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1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 The Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion (Inclusion) and Ipsos MORI were commissioned by the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) in 2008 to undertake a survey to evaluate the Impact of Care to Learn on the destinations of young parents funded in 2006/07.

Background

1.2 In 1999 the Government launched the Teenage Pregnancy Strategy which set out a national strategy for England to i) halve the rate of conceptions for under 18s, ii) set a firmly established downward trend in the under 16s conception rate by 2010, and iii) minimise the social exclusion experienced by teenage parents.

1.3 Care to Learn helps young parents to participate in learning by covering the costs of childcare while they learn. Any publicly funded learning can be undertaken; this includes school, FE and sixth form colleges, work-based learning and community, taster and short courses. In 2006/07 up to £155 per week per child was payable directly to the childcare provider on behalf of the learner (£170 in London). The childcare provider must be OFSTED registered.

1.4 The key objective of Care to Learn is to raise participation in learning by young parents, and to lift them out of the cycle of poverty by equipping them with skills and qualifications.

Research aims and objectives

1.5 The LSC plan and invest in high quality education and training for young people and adults that will build a skilled and competitive workforce. Working at national, regional and local levels from a network of offices across the country, the LSC has a single goal; to improve the skills of England’s young people and adults to ensure we have a workforce that is of world-class standard.

1.6 The LSC has three national priorities:

- create demand for Learning and Skills
  - a) all young people to have the opportunity to gain skills and qualifications and participate in learning that excites and motivates them
  - b) more adults to participate in learning that they wish to invest in and enable adults most excluded from the labour market and society to progress into learning and employment

---

1 At the time of publication the current amount of funding for Care to Learn recipients in the academic year 2007/08 was £160 per week per child and £175 in London.
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c) more employers to invest in training and up-skill their workforce
   - transforming the FE system to meet demand
   - delivering better skills, better jobs, better lives.

1.7 This piece of work supports the work of the LSC in achieving priority 1a.

1.8 This research replicates previous Care to Learn evaluations which have tracked the destinations of young parents who have received Care to Learn funding for their childcare. In particular this research:
   - evaluates the impact of Care to Learn on the academic progression of recipients during the 2006/07 academic year and subsequently
   - evaluates the effectiveness of Care to Learn funding to meet the costs associated with childcare
   - provides information on Care to Learn recipients including what other support and advice was available, what the reasons for participating in learning were and what type of childcare was used.

1.9 This research also evaluates the impact of two changes to Care to Learn funding that were introduced in 2006/07. First, the introduction of London weighting which provides an additional £15 per child per week towards costs associated with childcare for young parents living in the London Boroughs. Second, the extension of the age eligibility to include 19 year olds. The academic year 2006/07 was the first year that 19 olds could claim Care to Learn funding for a new course, which was previously only available to 19 year olds if they had started to receive Care to Learn funding at a younger age and were still on the same course.

Methodology

1.10 In the academic year 2006/07 6,470 young parents nationally received Care to Learn funding. This survey interviewed 1,350 of these young parents between 24th April and 15th May 2008. Interviews were conducted using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). A separate technical report has been published in conjunction with this report with further details about the methodology and questionnaire used in this research.

Presentation of the findings

1.11 For the purpose of this report young parents who received Care to Learn funding in 2006/07 are referred to as 'young parents' throughout. Young parents who lived in the London Boroughs and were eligible for London Weighting are referred to as ‘young parents who received the London rate funding’. Young parents who were aged 19 on the 1st August 2006 and were starting a new course and had
not previously received Care to Learn funding are referred to as 'new 19 year old' parents.

Statistical significance

1.12 Relationships between variables are only reported in the text of the report if they are statistically significant and if the relationship is thought to be relevant and interesting to the topic being discussed (not all relationships that are statistically significant will be discussed in the text due to the need for a readable and fairly concise report). Relationships that are not significant will not be discussed in the text. Significance is measured at a cut-off of 95 per cent significance in a two-sided test. Pearson’s Chi-Square has been used to test significance on cross-tabulations.

Treatment of small base sizes

1.13 Where unweighted bases are lower than 47 young parents, the findings are not reported. For each occurrence the text, table or chart will have a footnote indicating this. Findings based on 48 to 99 learners will also be flagged to be treated with caution due to low base size.

1.14 Where any of the weighted cell counts of tables are fewer than five, the cell is marked with an asterisk (*), while where there are no learners in a cell, the cell is marked with a dash (-).

Treatment of ‘don’t knows’ and ‘other’ responses

1.15 The ‘don’t know’ and ‘other’ responses are included within the unweighted bases of tables and charts, and are included as bars in the charts, or as columns in the tables throughout the report unless they were one per cent or less. Notes in the tables explain what is included in the bases. Responses such as 'recoded others' and 'don’t knows' will be included in the base.

Structure of the report

1.16 The findings from the survey are presented in the following chapters:
- Chapter 2 provides a summary of the key findings
- Chapter 3 discusses the overall impact of Care to Learn funding
- Chapter 4 discusses the impact of Care to Learn funding on young parents in London

2 Except in the case of multiple response questions where significance has not been tested but some differences between groups are discussed.
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- Chapter 5 examines the impact of Care to Learn funding on new 19 year old recipients
- Chapter 6 presents additional information on Care to Learn
- Chapter 7 details the characteristics of Care to Learn recipients in 2006/07
- Chapter 8 provides both policy and research recommendations with regards to the Care to Learn programme.

1.17 The technical report published in conjunction with this report contains

- Technical information, including the methodology, sampling, weighting and fieldwork outcomes
- The full questionnaire.
2. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

2.1 Care to Learn helps young parents to participate in learning by covering the costs of childcare while they learn. Any publicly funded learning can be undertaken; this includes school, FE and sixth form colleges, work-based learning and community, taster and short courses. In 2006/07 up to £155 per week per child\(^3\) was payable directly to the childcare provider on behalf of the learner (£170 in London). The childcare provider had to be OFSTED registered.

Impact of Care to Learn

2.2 Care to Learn was very important in supporting young parents in learning - 75 per cent of all young parents in the survey felt they could not have gone on a course without the help of Care to Learn in paying for their childcare. Fifteen per cent of all young parents said they would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help from Care to Learn made it much easier and seven per cent of young parents said the funding from Care to Learn enabled them to do more study than they would have been able to do otherwise. Only two per cent reported that the funding from Care to Learn for their childcare made no difference and that they would have gone on the course anyway.

2.3 The majority (84 per cent) of young parents funded by Care to Learn in 2006/07 attended long courses of nine months or more and only three per cent attended short courses of three months or less.

2.4 By providing financial support, which pays for childcare and transport, Care to Learn contributed to positive learning outcomes of young parents. For example, 65 per cent of young parents completed their course and 61 per cent completed the course and gained a qualification.

2.5 Care to Learn has a positive impact on reducing the proportion of young parents who are not in employment, education or training (NEET). In summer 2006, before starting the 2006/07 academic year in which these young parents received Care to Learn funding, 64 per cent of young parents were NEET. When interviewed in April/May 2008 only 25 per cent were NEET.\(^4\)

2.6 In addition to reducing the proportion of young parents who are NEET, findings suggest that Care to Learn plays a crucial role in the educational progression of young parents.

\(^3\) At the time of publication the current amount of funding for Care to Learn recipients in the academic year 2007/08 was £160 per week per child and £175 in London.

\(^4\) For the purpose of this analysis NEET is defined as all young parents who were not studying (at school, college or on a training course) or working.
2.7 Over half of all young parents were still studying when interviewed, roughly a year after their original course. Almost half of these (46 per cent) had started a new course which equates to 33 per cent of all young parents. Almost all (97 per cent) of the young parents who have subsequently started a new course were working towards a qualification in that course (this equates to 27 per cent of all young parents).

2.8 There was also a trend for young parents attending new courses to have progressed onto higher level courses. For example, 34 per cent of young parents who studied at Level 1 in 2006/07 continued on the same course the following year and 13 per cent moved onto Level 2.

Care to Learn funding and suggested improvements

2.9 Care to Learn effectively met the childcare needs of the vast majority of young parents. For example, 95 per cent of young parents,\(^5\) reported that their main source of childcare was also their preferred form, while 93 per cent of all young parents in the survey said that they were satisfied about the childcare provided. However, Care to Learn funding is valid with any OFSTED registered childcare provider so in reality young parents would have been able to change childcare if they were unhappy, hence these high levels of satisfaction are to be expected.

2.10 More than half (53 per cent) of all young parents in the survey did not feel Care to Learn needed any improvement. Amongst those suggesting improvements, 10 per cent said that clearer communication, information and awareness were needed and seven per cent that more advertising was required. However, given the high proportion of young parents who report that they could not have gone on their course without Care to Learn paying for the childcare this is perhaps to be expected. Further research with other stakeholders may be a better way of highlighting potential improvements to the programme.

2.11 Interestingly, just over half (56 per cent) of young parents said they knew very little or nothing at all about Care to Learn when they applied.

