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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

1. York Consulting Limited (YCL) was commissioned by the National Learning and Skills Council (NLSC) to carry out an impact evaluation of the National Phase of the Leadership and Management Development Programme.

2. The Programme allowed for the availability of a grant of up to £1,000 to support Managing Directors (MDs), or other key directors of small and medium-sized businesses, who, following in-depth assessment, wanted to pursue specific leadership and management development.

3. The Programme was organised locally by Business Link Operators (BLOs) working under a contract to local Learning and Skills Councils (LLSCs) and delivered via a network of intermediary organisations. The Centre for Enterprise was appointed to support the LSC in delivering the Programme.

4. The Programme began with a pathfinder phase in April 2004 and was rolled out across the country from September 2004. As of April 2006, the Programme formally ended and support for leadership and management skills development now forms part of the offer to businesses under the Train to Gain Service.

5. The aims of the evaluation were to measure the impact of the Programme on the participant’s own performance and on their respective organisations, to assess how effective the brokerage models have been from the customer perspective and to inform policy on the way in which leadership and management provision can be embedded in Train to Gain.

6. The methodology consisted of a postal/email survey of all LLSCs and BLOs; six partnership case studies and telephone follow-up with ten BLOs; stakeholder interviews with Programme Managers at the Centre for Enterprise; a telephone survey of 500 participants on the Programme and in-depth case studies with 20 participants; a telephone survey of 216 intermediary organisations and a control group survey with 100 organisations.
Benefits and Impact

7. The Programme has had a significant positive impact on the leadership and management of the businesses of the participants. Over three-quarters (77%) of participants indicated that the skills they had gained through the Programme had led to changes in the way that they lead or manage their business.

8. Participants on the Programme perceive that their involvement has had a greater positive influence on organisational/business change than control group participants who had undertaken alternative leadership and management development activity. This demonstrates the potential value of the Programme in contributing to business change and development over alternative leadership and management development activity.

9. Over half of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had influenced, or was likely to influence improved productivity (69%), profitability (59%) and sales (52%) within the business. The majority of businesses stated that their involvement in the Programme had influenced, or was likely to influence, the development of improved working practices within the business (88%), increased investment in training and skills (73%), improved business growth (71%) and improved quality standards within the business (71%).

10. The Programme is reported to have had most benefit/expected future benefit on those businesses that were already on a positive financial trajectory in terms of increasing profitability and turnover.

11. Around two-fifths (39%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had led to the introduction of new standards, action statements or awards within the business. Over a quarter (26%) of these participants had developed a formal training plan for the business, while just under a quarter (24%) had developed a formal quality statement, formal business plan (24%) or had committed to the Investors in People Standard since their involvement in the Programme.
12. A quarter of participants (25%) indicated that they were now more aware of other business support directly through their involvement in the Programme. Over two-fifths of participants (43%) indicated that their involvement in the Programme had encouraged others in the organisation to seek similar development opportunities. The vast majority of participants (90%) indicated that they would take part in further leadership and management training in the future. This is significantly more than the 60% of control group participants that stated they would seek to undertake further training activity.

Programme Set-Up

13. A crucial element of the Programme has been the role of intermediary organisations in the delivery of the Programme. Just under half (45%) of intermediary organisations indicated that they first became involved in the Programme as a result of being approached directly by the Business Link. Around two-fifths (38%) contacted the Business Link directly, which would indicate that organisations were keen to be involved in programme delivery.

14. Two-thirds (67%) of intermediary organisations stated that they went through an assessment process prior to involvement in the Programme. Over half (52%) of organisations indicated that they were provided with training to carry out their role.

15. The majority of partnerships had not engaged intermediaries to deliver specific elements of the Programme – it could often be the same organisation with responsibility for client engagement and then taking the client through the assessment process and the development of the PDP. Over 80% of Business Links perceived intermediaries to have been effective in their delivery role under the Programme.

16. Around two-thirds (65%) of programme participants first heard of the Programme through the Business Link. Just under a third (29%) of control group participants were aware of the Programme, in the main (66%) as a result of Business Link contact or marketing. This highlights the importance of the Business Link in raising awareness of the Programme.
17. A requirement of the Programme was for 80% of participants to be ‘new’ Business Link clients. Management Information provided by the Centre for Enterprise (August 2006) indicated that 63% of participants that had completed their PDP were ‘new’. Around three-quarters (74%) of survey participants were ‘new’ clients. Less than two-thirds (63%) of intermediary organisations indicated that they were aware of the requirement to target ‘new’ Business Link clients.

