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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 In 2007/08 Care to Learn helped 7,914 young parents to continue with or return to learning by covering the costs of childcare and travel while they learn. By doing this it improves the education levels and opportunities of teenage parents and therefore reduces the risk of their remaining in a cycle of poverty.

1.2 The main focus of this report is findings from the 2009 survey of 1,964 young parents who received funding in 2007/08. The majority of findings, where comparable, are in line with the findings from the previous year’s survey¹ unless otherwise stated.

Impact of Care to Learn for 2007/08 learners

1.3 Care to Learn continues to have been very important in supporting young parents in learning. Ninety-seven per cent of young parents reported that Care to Learn made a positive difference to their ability to attend learning. Only two per cent of all young parents felt the help with paying for childcare made no difference and they would have done the course anyway. This was in line with the 2008 survey and in turn contributed to a positive learning outcome for young parents, as 59 per cent completed the course and gained a qualification. Of those that were still studying, nearly half were attending a new course.

1.4 For all age groups involved in the survey, the comparison between young parents’ activities before and after the course showed that only 27 per cent of all young parents were not in employment, education or training (NEET)² at the time of the interview compared with the 66 per cent who were NEET before the start of the course.

1.5 The proportion of young parents in learning (64 per cent) is significantly higher in the 2007/08 cohort compared with the 2006/07 cohort of young parents, in which 58 per cent were in learning. Conversely, the proportion of young parents in employment is lower in the 2007/08 cohort (nine per cent) compared with the 2006/07 (14 per cent). The impact of the recession on job opportunities is likely to be a factor in this difference.

² 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.
Care to Learn funding and suggested improvements

1.6 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. The main channel through which young parents found out about Care to Learn was a Connexions adviser.

1.7 Care to Learn effectively met the childcare needs of young parents, and level of satisfaction with the provision was high. Nearly all (97 per cent) young parents reported that their main source of childcare was also their preferred one and 94 per cent said that they were satisfied with the childcare provided. Most found the application process easy (91 per cent).

1.8 Over half (54 per cent) of young parents used a day nursery (not at college or school) as their main form of childcare, with nearly all of them (94 per cent) stating it was easy to find the childcare they wanted. Of the very small number that did have a problem, the main reason stated was the lack of places – which was a bigger issue in London.

1.9 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-four per cent of all young parents in the survey applied for help with transport costs and three-quarters (74 per cent) of those who applied received it.

Impact of Care to Learn in London

1.10 The cost of living in London is generally higher than the rest of the country and Care to Learn provides up to £15 extra per child per week to young parents in London. The extra support was particularly valued by young parents receiving the London rate of funding with many them (44 per cent) reporting that they could not have gone on a course without the extra £15. Nearly two-thirds (65 per cent) of young parents receiving the London rate of funding completed the course and achieved a qualification. A slightly higher proportion of young parents who received the London rate of funding had started a different course from the one they took in 2007/08.

1.11 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. However, young parents receiving the London rate of funding were less likely to receive support to cover their travel expenses than the other young parents.
Impact of Care to Learn on ‘new 19 year old’ recipients

1.12 Care to Learn funding proved essential for the majority of new 19 year old parents to be able to attend their course in 2007/08. Almost four in five (78 per cent) reported that they could not have attended their course without funding from Care to Learn. New 19 year old parents were significantly more likely to use a day nursery (outside their college) as their main form of childcare than other young parents.

1.13 New 19 year old parents were found to have attended longer rather than shorter courses in 2007/08. Sixty-one per cent of new 19 year old parents had completed their course and achieved a qualification, which was in line with other young parents and they were significantly more likely to have gained a higher level qualification than other young parents.

Longer term impact of Care to Learn – destinations of 2006/07 recipients

1.14 Learning was the main current destination for young parents who received Care to Learn in 2006/07 – nearly half (46 per cent) were in school or college or on another training course. Of these nearly half (45 per cent) were on the same course as when last surveyed and the other half were on a different course. Twenty per cent of young parents funded in 2006/07 were working at the time of interview in 2009, while 21 per cent were at home looking after their baby/child or pregnant and not looking for work.

1.15 Half of young parents who received Care to Learn in 2006/07 had obtained qualifications since the previous survey in 2008. Many progressed to a higher course level.

Non take-up of Care to Learn

1.16 Non take-up was largely owing to respondents not starting or continuing on the course, either for personal reasons or because of changes to the course. Care to Learn funding was considered important to enable participation in learning.

1.17 The application process was commonly reported to be relatively easy. For those that had some difficulty in completing the form it was reported that it was often owing to getting learning and/or childcare providers to complete their sections.

1.18 Respondents, who had dropped out of the learning for which they had applied for Care to Learn in 2007/08, commonly either planned to enter, or had already
entered learning subsequently. Some respondents had successfully re-applied for Care to Learn in 2008/09 and others intended to re-apply on their return into learning.

1.19 Simplification of the application process and improved awareness/communication with learning and childcare providers may benefit some applicants.
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2 INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 The Centre for Economic & Social Inclusion (Inclusion) and Ipsos MORI were commissioned by the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) to track the destinations of young parents funded by Care to Learn in 2006/07 and 2007/08. This report presents the results of the survey conducted in 2009 and updates last year’s report on the 2008 survey.

2.2 Care to Learn helps young parents to continue with or return to learning by covering the costs of childcare and travel while they learn. By doing this it improves the education levels and opportunities of teenage parents and therefore reduces the risk of their being 'not in employment, education or training' (NEET) – which in return breaks the cycle of poverty and improves the prospects of their children. At the end of 2007, the proportion of 16 to 18 year olds who were NEET was 9.7 per cent and this went up to 10.3 per cent at the end of 2008.3

Background

2.3 Care to Learn was launched in 2003 in response to the Government’s 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. The provisional 2007 under-18 conception rate for England of 41.7 per 1,000 girls aged 15 to 17 represents an overall decline of 10.7 per cent since 1998 – the baseline year for the Teenage Pregnancy Strategy.4

2.4 Any publicly funded learning can be undertaken; this includes school, further education (FE) and sixth form colleges, work-based learning and community, taster and short courses. In 2007/08 up to £160 per week per child5 was payable directly to the childcare provider on behalf of the learner (£175 in London). The childcare provider must be OFSTED registered.

2.5 In 2006/07 and 2007/08, to be eligible for Care to Learn funding the parent must be aged under 20 when their learning starts, caring for their own children.

5 At the time of publication the current amount of funding for Care to Learn recipients in the academic year 2009/10 is still £160 per week per child and £175 in London.
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and living in England. In 2007/08, a total of 7,914 young parents received Care to Learn funding.6

Research aims and objectives

2.6 The LSC plans and invests 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.

2.7 The LSC has three national priorities:

1. 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
   c) more employers to invest in training and up-skill their workforce

2. Transform the FE system to meet demand

3. Deliver better skills, better jobs, better lives.

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

2.9 The research:

- evaluates the impact of Care to Learn on the academic progression of recipients during the 2007/08 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.

2.10 In addition this year the report explores the longer term impact of Care to Learn through examining the destinations of young parents who were surveyed in 2008 and then re-contacted in 2009. It also reports on those young parents that decided not to take up Care to Learn funding. The progress of those who were NEET is examined in greater detail.

---

6 This was the official end of year take up figure for 2007/08 at the time of publication.
2.11 To achieve this, a re-contact survey was conducted as well as the main survey. This was aimed at young parents who received funding in 2006/07 to track their destinations since they were first interviewed last year.

Methodology

2.12 The survey interviewed 2,418 young parents between 23 April and 24 May 2009. This includes 555 young parents who originally received funding in 2006/07 (and took part in the 2008 survey) and have agreed to be re-contacted to participate in the ‘2006/07 re-contact survey’ (see Figure 2-1).

Figure 2-1 Summary of recipients included in the evaluation, 2009

2.13 Therefore, two questionnaires were developed:

- the main 2007/08 survey (based on the previous 2006/07 survey), which covers group 1 and group 3 in Figure 2-1
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the re-contact survey for young parents who received funding in 2006/07 to track their destinations since they were interviewed last year – which is group 2 in Figure 2-1.

2.14 In order not to overburden young parents who received funding in both 2006/07 and 2007/08, only the key questions from the 2007/08 survey were asked to these young parents.

2.15 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

2.16 For the purpose of this report, young parents who received Care to Learn funding 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 1 August 2007, starting a new course and had not previously received Care to Learn funding are referred to as 'new 19 year old' parents.

Statistical significance

2.17 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 because of the need for a readable and fairly concise report). Relationships that are not significant will not be discussed in the text.\(^7\) 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

2.18 Where unweighted bases are less than 100 young parents, the findings are flagged ‘to be treated with caution because of low base size’.

2.19 Where any of the weighted cells are less than one per cent, the cell is marked with an asterisk (*), where there are no learners in a cell, the cell is marked with a dash (–).

---

\(^7\) 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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Treatment of ‘don’t knows’ and ‘other’ responses

2.20 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

2.21 The findings from the survey are presented in the following chapters:

- Chapter 3 discusses the overall impact of Care to Learn funding in 2007/08
- Chapter 4 discusses the impact of Care to Learn funding on young parents in London in 2007/08
- Chapter 5 examines the impact of Care to Learn funding on new 19 year old recipients in 2007/08
- Chapter 6 presents additional information on Care to Learn regarding access, provision and funding in 2007/08
- Chapter 7 examines the longer term prospects of Care to Learn recipients funded in 2006/07
- Chapter 8 presents information on the non take-up of Care to Learn in 2007/08
- Chapter 9 details the characteristics of Care to Learn recipients in 2007/08
- Chapter 10 provides both policy and research recommendations for Care to Learn.

2.22 The technical report published in conjunction with this report contains:

- technical information, including the methodology, sampling, weighting and fieldwork outcomes
- the full questionnaires.
3 THE IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN IN 2007/08

Summary

- Care to Learn continues to have been very important in supporting young parents in learning. Ninety-seven per cent of young parents reported that Care to Learn made a positive difference to their ability to attend learning. Only two per cent of all young parents felt the help with paying for childcare made no difference and they would have done the course anyway. These findings are in line with the previous year’s survey.8

- Comparison of young parents’ activities (all ages) before and after the course showed that only 27 per cent of young parents were not in employment, education or training (NEET)9 at the time of the interview compared with 66 per cent 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, 63 per cent of young parents completed their course and of those 59 per cent completed the course and gained a qualification.

- Among all young parents who were still studying at the time of the interview, almost half (48 per cent) were attending a new course (this equates to 33 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, among the young parents who originally attended Level 2 courses, 12 per cent undertook a following course at Level 2 and 15 per cent moved to Level 3.

- Overall, five per cent of young parents funded in 2007/08 were at university or on a Level 4 course when interviewed in 2009.

- Education and employment were the main destinations of young parents after the end of the original course (73 percent were in education, employment or training at the time of interview). The proportion of young parents in learning has increased in the 2007/08 cohort compared with the 2006/07 cohort, while the proportion in employment has decreased. This is likely to be linked to the impact of the recession on job opportunities.

- Young parents in work were asked whether they felt the course they did helped them to find a job and 39 per cent of them reported that the course had a role in moving them into work.