2.12 Better information was particularly relevant to engage with ethnic minority young parents who were slightly more likely than white young parents to have found it difficult finding out about Care to Learn. In particular, black African young parents were most likely to report having not known very much or nothing about Care to Learn at the time of the application.

\(^5\) Those who knew what their main type of childcare was. See Chapter 6 for discussion of types of childcare used.
2.13 Even though more than nine out of ten (92 per cent) young parents found the application process easy, there were still some significant differences amongst the response of different ethnic minority groups. Again, black African young parents were most likely to have found the application process difficult.

2.14 For nearly all young parents (96 per cent) Care to Learn provided funding through the whole period they were on the course.

2.15 Care to Learn provides some funding to cover the cost of travelling between home and the childcare provider. Thirty-five per cent of all young parents in the survey applied for help with these transport costs and 77 per cent of them received funding towards them. The funding received towards travel costs covered the total cost of travelling between home and childcare provider for four fifths of young parents who received it.

Impact of Care to Learn in London

2.16 The cost of living in London is generally higher than the rest of the country and Care to Learn provides £15 extra per child per week to young parents in London within the weekly maximum. The extra support was particularly valued by young parents receiving the London rate of funding and 44 per cent of them reported that they could not have gone on a course if the help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare had been £15 less per child per week.

2.17 Even though young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely to apply for support to cover their travel expenses, they were also least likely to receive it. In fact, 69 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding got help with travel expenses compared with 79 per cent of those not receiving the London rate.

2.18 The profile of young parents in London was slightly younger than that of other young parents. Black African and black Caribbean parents accounted for over half of young parents who received the London rate of funding, with white parents accounting for less than one quarter.

2.19 The high proportion of black Caribbean and black African parents in London is also likely to influence this, as these young parents were more likely to apply for transport funding (54 per cent of black Caribbean parents and 50 per cent of black African parents compared with 37 per cent of young parents from mixed backgrounds and 31 per cent of white young parents). Furthermore, this may be an indication that young parents in London are prepared to travel further to find the learning and/or childcare that they want and a reflection of the fact that many
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of them may have been eligible for free or discounted travel on transport in London.\(^6\)

2.20 In terms of learning outcomes, the support provided by Care to Learn had a positive impact on young parents receiving the London rate of funding. Sixty eight per cent completed the course and 80 per cent achieved a qualification or partial qualification. These proportions are in line with young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

2.21 Learning was the main destination of young parents receiving the London rate of funding with 66 per cent of them at school, college or training after the end of the original course. This was significantly higher than young parents not receiving the London rate of funding. Consequently, young parents who received the London rate of funding were less likely to be working at the time of interview than other young parents.

**Impact of Care to Learn on ‘new 19 year old’ recipients**

2.22 The academic year 2006/07 was the first time that 19 year old parents starting a new course could access Care to Learn support. This group could also continue receiving this support past their 20\(^{th}\) birthday until they completed their course. The proportion of young parents who were ‘new 19 year olds’ represents 16 per cent of all young parents interviewed.

2.23 Almost four in five ‘new 19 year old’ parents agreed they could not have done the course without funding from Care to Learn. This is in line with other young parents.

2.24 In 2006/07, ‘new 19 year old’ parents were most likely to have attended Level 3 courses (28 per cent) or Level 2 courses (27 per cent) with 14 per cent undertaking Level 1 learning.

2.25 ‘New 19 year old’ parents were significantly more likely to complete their course and achieve a qualification than other young parents.

2.26 The proportion of ‘new 19 year old’ parents who were NEET dropped significantly from 68 per cent in the summer of 2006 before they did their Care to Learn assisted course to only 26 per cent at the time of the interview in April/May 2008.

\(^{6}\) The location of the young parents’ childcare provider in relation to their learning provider and/or home is also likely to have affected whether or not they applied for funding towards transport costs, however this information was not available for analysis here.
3. THE IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN

Summary

- Care to Learn was very important in supporting young parents in learning as 75 per cent of all young parents in the survey felt they could not have gone on a course without the help of Care to Learn in paying for their childcare.
- The comparison between young parents’ activities before and after the course showed that only 25 per cent of young parents were not in employment, education or training (NEET) at the time of the interview compared with 64 per cent of them who were NEET before the start of the course.
- By providing financial support, which pays for childcare and transport, Care to Learn contributed to positive learning outcomes of young parents. For example, 65 per cent of young parents completed their course and 61 per cent completed the course and gained a qualification.
- Amongst all young parents who were still studying at the time of the interview, almost half (46 per cent) were attending a new course (this equates to 28 per cent of all young parents). Almost all of these were working towards a qualification in their new course.
- There was also a trend for young parents attending a new course to progress into higher level courses. For instance, amongst the young parents who originally attended Level 2 courses, eight per cent undertook a following course at Level 2 and 13 per cent moved to Level 3.
- Education and employment were the main destinations of young parents after the end of the original course (71 percent were in education, employment or training at the time of interview in April/May 2008).
- Fifty-nine per cent of those who were in work also reported that the job they had was better than any job they had done before.
- Over half of all young parents in the survey started their course between July and December 2006. The majority of young parents were attending courses lasting for nine months or more. Only three per cent of young parents were attending short courses of less than three months.

3.1 This section explores the overall impact of Care to Learn on young parents’ ability to participate in learning. Therefore, it examines whether young parents would have attended the course without the support of Care to Learn, which covered the cost of childcare and associated transport.
3.2 It also looks at the main reasons why young parents moved into learning and some characteristics of the courses they attended while receiving funding from Care to Learn.

3.3 Finally, it analyses young parents’ learning outcomes in terms of course completion and getting a qualification and tracks young parents’ destinations after attending the original course, including moving into further learning and employment.

Impact of Care to Learn

3.4 As detailed in Figure 3-1, Care to Learn had a strong impact on young parents undertaking learning. Three-quarters of all young parents in the survey felt they could not have gone on a course without the help of Care to Learn in paying for their childcare.

3.5 Fifteen per cent of all young parents said that they would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help provided by Care to Learn made it easier. Seven per cent of all young parents would have done some study but the financial support of Care to Learn meant that they could do more and only two per cent felt the help with paying for childcare made no difference and they would have done the course anyway.
Starting the course

3.6 Before looking at the learning outcomes of young parents receiving Care to Learn funding, this section will examine the reasons why young parents started the original course. It will also provide information on some of the characteristics of the courses attended, such as types of learning providers and length of the course.

3.7 Young parents were employment and skills focused in their decision to study. The three main reasons for them to attend the course (between September 2006 and July 2007) were the following:

- they wanted to get a better/good job (29 per cent)
- it was something they always wanted to do (27 per cent)
- to further their education (25 per cent).\(^7\)

3.8 Importantly, older young parents were more likely to be employment focused whilst younger parents were more likely to be skills focused. As shown in Table

\(^7\) This question is a multiple response and percentages do not add up to 100.
3-1 below, young parents aged 19 or over were more likely to undertake the course because they wanted a better/good job (35 per cent compared with 13 per cent of learners under 15). In contrast, younger parents (under 15) were more likely to undertake learning to further their education (38 per cent compared with 27 of those aged 19 or over).

Table 3-1 Reasons for undertaking the course by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Wanted to get a better/good job %</th>
<th>To further my education %</th>
<th>Unweighted bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or younger</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old or over</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008

3.9 In terms of the types of learning providers attended, almost seven out of ten learners (69 per cent) studied for their course in an FE College. Twelve per cent attended the course in Sixth Form Colleges; eight per cent in schools and five per cent through work-based learning (six per cent attended at other types of providers).

3.10 More than half (54 per cent) of all young parents in the survey started their course between July and December 2006. As shown in Figure 3-2 the majority of young parents were attending courses lasting for nine months or more. Only three per cent of young parents were attending short courses of less than three months.
3.11 As shown by Figure 3-3, the majority of young parents were studying for or gained Level 2 qualifications from attending the original course that Care to Learn supported. This was followed by those studying Level 3 and Level 1.

3.12 Just under one fifth of young parents were studying for ‘other qualifications’ which included first aid certificates (two per cent of all young parents), Key Skills Certificate (one per cent), OCRs (one per cent) and certificates in childcare and education (two per cent).
**Course completion**

3.13 Having Care to Learn pay for their childcare had a positive impact on young parents completing the course. Out of the sixty five per cent of all young parents who completed the course, 18 per cent were still on the course at the time of the interview and 17 per cent had dropped out.

3.14 The ‘new 19 year old’ parents were more likely to complete their course than the other parents (72 per cent of them completed their course compared with 64 per cent of the other young parents).

3.15 Amongst the different ethnic groups, black Caribbean parents were the most likely to drop out of the course or leave early (24 per cent compared with 18 per cent of white parents, 13 per cent of black African parents and 10 per cent of parents from mixed backgrounds).

