402	6,153	2,885	3,295	33,406
Population profile	59,051	38,582	12,055	8,414	4,737	63,788
Response rate	51%	53%	51%	34%	70%	52%

(a) Not all FE learners specified whether they were full-time or part-time learners so are not included in those breakdowns. However, they have been included in the figures for total responses from FEIs.

(b) Pilot sample of 12 "other" WBL providers.

An overall response rate of 52 per cent was achieved which well exceeded the minimum response rate set at 40 per cent. The 12 WBL providers did particularly well achieving a response rate of 70 per cent. FEIs achieved good response rates with their full and part-time learners (a 53 per cent response rate with their full-time learners and a 51 per cent response rate with their part-time learners). However, with their WBL learners they only achieved a 34 per cent response rate. Many FEIs anticipated that response rates within this group might be low as many WBL students learn on-the-job and do not have regular contact with the college.

Response rates differed by individual providers but on the whole providers did well with 19 of the 25 FEIs and 11 of the 12 other WBL providers achieving a response rate of 40 per cent or more. Feedback about methods used and how well they worked will be collated and this information will be used as guidance for providers in future waves.

Consideration was given to the confidence intervals in the final dataset in the design stages of the pilot. To obtain a given level of accuracy from survey data, one needs responses from a far higher proportion of learners in small providers than in large ones. This is why a 40 per cent response rate was offered to providers as a minimum requirement if possible.

In practice, with the response rates gained from the 2010 pilot, the data indicates that for:

- Full-time FE: 20 of the 22 providers achieved confidence limits within +/- 5 per cent, the remainder were outside this.

- Part-time FE: 9 of 23 providers achieved confidence limits within +/- 5 per cent, the remainder were outside this.

- WBL in FEIs: 7 of 19 providers achieved confidence limits within +/- 5 per cent, the remainder were outside this.

- WBL in other providers: 8 of 12 providers achieved confidence limits within +/- 5 per cent, the remainder were outside this.

4   Quality checks and weighting

4.1   Data processing and editing

The protocols for data processing and editing are summarised below. There was no routing involved in the questionnaire, and no coding required for the datasets.

Online questionnaire data:

- By default the online data needed little processing.

- At the point of online completion, learner or course identifiers typed in were checked against the codeframes from providers. Each time a respondent typed in an inappropriate code they were asked to try again or consult with their teacher/tutor.

Paper questionnaire data:

- Provider codes were checked to be correct and consistent within packages of responses received.

- Total numbers of responses received within packages were checked with the provider.

- All data was scanned, except for learner or course identifiers which were manually inputted. The identifiers were checked against provider codeframes, and any that didn't match the codeframe or duplicate learner IDs were resolved by reviewing the codeframe or contacting the provider. A 10 per cent sample of the data entered was validated by a quality monitoring team.

- If a respondent gave a multiple response to a single code question, a data processing executive would edit the data. The protocol used was that if the respondent had answered 'don't know' (dk) or 'not applicable' along with another answer code, the dk/not applicable answer would be removed. However, if they had given two answers such as 'very and quite good' both answers were removed as we could not make an assumption about which one was correct.

Merged online and paper data:

- If the same unique learner identifier appeared in both a paper and online response, the online response was prioritised.

- Respondents who provided a non-response or 'don't know' to each item were reviewed and removed from the dataset.

- The online data was tabulated and checked before the scanned data from paper returns was added. Then all down-break and cross-break information was rechecked to ensure that the data was decoded and merged in the right way.

4.2　Item non response

A detailed item non-response table is provided in Table 8 of Appendix A. Item non-response rates ranged from 1 per cent to 4 per cent, with questions achieving a 96 per cent response rate or more. Built in checks ensured that non-response rates on online surveys were generally lower than those on paper based surveys. Online non-response rates ranged from 0 per cent to 1 per cent compared with paper non-response rates which ranged from 0 per cent to 4 per cent.