---


9 For the purpose of this analysis NEET is defined as all young parents regardless of age who were not studying, at school, college or on a training course, or working.
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 Ninety-seven per cent of young parents reported that Care to Learn made a positive difference to their ability to attend learning. This is comprised of 73 per cent of all young parents in the survey who felt they could not have gone on a course without the help of Care to Learn in paying for their childcare, 17 per cent who said that they would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help provided by Care to Learn made it easier and eight 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 (see Figure 3-1). Only two per cent of all young parents felt the help with paying for childcare made no difference and they would have done the course anyway. These proportions are in line with the previous year’s findings.\(^{11}\)

\(^{10}\) These figures are reported as whole numbers, however when summed using numbers of one or more decimal places they equal 97 per cent. Similarly, the percentages in Figure 3-1 do not sum to 100 per cent due to rounding.

\(^{11}\) Findings from the 2008 survey show 75 per cent of young parents could not have gone on a course without help from Care to Learn in paying for their childcare, seven per cent said they would have done some study but the help meant they could do more, 15 per cent said they would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help made it much easier, two per cent said the help paying for childcare made no difference and they would have done the course anyway, one per cent answered ‘don’t know’. For further information see Franceschelli, M., Sims, L., Singler, R (2008) ‘Impact of Care to Learn: tracking the destinations of young parents funded in 2006/07’. Inclusion.
Figure 3-1 Impact of Care to Learn funding on young parents’ ability to attend learning

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 1,964

3.5 A higher proportion of 19 year olds (78 per cent) and those in further education (FE) (73 per cent) stated that they could not have gone on a course without help from Care to Learn compared with those aged 16 or under (68 per cent) and those at school (63 per cent). This may be related to young parents aged 16 and under needing to finish compulsory education at school or having more family support to help with childcare compared with other young parents and those in FE. However it is not possible to verify this with the information available.

3.6 A smaller proportion of young parents who lived with their parents reported that they could not have gone on a course without the help from Care to Learn in paying for their childcare (67 per cent) compared with young parents living in their own home (75 per cent). There was no significant difference between the proportions of lone parents, compared with other young parents, that reported they could not have gone on a course without the help form Care to Learn.

3.7 Seventy-four per cent of young white parents felt that, without the help of Care to Learn in paying for their childcare, they would not have gone on a course – compared with 66 per cent for black Caribbean parents. The reasons for this are unclear.

3.8 The level of funding offered through Care to Learn was an important factor in determining whether young parents would go on a course, with 36 per cent of young parents outside London saying that just £15 less (per week, per child)
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would have meant they could not have gone on the course, while another 45 per cent said they would probably have gone on a course anyway but less funding from Care to Learn would have made it much more difficult.

3.9 Forty-three per cent of young parents living in London\(^\text{12}\) said that £15 less per week would have meant they could not have gone on the course compared with the rest of the country, this was especially true when compared with young parents in the North West, and Yorkshire and Humberside.

Starting the course\(^\text{13}\)

3.10 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 in 2007/08. 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.

3.11 Young parents were focused on improving their skills and fulfilling long term aspirations to improve their chances of getting a better job in their decision to study. The two main reasons for attending the course were:

- they wanted to get a better/good job (45 per cent)
- it was something they always wanted to do (31 per cent).

3.12 Of these parents, lone parents\(^\text{14}\) were more likely to say they did the course because they 'wanted to get a better or a good job' than non-lone parents (47 per cent compared with 39 per cent).

3.13 Older young parents were more likely to be employment focused. As shown in Table 3-1 below, young parents aged 19 or over were more likely to undertake the course because they wanted a better/good job (50 per cent compared with 37 per cent of learners aged 16 and under).

---

\(^{12}\) Young parents in London receive an additional £15 per week compared with those in other regions.

\(^{13}\) This section is based on only those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07. Findings based on group 3 young parents are not comparable to last year’s report.

\(^{14}\) 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.
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Table 3-1 Proportion of young parents who gave ‘wanting a better or good job’ as the reason for undertaking the course by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wanted to get a better/good job</th>
<th>Unweighted bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 or younger</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 to 18 years old</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years old or over</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009

3.14 In terms of the types of learning providers attended, just over seven out of ten young parents (71 per cent) studied for their course in an FE College. Ten per cent attended the course in sixth form colleges, seven per cent in schools and six per cent through work-based learning (seven per cent attended at other types of providers).\(^{15}\) As may be expected, younger parent were more likely to attend learning at school (24 per cent of young parents aged 16 or under attended learning at school compared with only one per cent of ‘older’ young parents) and older young parents were more likely to attend FE colleges.

3.15 Figure 3-2 shows the length of courses attended by young parents, with a third attending courses lasting over two years and half of all young parents attending courses lasting a year or more.

Figure 3-2 Length of the course attended by young parents 2007/08

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 1,964

\(^{15}\) Total may not sum to 100 due to rounding
3.16 Figure 3-3 shows the qualification level of the original course supported by Care to Learn. The majority of young parents were studying for or gained a Level 2 qualification, followed by those studying Level 3 and Level 1.

**Figure 3-3 Qualification level of the original course supported by Care to Learn in 2007/08**

- Level 2, 37%
- Level 1, 19%
- Level 3, 26%
- Other qualification, 12%
- Skills for life, 1%
- Unsure, 1%
- Unknown, 4%
- Other, 1%

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 1,593

3.17 Twelve per cent of young parents were studying for ‘other qualifications’ which included first aid certificates (one per cent of all young parents) and under one per cent for key skills certificates and OCRs.

**Course completion**

3.18 Having Care to Learn pay for their childcare had a positive impact on the number of young parents completing the course. Sixty-three per cent of all young parents completed the course, 20 per cent were still on the course at the time of the interview and only 17 per cent had dropped out.\(^{17}\)

3.19 Receiving extra funding, such as Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA), had a positive impact on course completion. It may be that young parents receiving extra financial support to cover their expenses are less likely to work or look for work and thus find it easier to focus on their studying. Moreover, the

\(^{16}\) This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.

\(^{17}\) The proportion of young parents that completed or were still on their course (83 per cent) is only six percentage points lower than the overall retention rate of all FE learners in 2007/08 (88.7 per cent). Source: LSC, Table SR1 based on Individualised Learner Record (ILR) F05 data.
weekly EMA payments are highly likely to act as an incentive for young parents to stay on in learning. Young parents aged 16 to 19 receiving EMA were more likely to be still on the course (23 per cent compared with 15 per cent of those aged 16 to 19 not receiving EMA) and least likely to drop out (14 per cent compared with 23 per cent of those not receiving EMA) than any other group.

3.20 Young parents at school were less likely to drop out of learning (five per cent dropped out) than young parents attending learning at FE college, sixth form/sixth form college or work based learning (of whom 17 per cent, 18 per cent and 29 per cent dropped out respectively). The likelihood of dropping out of learning did not differ by course level.

3.21 Young parents who dropped out of learning were more likely to say this was because of personal problems (22 per cent of all young parents dropped out of learning because of personal problems). Other reasons included dropping out because:

- they became pregnant (nine per cent),
- it became too difficult to look after their child and study (nine per cent).

Qualifications gained by the end of the academic year 2007/08

3.22 In total, 75 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, nearly one third (31 per cent) of young parents who did not complete their course reported achieving a partial qualification.

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></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes %</td>
<td>No – left early/dropped out %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1012 260 318 1593

3.23 Having a qualification had an impact on young parents’ destinations after the course, and it was significantly correlated to achieving a positive job and

---

18 This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.
learning outcome. At the time of the survey, the majority of young parents had both completed their 2007/08 course and achieved a qualification (59 per cent).

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

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

3.25 In addition, 21 per cent of all young parents in the survey obtained another qualification between September 2007 and July 2008 apart from the one gained from the original course already discussed.

3.26 The majority of those who obtained another qualification between September 2007 and July 2008 got one of the following qualifications:19

- NVQ (18 per cent)
- GCSE (15 per cent)
- key skills (15 per cent)
- first aid (five per cent)
- A or AS levels (five per cent).

**Further learning**20

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

3.28 Among those in the survey who were studying or about to start a course at the time of the interview, almost half (48 per cent) were attending a new course which was not the same as the course they were doing between September 2007 and July 2008 (this equates to 33 per cent of all young parents).

3.29 The most common reasons for young parents to go into further learning were to continue or progress with previous learning (44 per cent), or to get a better or good job (30 per cent). The other major reason was that it was something they always wanted to do (11 per cent).

3.30 Encouragingly, 96 per cent of young parents who started a new course were in courses which lead to a qualification (this equates to 32 per cent of all young parents).

---

19 The remainder were made up of small percentages (less than five per cent) of various other qualifications. Nine per cent of young parents answered ‘don’t know’ to this question.

20 This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.
3.31 In terms of course level, Table 3-3 details that young parents attending further courses after the original one in 2007/08 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>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>5</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 2008/09</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young parents on same course as 2007/08</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009  
Unweighted base: 1,593

3.32 Overall, five per cent of young parents funded in 2007/08 were studying at Level 4 or were at university when interviewed in 2009.

3.33 Young parents who were on a different course from the one they were attending in 2007/08\(^{21}\) were mainly studying for one of the following qualifications\(^{22}\):

- NVQ (33 per cent, which equates to nine per cent of all young parents)
- BTEC (14 per cent, which equates to three per cent of all young parents)
- A or AS level (13 per cent, which equates to three per cent of all young parents)
- GCSE (seven per cent, which equates to two per cent of all young parents).

3.34 Table 3-4 details some young parents who continued learning or progressed to higher level courses. For example, 35 per cent of young parents who studied at Level 1 in 2007/08 continued on the same course the following year and 15 per cent moved onto Level 2 courses.

\(^{21}\) Unweighted base is 504.  
\(^{22}\) The remainder (33 per cent) were made up of small percentages of various other qualifications.
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Table 3-4 Learning progression from 2007/08 to 2008/09

| Level of the original course 2007/08 | Other qual | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Course does not lead to qual or unsure if leads to qual | Not studying at time of the interview in 2008-2009 | Young parent on same course as 2007-08 | Unweighted Base |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Level 1                               | 4          | 5       | 15      | 6       | *       | 1                                                         | 33                                              | 35                              | 297             |
| Level 2                               | 4          | 2       | 12      | 15      | 1       | 1                                                         | 31                                              | 34                              | 572             |
| Level 3                               | 7          | 2       | 5       | 10      | 10      | 1                                                         | 26                                              | 38                              | 416             |
| Other qualification                    | 9          | 4       | 12      | 8       | 3       | 1                                                         | 28                                              | 35                              | 221             |
| Unknown                               | -          | 20      | 20      | 20      | -       | -                                                         | 40                                              | -                               | 5               |
| Unsure if leads to qualification      | 14         | 3       | 12      | 2       | 2       | 3                                                         | 47                                              | 17                              | 62              |

Source: Inclusion 2009

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-two 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. Seventy-nine per cent of young parents who were still studying were receiving Care to Learn funding or about to apply for it.

3.37 Of those remaining, 20 per cent who were still studying and using childcare which was not covered by Care to Learn, said they were too old (26 per cent) – of these 69 per cent were aged 19 and over. Sixteen per cent thought they were not eligible\(^{23}\) – 56 per cent of these young parents were aged 19 years or over.

\(^{23}\) This is based on 144 young parents.
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Young parents’ destinations

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.

Figure 3-4 Young parents’ destinations

- School college learning, 64%
- At home looking after child, 13%
- Looking for work, 7%
- Working, 9%
- Pregnant and staying at home, 2%
- About to start course, 5%

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 1,964

3.38 The proportion of young parents in learning is significantly higher (64 per cent) in the 2007/08 cohort compared with the 2006/07 cohort, in which 58 per cent were in learning. Conversely, the proportion of young parents in employment is lower in the 2007/08 cohort compared with the 2006/07; nine per cent of young parents were working and seven per cent looking for work compared with results last year when seven per cent were looking for work and 14 per cent were actually working. The difference this year could be owing to the recession having an impact on job opportunities. Also the high proportion still studying may reflect a positive experience of Care to Learn funded education in the previous academic year.