**Participant Profile**

18. Data collected by the Centre for Enterprise on participants who had completed their PDP at the end of March 2006 highlighted that males made up the majority (69%) of Directors completing a PDP.

19. The largest ethnicity group is white, accounting for the vast majority (91%) of MDs at the completed PDP stage. The second largest is Asian or Asian British, accounting for just 4%.

20. Participants were most commonly from the “other social and personal care sector” (17%), with this along with the “manufacturing” and “health and social work” sectors accounting for over half (51%) of businesses at the completed PDP stage.

21. The majority (69%) of Directors that have completed a PDP are from companies that employ between 20-49 people. This would indicate that those participants recruited on to the Programme are from organisations that are fairly representative of the business population as a whole.

22. Approximately 4% of Directors at the completed PDP stage identified themselves as having some form of disability.

**Assessment and Development Activity**

23. A combination of assessment methods were used to assess leadership and management development needs. The most popular mechanism was face-to-face discussion, used by the majority (82%) of intermediary organisations. In the three-fifths (62%) of cases, intermediaries stated that the assessment process with clients lasted between one and two hours.

---

1 A ‘new’ client is defined as a business that the BLO has not previously engaged with in a meaningful way. Organisations that have been engaged with previously, but not within the preceding 12 months, can also be defined as ‘new’ clients.
24. The vast majority (90%) of participants stated that the assessment process was effective in identifying their development needs. Around two-fifths (38%) of clients stated that they were already aware of their development needs prior to undertaking the assessment. In three-fifths (60%) of cases, the assessment identified at least some needs that the participant was unaware of at the time. The importance of the assessment process is demonstrated by the fact that just under two-thirds (64%) of participants stated that they would not have gone ahead with the training and learning activity if they had not had the assessment.

25. The most common development area for a third (34%) of participants was ‘working with people’. Three quarters (75%) of participants indicated that they received a written statement of their development needs, compared to over three-fifths (63%) of control group participants who had undertaken leadership and management development activity in the past five years.

26. Two-fifths (41%) of intermediary organisations reported that clients started their development activity within a month of their assessment. Two-fifths (39%) of participants stated that they had undertaken a formal course not leading to a qualification or had a period of mentoring/coaching. A third (32%) had had a one-off training session.

27. Over four-fifths (81%) of participants stated that they were able to find suitable training courses, or other learning and development opportunities, to address all the leadership and management skills needs identified. The majority (90%) of clients indicated that the Programme was flexible enough to fit around their other responsibilities.

28. Satisfaction with the content of the leadership and management training activities to address development needs was greater under the main Programme survey than with control group participants who had accessed alternative leadership and management development training and learning activity. Seven out of ten (70%) of participants in the Programme were ‘very satisfied’ (95% “very” or “quite” satisfied), compared to two-fifths (38%) of control group participants.

Delivery Approaches and Performance

29. There was a slow start overall with the Leadership and Management Programme. It took partnerships time to get procedures and delivery arrangements set-up and to build momentum. In the early stages of the Programme in particular, client progression in terms of the move from assessment to completion of PDP was much slower than anticipated.
30. A range of delivery approaches were adopted. For example, the North East, South East and London were operating regional delivery models as opposed to delivery on a local partnership level. There was no evidence to suggest that a regional delivery model was more successful than a local partnership model in terms of meeting performance targets.

31. The role of the intermediary varied between partnership areas. In some partnership areas, training providers were allowed to carry out the assessment and provide the training and development solution to the same client, whereas this was not the case in others. The former raises questions with regard to intermediary impartiality.

32. The majority of LLSCs (97%) and Business Links (93%) indicated that communication mechanisms between the two organisations were effective. A majority of intermediary organisations (89%) perceived their relationship between the Programme managers to be effective (55% very effective).

33. Two-thirds (64%) of LLSCs and over half (55%) of Business Links perceived that the management arrangements and support from the Centre for Enterprise to be effective. The main benefits of the Centre for Enterprise were deemed to be the responsiveness and support of the staff in dealing with issues and problems raised and the provision of regular and up-to-date information.

Value for Money and the Significance of the Grant

34. There is significant variation in the approaches that have been adopted in the delivery of the Programme by different partnerships, leading to widespread variations in the costs per completed PDP purely in relation to programme delivery (engagement, activities, assessments, delivery of development support and re-assessments).