3.16 Receiving extra funding, such as Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA), had a positive impact on course completion. It may be that learners receiving extra financial support to cover their expenses are less likely to work or look for work.
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and thus find it easier to focus on their studying. Moreover, the weekly EMA payments are highly likely to act as an incentive for learners to stay on in learning. Young parents receiving EMA were more likely to be still on the course (24 per cent compared with 17 per cent of those not receiving EMA) and least likely to drop out (14 per cent compared with 21 per cent of those not receiving EMA) than any other group.

3.17 However, financial problems were not specifically quoted amongst the most common reasons for dropping out of learning. Only two per cent of young parents who did not complete the course said it was because they could not cope financially (which equates to less than half a per cent of all young parents).

3.18 Young parents who dropped out of learning were more likely to say this was due to personal problems (five per cent of all young parents dropped out of learning due to personal problems). Other reasons given included the course wasn’t what they expected (two per cent of all young parents dropped out for this reason) or that they found it too difficult to study and look after a child (one per cent of all young parents).

Qualifications gained by the end of the academic year 2006/07

3.19 In total, 78 per cent of young parents gained a qualification or partial qualification from their course. As may be expected this proportion was lower for young parents who were still on the course or did not complete their course. However, one third (33 per cent) of young parents who did not complete their course reported achieving a partial qualification (Table 3-2).

Table 3-2 Proportion of young parents who gained a qualification by whether or not they completed the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether they gained a qualification or partial qualification</th>
<th>Whether they completed the course</th>
<th>All young parents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes %</td>
<td>No - left early/dropped out %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,350

3.20 Similarly to the findings above about course completion, young parents receiving EMA funding were also more likely to achieve a qualification than those who did not (81 per cent gained a qualification compared with 68 per cent of those not receiving EMA). Moreover, EMA works as an incentive to complete the course.
and thus also towards getting a qualification. This is because learners in 2006/07 had to be on a qualification bearing course in order to get EMA.

3.21 Having a qualification had an impact on young parents’ destinations after the course, and it was significantly correlated to achieving a positive job and learning outcome. At the time of the survey, the majority of young parents had both completed their 2006/07 course and achieved a qualification (61 per cent).

3.22 The situation of the remaining young parents is detailed below:

- 12 per cent reported that they were still on the course but had already gained a partial qualification
- three per cent completed the course but did not get a qualification
- 11 per cent did not complete the course or achieve a qualification
- 12 per cent answered don’t know/not sure if they gained a qualification.

3.23 Importantly, 24 per cent of all young parents in the survey obtained another qualification between September 2006 and July 2007 apart from the one gained from the original course already discussed.

3.24 The majority of those who obtained another qualification between September 2006 and July 2007 got the following qualifications:

- numeracy and literacy (14 per cent)
- GCSE (13 per cent)
- NVQ (11 per cent)
- first aid (10 per cent)
- key skills (10 per cent)
- food and hygiene (six per cent)
- health & safety (four per cent)
- A levels (three per cent).

3.25 Twenty-nine per cent obtained other qualifications and two per cent answered ‘don’t know’.

**Further learning**

3.26 Supporting young parents while they participate in learning by paying for their childcare costs had a substantial positive impact on their continuing learning.

3.27 Overall, 61 per cent of all young parents in the survey were studying or about to start a course at the time of the interview. Amongst those, almost half (46 per cent) were attending a new course which was not the same as the course they

---

8 Interviews were carried out between 24th April and 15th May 2008, which is around a year after their original course.
were doing between September 2006 and July 2007 (this equates to 33 per cent of all young parents).

3.28 The most common reasons for young parents to go into further learning were to continue or progress with previous learning (36 per cent), or to further their education (12 per cent) or job progression (18 per cent). Other relevant reasons were the following:

- something they always wanted to do (14 per cent)
- wanted a better future for their child (three per cent)
- change of career (four per cent)
- other reasons (12 per cent)
- don’t know (one per cent).

3.29 By looking at the learning providers of those who started a new course it can be seen that the substantial majority of young parents were still studying in FE colleges (73 per cent). Ten per cent were in sixth form colleges, seven per cent at university, three per cent were in work-based learning and one per cent at school (five per cent were attending other learning providers).

3.30 Young parents were studying a range of courses. The table below shows that there were not substantial changes in the content of subjects studied by young learners in the original course (attended between September 2006 and July 2007) and the new course they were attending at the time of the survey (in 2007/08).

Table 3-3 Subjects studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of original course attended between 2006/07</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>New Course started 2007/08</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Health and social care</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for life</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social care</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressing/beauty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Business skills/administration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/computing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Beauty therapy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business skills/administration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty therapy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts/theatre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tourism and leisure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted Base 1350 Unweighted Base 325

1. Skills for Life in this context refers to basic/essential skills, literacy and numeracy. The current term ‘skills for life’ also includes ESOL and ICT.

Source: Inclusion 2008
3.31 Encouragingly, 97 per cent of young parents who started a new course were in courses which lead to a qualification (this equates to 27 per cent of all young parents).

3.32 In terms of course level, Table 3-4 details that young parents attending further courses after the original one in 2006/07 were mainly studying for Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Qualification</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course doesn’t lead to qualification or unsure if leads to qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not studying at time of the interview in 2007/08</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young parents on same course as 2006/07</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008
Unweighted base: 1350

3.33 Young parents who were on a different course to the one they were attending in 2006/07 were studying for the following qualifications:

- NVQ (29 per cent which equates to eight per cent of all young parents)
- BTEC (18 per cent which equates to five per cent of all young parents)
- A or A/S level (12 per cent which equates to three per cent of all young parents.)

3.34 GCSE (six per cent which equates to two per cent of all young parents). Table 3-5 details some young parents who continued learning or progressed to higher level courses. For example, 34 per cent of young parents who studied at Level 1 in 2006/07 continued on the same course the following year and 13 per cent moved onto Level 2 courses.

---

9 Unweighted base is 382.
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Table 3-5 Learning progression from 2006/07 to 2007/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of the original course</th>
<th>Skills for Life %</th>
<th>Level 1 %</th>
<th>Level 2 %</th>
<th>Level 3 %</th>
<th>Level 4 %</th>
<th>Other qualification %</th>
<th>Young parent on same course as 2006/07 %</th>
<th>Course does not lead to qualification or unsure if leads to qualification %</th>
<th>Not studying at time of the interview in 2007/08 %</th>
<th>Un-known %</th>
<th>Un-weighted Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills for life</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008

1. Level information is based on the qualifications young parents reported to have achieved or be working towards and should therefore be treated as an indication of course level rather than level as confirmed by learning providers.

3.35 Childcare was being used by the majority of young parents who were still studying. Ninety-three per cent of them said that they were/would be using childcare including any childcare that was free.

3.36 Young parents who had experience of Care to Learn and continued learning were likely to use it again. Eighty-eight per cent of young parents who were still studying were receiving Care to Learn funding or about to apply for it. Of those, 93 per cent felt that Care to Learn funding covered all their childcare costs whilst studying.

3.37 Those seven per cent who were still studying and using childcare which was not fully covered by Care to Learn were mainly paying by themselves (33 per cent) or their family was paying for the childcare (27 per cent)\(^\text{10}\).

**Young parents’ destinations**

3.38 Figure 3-4 shows the main activities young parents were involved in after the end of the original course. The majority of young parents were in education, training or employment.

\(^\text{10}\) This is based on only 52 young parents.
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Figure 3-4 Young Parents’ destinations

[Diagram showing destinations of young parents]

- At school/college/on a training course
- About to start a course
- At home looking after baby/child – not looking for work
- Looking for work
- Working
- Pregnant and staying at home
- Other

Source: Inclusion 2008
Unweighted base: 1,350

3.39 Table 3-6 shows different young parents’ destinations by age on the 1st August 2006. Young parents aged 15 or under at the time of the course (1st August 2006) were more likely to be in school or college after the end of the course whilst the older parents (over 18) were more likely to be in work than younger parents.
3.40 Table 3-7 shows that parents from black African backgrounds were substantially more likely to be in school and college after the end of the course compared with the other ethnic groups. White young parents were more likely to be in work, followed by parents from black Caribbean backgrounds.

Table 3-7 Young parents’ destination by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black or black British - Caribbean %</th>
<th>Black or black British - African %</th>
<th>Mixed %</th>
<th>All young parents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School, college or learning</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after child</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008
Unweighted base: 1,350
3.41 Finally, lone parents\(^{11}\) were more likely than the other young parents to be in school, college or learning (62 per cent compared with 45 per cent) but they were less likely to be working (12 per cent compared with 12 per cent) and to be pregnant and staying at home (two per cent compared with eight per cent).