3.39 Table 3-5 shows different young parents’ destinations by age on 1 August 2007. Young parents aged 15 or under at the time of the course (1 August 2007) were obviously more likely to be in school or college after the end of the course while the older parents (over 18) were more likely to be in work than
younger parents. Nine per cent were working and seven per cent looking for work compared with results last year when seven per cent were looking for work and 14 per cent were actually working. The difference this year could be owing to the recession having an impact on job opportunities. Also the high proportion still studying may reflect a positive experience of Care to Learn funded education in the previous academic year.

Table 3-5 Young parents’ destination by age on 31 July 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young parents’ destination</th>
<th>15 years old or younger (%)</th>
<th>16 years old (%)</th>
<th>17 years old (%)</th>
<th>18 years old (%)</th>
<th>19 and over (%)</th>
<th>All young parents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School college learning</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after child</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill, unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for a course</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year out or gap year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted base</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>251</strong></td>
<td><strong>460</strong></td>
<td><strong>507</strong></td>
<td><strong>582</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Inclusion 2009*

3.40 Table 3-6 shows that parents from black African backgrounds were 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 compared with parents from black Caribbean and African backgrounds.
3.41 Finally, lone parents were more likely than the other young parents to be in school, college or learning (65 per cent compared with 54 per cent) but they were less likely to be working (seven per cent compared with 14 per cent) and to be looking for work (six 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 3-7 shows the proportion of young parents (all ages) who were NEET before and after the course. Only 27 per cent of young parents were NEET at the time of the interview compared with 66 per cent who were NEET before the start of the course.

3.43 Table 3-8 shows the same information but for those aged 16 to 18 years (as used in the official definition of NEET). Only 28 per cent of this age group were NEET at the time of the interview compared with 67 per cent of them who were NEET before the start of the course.

Table 3-7 Proportion of NEET young parents before and after the original course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity before the start of the original course (2007) %</th>
<th>Current activity at the time of the survey (2009) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education employment or training</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 1,593

24 Only those ethnic groups with a large enough sample shown.
Table 3-8 Proportion of NEET young parents (aged 16 to 18) before and after the original course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity before the start of the original course (2007) %</th>
<th>Current activity at the time of the survey (2009) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education employment or training</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 1,031

3.44 At the time of the interview in 2009, 13 per cent of young parents were at home looking after a child and not looking for work.

3.45 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 (53 per cent). Other reasons for staying at home were:

- looking for a new course (11 per cent)
- could not afford childcare (10 per cent)
- dealing with personal problems (nine per cent)
- waiting to start a new course (seven per cent).

**NEET summary**

3.46 As Table 3-9 shows, the reduction in the proportion of NEET young parents, was similar across different groups of young parents, including ‘new 19 year old parents’ receiving Care to Learn for the first time and young parents who received the London rate of funding. See Chapter 7 for discussion of the longer term destinations of young parents funded by Care to Learn.

---

25 This is based on 202 young parents.
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Table 3-9 Summary of NEET young parents before and after the 2007/08 Care to Learn funding by main groups of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of young parents who were NEET in the summer of 2007 (%)</th>
<th>16 to 18 year olds</th>
<th>New 19 year olds</th>
<th>Young parents receiving the London rate of funding</th>
<th>All young parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unweighted base | 1,031 | 224 | 427 | 1,593 |

1. Young parents may be in more than one group of interest in this table; the groups are not mutually exclusive.
2. The percentages do not sum to 100% as they are from two different periods of time and therefore show the proportion of all young parents in a particular group who were NEET at a particular point in time.
3. Age is the young parents’ age at 31/07/07.

3.47 Findings from other research show that young people tend to move in and out of being NEET over time. Females were slightly less likely than males to have spent time NEET, however the proportion having spent 12 months or more NEET is similar between males and females. The main reason female NEET respondents (to the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England (LSYPE) and the Youth Cohort Survey (YCS)) gave for barriers to education, employment and training was that they ‘had their own child/pregnant (30 per cent of female NEET respondents).26

3.48 To put these findings into context, 9.7 per cent of 16 to 18 year olds in England were NEET at the end of 2007, which went up to 10.3 per cent at the end of 2008.27

Impact of Care to Learn on young parents moving into work28

Economic activity of young parents

3.49 Seven per cent of young parents were looking for work at the time of interview in April/May 2009 and an additional nine per cent were in work.

3.50 The two most common reasons why young parents were working were because they decided to take the job to earn some money (34 per cent) or for career aspirations (32 per cent). In addition to this:

- 12 per cent reported that they got the job to gain experience or training

28 This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.
3.51 More than half (55 per cent) of young parents in work were in part-time employment. Encouragingly, 83 per cent of young parents in work were in permanent jobs. Forty-three per cent of them were receiving training as part of their job and 69 per cent of them said they were still using childcare.

3.52 Young parents in work were asked whether they felt the course they were doing between September 2007 and July 2008 helped them to find a job. Thirty nine per cent of them reported that the course had a role in moving them into work.

Young parents in jobs without training

3.53 Nine per cent of all young parents were working after the course. The majority of young parents in work were in jobs without training (53 per cent, which is three per cent of all young parents in the survey).

3.54 The difference between the proportion of young parents working in jobs without training by temporary or permanent jobs is 67 per cent of young parents in temporary jobs and 53 per cent of those in permanent jobs, indicating that young parents in temporary jobs are less likely to receive training.
THE IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN IN LONDON IN 2007/08

Summary

- The cost of living in London is generally higher than the rest of the country and Care to Learn provides up to £15 extra per child per week to young parents in London\(^{29}\) 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.

- 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 – 65 per cent of young parents receiving the London rate of funding completed the course and achieved a qualification.

- Learning was the main destination of young parents receiving the London rate of funding, with 65 per cent of them at school, college or training after the end of the original course. Of these, 48 per cent had started a new course.

- 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 (38 per cent compared with 34 per cent outside London).

- 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 (56 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding got help with travel expenses compared with 78 per cent of young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding).

4.1 Young parents across England during 2007/08 could claim a maximum of £160 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 £175.

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 the learning outcomes of young parents receiving the London rate of funding in terms of course completion and qualifications gained, and their destinations.

\(^{29}\) Please see the list of London boroughs in Chapter 9 of this report
The profile of young parents in London

4.3 The age profile of young parents receiving the London rate of Care to Learn funding is slightly older than the young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

4.4 The majority of young parents receiving the London rate of funding were black African parents (33 per cent) or black Caribbean parents (17 per cent). Less than a quarter of parents receiving the London rate of funding were white (23 per cent), compared with the majority of parents who did not receive the London rate of funding (86 per cent of young parents living outside London were white) – see Table 4-1. Ethnic population figures for London\(^{30}\) indicate that young black Caribbean parents are less likely to receive Care to Learn funding compared with young black African parents. Additional information regarding how ethnic groups are paying for childcare if not receiving Care to Learn funding is needed to fully understand why this happening.

<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 – Caribbean</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – African</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British(^{31})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted base</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009

Impact of Care to Learn in London

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 (see Table 4-2). 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.


\(^{31}\) This includes Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Indian which were all at less than 0.5 per cent.
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Table 4-2 Impact of London rate of funding (extra £15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</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>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15 less per child per week would have made no difference, I would have done a course anyway</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted base</strong></td>
<td><strong>427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009

4.6 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.

4.7 Almost three quarters (70 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:

- seven per cent reported that they would have probably done some study but the help meant they could do more
- 19 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.32

4.8 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 (27 per cent compared with 18 per cent). Young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding were more likely to use childcare provision at college or school (10 per cent compared with six per cent of young parents receiving the London rate of funding).

4.9 Childcare costs in London are generally higher compared with the rest of the country, this is especially true for inner London. According to the Childcare Costs Survey33 for 2009 the average cost for nursery childcare (for those aged under two) is £226 per week in inner London and £192 in outer London.

---

32 Two per cent answered ‘don’t know’.  
33 Childcare Costs Survey 2009, Daycare Trust
compared with an English average of £167. For childminders looking after children aged under two the average costs are £196 for inner London and £189 for outer London compared with an average for England of £150.

4.10 The difference in childcare choice may be owing 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 (27 per cent compared with 19 per cent of white parents).

4.11 Overall, 72 per cent of parents receiving Care to Learn funding in London were very satisfied with the childcare received compared with 81 per cent for those not receiving the London rate. Another 29 per cent were fairly satisfied compared with 14 per cent. Only eight per cent showed no sign of satisfaction in London compared with six per cent not receiving the London rate.

4.12 Eleven per cent of young parents in London found it fairly or very difficult to find childcare compared with only five per cent not receiving the London rate. This again may be owing to the different profile in London, as 16 per cent of black African parents found it fairly difficult to find childcare compared with only four per cent for white young parents. There maybe a capacity issue in London, as eight per cent of those receiving the London rate found that there were not enough childcare places compared with only four per cent who did not get the London rate.

Funding to cover transport costs in London

4.13 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than other young parents to apply for funding to cover transport costs (38 per cent compared with 34 per cent outside London). Also, young parents receiving the London rate of funding were least likely to receive support to cover their travel expenses of all young parents (56 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding who applied for help with travel expenses received it, compared with 78 per cent of those not receiving the London rate of funding who applied for help with travel expenses). This may be because of two factors: they had already used up to their weekly maximum on childcare costs or 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.

4.14 Thirteen per cent of London learners also said that applying for travel costs was unnecessary because they got free transport (compared with six per cent for those not getting the London rate). All 16 to 17 year olds in London can travel at child-rate on bus, Tube, tram, DLR and London Overground services with a
16+ Oyster photocard. Those 16 to 18 year olds who live in a London borough and are still in qualifying full-time education can also apply to get free travel on buses and trams. All under-16s can travel free on buses and trams and at child-rate on Tube, DLR and London Overground services, if they have an Oyster photocard.34

Courses attended in 2007/0835

4.15 Looking at the level of courses attended in 2007/08 the majority of young parents receiving the London rate of funding attended Level 2 (33 per cent) or Level 3 courses (31 per cent) while 17 per cent were studying at Level 1. Thirteen per cent of them were undertaking courses leading to other qualifications and three per cent attended Skills for Life courses.

Course completion

4.16 The completion rate for young parents receiving the London rate of funding was high, with 69 per cent of them completing the course. Moreover, 14 per cent of the young parents receiving the London rate of funding dropped out and another 17 per cent were still on the course at the time of the interview.

Qualifications gained

4.17 Sixty-five per cent of young parents receiving the London rate of funding completed the course and achieved a qualification compared with 58 per cent for those who did not get the London rate.

4.18 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were less likely than the other young parents to achieve the following qualifications (only statistically significant differences highlighted):

- GCSE (six per cent compared with 11 per cent of the other young parents)
- NVQ (29 per cent compared with 36 per cent of the other young parents)

4.19 However, they were more likely to gain BTEC (23 per cent compared with 16 per cent of the other young parents).

35 Course and qualification analysis is based on those funded only in 2007/08 (group 3) – they are not comparable with last year’s report.
Destinations of young parents receiving the London rate of funding

4.20 Learning was the main destination of young parents receiving the London rate of funding with 67 per cent of them at school/college or in training after the end of the original course.