35. Across the Programme as a whole, the mean total cost per completed PDP (including delivery and management costs, but excluding grants) was £1,566. This total unit cost ranged from £738 per completed PDP in one partnership area, to £2,415 in another. The mean management cost per completed PDP was £542. The lowest unit cost of management was £224 per completed PDP, increasing to £1,197 in one partnership area.
36. On average, across the country as a whole, each client completing a PDP received a grant of approximately £902. Over a quarter (29%) of participants indicated that they would ‘definitely not’ have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the grant of up to £1,000. Nearly two-fifths (37%) of participants would ‘probably not’ have gone ahead if it was not for the grant funding on offer.

37. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of participants who indicated that they would have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the grant, stated that the grant enabled them to undertake development activity more quickly than they would have done otherwise. A quarter of these participants (24%) stated that the grant enabled them to undertake more development activity than they would have done.

38. For over two-fifths (44%) of participants, £1,000 was the minimum amount of grant funding that would have prompted them to go ahead with the development activity. For a quarter of participants (24%), £500 was the minimum amount of funding that would have prompted their involvement.

39. Over three-fifths (61%) of participants indicated that they had contributed additional funding towards the costs of training and learning activity on top of the grant. This additional contribution ranged from less than £100 to over £5,000, with a median/mode contribution of between £750 and £1,000.

**Key Conclusions**

40. The Programme has demonstrated that increased investment in leadership and management development of key managers within an organisation can have a positive impact upon business performance.

41. The Programme has led to the development of new relationships between Business Links and businesses, with a significant number of participants becoming aware of additional business support as a result of programme involvement. The Programme has therefore been a strong potential lever in to more general workforce development activity.

42. The importance of the assessment process is emphasised by the fact that in many cases, the assessment identified at least some needs that the participant was unaware of at the time. Assessment of need should be an essential element of future leadership and management development provision.
43. The flexibility of the Programme was valued highly, particularly by programme participants who had generally not undertaken qualification-based training and development activity. There is a need to retain this flexibility in future provision.

44. The Programme was attractive to managers of businesses that had not previously made use of business support services. Success in attracting such clients could potentially have been enhanced further by more targeted approaches to recruitment, especially where clients were being introduced to the programme by intermediaries, some of whom were unaware of the ‘new’ client targets.

45. Partnerships have been successful in recruiting a network of intermediary organisations including management consultancy organisations, private training providers and training consultants. There have been difficulties however in recruiting organisations such as banks, accountants and FE Colleges that were originally expected to play an important role. The approach to engaging such organisations to the Programme, and the feasibility of engagement, needs to be reviewed.

46. The majority of partnerships had not engaged particular intermediaries to deliver specific elements of the Programme. It could be questioned, however, whether intermediaries can be truly impartial if training providers are also allowed to undertake the assessment. Effective case management is crucial if intermediaries are able to carry out both roles.

47. The recruitment of a network of intermediaries for the Leadership and Management Programme has helped to develop long-term relationships for future initiatives and joint working. These relationships should be continued and built upon in terms of provision under Train to Gain.

48. It took partnerships time to get procedures and delivery arrangements set-up and to ‘get up to speed’, which is an inevitable part of establishing a new programme. There is therefore a need to be realistic about the time that is required to build momentum.

49. A diverse range of delivery approaches have been adopted. The specific delivery model adopted in terms of future provision must reflect capacity, capability and relationships in the area concerned.
50. There are significant variations in the total cost per completed PDP (excluding grants) and management costs per completed PDP across the regions and individual delivery areas. The differences between areas in total unit costs of delivery of the programme reflect variations across all elements of the support.

51. The grant was a significant lever to participation in the programme. It was evident however that the grant needs to be of a reasonably significant value to have an effect on participation, as £1,000 was the minimum amount of grant funding that would have prompted a large proportion of clients to go ahead with the development activity. The use of grants may therefore be appropriate engagement mechanisms in future support programmes.

52. The programme has led to the leverage of additional investment by the organisations of participants. The majority of participants have indeed made an additional investment for their development activity, which in most cases has at least matched the value of the grant.

Recommendations

53. Leadership and Management training should be part of the core offer under Train to Gain, rather than a ‘flexible’ element of support. There is an obvious demand for this support amongst businesses and there are clear business benefits that can be attributed to individuals undertaking leadership and management development activity.