4.3　Dataset checks

The following checks will be conducted on the dataset, and the results will be described fully in the detailed technical report:

- **Flatlining** is when the respondent appears to have answered every question in the same way, methodically ticking the first or middle or last box given. The dataset will be analysed for patterns of response suggesting flatlining. The survey contractors reported nothing concerning in the data for the 2009 pilot, and the same conclusion is expected to apply to the full-scale 2010 pilot.

- The dataset will be analysed to check for any **mode effects** between paper and online responses. The technical report will examine any differences in the online and paper generated data that may be due to survey mode rather than the profile of learners/learning, and contain any recommendations for further research into calibration of results in future learner voice surveys.

4.4　Weighting the data

The aim of the weighting is to ensure that the final survey estimates are reflective of the total population of Welsh learners. In learner groups where there is a census of learners, weighting will be applied to adjust for any differential non-response in particular demographic groups. Where a sample of learners has been selected, weighting will be applied to ensure that the demographic profile of the weighted sample matches that of the population, so that the weighted total is equal to the population of learners.

Weighting targets will be created using provider level information on the profile of the age, gender, disability status, ethnic group and education level of the population. The resulting weights will ensure that any provider level analysis would be representative of the demographic profile of learners at that provider and, when aggregated across all providers, the total level analysis will be representative of all learners.

5　　Summary results

It is envisaged that 2011 will be the first year that the provider-led learner voice survey is mandatory and the official benchmarks for providers will be established at that time. It should be emphasised that summary figures for 2010 presented in this article and subsequent publications are based on pilot data and will not represent the baseline going forward.

Summary results are presented in six tables, listed below. Earlier sections of this article describe the approach in detail, and in interpreting results users should bear in mind key limitations in terms of:

- scope - not a full sample of WBL providers, one FEI did not take part for FE learners;

- sampling – part-time FE learners were sampled 1 in 4;

- mode – allowing paper and online responses may lead to some mode effects;

- response – overall response rates for cohorts in each table are detailed below, and overall item non-response shown in table 8 of Appendix A.

Key points

- Overall, more than 4 in every 5 of each type of learner rated their learning provider as being 'good' or 'very good'.

- Work-based learners tended to report higher levels of satisfaction than FE learners.

- Nearly two-thirds of work-based learners at other training providers rated the training provider as 'very good' overall, compared to half of work-based learners at FEIs.

- Within FE learners, those studying part-time tended to report higher levels of satisfaction than those studying full-time.

- Each type of learner had broadly similar variations in satisfaction across the different aspects covered in the core questions.

- Within the questions about information/support, learners gave a slightly lower rating for the question about advice on what to do after the training, with relatively fewer 'very good' responses. Also nearly 1 in 4 full-time learners at FEIs rated this as either 'partly good/partly bad' or worse.

- Within the questions about teachers/trainers, the lowest scoring aspect tended to be 'making sure learners behave well and do not disturb your work', with a lower rate of 'very good' responses.

- Within 'Responsiveness', learners scored consistently highly on 'respect shown to you by staff', but less well on asking about and listening to learners' views.

- Within 'Environment', providers scored least highly on helping learners to have a healthy lifestyle, with fewer 'very good responses' and more 'partly good/partly bad' or worse responses. Also, relatively few learners scored Welsh language support as 'very good'. However, in both cases a relatively high proportion of learners answered 'don't know' or 'does not apply'.

List of tables	Response rate
Table 3a) Full time learners in Further Education Institutions	53 per cent
Table 3b) Part time learners in Further Education Institutions	51 per cent
Table 3c) Work-Based Learning in Further Education Institutions	34 per cent
Table 3d) All learners in Further Education Institutions	51 per cent
Table 4) Work-Based Learning in other providers: combined data for 12 providers	70 per cent
Table 5) Work-Based Learning in all providers: combined data for Further Education Institutions and 12 other providers	47 per cent

Table 3a) Full-time learners in Further Education Institutions (a)(b)