Table 4-3 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>School college learning</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start course</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after child</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill, unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for a course</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year out or gap year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted base</strong></td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009

4.21 In addition to these findings, the analysis has found that the proportion of young parents who were NEET and received the London rate of funding dropped considerably from 67 per cent in the summer 2007 (just before their course funded by Care to Learn began) to 27 per cent when interviewed in April/May 2009.

Further learning

4.22 As previously discussed, 74 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 2009 (Table 4-3). Of these, nearly half (48 per cent) were on or about to start a new course that was different from the one they took in 2007/08 (this equates to five per cent of all young parents who received the London rate of funding).

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 (47 per cent), which was in line with the rest of the young parents.

4.24 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.
5 THE IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN ON NEW 19 YEAR OLD PARENTS IN 2007/08

Summary

- Care to Learn funding proved essential for the majority of new 19 year old parents to be able to attend their course in 2007/08. Almost four in five (78 per cent) reported that they could not have attended their course without funding from Care to Learn.
- New 19 year old parents were significantly more likely to use a day nursery (outside their college) as their main form of childcare than other young parents.
- A significantly higher proportion of new 19 year old parents applied for help with the costs of transport from their home to their childcare (42 per cent as opposed to 33 per cent of other young parents).
- New 19 year old parents were found to have attended longer rather than shorter courses in 2007/08. The largest proportion of new 19 year old parents attended courses that lasted nine months or more but less than 12 months (36 per cent), while 30 per cent attended courses lasting two years or more.
- Sixty one per cent of new 19 year old parents had completed their course and achieved a qualification, in line with other young parents.
- New 19 year old parents were significantly more likely to have gained a Level 3 qualification than other young parents (35 per cent compared with 20 per cent).
- The proportion of new 19 year old parents who were NEET dropped from 71 per cent in 2007 before receiving Care to Learn funding, to 28 per cent by 2009.
- The destination for the majority of new 19 year old parents (71 per cent) after receiving Care to Learn funding was further learning. Twenty-five per cent of new 19 year old parents said they were currently studying for a Level 3 qualification. This was higher than for other young parents, of whom 18 per cent were studying for this.

Introduction

5.1 This chapter looks at the impact of Care to Learn on ‘new 19 year old’ parents. The academic year of 2007/08 was the second academic year for which 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. Altogether, the proportion of young parents who were ‘new 19 year olds’ represents 12 per cent of all young parents interviewed.

5.2 This chapter examines whether or not this group would have been able to attend the course without the support of Care to Learn (see Table 5.1) It also discusses the impact of Care to Learn funding on these young parents’ learning outcomes and destinations after their 2007/08 course had ended.

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 attended their course without Care to Learn funding to pay 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></th>
<th>New 19 year old parents (%)</th>
<th>Other young parents (%)</th>
<th>All young parents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could not have gone on a course without help from Care to Learn in paying for childcare</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have done some study but the help meant I could do more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would probably have gone on a course anyway but the help made it much easier</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with paying for childcare made no difference, I would have done a course anyway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted bases 224 1,726 1,9641

Source: Inclusion 2009
1. In total 14 people did not give permission for their administrative data to be added to the survey data, so it is unknown if they are new 19 year old parents or not.
2. The unweighted base includes those who answered ‘don’t know’ to this question, less than one per cent of young parents.

5.4 These findings show that there is no significant difference in the impact of Care to Learn on new 19 year old parents’ ability to attend learning compared with the rest of young parents – it was equally important to both groups. Only one per cent of new 19 year old parents said that Care to Learn would have made no difference to their study.

5.5 Over half (57 per cent) of new 19 year old parents used a day nursery (outside their college or school) as their main form of childcare. This was significantly

36 New 19 year old parents are identified as those young parents who received funding in 2007/08, were 19 years old at the start of the academic year and did not receive Care to Learn funding in 2006/07.
higher than other young parents, of whom 53 per cent used this childcare. New 19 year old parents were significantly less likely to use childminders than other young parents (15 per cent compared with 20 per cent). These findings show that new 19 year old parents used Care to Learn funding for different types of childcare compared with other young parents.

5.6 Eleven per cent of new 19 year old parents used nursery school (outside their college or school), which was closely aligned with other young parents, of whom 10 per cent used this form of childcare.

5.7 Overall, 75 per cent of new 19 year old parents said they were very satisfied with the childcare they received funding for, a similar response rate to other young parents (80 per cent).

5.8 Nearly all (97 per cent) of new 19 year old parents said that the funding received from Care to Learn was sufficient to cover their childcare for the whole time they were at their learning provider. This was in line with other young parents, of whom 96 per cent said this. However, significantly fewer new 19 year old parents (71 per cent) said this funding covered them while undertaking private study related to their course, as did 75 per cent of other young parents.

5.9 For the majority of both new 19 year old parents and other young parents, the amount of childcare funding available through Care to Learn did not affect their choice of course, as 95 per cent of both groups stated.

5.10 Forty-two per cent of new 19 year old parents had applied for help with transport costs to cover the cost of travelling between their home and their childcare provider. This is significantly higher than for other young parents, of whom 33 per cent had applied for this help.

5.11 Of those who applied for this additional support, new 19 year old parents were more likely than other young parents to receive funding for help with transport costs (81 per cent compared with 73 per cent).

5.12 While, as indicated in Chapter four, this varied by region, the number of new 19 year olds does not. This suggests that age may be a factor influencing applications for transport costs. Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were more likely than other young parents to apply for funding to cover transport costs (38 per cent compared with 34 per cent outside of London). Among new 19 year old parents, this may be owing to the fact that 19 year olds
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do not get free or discounted travel unless they are registered in full-time higher education.37

5.13 There may also be a link between applying for help with transport costs and the type of childcare provider used. Those using a day nursery (outside their college or school, i.e. somewhere they would need to travel to separately) as their main childcare were also most likely to apply for help with transport costs (36 per cent). Given that this was the type of childcare significantly more often used by new 19 year old parents than other young parents, the implication is that new 19 year old parents using day nurseries in London are potentially in greater need of help with transport costs than other young parents.

5.14 With regard to other sources of funding to help with costs while learning, 38 per cent of new 19 year old parents studying for their first Level 2 or Level 3 course applied for an Adult Learning Grant.38

Course length and learning provider39

5.15 The findings suggest that new 19 year old parents’ reasons for studying are predominantly career-related. Just over half of new 19 year old parents (51 per cent) stated that their main reason for wanting to do the course was to get a better/good job. This response had a higher rate than among other young parents, of whom 44 per cent said this.

5.16 The majority (82 per cent) of new 19 year old parents had attended a further education (FE) college. This was significantly higher than other young parents, of whom 69 per cent attended an FE college.

5.17 The findings show that the majority of new 19 year old parents were on long courses (91 per cent were on courses of nine months or more):

- New 19 year old parents were most likely to have attended a course lasting nine months or more but less than 12 months (36 per cent), which was significantly higher than other young parents of whom 24 per cent attended courses this length.

38 This proportion is based on the course levels young parents said they applied for in 2007/08 and on the qualifications they said they gained prior to 2007/08, so there may be some recall error. This figure may be related to course hours, but it is not possible to establish this as the numbers of new 19 year old parents involved are too small.
39 This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07. Findings based on group 3 young parents are not comparable with last year’s report.
Both new 19 year old parents and other young parents were nearly equally likely (21 and 22 per cent respectively) to attend a course lasting 12 months or more but less than 18 months.

Nearly a third (30 per cent) of new 19 year old parents attended a course lasting two years or more, in contrast to other young parents who were most likely to have attended a course of this length (34 per cent).

Course completion and qualifications gained

Overall, new 19 year old parents had a course completion and qualification achievement rate of 61 per cent, which was closely aligned with other young parents (59 per cent). Just over one in ten (13 per cent) of new 19 year old parents neither completed the course nor achieved a qualification, a similar scenario for other young parents (11 per cent).

New 19 year old parents were most likely to have gained Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications (36 and 35 per cent respectively) with 16 per cent of this group achieving Level 1 qualifications. In contrast, other young parents were most likely (31 per cent) to have gained an 'other' qualification.

In line with new 19 year old parents, 30 per cent of other young parents gained a Level 2 qualification. However, new 19 year old parents were significantly more likely to have achieved a Level 3 qualification compared with other young parents, of whom 20 per cent achieved this. This may be owing to age, as the new 19 year old parents are older than the others and more likely to have been eligible for the Level 3 stage.

---

40 This section on course completion and qualifications is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not included young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07. Findings based on group 3 young parents are not comparable with last year’s report.
**Impact of Care to Learn: tracking the destinations of young parents funded in 2007/08**

### Young parents’ destinations

#### 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>School/college/learning</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after baby/child</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to start a course</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant and staying at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill and unable to work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for a course</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year out or gap year</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted base</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,726</strong></td>
<td>1,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009

1. In total 14 people did not give permission for their administrative data to be added to the survey data, so it is unknown if they are new 19 year old parents or not.

* refers to percentages below one.

5.21 Following on from using Care to Learn support to attend learning in 2007/08, the majority (64 per cent) of new 19 year old parents were continuing in learning. This was the same for other young parents. Both groups were also equally likely (13 per cent) to say they were currently at home looking after their child.

5.22 In addition to these findings, the analysis found that the proportion of new 19 year old parents who were NEET dropped from 71 per cent in 2007 before receiving Care to Learn funding, to 28 per cent by 2009.

### Further learning

5.23 Fifty-one per cent of both new 19 year old parents and other young parents who were still studying said this was for the same course they started between September 2007 and July 2008. This suggests that these young parents may be those who said they were undertaking a course lasting two years or more with the help of Care to Learn funding in 2007/08, which applied to approximately one third of both sets of parents, as outlined above.

5.24 Of new 19 year old parents studying on a different course from the one they attended between September 2007 and July 2008, nearly all (99 per cent) said

---

41 This section on further learning is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07. Findings based on group 3 young parents are not comparable with last year’s report.
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this would lead to a qualification. This was in line with other young parents (95 per cent). Twenty-five per cent of new 19 year old parents said they were currently studying for a Level 3 qualification. This is higher than for other young parents, of whom 18 per cent were studying for this.

**Characteristics of new 19 year old parents**

5.25 The majority (69 per cent) of new 19 year old parents identified themselves as white British, in line with other young parents, of whom 74 per cent said this. This was followed by black or black British Caribbean (seven per cent) and then black or black British African (also seven per cent), among new 19 year old parents. In comparison, a higher proportion of other young parents were more likely to be black or black British African (9 per cent) than black or black British Caribbean (5 per cent).

5.26 Seventy-nine per cent of new 19 year old parents were identified as lone parents, which is closely aligned with other young parents (82 per cent).
6 EVALUATING CARE TO LEARN: ACCESS, PROVISION AND FUNDING IN 2007/08

Summary

- 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 and the main channel through which young parents found out about Care to Learn was a Connexions adviser (36 per cent).
- Care to Learn effectively met the childcare needs of young parents and the level of satisfaction with the provision was high. Ninety-seven 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 94 per cent of all young parents in the survey said that they were satisfied with the childcare provided.
- Nine out of ten (91 per cent) young parents found the application process easy.
- The most used form of childcare at the time of the course was the day nursery (not at college/school), used by over half of young parents in the survey (54 per cent).
- Ninety-four per cent of all young parents found it easy to find the childcare they wanted. This was confirmed by 88 per cent of young parents who reported that they had no problem finding the childcare they wanted. Of those that did have a problem the main reason stated was the lack of places – this problem was greater in London compared with the rest of the country.
- 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-four per cent of all young parents in the survey applied for help with transport costs and the majority of them received it (74 per cent of young parents who applied for funding for transport costs received the funding).