**The impact of Care to Learn on NEET young parents**

3.42 All young parents in the survey were asked what they were doing before and after the original course. Table 3-8 shows the proportion of young parents who were NEET\(^{12}\) before and after the course. Only 25 per cent of young parents were NEET at the time of the interview compared with 64 per cent of them who were NEET before the start of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity before the start of the original course (2006)</th>
<th>Current Activity at the time of the survey (2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education employment or training</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Inclusion* 2008
Unweighted base: 1,350

3.43 At the time of the interview in 2008, 11 per cent of young parents were at home looking after a child and not looking for work.

3.44 The main reason for these young parents to stay at home at the time of the survey was to look after their child or baby (57 per cent).\(^{13}\) Other reasons for staying at home were the following:

- could not afford childcare (10 per cent)
- waiting to start a new course (nine per cent)
- were looking for a new course (seven per cent)
- finding it hard to find childcare (four per cent)
- dealing with personal problems (four per cent).

---

\(^{11}\) Lone parents are defined as young parents who are not married or in a civil partnership and do not live with anyone in their household as a couple. Some lone parents may be living with parents or other relatives.

\(^{12}\) For the purpose of this analysis NEET is defined as all young parents who were not studying, at school, college or on a training course, or working.

\(^{13}\) This is based on 137 young parents.
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**Young parents in jobs without training**

3.45 Fourteen per cent of all young parents were working after the course. The majority of young parents in work were in jobs without training (57 per cent, which is eight per cent of all young parents in the survey).

3.46 The majority of young parents in part-time jobs were in jobs without training (see Table 3-9). However, due to the small numbers the differences shown in Table 3-9 are not statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-9 Proportion of young parents in jobs without training by full-time or part-time job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving training in the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not receiving training in the job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted Base: 79, 92, 173

Source: Inclusion 2008

3.47 Interestingly, there was no significant difference between the proportion of young parents working in jobs without training by temporary or permanent jobs (60 per cent of young parents in temporary jobs received no training compared with 57 per cent of those in permanent jobs).

**Impact of Care to Learn on young parents moving into work**

**Economic activity of young parents**

3.48 Seven per cent of young parents were looking for work at the time of interview in April/May 2008.

3.49 There were specific sectors where the young parents were mainly looking for employment:

- Eighteen per cent of them were mainly looking for office jobs in administration, clerk, office junior
- Fifteen per cent were looking for care work
- Fifteen per cent for jobs in retail
- Eleven per cent for nursery nurse or nursery assistant
- Seven per cent in health and beauty
- Five per cent were looking for jobs in catering
- Three per cent for jobs in painting and decorating and teaching assistant
- Seventeen per cent answered any job
- Eleven per cent answered ‘other’
- Four per cent answered ‘don’t know’.
3.50 More than half (53 per cent) of young parents who were looking for a job were looking for part-time positions. This may confirm that young parents wanted to balance work and family responsibilities by working part-time.

**Employment situation of young parents**

3.51 Fourteen per cent of young parents were working at the time of the interview. Mainly they were in the following jobs:

- Sales and retail assistant (13 per cent)
- Nursery nurses (10 per cent)
- Care assistants and home carers (eight per cent)
- Customer care occupation (six per cent)
- Cleaners or domestics (five per cent)
- General office assistants/clerks (four per cent);
- Educational assistants, retail cashiers sales and receptionists (all three per cent each)
- Other (26 per cent)

3.52 The two most common reasons why young parents were working were because they decided to take the job to earn some money (38 per cent) or for career aspirations (27 per cent). In addition to this:

- Twelve per cent reported that they got the job to gain experience or training
- Ten per cent because the working hours were suitable
- Seven per cent because of the location
- Three per cent were interested in it
- Three per cent felt it was something to do
- Two per cent answered it was the first job that was available
- One per cent it was the job they got offered.

3.53 More than half (54 per cent) of young parents in work were in part-time employment. Encouragingly, 86 per cent of them were in permanent jobs. Forty-three per cent of them were receiving training as part of their job and seventy six per cent of them said they will still using childcare.

3.54 Young parents in work were asked whether they felt the course they were doing between September 2006 and July 2007 helped them to find a job. Thirty nine per cent of them reported that the course had a role in moving them into work.

3.55 Finally, Care to Learn impacted on young parents' perception of their job progression from before to after they finished the course. Fifty-nine per cent of young parents who were working agreed that the job they had was better than any they had had before. This includes 39 per cent of them who strongly agreed.
4. THE IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN IN LONDON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ The cost of living in London is generally higher than the rest of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Care to Learn provides up to £15 extra per child per week to young parents in London(^{14}) within the weekly maximum. The extra support was particularly valued by young parents receiving the London rate of funding and 44 per cent of them reported that they could not have gone on a course if the help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare had been £15 less per child per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ In terms of learning outcomes, the support provided by Care to Learn with childcare and transport had a positive impact on young parents receiving the London rate of funding who completed the course (68 per cent) and achieved a qualification or partial qualification (80 per cent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Learning was the main destination of young parents receiving the London rate of funding with 66 per cent of them at school, college or training after the end of the original course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ A higher proportion of young parents who received the London rate of funding and were still studying at the time of interview had started a different course from the one they took in 2006/07 course (56 per cent compared with 44 per cent of the young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding to apply for funding to cover transport costs (43 per cent compared with 34 per cent outside of London).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ However, young parents receiving the London rate of funding were least likely to receive support to cover their travel expenses than the other young parents (69 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding got help with travel expenses compared with 79 per cent of young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Young parents across England during 2006/07 could claim a maximum of £155 per child per week for childcare and travel (between home and childcare only). Young parents in London could claim an extra £15 per child per week, a maximum of £170.

4.2 This section looks specifically at the impact that Care to Learn had on young parents who received the London rate of funding. The chapter will also analyse

\(^{14}\) Please see the list of London boroughs in Chapter 7 of this report
the learning outcomes of young parents receiving the London rate of funding in terms of course completion and qualifications gained and their destinations.

The profile of young parents in London

4.3 The age profile of young parents receiving the London rate of funding is slightly older than the young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1 Age profile of young parents by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age profile</th>
<th>Young parents receiving London rate of funding %</th>
<th>Young parents not receiving the London rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 years old or younger</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years and over</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted base</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008

4.4 The majority of young parents receiving the London rate of funding were black African parents (34 per cent) or black Caribbean parents (21 per cent). Less than a quarter of parents receiving the London rate of funding were white (23 per cent), compared to the majority of parents who did not receive the London rate of funding (86 per cent of young parents living outside of London were white) (Table 4-2).

Table 4-2 Ethnicity of young parents by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Young parents receiving London rate of funding %</th>
<th>Young parents not receiving the London rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British - African</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – Caribbean</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British(^{15})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted base</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008

\(^{15}\) This includes Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Indian which were all at less than 0.5%.
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4.5 Young parents were asked what would have been the impact on learning if the amount of funding available had been £15 less per child per week.

4.6 As detailed by Table 4-3, young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than the others to say that they could not have gone on a course if the help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare had been £15 less per child per week.

Table 4-3 Impact of London rate of funding (extra £15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young parents receiving London rate of funding %</th>
<th>Young parents not receiving the London rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could not have gone on a course if the help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare had been £15 less per child per week</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would probably have gone on a course anyway but less funding from Care to Learn would have made it much harder</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15 less per child per week would have made no difference, I would have done a course anyway</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted base</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008

4.7 A more general question was asked about the impact of Care to Learn on young parents attending the course. In this case the responses of young parents receiving the London rate of funding were in line with the responses of those young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

4.8 Almost three quarters (73 per cent) of young parents who received the London rate of funding felt that they could not have gone on the course without the help of Care to Learn in paying for their childcare. In addition:

- nine per cent of them reported that they would have probably done some study but the help meant they could do more
- 13 per cent would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help made it easier
- only two per cent said that the help with paying for childcare made no difference and they would have studied anyway.

4.9 Young parents who received the London rate of funding were more likely than those who didn’t to use a registered childminder as their main form of childcare (34 per cent compared with 20 per cent). Young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding were more likely to use childcare provision at college,
Impact of Care to Learn: tracking the destinations of young parents funded in 2006/07

school (14 per cent compared with seven per cent of young parents receiving the London rate of funding) or day nursery as their main form of childcare (48 per cent compared with 40 per cent of those receiving the London rate).

4.10 This may be due to the different profile of young parents receiving Care to Learn funding in London. For example, black African parents make up the largest group of young parents in London and were more likely to use a registered childminder as their main form of childcare (34 per cent compared with 21 per cent of white parents). Conversely, white parents who make up the majority of the young parents not receiving the London rate of funding were more likely to use day nursery as their main form of childcare, compared with black Caribbean parents and parents from a mixed background.

4.11 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than other young parents to apply for funding to cover transport costs (43 per cent compared with 34 per cent outside of London). Also, young parents receiving the London rate of funding were least likely to receive support to cover their travel expenses than the other young parents (69 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding got help with travel expenses compared with 79 per cent of those not receiving it). This may be due to two factors: probably because they had already used up to their weekly maximum on childcare costs, some of them did not receive all the travel support they requested; also it may be that learners in London travel greater distances to find the learning and/or childcare that they want.