Unweighted base = 20,402	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know/does not apply to me	Not stated	Mean score (c)	Standard Deviation
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Number	Number
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	37	46	15	1	1	1	-	4.16	0.80
Information/support									
Information given when you were choosing your training	31	54	11	1	1	2	-	4.15	0.72
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	25	48	18	4	1	5	-	3.96	0.85
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	44	44	9	1	1	1	-	4.32	0.72
The support you get on the course/training?	40	45	13	2	1	1	-	4.22	0.78
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors									
Explaining the work you have to do	38	42	18	1	1	-	-	4.16	0.80
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	36	44	17	2	1	-	-	4.12	0.82
Talking about learning aims or goals	30	49	16	2	1	1	-	4.08	0.79
Giving you feedback on how to improve	38	45	14	2	1	-	-	4.18	0.79
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	27	46	21	4	2	1	-	3.93	0.90
Responsiveness									
Respect shown to you by staff	37	45	14	2	1	1	-	4.15	0.83
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	21	48	20	5	2	5	-	3.85	0.88
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	18	44	20	6	2	9	-	3.75	0.94
Environment									
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	35	47	9	1	1	8	-	4.23	0.74
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	15	33	21	8	5	18	-	3.55	1.08
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	30	45	11	2	1	11	-	4.14	0.79
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	32	42	12	3	1	10	-	4.12	0.85
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	20	31	11	4	2	31	-	3.92	0.99

(a) Scale used on questionnaire: Very good, Good, Partly good/partly bad, Bad, Very bad, Don't know, This does not apply to me.
(b) Question text in the table is abbreviated/shortened. Please see Table 7 of Appendix A for full versions.
(c) Meanscores are derived from Very good (5) Good (4) Partly good/partly bad (3) Bad (2) Very bad (1).

Table 3b) Part-time learners in Further Education Institutions (a)(b)

Unweighted base = 6,153	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know/does not apply to me	Not stated	Mean score (c)	Standard Deviation
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Number	Number
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	46	40	9	1	1	2	1	4.35	0.74
Information/support									
Information given when you were choosing your training	37	43	7	1	1	10	-	4.27	0.74
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	23	38	8	3	1	25	1	4.08	0.83
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	53	35	5	1	-	5	1	4.47	0.70
The support you get on the course/training?	55	35	8	1	-	1	-	4.45	0.71
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors									
Explaining the work you have to do	63	27	8	1	-	-	-	4.53	0.69
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	61	30	7	1	-	-	1	4.51	0.70
Talking about learning aims or goals	48	38	8	1	-	4	1	4.39	0.72
Giving you feedback on how to improve	54	34	8	1	-	2	1	4.44	0.72
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	50	33	7	1	1	7	1	4.42	0.74
Responsiveness									
Respect shown to you by staff	58	31	4	1	-	5	1	4.54	0.67
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	28	38	9	3	1	21	2	4.16	0.81
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	25	32	9	3	1	28	2	4.11	0.86
Environment									
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	41	35	3	-	-	19	1	4.47	0.61
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	16	23	7	2	1	49	2	4.03	0.94
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	26	30	4	1	-	37	2	4.31	0.71
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	29	29	4	1	-	34	2	4.33	0.74
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	21	20	4	2	1	50	2	4.22	0.91

(a) Scale used on questionnaire: Very good, Good, Partly good/partly bad, Bad, Very bad, Don't know, This does not apply to me.
(b) Question text in the table is abbreviated/shortened. Please see Table 7 of Appendix A for full versions.
(c) Meanscores are derived from Very good (5) Good (4) Partly good/partly bad (3) Bad (2) Very bad (1).