54. There is a need for effective, independent brokerage with on-going client relationship management for Leadership and Management provision under Train to Gain. This must be underpinned by appropriately skilled providers that can meet the specific needs of individual client businesses. Within Train to Gain it is important that reflection on provider capacity and the introduction of new providers to fill gaps takes place.

55. It is important that regional delivery arrangements are sufficiently flexible to ensure that the leadership and management development needs of MDs and other key directors are most appropriately met.

56. Partnership feedback is that the eligibility criteria for Leadership and Management Provision under Train to Gain should be expanded to include those organisations with less than 20 employees who may also benefit from the support.
57. Future provision must continue to provide flexibility to clients, which has been highlighted as a key benefit of the Leadership and Management Programme. There should be flexibility in terms of the choice of assessment tool and choice of development activity, with appropriate support to enable informed decisions by clients.

58. Effective client management is essential in order to ensure client progress through the Programme and to reduce the risk of drop-out at the PDP stage. It is important to be clear about timescales for completion of the PDP in order to enable on-going management and support.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report presents the findings from the Impact Evaluation of the National Phase of the Leadership and Management Development Programme for the National Learning and Skills Council (NLSC).

1.2 The aims of the evaluation were to:
   • measure the impact of the Programme on the participants’ own performance;
   • measure the impact of the Programme on their respective organisations;
   • assess how effective the brokerage models have been from the customer perspective;
   • inform policy on the way in which Leadership and Management provision can be embedded in Train to Gain.

1.3 The Programme sought to focus leadership and management support on Managing Directors of medium-sized businesses, following an assessment of need. The Programme was organised locally by Business Link Operators (BLOs) working under contract to local Learning and Skills Councils (LSCs) and delivered via a network of intermediary organisations, whose role included the recruitment and support of participants.

Background

1.4 The Leadership and Management Programme began with a pathfinder phase in April 2004 and was rolled out across the country from September 2004. As of April 2006, the Programme formally ended and now forms part of the offer to businesses under the Train to Gain service.

Programme Objectives

1.5 The Programme allowed for the availability of a grant of up to £1,000 to support leadership and management development activities tailored to the individual’s own development needs. The Programme sought to:
• support Managing Directors (MDs) or other key Directors of small or medium-sized businesses who, following in-depth assessment, wanted to pursue specific leadership and management development;

• help them to improve their leadership and management skills, including how to build a strong leadership and management team, to innovate, grow and increase overall business productivity;

• promote continuing skills development by the target group;

• increase demand for workforce development of employees, and increase the benefits of Investors in People (IiP) recognition and use of the IiP Management and Leadership Model;

• promote informal leadership and management learning through participation in local, regional and sectoral employer networks;

• build a system that can be sustained after the £1,000 offer ends, remaining attractive to MDs.

Eligibility

1.6 Eligibility for the grant and associated support was confined to MDs or other key directors who:

• ran a private sector commercial business or commercial enterprise (but excluded subsidiaries/franchises or larger organisations providing leadership and management development) in England;

• employed between 20 and 250 people\(^2\);

• would undergo an in-depth leadership and management assessment and agree a personal development plan with an adviser;

• agreed to complete their development activity within a 12 month period. The £1,000 must have been used within 12 months of a personal development plan being agreed.

\(^2\) The following DTI definitions are used to classify business size – small: 0-49 employees; medium: 50-249 employees; large: 250+ employees.
Centre for Enterprise

1.7 The Centre for Enterprise was appointed to support the LSC in delivering the Leadership and Management Programme. The Centre for Enterprise’s role included the:

- design and implementation of programme management systems that collected, collated and interpreted performance data from local LSCs;
- identification of current good practice amongst LSCs, BLOs and other key intermediaries, relating to Leadership and Management;
- identification of the operational opportunities and constraints amongst the delivery network in the roll out and expansion of these programmes in line with Train to Gain;
- coordination and support for local activity by a team of managers providing practical support in achieving the objectives of each of the Programmes;
- the dissemination of findings to main policy and operational customers through workshops, reports and meetings;
- analysis and summarising of emerging findings for main policy and operational customers and production of reports;
- provision of support to the relevant LSC and project boards – the preparation of papers, monitoring budgets, risk registers, progress against plans and providing update reports.