---

42 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.
6.1 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 2007 and July 2008, and the funding provided by Care to Learn.

**Finding out about Care to Learn**

6.2 Most young parents had heard about Care to Learn before applying for their course (59 per cent) compared with a quarter of young parents who heard about Care to Learn while applying for their course. The rest did not hear about Care to Learn until after applying for the course (15 per cent).

6.3 Young parents aged 16 and under were more likely than those aged 19 and over to have heard about Care to Learn before applying for their course (65 per cent compared with 52 per cent). The reason for this could be that younger respondents had greater access to advice services such as Connexions. Thirty-six per cent of those aged 16 and under stated that they heard about Care to Learn through Connexions. This compares with 28 per cent of young parents aged 19 and over.

6.4 The main channels through which young parents found out about Care to Learn were a Connexions adviser (36 per cent) or college student support staff (21 per cent). A smaller proportion of young parents came to know about Care to Learn through the following (may not add up to 100 due to rounding):

- school/career guidance staff (five per cent)
- teachers and tutors (four per cent)
- family or friends (six per cent)
- midwives, nurses, healthcare workers (six per cent)
- internet/websites (four per cent)
- Care to Learn posters and leaflets (three per cent)
- Sure Start advisers (three per cent)
- Jobcentre Plus (two per cent)
- other (nine per cent)
- don’t know (two per cent).

6.5 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. Young parents aged 16 and under were more likely than other young parents to find it easy to find out about Care to Learn (97 per cent of those aged 16 and under reported finding it easy compared with 90 per cent of other young parents).

---

43 This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.
6.6 Of those young parents who said it was difficult to find out about Care to Learn, the majority (59 per cent) explained it was difficult because they didn’t know where to go or who to speak to.

6.7 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 funded in 2007/08), 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.

6.8 More than half (58 per cent) of all young parents in the survey did not feel Care to Learn needed any improvement. However, among those suggesting improvements, eight per cent said that clearer communication, information and awareness were needed and another eight per cent that more advertising was required. Six per cent of young parents suggested increasing the age limit on Care to Learn eligibility. Understandably, this was higher for 19 year olds and above (19 per cent compared with only one per cent of young parents aged 16 or under).

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 (10 per cent compared with seven per cent).

Applying for Care to Learn

6.10 Applying for Care to Learn was regarded as an easy process overall and more than nine out of ten (91 per cent) of all young parents in the survey found the application process easy. This did not differ significantly by the age of the young parent.

6.11 The sources 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 (50 per cent)
- college student support staff (34 per cent)
- Care to Learn posters/leaflets (25 per cent)
- family or friends (20 per cent)
- teachers and tutors (19 per cent)
- school careers guidance staff (16 per cent)
- midwives/nurses/health workers (14 per cent)

---

44 This section is based only on those funded in 2007/08 (group 3) and does not include young parents funded by Care to Learn in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.
6.12 Young parents under the age of 19 were more likely to use Connexions advisers for advice on applying (54 per cent) compared with those aged 19 and over (39 per cent). Whereas, those aged 19 and over are more likely to use college student support staff for advice (42 per cent) compared with under 19s (32 per cent). Those aged 16 and under are more reliant on teachers, tutors, school careers guidance staff and midwives/health workers for advice compared with older age groups.

6.13 Almost all young parents (98 per cent) felt the help and advice received by Connexions advisers was useful. Moreover, 78 per cent of young parents specified it was very useful.

Use of childcare

6.14 Young parents were asked what type of childcare they used while they were on the course between September 2007 and July 2008.

6.15 The most common form of childcare funded by Care to Learn was the day nursery (not at college/school), used by over half of young parents in the survey (54 per cent). Other forms of childcare used by young parents at the time they attended the original course were:

- registered childminder (21 per cent)
- nursery school (not at college/school) (10 per cent)
- childcare provided by the college/school (nine per cent)
- crèches (not at college/school) (six per cent).

6.16 Young parents who received the London rate of funding were more likely than those who did not to use a registered childminder (28 per cent compared with 19 per cent) while young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding were more likely to use childcare provision at college/school (10 per cent compared with six per cent of young parents receiving the London rate of funding). 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.

---

45 This section is based on all young parents funded in 2007/08 (group 1) including those who also received funding in 2006/07.
6.17 Young parents in London and the south east are less likely to use day nurseries compared with those in regions in the rest of the country. Only 44 per cent use day nurseries in the south east compared with the national average of 54 per cent. Exactly half of young parents in London use day nurseries compared with 58 per cent in the north west and 61 per cent in the west Midlands. This may be because of the cost of day nurseries in London and the rest of the south east.

6.18 Care to Learn effectively met the childcare needs of young parents and 97 per cent of young parents reported that their main source of childcare was also their preferred form.46 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 (56 per cent).47

6.19 All the young parents in the survey were then asked how easy it was to find the childcare funded by Care to Learn. Ninety-four per cent of all young parents found it easy to find this childcare. This was confirmed by 88 per cent of young parents who reported that they had no problem finding the childcare funded by Care to Learn. Of those that did have a problem the main reason stated was the lack of places – this problem was greater in London compared with the rest of the country.

6.20 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 (24 per cent)
- close to college (18 per cent)
- looked at options and liked this best (12 per cent)
- know and trust this person/people (10 per cent)
- told to use this childcare (five per cent)
- no choice/the only one available (four per cent)
- transport convenient (four per cent)
- wanted to be near to child (three per cent).

6.21 Location of the childcare was particularly important for some young parents. Black African parents were more likely than white parents to report being ‘close to home’ as the most important reason for choosing their childcare (31 per cent of black African parents reported this compared with 22 per cent of white parents). However, 12 per cent of black African parents stated ‘close to college’ as the most important reason for choosing their childcare compared with 19 per cent for white parents.

---

46 Based on young parents that knew what their main type of childcare was.
47 These findings are only based on 57 young parents.
6.22 Overall, the level of satisfaction about the childcare used by young parents was high and 94 per cent of all young parents said that they were satisfied with their childcare. Among those, 79 per cent answered that they were very satisfied and 15 per cent were fairly satisfied. However, it would be surprising if a young parent left their child with a carer they were not satisfied with, as they would quickly switch to an alternative one.

**Funding provided by Care to Learn**

6.23 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.

6.24 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 75 per cent of young parents. It was slightly more for those aged 20 and over, at 82 per cent, and black African parents, at 79 per cent.

6.25 Young parents living in the east of England and the south east were less likely to say that Care to Learn funded childcare for private study (64 per cent of those in the east of England and 66 per cent of those in the south east) compared with young parents in other regions.

6.26 Table 6-1 shows that for those saying that ‘funding did not cover the whole time of private study’ there was a slight reduction in the amount of funding from Care to Learn. To fully understand the reasons behind those saying no we would need additional information on their course length in weeks to determine if they reached their maximum funding allowance.

---

48 This is in line with other childcare satisfaction rates. See [http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR083.pdf](http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR083.pdf) for further information.

49 The remainder of this chapter is based on all young parents funded in 2007/08 (Group 1) including those who also received funding in 2006/07.

50 For young parents attending full-time learning Care to Learn could fund up to an additional 10 hours of 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.
Table 6-1 Actual payments received for childcare by whether they covered whole time of private study (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered whole time of private study %:</th>
<th>£0 to £2,500</th>
<th>£2,501 to £5,000</th>
<th>£5,001 to £10,000</th>
<th>£10,001 to £20,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted base</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009 using administrative data on childcare payments
Unweighted base: 1,964

6.27 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.

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

- they cared for their own child (53 per cent)
- members of their family looked after their child (24 per cent)
- they studied when the child was asleep (11 per cent)
- other (12 per cent).

6.29 Only seven per cent of young parents paid by themselves. This shows that overall, payments for additional childcare are generally not a problem and when additional childcare is needed most can make alternative arrangements, with only a small number having to meet costs themselves. Only four per cent of young parents said the amount of funding available for Care to Learn affected their choice of course.

6.30 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.

6.31 Thirty-four per cent of all young parents in the survey reported applying 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.

---

51 In order to determine if these young parents had reached their maximum funding allowance, we would need additional information on their course length in weeks.
6.32 New 19 year old applicants in 2007/08 were more likely to apply for funding towards transport costs (42 per cent compared with 33 per cent for all non new 19 year olds).

6.33 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, 74 per cent received funding towards them (this equates to 25 per cent of all young parents receiving funding towards their travel costs\(^{52}\)). Of the young parents who received funding for transport costs, 78 per cent received funding that covered the whole cost of travel.

6.34 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were less likely to receive funding for their travel expenses (56 per cent of those receiving the London rate of funding got help with travel expenses compared with 78 per cent of those not receiving the London rate). This may be because they used most or all of their weekly allowance on childcare or because they were able to access free London transport (see Chapter 4 for more details). It may also be because those in London reached the weekly maximum amount on childcare costs alone even with the additional London payment.

6.35 The high proportion of black African parents in London is also likely to influence this, as these young parents were more likely to apply for transport funding (53 per cent of black African parents compared with 31 per cent of young parents from white parents and 35 per cent for black Caribbean 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.\(^{53}\)

6.36 Just over three quarters (77 per cent) of young parents who did not receive funding (which covered all of the cost between home and childcare) said that they paid for their travel/the rest of the cost of their travel themselves. Another seven per cent said the travel costs paid by the learning provider and the same percentage said that the cost was paid by their family.

\(^{52}\) According to Care to Learn administrative data, only 19 per cent of young parents in the survey received funding towards their travel costs. This suggests either not all travel payments are recorded in the administrative data or the young parents are unclear about the source of funding for their travel.

\(^{53}\) 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.
Education Maintenance Allowance

6.37 Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) is intended to encourage more young people from low income backgrounds to participate in post compulsory learning. The allowance is up to £30 per week for those aged 16 to 18. To be eligible for EMA the course must be full-time (at least 12 hours a week) and last for at least 10 weeks. Applicants are also income assessed, based on the learner’s total household income, with the maximum income to be eligible in 2007/08 of £30,810. Where an applicant is also a parent, the assessment is based only on their own income (and their partner’s income if they live with someone).

6.38 To calculate all those that were eligible to claim EMA, the number of young parents aged 16, 17, or 18 years old at 31 July 2007\(^{54}\) and on courses that were over 12 hours a week long and lasted for 10 weeks or more was calculated. However, information was not collected about whether the young parent was an asylum seeker (and therefore not eligible for EMA) or the household/young parent’s income and this should be taken into account when looking at the results.\(^{55}\)

6.39 According to the criteria above, 72 per cent of young parents eligible for EMA in the survey applied for EMA between September 2007 and July 2008. Eighty-nine per cent of those that were eligible and applied for EMA received it.

6.40 Black African young parents who were eligible were the least likely group to apply for EMA (36 per cent) compared with 75 per cent of white parents, 78 per cent of black Caribbean parents and 69 per cent of parents from mixed backgrounds.\(^{56}\)

6.41 Young parents receiving the London rate of funding were less likely to apply for EMA than young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding (59 per cent compared with 74 per cent). This is again likely to be a reflection of the fact that black African parents are less likely to apply for EMA and account for around one third of all young parents receiving the London rate of Care to Learn funding.