Table 3c) Work-based learners in Further Education Institutions (a)(b)

Unweighted base = 2,885	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know/does not apply to me	Not stated	Mean score (c)	Standard Deviation
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Number	Number
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	50	40	7	1	1	1	1	4.39	0.74
Information/support									
Information given when you were choosing your training	43	47	5	-	1	5	-	4.37	0.66
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	35	47	6	1	1	8	-	4.27	0.71
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	51	40	6	1	1	1	-	4.41	0.73
The support you get on the course/training?	53	37	8	1	-	1	-	4.43	0.70
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors									
Explaining the work you have to do	52	38	8	1	1	-	-	4.41	0.72
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	52	38	8	1	1	-	1	4.41	0.74
Talking about learning aims or goals	44	42	10	1	1	1	1	4.31	0.75
Giving you feedback on how to improve	48	39	10	2	1	1	1	4.33	0.77
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	40	39	9	2	1	8	1	4.28	0.78
Responsiveness									
Respect shown to you by staff	55	35	5	1	1	2	-	4.48	0.69
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	36	44	8	2	1	8	1	4.24	0.78
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	37	41	9	2	1	10	1	4.23	0.81
Environment									
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	44	39	4	-	-	12	1	4.43	0.64
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	23	30	8	1	2	34	1	4.11	0.90
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	34	37	5	1	-	21	1	4.32	0.71
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	38	36	7	1	1	16	1	4.32	0.78
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	26	30	6	2	2	33	1	4.17	0.90

(a) Scale used on questionnaire: Very good, Good, Partly good/partly bad, Bad, Very bad, Don't know, This does not apply to me.
(b) Question text in the table is abbreviated/shortened. Please see Table 7 of Appendix A for full versions.
(c) Meanscores are derived from Very good (5) Good (4) Partly good/partly bad (3) Bad (2) Very bad (1).

Table 3d) All learners in Further Education Institutions (a)(b)

Unweighted base = 30,111	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know/does not apply to me	Not stated	Mean score (c)	Standard Deviation
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Number	Number
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	42	42	11	1	1	2	1	4.27	0.78
Information/support									
Information given when you were choosing your training	34	48	9	1	1	7	-	4.22	0.74
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	25	43	12	3	1	15	1	4.03	0.84
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	49	39	7	1	1	3	-	4.39	0.72
The support you get on the course/training?	48	39	10	1	1	1	-	4.35	0.75
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors									
Explaining the work you have to do	52	34	12	1	-	-	-	4.36	0.77
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	49	36	11	1	1	1	-	4.34	0.78
Talking about learning aims or goals	40	43	11	2	-	3	1	4.25	0.77
Giving you feedback on how to improve	47	39	11	2	1	1	1	4.32	0.77
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	40	39	13	2	1	4	1	4.19	0.86
Responsiveness									
Respect shown to you by staff	49	37	8	1	1	3	1	4.36	0.78
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	25	42	13	3	1	14	1	4.02	0.86
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	23	38	14	4	2	19	1	3.95	0.92
Environment									
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	39	40	6	1	-	14	1	4.35	0.69
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	16	28	13	4	3	35	1	3.78	1.05
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	28	36	7	1	1	25	1	4.22	0.77
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	31	35	8	2	1	23	1	4.22	0.81
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	21	25	7	3	2	40	1	4.06	0.96

(a) Scale used on questionnaire: Very good, Good, Partly good/partly bad, Bad, Very bad, Don't know, This does not apply to me.
(b) Question text in the table is abbreviated/shortened. Please see Table 7 of Appendix A for full versions.
(c) Meanscores are derived from Very good (5) Good (4) Partly good/partly bad (3) Bad (2) Very bad (1).

14

Table 4) Work-based learners in other providers: combined data for 12 providers (a)(b)