1.8 The role of the Centre for Enterprise is considered in more detail in Section Seven.

Targets

1.9 The original targets under the Leadership and Management Programme (Table 1.1) were for 40,611 engagements, 21,891 assessments, 17,773 agreed PDPs and 13,749 completed PDPs. It is significant that the original target for engagements equated to engagement with approximately a quarter of all beneficiaries in England in the target group.
1.10 In January 2005, a first reprofiling exercise was carried out in response to requests from the network as a result of the time taken to get delivery arrangements and procedures set-up. All local offices were asked to review their profile in view of performance to date. In the majority of cases, this resulted in the delivery profile being rescheduled, i.e. delivery targets were pushed back.

1.11 Following this initial exercise, the Leadership and Management Steering Group agreed that local offices could revise delivery profiles at any time. The process for this was for LSC contract managers to submit revised versions of Sections 3 and 4 of the original bid document to Centre for Enterprise. LSC National Office and the relevant Regional Skills Director were then asked to approve the changes. If approved, the LSC contract managers were informed and the profile updated. In a small number of cases where the reprofile had been rejected, the LSC and Business Link were given feedback as to why. The revised targets were therefore based on what the network considered it would be able to deliver, based on its experiences during the early stages of programme activity.

1.12 The revised targets under the Programme as of April 2006 are highlighted in Table 1.1, with targets for 36,210 engagements, 20,359 assessments, 17,573 agreed PDPs and 14,070 completed PDPs. It is significant to note, that the re-profiling led to a marginal increase in the target number of PDPs to be completed, despite reductions in the total number of engagements, assessments and agreed PDPs. A more detailed overview of programme targets and performance to date is provided in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1: Programme Targets and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed PDPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed PDPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ August 2006 Performance Figures (Centre for Enterprise)
1.13 The fact that the majority of partnerships got off to a relatively slow start to the Programme added to the difficulty of meeting targets. However, over the course of the Programme, targets for agreed PDPs have been all but achieved (97%). Performance with regards to completed PDPs is somewhat behind profile at present (63%), although recruitment was being undertaken to the end of 2005/06 with up to 12 months to complete development activities. As such there is still significant development activity going on.

The Skills White Paper

1.14 On 22 March 2005, the Department for Education and Skills published the Skills White Paper. The White Paper developed the strategy for ensuring that employers have the right skills to support the success of their businesses. It also set out a mechanism to help individuals gain the skills they need to be employable and personally fulfilled. The Skills White Paper set out a target of 17,000 managers to benefit from leadership and management support by March 2008:

- “For Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), Train to Gain will include support for leadership and management development. Leadership and management skills are one of our areas of relative weakness, particularly at middle management level. If we could tackle that, we would at the same time tackle one of the obstacles to wider investment in training, because of the role of training in supporting more ambitious business development strategies and adopting more effective working practices would be better understood. Our new programme to support leadership and management in SMEs meets those needs, with a focus on coaching and on-the-job development. It will support over 17,000 SME managers by March 2008”.

Train to Gain

1.15 The Train to Gain service available to employers is an independent and impartial brokerage service to diagnose business need and source appropriate training provision. The brokerage service provides:

- a comprehensive analysis of and solution to training needs, which identify clearly the elements that attract Government funding and those for which the employer will have to pay;

---

• easy access to relevant, flexible and high quality training, delivered mostly in the workplace and using increasingly an assess-train-assess model, which enable the employee’s prior learning and experience to be taken into account;

• information and support to access a wide range of training packages including higher level qualifications (including Level 3) and also non-qualifications based training. Brokers are able to signpost to other sources of information such as websites and telephone helplines;

• information and advice to employees on qualifications and training; eligibility for LSC funded training options, financial support and local and regional skill shortages and priorities;

• support to develop ongoing strategies to address future training needs, which are aligned to business objectives.

1.16 Leadership and Management development activity may be offered as one of the flexible elements under Train to Gain at regional and local level. These flexible elements may also include the following:

• support to achieve Investors in People recognition status;

• training for Union Learning Representatives;

• support for Foundation Degrees;

• recruitment solutions through Jobcentre Plus;

• support for continuation of individual skills development when moving from welfare to work into employment.

1.17 The Skills brokerage element of Train to Gain is funded and managed by the LSC and linked to a reformed Information, Diagnostic and Brokerage (IDB) business support service, managed by the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs). From April 2006 each region had developed a specialist skills brokerage service, which:

• uses brokers working towards a national standard and participating in a national training and development programme;

• is impartial and easy to access;

• is integrated with the generalist brokerage service to be offered under the Business Link brand;
builds on resources currently available in each region;

is underpinned by quality assurance arrangements, e.g. a service level agreement setting out the delivery criteria for brokers and by employer satisfaction surveys.