\(^{54}\)Up to 2007/08, in some circumstances young people were eligible for EMA in their fourth year after leaving compulsory education (i.e. the year in which they turned 20) if a Connexions adviser certified that they met the specified criteria. However, no young parents who were 19 at the start of the 2007/08 academic year were asked about applying for EMA therefore these young people are not included in the definition of EMA eligibility here.

\(^{55}\)It is likely the nearly all young parents attending learning would have been eligible for EMA based on their income, however as income data were not collected it is not possible to verify this.

\(^{56}\)These findings are based on 120 black African parents, 753 white parents and only 66 black Caribbean parents and 68 young parents from mixed backgrounds.
6.42 Sixty-five per cent of those in the eligible age group that did not apply for EMA stated that they didn’t think they were eligible and of these 31 per cent stated it was because they thought they were too old (this equates to 21 per cent of all those eligible for EMA but did not apply for EMA). Only three per cent of young parents didn’t apply because they thought the forms were too complicated. Ten per cent of eligible young parents, who did not apply for EMA, said the reason for not applying for EMA was because they had not heard of it.

**Adult Learning Grant**

6.43 Another source of funding is the Adult Learning Grant (ALG). The ALG is only available to young parents studying their first full Level 2 or 3 qualification and aged 19 or over. As with EMA, the course has to be full time\(^{57}\) and the young parent’s own income is assessed (and their partner’s income if they live with someone). Young parents in receipt of Jobseeker’s Allowance or Income Support are not eligible for ALG.

6.44 The criteria used to identify young parents eligible for ALG was based on young parents aged 19 and over\(^{58}\) and studying a full time course at Levels 2 and 3. Based on this age and course information, 20 per cent of young parents eligible for ALG applied for ALG. Of those that applied, 44 per cent received it.

6.45 However, these findings should be treated with caution as no information on young parents’ income or benefits received was available. Therefore, it was not possible to remove young parents in receipt of Income Support or Jobseeker’s Allowance from the ‘eligible’ group of young parents these figures are based on. Consequently, it is likely that the proportion of eligible young parents claiming ALG was higher than 20 per cent.

6.46 In addition, a sizeable number of young parents who received ALG did a course that was categorised under ‘other qualification’ and even Level 1\(^{59}\) and therefore were not included in our definition of ‘eligible’. Some of this may be because some respondents were unclear about the level of their course and others were unclear about the type of funding they were receiving.

---

\(^{57}\) 450+ guided learning hours a year or its equivalent

\(^{58}\) Young parents’ age was only available ‘at the start of the academic year’, whereas ALG is dependent on the learner’s age at the start of the course. Therefore, some young parents who were 18 at the start of the academic year (and therefore not included in our definition of eligible for ALG) reported receiving ALG. This is likely to be due young parents applying for ALG when they turn 18 years old during the academic year.

\(^{59}\) Course level is based on the qualifications young parents reported when interviewed that they were studying for, rather than defined by learning providers. Young parents were interviewed on average around 18 months after starting learning in 2007/08 therefore course information is dependent on respondent recall.
6.47 The proportion of young parents applying for ALG (whether they were eligible or not) differs by type of learning provider being attended. Eighteen per cent of young parents in an FE college applied for ALG compared with only five per cent at sixth form colleges.

6.48 The main reason given by those who did not apply for ALG was they didn’t think they were eligible (42 per cent). Another 38 per cent said they had not heard of the ALG. Twenty-five per cent of young parents who reported not applying for ALG because they didn’t think they were eligible, were in fact eligible based on their reported course information.

6.49 For those that thought they were not eligible just over half stated it was because they were claiming other benefits (52 per cent). Lone parents were more likely to give this reason (55 per cent compared with 36 per cent of those that were not a lone parent).
7 LONGER TERM IMPACT OF CARE TO LEARN: DESTINATIONS OF 2006/07 RECIPIENTS

Summary

- Learning is the main destination for young parents who received Care to Learn in 2006/07 (46 per cent in school/college/on a training course); 20 per cent are working, while 21 per cent are at home looking after their baby/child or pregnant and not looking for work.
- Comparison with destinations at the time of the previous year’s survey shows movement out of learning (58 per cent of young parents were in school/college/on a training course in 2008), mostly either into work (six per cent more young parents were in work in 2009) or to being at home looking after their baby or child and not working (eight per cent more young parents were doing this in 2009).
- Of the 80 per cent of young parents not in work at the time of interview in 2009, 15 per cent had worked in the previous year (since last interviewed).
- Half of young parents who received Care to Learn in 2006/07 had obtained qualifications since the previous survey in 2008.
- Of the 46 per cent of young parents in learning at the time they were re-contacted, 45 per cent were on the same course as when last surveyed and 54 per cent on a different course.
- Most of these progressed to a higher course level. Twenty eight per cent of young parents studying at Level 3 in 2006/07 were studying at Level 4 in 2009.
- Thirty-three per cent of young parents who received Care to Learn in 2006/07 were not in education, employment or training (NEET) in 2009, compared with 25 per cent NEET in April/May 2008. However, this remains significantly lower than the proportion of young parents in the re-contact survey who were NEET in the summer of 2006, before they received Care to Learn funding in 2006/07.

7.1 This section explores the longer term impact of Care to Learn through tracking the destinations of young parents who were funded by Care to Learn in 2006/07, and agreed to be re-contacted for the 2008 research. This group numbers 555 young parents in total (group 2 young parents).

7.2 The following looks at the main destinations of this group in 2009 and compares this to their destinations a year previously. It then goes onto examine those destinations in greater detail, looking first at learning destinations, employment destinations and finally young people NEET. Logistic regression
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analysis has been performed to identify the key factors which influenced learning destinations.

7.3 Although the sample size for this part of the survey was often too small to allow much analysis of London learners or new 19 year olds, some analysis of these two groups is included at the end of the chapter.

Destination of 2006/07 Care to Learn recipients

7.4 Figure 7-1 and Figure 7-2 show the main activities young parents were engaged in at the time they were surveyed in 2009 and at the time of the previous survey in April-May 2008. As Figure 7-1 shows, just over half of re-contacted 2006/07 respondents were either undertaking some form of learning (the majority) or about to start a course in 2009. A quarter of respondents were either working (the majority) or looking for work. Most of the remainder (a similar proportion to those who were in work) were at home looking after their child and not looking for work.

Figure 7-1 Re-contacted young parent’s destinations in 2009

Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 555
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Figure 7-2 Young Parents’ destinations in 2008

7.5 Comparison between the destinations of young parents in April-May 2008 and the re-contacted respondents in April 2009 (see Figures 7-1 and 7-2) shows that a lesser, but still majority, proportion are currently in education or training. A slightly larger proportion are working in 2009 compared with 2008 and a larger proportion are staying at home looking after their baby/child or pregnant, and not looking for work.

7.6 As Table 7-1 shows, many young parents were undertaking the same activity as they were when surveyed the year previously, but there has also been movement between activities.

7.7 Most (74 per cent) of those who were in training or education or about to start a course in April-May 2008 were also in, or about to be in learning a year later, with most of the remainder now at home looking after their baby/child and not looking for work, and around one in ten now in work.

7.8 The majority (64 per cent) of those who were working in 2008 were also working in 2009, with the remainder either: at home looking after their baby/child and not looking for work in learning or about to be in learning (the latter being the more likely destination of the two).

7.9 A little under half of those who were at home looking after their baby/child or were pregnant, and not looking for work in 2008 were also doing this in 2009,
but nearly one third were in, or about to be in learning, while around one tenth were working.

Table 7-1 Current destinations by destinations in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young parent’s destinations in 2009</th>
<th>In or about to be in learning</th>
<th>At home looking after baby/child or pregnant/not looking for work</th>
<th>Working</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unweighted base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young parents destinations in 2008</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In or about to be in learning</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after baby/child or pregnant/not looking for work</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 555
Source: Inclusion 2009

7.10 Among the young parents in the re-contact survey, lone parents were less likely to be working than non-lone parents (17 per cent compared with 30 per cent) and more likely to be in training or education (51 per cent compared with 30 per cent).

7.11 As Table 7-2 shows, ‘black or black British African’ young parents were much more likely than white or ‘black or black British Caribbean’ young parents to be in education or training, and correspondingly less likely to be working or looking for work. White young parents were comparatively more likely to be at home looking after their child and not looking for work. The figures for the ‘black or black British Caribbean’ group are based on a small sample size and so should be treated with caution.

Table 7-2 Destinations of re-contacted young parents by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young parents destinations in 2009</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>Black or black British – African %</th>
<th>Black or black British – Caribbean %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At school/college/on a training course</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home looking after baby/child or pregnant/not looking for work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 306
1. Treat findings with caution due to small base size.
Source: Inclusion 2009

Learning destinations

7.12 Encouragingly, half (50 per cent) of the re-contacted young parents funded in 2006/07 had obtained qualifications since the time of the last survey. These were not necessarily young parents who were currently in education or training.
While the majority (59 per cent) of young parents who had obtained qualifications since 2008 were at school/college/university or on a training course at the time of interview in 2009, 14 per cent were at home looking after baby/child, and not looking for work, nine per cent were looking for work, nine per cent were about to start a course, and nine per cent were pregnant and staying at home.

7.13 Black or black British African young parents were more likely than white young parents to have gained qualifications in the past year (65 per cent compared with 47 per cent respectively).

7.14 As previously indicated, 46 per cent of young parents were in education or training at the time they were re-contacted in 2009. Of these, 45 per cent were on the same course as they were doing when last surveyed and 54 per cent were doing a different course.\(^{60}\)

7.15 Those young parents who were studying on a different course from the one they were on in 2006/07 were asked what their main reason was for starting this new course. For the majority (50 per cent) it was to continue or progress with previous learning. The other key reason given was because they wanted to get a better/good job (34 per cent). This indicates that young parents who have received Care to Learn funding and gone on to undertake further learning are doing so with clear employment or skills related goals.

7.16 Nearly all young parents (99 per cent) who were undertaking a new course further to the one they were on in 2006/07 reported that their current study would lead to qualifications. As Table 7-3 shows, there was a fairly even spread across different qualification levels, although it is also notable that Level 4 was the most common qualification level being studied for (10 per cent of current learners).

\(^{60}\) One per cent of young parents did not know if the course was the same one they were doing in April/May 2008.
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Table 7-3 Qualifications being studied for at time of interview in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of qualification</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills for life</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course does not lead to qualification or unsure if leads to qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification &amp; unknown level</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not studying at time of the interview in 2009</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young parent on same course as when interviewed in April/May 2008</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. * Indicates less than 0.5 per cent.
Source: Inclusion 2009
Unweighted base: 555

7.17 Of the young parents who had continued in learning from April-May 2008, most had progressed to learning at a higher level. As Table 7-4 shows, 30 per cent of young parents studying at Level 1 in 2006/07 were studying (or about to study) at Level 2 (17 per cent) or Level 3 (13 per cent) in 2009, while five per cent were studying at Level 4.

7.18 Twenty-eight per cent of young parents studying at Level 3 had moved to Level 4 at the time of interview in 2009.

Table 7-4 Learning progression from 2006/07 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New course level 2008/09</th>
<th>Level of the original course 2006/07</th>
<th>Other qual</th>
<th>Level 1 %</th>
<th>Level 2 %</th>
<th>Level 3 %</th>
<th>Level 4 %</th>
<th>Course doesn’t lead to qual or unsure if leads to qual</th>
<th>Not studying at time of the interview in 2009 %</th>
<th>Unweighted Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Inclusion 2009

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.