Unweighted base = 3,295	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know/does not apply to me	Not stated	Mean score (c)	Standard Deviation
	Percentage	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Number*	*Number*
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	63	31	4	-	-	1	1	4.58	0.61
Information/support									
Information given when you were choosing your training	55	39	3	-	-	2	-	4.52	0.61
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	44	43	5	1	-	6	-	4.38	0.67
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	60	34	5	-	-	1	-	4.54	0.62
The support you get on the course/training?	60	33	4	-	-	1	-	4.56	0.61
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors									
Explaining the work you have to do	64	31	3	-	-	-	-	4.59	0.61
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	61	33	4	1	-	1	1	4.56	0.63
Talking about learning aims or goals	55	37	5	1	-	1	1	4.50	0.62
Giving you feedback on how to improve	58	35	4	1	-	1	1	4.53	0.63
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	46	32	7	1	1	12	1	4.39	0.76
Responsiveness									
Respect shown to you by staff	64	30	3	1	-	2	-	4.61	0.61
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	45	41	6	1	-	7	1	4.40	0.66
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	44	40	5	1	-	9	1	4.40	0.67
Environment									
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	56	30	2	-	-	10	-	4.60	0.56
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	28	31	7	1	1	32	1	4.24	0.80
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	46	36	4	-	-	13	1	4.48	0.62
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	50	31	4	1	-	14	1	4.51	0.65
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	28	22	4	2	1	41	1	4.29	0.90

(a) Scale used on questionnaire: Very good, Good, Partly good/partly bad, Bad, Very bad, Don't know, This does not apply to me.
(b) Question text in the table is abbreviated/shortened. Please see Table 7 of Appendix A for full versions.
(c) Meanscores are derived from Very good (5) Good (4) Partly good/partly bad (3) Bad (2) Very bad (1).

Table 5) Work-based learners in all providers: combined data for Further Education Institutions and 12 other providers

Unweighted base = 6,180	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know/does not apply to me	Not stated	Mean score (c)	Standard Deviation
	Percentage	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Percentage*	*Number*	*Number*
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	56	36	6	1	1	1	1	4.47	0.69
Information/support									
Information given when you were choosing your training	48	43	4	-	-	4	-	4.43	0.64
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	39	46	6	1	-	7	-	4.32	0.70
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	55	37	5	1	1	1	-	4.47	0.69
The support you get on the course/training?	56	36	6	1	-	1	-	4.48	0.67
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors									
Explaining the work you have to do	57	35	6	1	-	-	-	4.49	0.68
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	56	36	6	1	1	-	1	4.47	0.70
Talking about learning aims or goals	49	40	8	1	-	1	1	4.39	0.71
Giving you feedback on how to improve	52	37	8	1	-	1	1	4.42	0.72
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	42	36	8	1	1	10	1	4.32	0.78
Responsiveness									
Respect shown to you by staff	59	33	4	1	-	2	-	4.54	0.66
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	40	43	7	1	1	8	1	4.31	0.73
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	40	40	7	2	1	9	1	4.30	0.76
Environment									
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	49	35	4	-	-	11	1	4.50	0.61
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	25	30	7	1	1	33	1	4.17	0.86
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	39	37	5	1	-	18	1	4.39	0.68
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	43	34	5	1	1	15	1	4.40	0.73
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	27	27	5	2	2	37	1	4.22	0.90

(a) Scale used on questionnaire: Very good, Good, Partly good/partly bad, Bad, Very bad, Don't know, This does not apply to me.
(b) Question text in the table is abbreviated/shortened. Please see Table 7 of Appendix A for full versions.
(c) Meanscores are derived from Very good (5) Good (4) Partly good/partly bad (3) Bad (2) Very bad (1).

APPENDIX A

Table 6: Scope of research (learner type) by provider (2010)

FE Institution (a)	FE Full-time	FE part-time	WBL in FEI	WBL in other providers
Barry College (b)	Yes	Yes	.	.
Bridgend College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Ceredigion	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Glan Hafren (b)	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Gwent (c)	No	No	Yes	.
Coleg Harlech/WEA (North Wales)	.	Yes	.	.
Coleg Llandrillo	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Llysfasi	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Meirion-Dwyfor	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Menai (b)	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Morgannwg	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Powys (d)	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Coleg Sir Gâr	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Deeside College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Gorseinon College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Merthyr Tydfil College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Neath Port Talbot College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
Pembrokeshire College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
St David's 6th Form College	Yes	Yes	.	.
Swansea College (b)	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
WEA South	Yes	Yes	.	.
Yale College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.
YMCA Community College	.	Yes	.	.
Ystrad Mynach College	Yes	Yes	Yes	.