4.12 Moreover, those young parents receiving the London rate of funding, who did not receive funding which covered all the cost of travel between home and childcare were more likely than the other young parents to pay by themselves (60 per cent compared with 40 per cent).

Courses attended in 2006/07

4.13 Looking at the level of courses attended in 2006/07 the majority of young parents receiving the London rate of funding attended Level 2 (32 per cent) or Level 3 courses (23 per cent) while 13 per cent were studying at Level 1. Twenty-nine per cent of them were undertaking courses leading to other qualifications and three per cent were unsure or could not remember what qualification they were studying for.

Course completion

4.14 The completion rate for young parents receiving the London rate of funding was high, with 68 per cent of them completing the course. Moreover, 16 per cent of
the young parents receiving the London rate of funding dropped out and another 16 per cent were still on the course at the time of the interview. These proportions were in line with young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

**Qualifications gained**

4.15 Eight out of ten (80 per cent) young parents receiving the London rate of funding achieved a qualification or partial qualification from attending the course, which was in line with the responses of the other young parents in the survey (78 per cent).

4.16 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were less likely than the other young parents to achieve the following qualifications:

- GCSE (seven per cent compared with 13 per cent of the other young parents)
- NVQ (23 per cent compared with 31 per cent of the other young parents)
- A or AS level (11 per cent compared with 13 per cent of the other young parents).

4.17 However, they were more likely to gain BTEC (17 per cent compared with 13 per cent of the other young parents) and other qualifications (19 per cent compared with 11 per cent of the other young parents).

**Destinations of young parents receiving the London rate of funding**

4.18 Learning was the main destination of young parents receiving the London rate of funding with 66 per cent of them at school/college or training after the end of the original course.
Table 4-4 Destinations of young parents by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Young parents receiving the London rate of funding %</th>
<th>Young parents not receiving London rate of funding %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/on a training course</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after baby/child – not looking for work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start a course</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill and unable to work</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unweighted base* 350 936

Source: Inclusion 2008

4.19 This is likely to be partially explained by the different profile of young parents who received the London rate of Care to Learn funding compared with those who did not. As previously discussed, black African parents form the largest group of young parents in London and are also most likely to continue in learning (79 per cent were in school, college or training when interviewed in April/May 2008 compared with 54 per cent of white parents). Conversely, white parents (who account for 86 per cent of young parent not receiving the London rate of funding) were more likely to be working when interviewed (16 per cent compared with only one per cent of black African parents) (Table 4-5).

Table 4-5 Destination of young parents by (selected) ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black or black British – Caribbean %</th>
<th>Black or black British – African %</th>
<th>Mixed %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/on a training course</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after baby/child – not looking for work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start a course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill and unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unweighted base* 853 133 227 82

1. Only the ethnic groups in this table had sufficient base sizes for this analysis.

Source: Inclusion 2008
4.20 In addition to these findings, the analysis has found that the proportion of young parents who were not in employment, education or training (NEET) and received the London rate of funding dropped considerably from 63 per cent in the summer 2006 (just before their course funded by Care to Learn began) to only 20 per cent when interviewed in April/May 2008.

Further Learning

4.21 As previously discussed, 66 per cent of young parents who received the London rate of funding were at school, college, on a training course or were about to start a course at the time of interview in April/May 2008 (Table 4-4). Of these, over half (56 per cent) were on or about to start a new course that was different from the one they took in 2006/07 (this equates to 36 per cent of all young parents who received the London rate of funding).

4.22 This is significantly higher than the proportion of young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding, of whom 44 per cent were on or about to start a new course that was different from the one they took in 2006/07. This equates to 26 per cent of all young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding being on or about to start a new course that was different from the one they took in 2006/07.

4.23 The main reason to start a new course, quoted by young parents receiving the London rate of funding, was to continue and progress with previous learning (30 per cent) which was in line with the rest of the young parents.

4.24 Importantly, young parents receiving the London rate of funding and who were on a new course, were much less likely to report that getting a better job was the main reason for starting a new course compared with all the other young parents (10 per cent compared with 20 per cent of young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding).

4.25 In terms of the level of further learning, there were no significant differences between young parents receiving the London rate of funding and young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

4.26 The majority of young parents receiving the London rate of funding were attending a new course leading to other qualifications whose level could not be identified (43 per cent). Ten per cent of them were attending Level 2 courses and six per cent Level 3.
5. THE IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN ON NEW 19 YEAR OLD PARENTS

Summary

- Almost four in five 'new 19 year old' parents agreed they could not have done the course without funding from Care to Learn.
- The largest proportion of 'new 19 year old' parents attended courses that lasted two years or more (37 per cent) and 26 per cent were on courses which lasted 9 months or more (but less than a year). Twenty one per cent were on courses which lasted 12 months or more but less than 18 months.
- The 'new 19 year old' parents were most likely to be undertaking Level 3 (28 per cent) or Level 2 (27 per cent) courses. A smaller proportion was undertaking Level 1 courses (14 per cent).
- A high proportion of this group completed their course, 72 per cent in comparison with 64 per cent of the rest of the young parents.
- A large proportion, 84 per cent, of this group gained a qualification from their course.
- The proportion of 'new 19 year old' parents who were not in employment, education or training (NEET) dropped significantly from 68 per cent in the summer of 2006 before they undertook their Care to Learn assisted course to only 26 per cent when interviewed in April/May 2008.
- 'New 19 year old' parents are significantly less likely to be at school, college, or on a training course at the time of interview in April/May 2008 (45 per cent compared with 60 per cent of other young parents).

Introduction

5.1 This chapter looks at the impact of Care to Learn on 'new 19 year old' parents. The academic year 2006/07 was the first time that 19 year old parents starting a new course could access Care to Learn support. This group could also continue receiving this support past their 20th birthday until they completed their course. The proportion of young parents who were 'new 19 year olds' represents 16 per cent of all young parents interviewed.

5.2 This chapter looks at whether this group would have been able to attend the course without the support of Care to Learn. It also discusses the impact of Care to Learn funding on these young parents' learning outcomes and what they went on to do after their 2006/07 course had ended (see Table 5-1).
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The impact of Care to Learn

5.3 The majority of 'new 19 year old' parents, almost four in five, agreed that they could not have done their course without funding from Care to Learn paying for their childcare (Table 5-1).

Table 5-1 The impact of Care to Learn on young parents’ ability to attend learning by whether or not they were ‘new 19 year old’ parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I could not have gone on a course without help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare</th>
<th>New 19 year old parents %</th>
<th>Other young parents %</th>
<th>All young parents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would have done some study but the help meant I could do more</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help made it much easier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with paying for childcare made no difference, I would have done a course anyway</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted bases</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2008

5.4 These findings show that there is no significant difference in the impact of Care to Learn on 'new 19 year old' parents and the rest of the young parents.

5.5 Over half (54 per cent) of 'new 19 year old' parents used a day nursery (not at college or school) as their main form of childcare. This is significantly higher than the 46 per cent of other young parents who were not 'new 19 year old' parents who used a day nursery as their main form of childcare.

5.6 Eighteen per cent of 'new 19 year old' parents used a registered childminder and 14 per cent used childcare provision at college or school as their main form of childcare provider. These were in line with other young parents who were not 'new 19 year old' parents.

Course length

5.7 Very few of the 'new 19 year old' parents attended short courses of less than three months (four per cent) and a large proportion were on a course that lasted two years or more (34 per cent).

5.8 In addition,

- four per cent of 'new 19 year old' parents attended courses which lasted six months or more (but less than nine months)
- 26 per cent attended courses which lasted nine months or more (but less than one year)
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- 21 per cent attended courses that were 12 months or more but less than 18 months
- seven per cent attended courses which lasted 18 months or more (but less than two years).

5.9 The length of courses attended by the ‘new 19 year old’ parents was in line with the rest of the young parents.

**Course completion**

5.10 Overall, the completion rate for ‘new 19 year old’ parents in the survey was high:

- 72 per cent completed the course. In comparison this is true of only 64 per cent of the rest of the young parents, a significant difference
- 11 per cent were still on the course at the time of the interview. This was true for a significantly higher proportion of the rest of the young parents (19 per cent)
- 17 per cent left the course early. This was the same for the rest of the young parents.

**Qualifications gained**

5.11 The ‘new 19 year old’ parents were most likely to be aiming towards achieving a Level 3 (28 per cent), or a Level 2 (27 per cent) qualification. A smaller proportion was working towards a Level 1 qualification (14 per cent). Twenty seven per cent of ‘new 19 year old’ parents were working towards other qualifications and four per cent were unsure or could not remember which qualifications they were working towards. This was in line with the rest of the young parents.

5.12 A large proportion of ‘new 19 year old’ parents attained a qualification or partial qualification from their course (84 per cent).