Multivariate analysis

7.19 Multivariate analysis was carried out to further determine the key factors contributing to learning destinations. The analysis was performed using logistic regression, which estimates the effect of each variable on the odds of the outcome being achieved. The outcome (or dependent variable) in this analysis is ‘in or about to be in learning’ (with ‘about to be in learning’ signifying that the
A range of factors/variables were taken into consideration for the logistic regression model:

- whether the young parent was in or about to be in learning when interviewed previously in April-May 2008
- whether they completed the course they received Care to Learn for in 2006/07
- ethnicity
- age
- whether they were a lone parent
- Care to Learn rate (as a proxy for London and non-London learners).

The results indicate which of these factors are significant in relation to increasing a young parent’s likelihood of being in or about to be in learning in 2009.

The estimates shown in Table 7-5 are understood in the same way as odds are understood in betting. In this case, positive coefficients lengthen the odds, so categories of re-contacted young parents with an estimate that is greater than zero are less likely to be or about to be in learning in 2009 than re-contacted young parents in all the reference categories. Negative coefficients shorten the odds, so categories of young parents with estimates less then zero are more likely to be or about to be in learning in 2009 than a young parent in all the reference categories.

Statistical significance is shown by a star in the Significance column indicating significance of 0.05 and above.

**Table 7-5 Learning destinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference category: in learning in Apr-May 2008*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not in or about to be in learning in Apr-May 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07 course completer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference category: completed course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed – left early/dropped out</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed – still on course (at time of 2008 interview)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lone parent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference category: lone parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non lone parent</td>
<td>0.6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference category: white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – African</td>
<td>-1.4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – Caribbean</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed ethnicity</th>
<th>-0.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference category: Aged 19 and under (on 31/7/09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 20-21 (on 31 July 2009)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 22+ (on 31 July 2009)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Care to Learn rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference category: Care to Learn rate – London National</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reference categories are set for each group of variables. Results show the effects of someone in a particular category compared with someone in all the reference categories, given all the other factors stay the same.

7.23 The results from the above logistic regression model show that when controlling for all other factors, young parents not in or about to go into learning in 2008 were significantly less likely to be in learning in 2009. This supports the link (suggested in earlier comparisons between 2008 and 2009 destinations, see Table 7-1) that many young parents have remained in the same activity over the year (with learning being the most common). In the case of learning destinations this is partly because young parents have remained on the same course over this period. As shown in Chapter 3, many young parents are on long courses lasting a year or more. As previously noted in this chapter, a little under half of re-contacted young parents who were in learning in 2008/09 were on the same course as in 2006/07. However, the findings also suggest that young parents are relatively unlikely to re-enter learning once they have been out of it for more than a year.

7.24 The results show that black or black British African young parents are significantly more likely than white young parents to have continued in or re-entered education and training.

7.25 Moreover, the regression results also support the finding from the general analysis that non lone parents are less likely than lone parents to have continued in or re-entered education and training (although the correlation and significance is not as strong as it is with the other two groups). This may be a consequence of the support available to lone parents.

7.26 Age, Care to Learn rate and 2006/07 course completion emerge as not significant when controlling for all other factors. Many of the re-contacted group of 2006/07 Care to Learn recipients are now aged over the Care to Learn eligibility cut off of 19 years old. The finding that age is not a significant factor in likelihood of being in education or training may therefore indicate that Care to Learn is successfully providing young parents with a platform for learning development and progression in subsequent years.
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Employment destinations

7.27 Overall, 20 per cent of young parents\(^{61}\) were working in 2009, compared with 14 per cent in 2008. Forty-three per cent per cent of young parents working in 2009 were also working when interviewed in 2008.

7.28 In addition, 15 per cent of young parents who were not working when interviewed reported that they had worked at some point in the last year. Of these, lone parents were less likely than non lone parents to have had paid work in the previous year (11 per cent of lone parents not currently in work had worked in the past year compared with 29 per cent of non-lone parents).

NEET

7.29 In the summer of 2006 before receiving Care to Learn funding in 2006/07, 65 per cent of the young parents who took part in the re-contact survey were NEET\(^{62}\). Only 25 per cent of the young parents in the re-contact survey were NEET at the time of the previous survey in April/May 2008 while 33 per cent were NEET when interviewed in April/May 2009 (see Figure 7-3).

Figure 7-3 Proportion of young parents in re-contact study (funded in 2006/07) that were NEET at different points in time

![Bar chart showing NEET percentages over time]

Unweighted base: 555 young parents

---

\(^{61}\) This 20 per cent equates to only 95 young parents in work. Therefore it is only possible to report limited information about these young parents because of the low numbers.

\(^{62}\) As most young parents funded in 2006/07 were aged over 18 at the time of interview in 2009 this definition of NEET is based on all young parents rather than the Government's 16 to 18 year old NEET measure.
7.30 This suggests that there is a long term reduction in the proportion of NEET young parents in the 2006/07 cohort, however it is interesting to note the increase from 25 per cent in 2008 to 33 per cent in 2009. As this is the first time that the longer term destinations of young parents funded by Care to Learn have been tracked, it is not possible to establish whether this is because of the recession and therefore requires further monitoring.

7.31 The findings suggest that over time young parents may be moving between being NEET and being in either education or employment. For example, the majority of young parents who were NEET when interviewed in 2009 were in education, employment or training the previous year (58 per cent). Nearly half (44 per cent) of the young parents who were NEET when interviewed in 2009 reported having worked and/or gained a qualification in the previous year.

7.32 The majority of young parents who were NEET when interviewed in 2009 were either at home looking after their child(ren) (57 per cent of NEET young parents), pregnant and staying at home (seven per cent). However, 19 per cent of NEET young parents said they were about to start a course and 15 per cent were looking for work.63

7.33 Findings offer some insight into why some young people have returned to being NEET. Those young parents who reported that they were currently staying at home looking after their child and not looking for work, were asked for the main reason they decided to do this. The most common reason was that they wanted to be at home to look after their child (54 per cent). Thirteen per cent said it was because they were pregnant, while eight per cent reported that the main reason was not being able to afford childcare.

**Long term impact in London**

7.34 The key difference in current activities between young parents who received the London rate of funding and those who did not was that London learners were more likely to be in training or education (55 per cent compared with 44 per cent of learners who did not receive the London rate of funding). However, the above logistic regression analysis suggests that being in London is not the causal factor. Rather, the analysis suggests this finding is owing to the greater proportion of black or black British African young parents (who are significantly more likely to be in learning than young parents from other ethnic groups) in London and in the London re-contact sample.

63 Less than one per cent of young parents in the re-contact survey who were NEET in 2009 were looking for a course when interviewed and less than one per cent were ill and unable to work.
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7.35 Young parents who received the London rate of funding who were still studying when re-contacted in 2009 were more likely to be on the same course (59 per cent) and less likely to be on a different course (41 per cent) from the one they were doing in April 2008 compared with young parents who did not receive the London rate of funding.

Long term impact for new 19 year olds

7.36 There were no significant differences in the 2009 destinations of respondents who were new 19 year old Care to Learn recipients in 2006/07 and those of non-new 19 year old recipients.
8 NON TAKE-UP OF CARE TO LEARN IN 2007/08

Summary

- Non take-up of Care to Learn was largely owing to respondents not starting or continuing on the course, either for personal reasons or because of changes to the course.
- Care to Learn funding was mostly considered important to respondents’ ability to begin or complete learning.
- The application process was commonly reported to be relatively easy, although respondents who said this also reported they had received support in completing their application.
- There was some experience of difficulty in completing the form, often associated with getting learning and/or childcare providers to complete their sections.
- Respondents who had dropped out of the learning for which they had applied for Care to Learn in 2007/08 commonly either planned to re-enter or had already re-entered learning.
- Some respondents had successfully re-applied for Care to Learn in 2008/09 while others intended to re-apply on their return into learning.
- Simplification of the application process and improved awareness/communication with learning and childcare providers may benefit some applicants.

Introduction

8.1 This chapter reports the findings from a series of qualitative interviews held with young parents who applied for but did not take up Care to Learn in the 2007/08 academic year. The purpose of this part of the research was to gain a greater understanding of the reasons behind non take-up, wider insight into how young parents who do not take up funding experience the process of applying for Care to Learn, and what the impact of their non take-up of funding had been.

8.2 The following findings are based on the results of 19 telephone interviews with young parents who applied for Care to Learn funding during the 2007/08 academic year. Interviews covered reasons for non take-up, experience of applying for Care to Learn, current activities and future aspirations.

8.3 The Learning and Skills Council categorises Care to Learn applicants who do not take-up the funding into three groups:
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- application withdrawn before assessment completed
- assessed as eligible but not taken up
- incomplete application (full information not submitted).

8.4 As close to a representative mix as possible was sought between the three categories of non take-up. Of these, submitting an incomplete application is the most common, and assessed as eligible but not taken-up is the least common. Table 8-1 shows how many interviews were achieved across the categories.

Table 8-1 Non take-up interview respondents by category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non take-up category</th>
<th>Interviews achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application withdrawn before assessment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed as eligible but not taken up</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete application</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Inclusion* 2009

8.5 Non take-up respondents were aged between 17 and 22; all were female. Around the time of applying for Care to Learn respondents were, variously, engaged in the following activities: being a full-time mother (staying at home looking after their child) or undertaking part time voluntary work, or working part-time. Some respondents were already in learning, either at school or with other education and training providers.

Reasons for non take-up

8.6 Respondents gave a variety of reasons for withdrawing Care to Learn applications, including:

- deciding to take a gap year instead of going on the course applied for
- deciding not to proceed with the course to enable them to spend more time with their child
- not wanting to leave their child in childcare at a very young age
- changes to course arrangements; for example, one respondent’s course was changed from daytime to evening and she had to withdraw owing to a lack of evening childcare
- receiving childcare funding from elsewhere; for example, one respondent received funding from her Local Education Authority towards childcare costs to allow her to complete A levels and move onto university
- becoming ineligible; for example, one respondent had turned 20 before the course started and so had to withdraw.
8.7 The situations of those respondents who had been assessed as eligible similarly indicated that personal or course related reasons were behind non take-up. One respondent’s plans were disrupted owing to having a premature birth and moving house shortly before the course began. Consequently, she did not attend the course and therefore did not take up Care to Learn. Another had been receiving Care to Learn previously but decided, after finishing the course she had been on in 2006/07, not to continue in education but to move into employment. The 2007/08 Care to Learn funding was therefore no longer required. One respondent who did not take-up for personal reasons in 2007/08 had subsequently re-applied to attend the course in 2008/09 and was receiving Care to Learn funding at the time of interview.

8.8 For some respondents in the ‘full information not provided’ category, non take-up was owing to difficulties with the Care to Learn application process rather than personal or course-related factors, although these were also present. These respondents’ applications had been recorded by Care to Learn as having ‘timed out’ following incomplete information having been submitted in their initial application, which was subsequently not provided in response to additional information requests.

8.9 In some cases, problems with the application process related to requests for further information which had been sent to the respondents after they had sent their initial application, while in others it was unclear whether any additional information had been requested. However, steps have been taken since 2007/08 to simplify the Care to Learn application form and application process.