1.18 It is intended that brokers will provide an independent and impartial service, regardless of the organisation employing them and will act on behalf of employers to:

- provide them with the best possible advice on the skills training that will support their business need;
- design and cost integrated training packages, which define clearly which elements are Government funded and which the employer will have to pay for;
- source training from the most appropriate provider.

1.19 Brokers may also provide specialist support on sector specific issues. This support could include information on qualification frameworks, delivery models, funding, availability of provision and up to date intelligence on their specific sectors.

1.20 It is important that the evaluation identifies any key issues and lessons learnt in order to inform the development of the Train to Gain programme.

Client Brief

1.21 The specific objectives of this evaluation were to:

- assess the ease of access to the Programme;
- assess the effectiveness of the needs assessment and the appropriateness of solution;
- assess the effect on participants’ performance and that of the company;
- understand the impact on company involvement in more general workforce development and qualifications, Investors in People (IiP) status and engagement with wider skills development and business support;
- assess the characteristics of participants;
• identify the numbers, role, characteristics and effectiveness of intermediaries;
• assess the effectiveness of the managing agents’ operation of the Programme;
• assess market penetration;
• understand and assess the effectiveness of the different delivery strategies and models;
• assess any linkages to the Investors in People Standard;
• assess the significance of the £1000 worth of support in engaging participants;
• assess the synergy with other leadership and management development provision as distinct from more general business support;
• assess the level of fit with regional Leadership and Management Strategies;
• identify good practice;
• identify the lessons learnt to inform the development of the Train to Gain programme.

Methodology

1.22 The findings within this report are based on the following sources:

• postal/email survey of all Local Learning and Skills Councils (LLSCs) undertaken between November and December 2005. Responses were received from 29 LLSCs, which equates to a response rate of 83%\(^5\);

• postal/email survey of all Business Links undertaken between November and December 2005. Responses were received from 30 Business Links, which equates to a response rate of 85%\(^6\);

• six partnership area case studies in November/December 2005, including interviews with the LSC, the Business Link and intermediaries;

\(^5\) One LSC contact for each of the South East, London and North East regional delivery models.
\(^6\) One Business Link contact for each of the South East, London and North East regional delivery models.
• stakeholder interviews with Programme Managers at the Centre for Enterprise;

• telephone survey of 500 participants on the Programme in March - May 2006. Of the 500 participants, around three-fifths (58%) had completed their training/learning activities, with over a quarter (28%) having started their activities. A full breakdown of the characteristics of these 500 participants can be found in Appendix B;

• telephone survey of 216 intermediary organisations in March - May 2006;

• control group survey with 100 organisations in May/June 2006 that had had no involvement in the Programme. A geographically representative sample of businesses were chosen at random from the Yellow Pages database to form the control group. An overview of the key findings from the control group survey can be found in Appendix C;

• in-depth case studies with 20 participants in May/June 2006;

• telephone follow-up with ten Business Links/Programme Managers in May/June 2006.

1.23 We have also been able to utilise findings and information from the following:

• management information and performance updates from the Centre for Enterprise;

• review of programme documentation, bidding documents and project board meeting minutes.

1.24 Copies of the survey questionnaires can be found as follows:

• LSC Survey – Appendix D;
• Business Link Survey – Appendix E;
• Participant Questionnaire – Appendix F;
• Intermediary Questionnaire – Appendix G;
• Control Group Questionnaire – Appendix H.
Survey Analysis

1.25 We have undertaken a detailed and in-depth review of the survey findings and cross-tabulated key question areas by participant and business characteristics. This analysis process highlighted few differences in the cross-tabulated data, although we highlight in the main body of the report any key variances that were observed. Full survey data is provided separate to the main report.

Report Structure

1.26 The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- in Section Two we consider the key benefits and impact of the Programme;
- in Section Three we look at the set-up of the Programme;
- in Section Four we provide an overview of the key characteristics of participants;
- in Section Five we consider the assessment process and the development activity undertaken;
- in Section Six we discuss the key issues in relation to delivery of the Programme;
- in Section Seven we look at funding issues and the implications of the grant;
- in Section Eight we provide an overview of the key findings from the control group survey;
- in Section Nine, we consider the key operational issues associated with programme management;
- in Section Ten we present our conclusions and discuss the implications for Train to Gain.