Other Training Provider	FE Full-time	FE part-time	WBL in FEI	WBL in other providers
A4E Wales Ltd	.	.	.	Yes
ACT Ltd	.	.	.	Yes
Arfon Dwyfor Training Ltd	.	.	.	Yes
Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council	.	.	.	Yes
Cambrian Training Company	.	.	.	Yes
Hyfforddiant Gwynedd Training	.	.	.	Yes
League Football Education	.	.	.	Yes
Llanelli Rural Council	.	.	.	Yes
Nacro Cymru	.	.	.	Yes
Professional and Technical Development	.	.	.	Yes
Sporttrain Wales Ltd	.	.	.	Yes
TSW Training Ltd	.	.	.	Yes

Welsh for Adults Centre	FE Full-time	FE part-time	WBL in FEI	WBL in other providers
University of Wales, Bangor	.	Yes	.	.

(a) If a provider achieved a very low response rate for a specific learner type they were removed from the relevant segment of data. The analysis aimed to limit any largescale distortion in the weighting process and therefore the results.

(b) Four FEIs were administering their QDP survey at the same time of year and integrated the Learner Voice survey into this. Please see section 2 for details of how the surveys were integrated.

(c) Due to other research commitments which directly coincided with the survey Gwent engaged in the Learner Voice survey for their work based learners but not their full-time and part-time learners.

(d) Coleg Powys was the only college to integrate the survey questions into their own learner survey which was administered at the same time of year. Coleg Powys worked closely with GfK NOP to ensure that order effect was minimised. Please see section 2 for details of how the surveys were integrated.

Table 7: Core questions (2010)

The next few questions are about advice and information you have been given by your college.

1   How good was the <u>information</u> you were given by <u>this college</u> when you were <u>choosing</u> your <u>course(s)</u>, was it...? PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX ONLY

Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	This does not apply to me
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2   How good was the advice you have been given by <u>this college</u> about what you can do after your course(s) has <u>finished</u>, was it...? PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX ONLY

Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	This does not apply to me
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3   How good was the help staff gave you in the <u>first few weeks</u> at this college, was it...?
PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX ONLY

Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	This does not apply to me
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The next question is about the support the <u>college</u> gives you.

4   How good is the support you get on your course(s)? Please think about support from your teachers and tutors and other support offered by your college.
PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX ONLY

Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Serial No.

The next questions are about your teachers and tutors. Please think about all the teachers and tutors you have contact with.

5   How good are your <u>teachers</u> and <u>tutors</u> at each of the following…
     PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX FOR EACH STATEMENT

	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	This does not apply to me
Explaining the work you have to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Talking about your learning aims or goals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Giving you feedback on how to improve	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The next questions are about what you think about your <u>college</u>. If any of the questions do not apply to you then please say so.

6   How good is your <u>college</u> at each of the following…
     PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX FOR EACH STATEMENT

	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	This does not apply to me
The respect shown to you by staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Asking you to give your views about the college	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Listening to your views about the college and telling you what has happened as a result	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7   And how good is your <u>college</u> at each of the following, … If any of the questions do not apply to you then please say so.
     PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX FOR EACH STATEMENT

	Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know	This does not apply to me
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Helping you to understand and respect people from different backgrounds	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Making sure that you have someone to talk to when you are worried	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Offering you the chance to learn through Welsh or with Welsh-language support if you want to	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

These questions are about how you are feeling about your course(s) and your college overall.