Experience of applying for Care to Learn

8.10 Overall, respondents found the application process for Care to Learn fairly straightforward and did not experience significant problems with engaging the childcare and learning providers in completing their sections. These findings indicate that the application process is not a major barrier to take-up. However, many respondents had received support with their applications from, variously, their Connexions adviser, social worker, college tutor, their childcare provider or a parent. While not all found this support useful or necessary, some found it invaluable. For example, one respondent whose Connexions adviser had helped her fill out the form commented: “I probably wouldn’t have been able to do it otherwise”. Another, for whom English was not a first language, similarly said she would not have been able to complete the form without help from her social worker and Connexions.

8.11 Specific comments relating to the application form itself included one description of it as “this massive booklet with many different parts to fill out and
different people to chase”. Having also moved house a few times, this respondent found filling in the personal details section “tricky”. However, another respondent commented that, while she found the form long, it was easy to understand.

8.12 For those respondents who did experience difficulties with the application process, these largely centred on getting the childcare and/or learning provider sections completed. This related to the length of time it took for them to fill in their section, although there was also some experience of wariness from childcare providers around Care to Learn payments. One respondent reported that the first nursery she approached refused to take Care to Learn. She then found a nursery who would take it but the nursery and the learning provider between them took several months to fill in their details and did not indicate how long they would take. This delayed the submission of the application form and subsequently caused problems. Other respondents reported that they had had to “chase up” their learning provider, causing themselves “hassle” and delaying the submission of the application. One respondent reported that her college did not know “who to send me to” about filling in the application.

**Importance of Care to Learn**

8.13 Respondents were asked how important Care to Learn would have been to their ability to enter or continue their learning activity. Most respondents reported that Care to Learn would have been either essential (i.e. they could not have done the course without it) or very useful (e.g. it gave more choice of childcare providers or eased the burden on parents looking after their child). There was very little suggestion that non take-up was linked to Care to Learn not being necessary to ability to enter or continue in learning. This is borne out by most respondents reporting that they did not complete the course they had applied for Care to Learn for. Those who did complete the course without Care to Learn funding managed to cover the childcare costs through either paying for it themselves from part-time work or gaining alternative funding.

**Current situation and future aspirations**

8.14 The two main subsequent activities for non take-up respondents who did not enter or complete the course for which they had applied for Care to Learn, were staying at home and looking after their child or working. Re-entering another course was also a route taken by some.

8.15 Some non take-up respondents were unsure what they would do next, while many had fairly definite plans as well as ideas for what they would like to do in the future. Plans typically involved going back into learning. Courses
respondents planned to take included physiotherapy, nursing, child psychology, health and social care, business and re-taking/completing GCSEs or A levels. Some had already begun these courses and obtained Care to Learn funding for 2008/09. Those intending to attend a course in the next academic year, and not disbarred by going beyond the age eligibility rules, generally also intended to re-apply for Care to Learn in order to pay for childcare to help them do this course.

8.16 For some respondents, current or intended learning was a route to study at university. A range of career aspirations was also expressed, including: paediatric nurse, teacher, mechanic, lawyer/legal work, beauty therapist, social worker, policewoman and carer for elderly people.

Conclusion

8.17 Despite some respondents reporting delays and difficulties with the application process, in no cases were these a cause of non take-up. Rather, the findings suggest that non take-up may often not be connected with Care to Learn processes but rather with external factors, such as a change in personal circumstances, deciding to stay at home and look after the child, or changes to the course schedules that then make it difficult to attend. The findings also suggest that non take-up one year does not mean that young parents will not benefit or seek to benefit from both learning opportunities and Care to Learn support subsequently.
9 CHARACTERISTICS OF 2007/08 CARE TO LEARN RECIPIENTS

9.1 This chapter looks at the characteristics of all young parents who received funding for their childcare while learning through Care to Learn.64 This includes their age, ethnicity, living arrangements and relationship status, and whether or not they have completed their course.

9.2 Over half of the young parents in the survey were aged 17 or 18 on 31 July 2007. The next largest age group consisted of 19 year olds (see Table 9-1). The proportion of parents aged 20 and over has more than tripled compared with those aged 20 or over who applied for Care to Learn funding in 2006/07.

Table 9-1 Age of applicants on 31 July 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 years old or younger</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,964
Source: Inclusion 2009

9.3 Table 9-2 shows age groups of young parents by region. Generally the age profile of young parents in London was older compared with other regions. Thirty-eight per cent of young parents in London were aged 19 years or older compared with 28 per cent in England as a whole.

Table 9-2 Age of applicants by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>East of England %</th>
<th>East Midlands %</th>
<th>Greater London %</th>
<th>North East %</th>
<th>North West %</th>
<th>South East %</th>
<th>South West %</th>
<th>West Midlands %</th>
<th>Yorkshire &amp; Humber %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 years old or younger</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,964
Source: Inclusion 2009

64 This chapter is based on all young parents who received funding in 2007/08 including some young parents who received funding in both 2007/08 and 2006/07.
9.4 Out of all the young parents in the survey, 12 per cent were ‘new 19 year old’ applicants (see Table 9-3).

**Table 9-3 New 19 year old applicants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,964. Fourteen 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.

Source: Inclusion 2009

9.5 The majority of the young parents, just under three quarters, identified themselves as white British. This was followed by the African black or black British group, comprising just under one in ten young parents, and mixed young parents at around one in 16 (see Table 9-4).

**Table 9-4 Ethnicity of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White – British</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Irish</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – African</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – Caribbean</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British – other</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,964

Source: Inclusion 2009

9.6 Four-fifths of young parents interviewed were lone parents, with the remaining fifth living with a partner or spouse (see Table 9-5). Lone parents here 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 9-5 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: 1,964

Source: Inclusion 2009

9.7 Just under two-thirds of lone parents were living in their own home with no other adult, while a third were living with their parents (see Table 9-6).

---

65 This includes Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Indian which were all at or less than 0.5 per cent.
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Table 9-6 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>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own home – with no one</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own home – with partner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</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>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,964
Source: Inclusion 2009

9.8 Just under two-thirds of young parents completed the course they studied for between September 2007 and July 2008. One in five said they were still attending the course, with a similar proportion saying they had not completed (see Table 9-7).

Table 9-7 2007/08 course completion status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – left early/dropped out</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – still on course</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,593
Source: Inclusion 2009

9.9 The majority of the young parents interviewed had studied in an further education (FE) college, followed by one in ten who had studied at school sixth form/sixth form college. The next biggest groups were schools and work based learning training providers (see Table 9-8).
Table 9-8 Type of learning provider attended between September 2007 and July 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FE College</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sixth form/sixth form college</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL training provider</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/community centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning centre/provider</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young mothers unit/the Meritan/young parents project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College – type not specified</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start centre/nursery</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connexions</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training agency/centre unspecified</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leamdirect</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,593
Source: Inclusion 2009
* refers to percentages below one that are too small to report

9.10 The young parents interviewed were most likely to have undertaken Level 2 learning in 2007/08, closely followed by those taking ‘other qualifications’.

Table 9-9 Proxy course level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for Life</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualification</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 1,964
Source: Inclusion 2009

9.11 Seventeen per cent of young parents received the London rate of Care to Learn funding. 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):

- Barking and Dagenham
- Barnet
- Bexley
- Brent
- Bromley
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- 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
10 RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy recommendations

Amount of funding

10.1 Care to Learn funding is intended to pay for childcare while 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 2007/08 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. Nearly three quarters of young parents reported that they could not have gone on a course without the funding.

10.2 Care to Learn also funded childcare for private study time for 75 per cent of young parents. The amount of childcare funding available through Care to Learn did not affect their choice of course, as 95 per cent of young parents stated.

10.3 The current levels of funding from Care to Learn seem to be set at the right level for 2007/08, however these should continue to be reviewed annually to take into account the rate of inflation of the cost of childcare.\(^6\)

Age eligibility

10.4 The age eligibility for Care to Learn increased in 2006/07 to include 19 year olds starting a new course. These new eligible 19 year olds can continue receiving support past their 20th birthday until they have completed their 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 35 per cent of them attended Level 3 courses, 36 per cent attended Level 2 and 16 per cent attended Level 1 courses. Six per cent of all young parents suggested increasing the age limit on Care to Learn eligibility. Understandably, this was higher for 19 year olds.

Course eligibility

10.5 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

---

\(^6\) The Daycare Trust’s ‘Childcare costs survey 2009’ reports that the cost of childcare continues to rise above the rate of inflation (see http://www.daycaretrust.org.uk/data/files/Policy/costs_survey_2009.pdf). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the weekly rates of Care to Learn in 2007/08 are not going to cover all childcare costs in the future.
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note that only two 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 courses was attended. However just over 60 per cent of the young parents were either studying for or obtained Level 2 or Level 3 qualifications. Just over 12 per cent of young parents were studying for or achieved ‘other qualifications’ which included first aid certificates, key skills certificates, OCRs and certificates in childcare and education.67

10.6 The age and course eligibility criteria for Care to Learn seem to be set at the right level for the cohort of learners surveyed and no further changes are recommended.

Application process

10.7 More than nine out of ten young parents found the application process easy. Last year there were significant differences within this, with black African parents the most likely to have found the application process difficult. However, the differences are less marked this year suggesting that the application process has improved for some groups. Even though the proportion of young parents who had difficulties finding out about Care to Learn was relatively small, 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.

10.8 The LSC should continue to invest in improving the application process and activities to raise awareness of Care to Learn.

Marketing

10.9 Nearly 60 per cent of all young parents in the survey did not feel Care to Learn needed any improvement. Among those suggesting improvements, eight per cent said that clearer communication, information and awareness were needed and another eight per cent that more advertising was required. Therefore raising awareness among support workers and providers should be considered.

10.10 The need for further research among stakeholders and young parents who did not receive Care to Learn funding is discussed below.

Research recommendations

10.11 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

67 Other qualifications are those that could not be identified as Skills for Life, entry level, Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3 and above.
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service and communication about the funding have to be understood in this context. Findings from other research (the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England and the Youth Cohort Study) state that 46 per cent of the 17 year old teenage parents interviewed had heard of Care to Learn and of those that had heard of Care to Learn, 32 per cent applied for it.\textsuperscript{68} 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.\textsuperscript{69}

10.12 The main channel through which young parents found out about Care to Learn was through Connexions advisers. Interviews with stakeholders such as these could explore best practice and apply it to other advisers.

10.13 It may be that more young parents could use Care to Learn to fund childcare while they carry out private study or to help with their travel costs. However, in order to understand better the proportions of young parents using Care to Learn for this, we need to be able to verify whether or not they have reached their weekly maximum amount of funding. The administrative data shows the total amount of Care to Learn funding received by a young parent in the whole academic year. Therefore, we need either the amount of funding per week or an accurate measure of the number of weeks young parents attended learning.

10.14 In order to better understand the levels of awareness of Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) and Adult Learning Grant (ALG) additional information is required to identify eligible young parents. In particular, income, type of benefits received and asylum seeker status would be needed to more robustly estimate the proportion of young parents eligible for these additional sources of funding.

10.15 Finally, we recommend that future research on Care to Learn further explores what childcare arrangements young parents would use, for the minority of young parents who report that they would have done a course anyway without Care to Learn. This would enable better understanding of the impact of Care to Learn on young parents.

\textsuperscript{68} Source http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SBU/b000850/Bull01_2009textvfinal.pdf

\textsuperscript{69} For further discussion of this see Dench, S., Bellis, A., Truohy, S. (2007) Young Mothers Not in Learning: a qualitative study of barriers and attitudes. Report 439 Institute for Employment Studies. At the time of publication research was underway on behalf of DCSF into the ‘barriers to participation in education and training’ with a provisional publication date of spring 2010.