5.13 The ‘new 19 year old’ parents who completed their course gained the following qualifications:

- NVQ (23 per cent)
- BTEC (16 per cent)
- A or A/S level (nine per cent)
- GCSEs (eight per cent)
- GNVQ (four per cent).

5.14 The rest of the young parents (i.e. those who were not ‘new 19 year old’ parents) were mostly in line with these figures, although a slightly higher proportion gained NVQs (31 per cent).
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Young parents’ destinations

5.15 Following on from using Care to Learn support to attend learning in 2006/07 almost half of the ‘new 19 year old’ parents continued in training or learning and a quarter were in employment (see Table 5-2).

5.16 Those parents who do not fall into the ‘new 19 year old’ parent category are significantly more likely to be at school, college or on a training course (by 15 per cent). ‘New 19 year old’ parents are also 13 per cent more likely to be working (see table 5-2). This is likely to be the result of age, with the ‘new 19 year old’ parents being older than other young parents and therefore are more likely to be in work having left full time education.

Table 5-2 Destinations of ‘new 19 year old’ and other young parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New 19 year old parents %</th>
<th>Other young parents %</th>
<th>All young parents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/on a training course</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after baby/child – not looking for work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start a course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill and unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base 216 1070 1350

Source: Inclusion 2008

5.17 In addition to these findings, the analysis has found that the number of ‘new 19 year old’ parents who were NEET dropped considerably from 68 per cent in the summer of 2006 (just before their course funded by Care to Learn began) to only 26 per cent who were in this category when interviewed in April/May 2008.

Further learning

5.18 In total 49 per cent of all ‘new 19 year old’ parents were at school, college, on a training course or were about to start a course (Table 5-2) at the time of interview in April/May 2008. Of these, nearly half (46 per cent) were on or about to start a new course that was different from the one they took in 2006/07 (this equates to four per cent of all ‘new 19 year old’ parents).
5.19 The main reasons for ‘new 19 year old’ parents starting a different course were to continue or progress previous learning (47 per cent) or to get a better job (16 per cent).\(^\text{16}\)

**Employment outcomes**

5.20 The results from which the following analysis is based comes from a relatively small sample of 47 respondents and so should be treated with caution. All of the following findings are in line with young parents who were not ‘new 19 year old’ parents.

5.21 Out of those ‘new 19 year old’ parents who were working just over half (51 per cent) agreed that the job they were doing now was better than the one they had before they did their course. However, a large proportion (39 per cent) said they neither agreed nor disagreed.

5.22 Just over half (51 per cent) also said they were in a job where they were being given training. Just under nine in ten (89 per cent) of the group were in a permanent job.

5.23 ‘New 19 year old’ parents who were working at the time of interview were split fairly evenly between those who were working full-time and those who were working part-time (51 per cent and 49 per cent respectively).

5.24 Just under half (44 per cent) of the ‘new 19 year old’ parents who were working when interviewed said that the course they undertook with the assistance of Care to Learn funding helped them to get the job they were now in.

**Aspirations**

5.25 The majority of the ‘new 19 year old’ parents, over six in ten (64 per cent) saw themselves working in three years’ time. A quarter (26 per cent) saw themselves studying at university. This is more or less in line with the rest of the sample.

\(^{16}\) These results should be treated with caution as they are based on only 53 respondents.
6. EVALUATING CARE TO LEARN: ACCESS, PROVISION AND FUNDING

Summary

■ Care to Learn effectively met the childcare needs of young parents and level of satisfaction with the provision was high. Ninety-five per cent of young parents who knew what their main type of childcare was reported that their main source of childcare was also their preferred form, and 93 per cent of all young parents in the survey said that they were satisfied with the childcare provided.

■ More than half (53 per cent) of all young parents in the survey did not feel Care to Learn needed any improvement. Amongst those suggesting improvements, 10 per cent said that clearer communication, information and awareness were needed and seven per cent that more advertising was required.

■ The need for better information channels was also confirmed by 56 per cent of the young parents in the survey who said they did not know very much/they knew nothing at all about Care to Learn when they applied.

■ Better information was particularly relevant to engage with ethnic minority young parents who were slightly more likely than white parents to have found it difficult finding out about Care to Learn. In particular, black African parents were the most likely group to have reported knowing not very much or nothing about Care to Learn at the time of the application.

■ Even though more than nine out of ten (92 per cent) young parents found the application process easy, there were still some significant differences amongst the response of different ethnic minority groups and black African parents were most likely to have found the application process difficult.

■ For almost all young parents (96 per cent) Care to Learn provided funding through the whole period they were on the course.

■ Care to Learn provides some funding to cover the cost of travelling between home and childcare and findings showed that the programme was effective in meeting the young parents’ requests for financial support with transport costs. Thirty-five per cent of all young parents in the survey applied for help with transport costs and the majority of them received it (77 per cent of young parents who applied for funding for transport costs received the funding).

6.1 This chapter looks at different aspects of Care to Learn including how young parents first heard about it, an assessment of the application process, information on the childcare used during the course attended between September 2006 and July 2007, and the funding provided by Care to Learn.
Finding out about Care to Learn

6.2 The main channels through which young parents found out about Care to Learn were a Connexions adviser (34 per cent) or college student support staff (23 per cent). A smaller proportion of young parents got to know about Care to Learn through the following:

- school /career guidance staff (six per cent)
- teachers and tutors (six per cent)
- family or friends (five per cent)
- social services (four per cent)
- midwives, nurses, healthcare workers (four per cent)
- Care to Learn posters and leaflets (four per cent)
- young mother groups (three per cent)
- Jobcentre Plus (two per cent)
- Sure Start advisers (two per cent)
- other (13 per cent)
- don't know (two per cent).

6.3 Similarly, Connexions advisers (34 per cent), college student support staff (17 per cent) and teachers and tutors (seven per cent) were the most important sources of information about Care to Learn for young parents.

6.4 More than nine out of ten (92 per cent) of all young parents in the survey found it easy to find out about Care to Learn. Conversely, of those young parents who said it was difficult to find out about Care to Learn, the majority (45 per cent) explained it was difficult because they didn’t know where to go or who to speak to.

6.5 Even though the proportion of young parents who found it difficult to find out about Care to Learn was relatively small (seven per cent of all young parents in the survey), it appears that some improvements in the provision of information could help to engage with young parents in specific groups. Overall, knowledge of Care to Learn at the time of application was quite low.

6.6 Fifty six per cent of the young parents in the survey said they did not know very much/they knew nothing at all about Care to Learn when they applied. This may be explained by the fact that in many cases it is third party stakeholders such as Connexions advisers who deal with the applications and ensure payments are made. As the young parent does not receive any funding directly they may be less inclined to get directly involved with parts of the application process. Thirty
six per cent of all young parents answered that they knew a fair amount about Care to Learn and eight per cent that they knew a great deal.  

6.7 More than half (54 per cent) of all young parents in the survey did not feel Care to Learn needed any improvement. However, amongst those suggesting improvements, 10 per cent said that clearer communication, information and awareness were needed and seven per cent that more advertising was required. Five per cent of young parents suggested increasing the age limit on Care to Learn eligibility. Understandably, this was higher for 19 year olds (eight per cent compared with two per cent of young parents aged 16 or under).

6.8 Better communication and information mechanisms were particularly relevant to engage with ethnic minority young parents as they were slightly more likely than white young parents to have found it difficult to find out about Care to Learn (six per cent of white parents, 10 per cent of parents of mixed background, 12 per cent of black African parents and 13 per cent of the black Caribbean parents). Black African parents were more likely to report not knowing very much or knowing nothing about Care to Learn (64 per cent of them compared with 55 per cent of white parents, 52 per cent of young parents from a mixed background and 50 per cent of black Caribbean parents).

6.9 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding to report that it was difficult to find out about Care to Learn (12 per cent compared with 6 per cent).

6.10 Young parents who have children born before August 2006 were asked whether the first time they received Care to Learn funding was between September 2006 and July 2007. Seventy five per cent of those young parents used Care to Learn for the first time between September 2006 and July 2007. This equates to 79 per cent of all young parents claiming Care to Learn funding in 2006/07 who were claiming it for the first time.

**Applying for Care to Learn**

6.11 Applying for Care to Learn was regarded as an easy process overall and more than nine out of ten (92 per cent) of all young parents in the survey found the application process easy.

6.12 However, there were significant differences amongst the responses of different ethnic groups about how easy it was for them to apply for Care to Learn. Black African parents were most likely to have found the application process difficult (11 per cent compared with six per cent of white young parents, six per cent of black

---

17 One per cent answered ‘don’t know’.
Caribbean young parents and nine per cent of young parents of mixed background).

6.13 The source of help and advice most quoted by young parents were the following (please note this question was a multiple response and therefore the percentages do not add up to 100 per cent):

- Connexions advisers (55 per cent)
- College student support staff (35 per cent)
- Care to Learn posters/leaflets (33 per cent)
- School careers guidance staff (22 per cent)
- Teachers and tutors (22 per cent)
- Sure Start advisers (20 per cent)
- Midwives/nurse/health workers (18 per cent)
- Family or friends (19 per cent)
- Internet/website (14 per cent)
- Jobcentre Plus (nine per cent)
- Work based learning (WBL) (six per cent)
- Learn Direct (four per cent).