8   **Overall how good do you think this <u>college</u> is?** PLEASE TICK <u>ONE</u> BOX ONLY

Very good	Good	Partly good/ partly bad	Bad	Very bad	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Table 8: Item non response per question for online and paper responses

Item non-response:	Online		Paper		Not known (a)		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Base: Unweighted	21,788	.	10,229	.	1,389	.	33,406	.
Information/support								
Information given when you were choosing your training	5	-	47	-	20	1	72	-
Advice about what you can do after your course/training	5	-	94	1	28	2	127	-
The help staff gave you in the first few weeks?	4	-	53	1	28	2	85	-
The support you get on the course/training?	2	-	54	1	27	2	83	-
Teachers/trainers/assessors/tutors								
Explaining the work you have to do	1	-	52	1	24	2	77	-
Listening to you and what you need to help you learn	2	-	95	1	28	2	125	-
Talking about learning aims or goals	4	-	119	1	34	2	157	-
Giving you feedback on how to improve	4	-	120	1	30	2	154	-
Making sure that learners behave well and do not disturb your work	4	-	136	1	32	2	172	1
Responsiveness								
Respect shown to you by staff	4	-	79	1	46	3	129	-
Asking you to give your views about college/provider	3	-	161	2	52	4	216	1
Listening to your views/telling you what has happened as a result	5	-	186	2	53	4	244	1
Environment								
Making sure that you feel safe whilst on your course/training	8	-	121	1	32	2	161	-
Helping you to have a healthy lifestyle	8	-	216	2	37	3	261	1
Helping you understand/respect people from different backgrounds	4	-	195	2	38	3	237	1
Making sure you have someone to talk to when you are worried	5	-	167	2	36	3	208	1
Offering you Welsh/Welsh language support	7	-	238	2	42	3	287	1
Overall								
Overall, how good do you think this college/training provider is?	5	-	129	1	26	2	160	-
Personal demographics								
Age	3	-	0	0	10	1	13	-
Gender	2	-	0	0	12	1	14	-
Learners with learning difficulties or disabilities	4	-	66	1	17	1	87	-
Ethnicity	0	0	0	0	19	1	19	-
Full-time/part-time (b)	208	1	135	2	21	2	364	1
Prefer to learn in medium of Welsh language	3	-	301	3	21	2	325	1
Level of learning (highest current)	24	-	363	4	59	4	446	1

(a) For one FEI (which integrated the survey into their own and processed the data) we do not have information about how many learners completed the survey by mode of response.

(b) Only asked of FE learners. Base: 27,226

Notes on the use of statistical articles

Statistical articles generally relate to one-off analyses for which there are no updates planned, at least in the short-term, and serve to make such analyses available to a wider audience than might otherwise be the case. They are mainly used to publish analyses that are exploratory in some way, for example:

- Introducing a new experimental series of data;

- A partial analysis of an issue which provides a useful starting point for further research but that nevertheless is a useful analysis in its own right;

- Drawing attention to research undertaken by other organisations, either commissioned by the Welsh Assembly Government or otherwise, where it is useful to highlight the conclusions, or to build further upon the research;

- An analysis where the results may not be of as high quality as those in our routine statistical releases and bulletins, but where meaningful conclusions can still be drawn from the results.

Where quality is an issue, this may arise in one or more of the following ways:

- being unable to accurately specify the timeframe used (as can be the case when using an administrative source);

- the quality of the data source or data used; or

- other specified reasons.

However, the level of quality will be such that it does not significantly impact upon the conclusions. For example, the exact timeframe may not be central to the conclusions that can be drawn, or it is the order of magnitude of the results, rather than the exact results, that are of interest to the audience.

The analysis presented does not constitute a National Statistic, but may be based on National Statistics outputs and will nevertheless have been subject to careful consideration and detailed checking before publication. An assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in the analysis will be included in the article, for example comparisons with other sources, along with guidance on how the analysis might be used, and a description of the methodology applied.

Articles are subject to the release practices as defined by the release practices protocol, and so, for example, are published on a pre-announced date in the same way as other statistical outputs. Missing value symbols used in the article follow the standards used in other statistical outputs, as outlined below.

.. The data item is not available

. The data item is not applicable

- The data item is not exactly zero, but estimated as zero or less than half the final digit shown
* The data item is disclosive or not sufficiently robust for publication