6.14 Almost all young parents (98 per cent) felt the help and advice received by Connexions advisers was useful. Moreover, 75 per cent of young parents specified it was very useful.

Use of childcare

6.15 Young parents were asked what type of childcare they used while they were on the course between September 2006 and July 2007.

6.16 The most used form of childcare\(^\text{18}\) at the time of the course was the day nursery (not at college/school), used by almost half of young parents in the survey (49 per cent). Other forms of childcare used by young parents at the time they attended the original course were:

- Registered childminder (24 per cent)
- Childcare provided by the college/school (15 per cent)
- Nursery school (not at college/school) (10 per cent)
- Child's grandparents (four per cent)
- Creches (not at college/school) (three per cent)
- Private nursery and nursery class attached to a primary school (one per cent each)
- Other (two per cent).

\(^{18}\) Young parents were asked about all forms of childcare used, including childcare not funded by Care to Learn. Therefore a range of childcare is listed, including grandparents who may not necessarily be OFSTED registered.
6.17 Young parents who received the London rate of funding were more likely than those who didn’t, to use a registered childminder (38 per cent compared with 21 per cent) whilst young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding were more likely to use childcare provision at college/school (16 per cent compared with nine per cent of young parents receiving the London rate of funding) and day nursery (50 per cent compared with 42 per cent of those receiving the London rate). This is likely to be related to the differences in ethnicity of young parents in London compared with other young parents, as discussed in Chapter 4.

6.18 For example, black African parents account for the largest group of young parents who received the London rate of funding and they were also the most likely to use a registered childminder (36 per cent compared with 22 per cent of white parents, 23 per cent of black Caribbean parents and 26 per cent of young parents from mixed backgrounds). In addition, black Caribbean parents were more likely than black African parents to use a day nursery (56 per cent compared with 42 per cent).

6.19 Care to Learn effectively met the childcare needs of young parents and 95 per cent of those reported that their main source of childcare was also their preferred form. Young parents who reported that their main type of childcare was not their preferred one, explained that this was because their preferred type was not available (39 per cent).²⁰

6.20 All the young parents in the survey were then asked how easy it was to find the childcare they wanted. Ninety-two per cent of all young parents found it easy to find the childcare they wanted. This was confirmed by 81 per cent of young parents who reported that they had no problem finding the childcare they wanted.

6.21 Young parents were also asked why they chose their main type of childcare. The main emerging reasons were the following (please note this question is a multiple response and so the percentages do not add up to 100 per cent):

- close to home (21 per cent)
- close to college (19 per cent)
- looked at options and liked this best (18 per cent)
- know and trust this person/people (11 per cent)
- told to use this childcare (six per cent)
- no choice/the only one available (four per cent)
- wanted child to interact with peer group (three per cent)
- transport convenient (three per cent)

¹⁹ Those who knew what their main type of childcare was.
²⁰ These findings are only based on 59 young parents.
wanted someone properly trained to look after child (three per cent)
- nice/friendly/clean environment (three per cent).

6.22 Location of the childcare was particularly important for some young parents. White parents and black African parents were more likely than black Caribbean parents to report being ‘close to home’ as the most important reason for choosing their childcare (17 per cent of white parents, 24 per cent of black African parents reported this compared with 7 per cent of black Caribbean parents). Furthermore, nearly one quarter (24 per cent) of black African parents stated ‘close to home’ as the most important reason for choosing their childcare, which is a higher proportion than other groups (15 per cent of white parents said this as did 13 per cent of parents from mixed backgrounds).

6.23 Overall, the level of satisfaction about the childcare used by young parents was high and 93 per cent of all young parents said that they were satisfied with their childcare. Amongst those, 76 per cent answered that they were very satisfied and 18 per cent were fairly satisfied. However, it would be surprising if a young parent left their child with an unsatisfactory carer, they would quickly switch to a suitable alternative one.

**Funding provided by Care to Learn**

6.24 All young parents in the survey were asked whether the funding they received through Care to Learn covered the whole time they were attending the course.

6.25 Almost all young parents (96 per cent) received Care to Learn funding for the entire period they were on the course. Care to Learn also funded childcare for private study time for 78 per cent of young parents.21

6.26 Those young parents for whom Care to Learn did not cover the whole time of the course or the whole time they were doing private study were asked how they paid for their childcare the rest of the time. This question was multiple response and therefore the percentages do not add up to 100.

6.27 Some young parents said they did not need to pay for additional childcare because:

- they cared for their own child (39 per cent)
- members of their family looked after their child (19 per cent)
- they studied when the child was asleep (12 per cent).

---

21 For young parents attending full-time learning Care to Learn would fund up to an additional 10 hours childcare per week to cover private study time and revision. This amount is proportional to the guided learning hours and is therefore pro rata for part-time courses.
6.28 However, 10 per cent of young parents paid by themselves, in the case of four per cent the family paid for their childcare and two per cent said the college funded their childcare the rest of the time.  

**Funding for transport**

6.29 Care to Learn also provides some funding to cover the cost of travelling between home and childcare. Young parents can receive the actual cost of this journey if it is within the weekly maximum once childcare has been claimed.

6.30 Thirty-five per cent of all young parents in the survey applied for help with these transport costs. It may be that more young parents needed support but did not claim it as they had already reached the weekly maximum amount on childcare costs alone or that they were not aware they could claim.

6.31 Care to Learn effectively met the majority of young parents’ requests for support with transport costs. Of those young parents who applied for help with travel expenses, 77 per cent received funding towards them. Of the young parents who received funding for transport costs, 82 per cent received funding that covered the whole cost of travel (which equates to 22 per cent of all young parents receiving funding to cover all their transport costs).

6.32 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than the others to apply for help to cover the transport costs (43 per cent compared with 34 per cent). However, these young parents in London were also least likely to receive funding for their travel expenses (69 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding got help with travel expenses compared with 79 per cent of those not receiving the London rate). This may be due to them using most or all of their weekly allowance on childcare.

6.33 The high proportion of black Caribbean and black African parents in London is also likely to influence this, as these young parents were more likely to apply for transport funding (54 per cent of black Caribbean parents and 50 per cent of black African parents compared with 37 per cent of young parents from mixed backgrounds and 31 per cent of white young parents). Furthermore, this may be an indication that young parents in London are prepared to travel further and a reflection of the fact that many of them would have been eligible for free or discounted travel on transport in London.

---

22 Young parents who reported receiving additional funding from their college were likely to be in receipt of discretionary learner support funding (DLSF), however it is not possible to verify this.

23 The location of the young parents’ childcare provider in relation to their learning provider and home is also likely to have affected whether or not they applied for funding towards transport costs. However this information was not available for analysis here.
6.34 Moreover, those in FE colleges and sixth forms were more likely than young parents attending other learning providers to apply for support with transport costs (37 per cent and 36 per cent compared with 23 per cent of those attending schools and 26 per cent of those in Work-Based Learning).

6.35 All young parents who did not receive funding which covered all of the cost between home and childcare were asked how they paid for their travel/the rest of the cost of their travel. Their answers were as follows.24

- paid themselves (43 per cent of those who didn't receive funding to cover all the travel costs)
- lived within walking distance (25 per cent)
- travel costs paid by the learning provider (10 per cent)
- cost paid by their family (six per cent)
- free travel/no need to pay (five per cent).

6.36 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely to pay themselves for the rest of the travel to the childcare provider than those not receiving the London rate (60 per cent compared with 40 per cent). Young parents not receiving the London rate were more likely to say that they did not need to pay for the travel expenses because the destination was within walking distance (28 per cent compared with 12 per cent of young parents receiving London rate of funding).

Other sources of financial help

6.37 All young parents aged 16 to 18 were asked if they received Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). Overall, more than half (56 per cent) of all young parents in the survey were receiving EMA between September 2006 and July 2007.

6.38 Young parents who attended sixth form colleges (65 per cent) and FE colleges (62 per cent) were more likely to receive EMA than young parents attending school (29 per cent).

6.39 Black African parents were the least likely group to receive EMA (27 per cent) compared with 60 per cent of white parents, 61 per cent of black Caribbean parents and 55 per cent of parents from mixed backgrounds.

24 This question was multiple response and percentages may not add up to 100.
6.40 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were less likely to receive EMA than young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding (39 per cent compared 59 per cent). This is again likely to be a reflection of the fact that black African parents are less likely to receive EMA and account for around a third of all young parents receiving the London rate of Care to Learn funding.

6.41 Moreover, 13 per cent of all young parents in the survey were receiving other financial help from their learning provider. This was mainly for books and equipment (as stated by 55 per cent of young parents who received additional funding from their learning provider) or transport (31 per cent).
7. CHARACTERISTICS OF CARE TO LEARN RECIPIENTS

7.1 This chapter looks at the characteristics of young parents who received funding for their childcare whilst learning through Care to Learn. This includes their age, ethnicity, relationship status and whether or not they have completed their course.

7.2 Over half of the young parents in the survey were aged 17 or 18 on 1st August 2006. The next largest age group was 19 year olds (see Table 7-1).

Table 7-1 Age of applicants on 1st August 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 years old or younger</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1350
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.3 The academic year 2006/07 was the first time that 19 year old parents starting a new course could access Care to Learn support. This group could also continue receiving this support past their 20th birthday until they completed their course of learning. Out of all the young parents in the survey, approximately 1 in 6 (16 per cent) were ‘new 19 year old’ applicants.

Table 7-2 New 19 year old applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 64 young parents refused to have their application details added to the survey data therefore it is unknown whether they were new 19 year old applicants
Unweighted base: 1,350
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.4 The majority of the young parents were white i.e. three quarters of the group. The next biggest group was black British African young parents at one in ten and black British Caribbean young parents at just over one in twenty. These ethnic groups are based on young parents’ self-classification.
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Table 7-3 Ethnicity of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British - African</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – Caribbean</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1350  
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.5 A high proportion, four fifths, of young parents were lone parents and one fifth had a partner or spouse with whom they were living. Lone parents are defined as young parents who are not married or in a civil partnership and do not live with anyone in their household as a couple.

Table 7-4 Lone parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1350  
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.6 Most lone parents were living in their own home and one quarter were living with their parents (Table 7-5).

Table 7-5 Living arrangements of lone and couple parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lone parents %</th>
<th>Couple parents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With their parents</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own home - with no other adults</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own home - with partner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own home - with relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a hostel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base 1116 234
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.7 Overall, 79 per cent of young parents were claiming Care to Learn funding in 2006/07 for the first time.

7.8 The majority of young parents completed the course they studied for between September 2006 and July 2007. Almost one in five were still on the course at the

---

25 This includes Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Indian which were all at less than 0.5%.
time of the interview\textsuperscript{26} and a similar proportion did not complete the course (Table 7-6).

Table 7-6 2006/07 course completion status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - left early/dropped out</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - still on course</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1350
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.9 The majority of the young parents studied in an FE college. The next biggest groups were those who attended school sixth form or sixth form colleges at just over one in ten, and schools at just under one in ten.

Table 7-7 Type of learning provider attended between September 2006 and July 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FE College</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Sixth Form/Sixth Form College</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL training provider</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1350
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.10 Most young parents surveyed were in Level 2 learning in 2006/07, followed by those in Level 3, other qualifications and Level 1. A very small proportion was studying a course which was equivalent to below Level 1.

Table 7-8 Proxy course level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure if leads to qualification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Level 1 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1350
Source: Inclusion 2008

7.11 Seventeen per cent of young parents received the London rate of Care to Learn funding. The young parents are eligible for the London rate funding if they live in one of the following London Boroughs – the childcare and/or learning do not have to take place in that borough:

\textsuperscript{26} The interviews took place between 24\textsuperscript{th} April and 15\textsuperscript{th} May 2008.
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- Barking and Dagenham
- Barnet
- Bexley
- Brent
- Bromley
- Camden
- City of London
- Croydon
- Ealing
- Enfield
- Greenwich
- Hackney
- Hammersmith and Fulham
- Haringey
- Harrow
- Havering
- Hillingdon
- Hounslow
- Islington
- Kensington and Chelsea
- Kingston upon Thames
- Lambeth
- Lewisham
- Merton
- Newham
- Redbridge
- Richmond upon Thames
- Tower Hamlets
- Waltham Forest
- Wandsworth
- Westminster
8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Recommendations

Amount of funding

8.1 Care to Learn funding is intended to pay for childcare whilst the young parent is attending learning and to fund transport between home and childcare if the weekly maximum is not reached with the childcare costs alone. The amount of funding provided in 2006/07 appears to be at the right level for that year as almost all young parents (96 per cent) reported that the funding covered the entire period they were on the course. Three quarters of young parents reported that they could not have gone on a course without the funding.

8.2 Care to Learn also funded childcare for private study time for 78 per cent of young parents. However, it is not possible to establish from this research whether young parents restricted the amount of learning undertaken as a result of the amount of funding available.

8.3 The fact that Care to Learn reduced the proportion of young parents not in employment, education or training (NEET) from 64 per cent before the course to 25 per cent after the course illustrates the positive impact of Care to Learn on young parents.

EMA

8.4 Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) is available to all 16-19 year olds in FE learning and is income-assessed on household income. Learners need to be studying in valid FE provision for at least 12 hours per week on a course lasting at least 10 weeks. For young parents in this age group they are assessed on their own income only, not the wider household so many of them will qualify for EMA on the income criteria. However, just over half of all young parents interviewed reported receiving EMA in 2006/07.

8.5 Analysis of the courses being studied by young parents shows that most of it is valid provision for EMA and nearly all young parents interviewed attended courses that lasted for more than 10 weeks.\textsuperscript{27} EMA is widely advertised to all young people including young parents, therefore it seems unlikely that these young parents who did not receive EMA were unaware of it however it is not possible to verify this from this research. It is more likely that the young parents not receiving EMA were not in learning for 12 hours a week or more. Given the

\textsuperscript{27} See Chapter 3 for information on courses length. Only three per cent of young parents were studying for short courses of less than three months.
issues in young parents lives they are often not able to commit to full time learning or need to build up the hours they spend learning, in order to qualify for EMA. Analysis of administrative data or further research is required in order to be able to understand this issue further.

Age eligibility

8.6 The academic year 2006/07 was the first time that 19 year old parents starting a new course could access Care to Learn support. This group could also continue receiving support past their 20th birthday until they completed the course. Care to Learn funding is highly valued by these young parents with almost four in five of them agreeing that they could not have done the course without funding from Care to Learn. The value of the funding for these ‘new 19 year olds’ is also illustrated by the fact that 28 per cent of them attended Level 3 courses, 27 per cent attended Level 2 and 14 per cent attended Level 1 courses.

Course eligibility

8.7 A wide variety of courses are supported through Care to Learn funding and there is no evidence to suggest that this needs to change. It is interesting to note that only three per cent of young parents were attending short courses of less than three months and the majority were attending courses of nine months or more. A variety of levels of course was attended. However just over half of the young parents were attending Level 2 or Level 3 courses. Just under one fifth of young parents were studying for ‘other qualifications’ which included first aid certificates, Key Skills Certificate, OCRs and certificates in childcare and education.²⁸

Application process

8.8 More than nine out of ten (92 per cent) young parents found the application process easy. However, there are significant differences within this, with black African parents the most likely to have found the application process difficult. This suggests that for the young parents who received Care to Learn the application process is working well, but could be improved for some groups. It is important to note that the views of young parents who did not receive Care to Learn funding are not included in this research and need to be taken into consideration to establish if there are problems that are preventing some young parents from applying.

²⁸ Other qualifications are those that could not be indentified as Skills for Life, below Level 1, Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3 and above.
Marketing

8.9 Just over half (53 per cent) of all young parents in the survey did not feel Care to Learn needed any improvement. Amongst those suggesting improvements, ten per cent said that clearer communication, information and awareness were needed and seven per cent that more advertising was required. However, given the high proportion of young parents saying that they could not have gone on the course without the help of Care to Learn this is perhaps to be expected. The need for further research amongst stakeholders and young parents who did not receive Care to Learn funding is discussed below.

Research recommendations

8.10 Analysis of administrative Care to Learn data looking at the proportion of young parents who received the London rate of funding and whether or not they received the maximum weekly amount could further inform the situation of young parents who received the London rate of funding. For example, findings in this report highlight that young parents who received the London rate of funding were more likely to apply for funding for transport costs but were less likely to receive it compared with young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

8.11 Furthermore, the young parents who received the London rate of funding valued the additional amount available and 44 per cent of them reported that they could not have gone on a course if the help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare had been £15 less per child per week as it is outside of London. However, analysis of Care to Learn administrative data would be necessary to further investigate these findings.

8.12 Further research into whether or not childcare was a factor resulting in some young parents choosing to undertake part-time rather than full-time learning would be useful. This would further explore the effectiveness of Care to Learn funding in meeting the childcare needs of young parents.

8.13 The limitation of this research is that it only includes the views of young parents who received Care to Learn funding. Therefore, suggestions to improve the service and communication about the funding have to be understood in this context. In order to further explore the awareness of Care to Learn, further research would need to be carried out with young parents who did not apply for funding to see if they were aware of the availability of funding, and if so to explore the reasons why they did not apply for funding.29 Similarly, interviews with

---
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stakeholders such as Connexions advisers and teenage pregnancy co-ordinators could better explore improvements needed to Care to Learn.