2 BENEFITS AND IMPACT

Introduction

2.1 In this section of the report we focus on the perceived benefits and impact of the Leadership and Management Programme, as identified by programme participants. Reference is also made to perceptions of impact from both intermediary organisations and those involved in programme management. Specifically, the following is considered:

- changes in leadership/management of the business;
- business benefits;
- introduction of new standards/awards;
- awareness of other business support;
- impact upon other employees;
- future development activity;
- capacity building and penetration.

2.2 The survey results were consistent across all nine geographical regions. There were no significant regional or local variations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points – Benefits and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over three-quarters of participants (77%) indicated that the skills they had gained through the Programme had led to changes in the way that they led or managed the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Programme is reported to have had most benefit/expected future benefit on those businesses that were already on a positive financial trajectory in terms of increasing profitability and turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast majority of participants (88%) indicated that their involvement in the Programme had influenced, or was likely to influence, improved working practices within the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just under three-quarters of participants (73%) stated that programme involvement had influenced, or was likely to influence increased investment in training and skills within the business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of participants (71%) indicated that their involvement in the Programme had influenced, or was likely to influence, improved business growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of participants (71%) stated that their involvement in the Programme had influenced, or was likely to influence improving quality standards within the business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over half of participants indicated that programme involvement had influenced, or was likely to influence improved productivity (69%), profitability (59%) and sales (52%) within the business.

Around two-fifths of participants (39%) stated that their involvement in the Programme has led to the introduction of new standards, action statements or awards within the business.

A quarter of participants (25%) indicated that they were more aware of other business support directly through their involvement in the Programme.

Over two-fifths of participants (43%) indicated that their involvement in the Programme had encouraged other employees to seek similar development opportunities.

The vast majority of participants (90%) stated that they would be willing to take part in further leadership and management development activity in the future.

Timing

2.3 Appendix A highlights that as of April 2006, 45% of the profiled number of completed PDPs had been achieved (6,262 completed against a target of 14,070). The participant survey was undertaken between March and May 2006, with three-fifths of participants (58%) having completed their PDP. It is unlikely therefore that there will have been sufficient time for the activities that have been undertaken to have led to changes in activity, approaches and performance of both the individuals and organisations concerned, for those clients who have still to complete, or have only just completed their PDPs.
Changes in the Leadership and Management of the Business

2.4 The Programme has had a significant positive impact on the leadership and management of the participants’ businesses. The vast majority of participants interviewed indicated that the skills they have gained through the Programme had led to changes in the way that they lead or manage the business (Figure 2.1). Over three-quarters of participants (77%) indicated this to be the case. A tenth of participants, stated that there had been no changes, whilst 12% indicated that it was too early to make any assessment. The control group survey sought information on the changes resulting from participation in other types of management development programmes. This showed that a similar proportion of those control group survey clients who had undertaken training and learning in relation to leadership and management in the previous five years had made changes to their leadership or management of the business (74%).

Figure 2.1: Have skills gained through the programme led to changes in the way participants lead or manage the business

Number = 500
Source: YCL Participant Survey
2.5 The key changes identified by Programme participants include better communication between management and staff (18%), ability to get things done more efficiently/more organised (18%) and better awareness of staff and the business (18%). Other changes as a result of skills gained included the following:

- assertiveness and stronger leadership – 10%;
- improved confidence – 9%;
- improved training/development/assessment of staff – 7%;
- better overall control of the business – 7%;
- more professional structures – 6%;
- ability to delegate – 6%.

Business Benefits

2.6 There are a number of benefits that organisations may have been expected to experience as a result of involvement in the Programme. Participants were asked to comment on the extent to which their involvement has influenced, or is likely to influence, this range of potential benefits. The Programme is reported to have had most benefit/expected future benefit on those businesses that were already on a positive financial trajectory in terms of increasing profitability and turnover.

Improved Business Growth

2.7 Programme involvement was deemed to have had made a major contribution to business growth. Around a third (31%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on improved business growth (Figure 2.2).
2.8 A further two-fifths (40%) of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on business growth to date, or would do in the future. As would be expected, there are some differences between the impact upon improved business growth and the financial characteristics of participant businesses. This can be seen as follows:

- 78% of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ turnover, stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on improved business growth, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 67% of participants from businesses with ‘decreasing’ turnover;

- 80% of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ profitability, stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on improved business growth, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 67% of participants from businesses with ‘static’ profitability;

- 56% of participants from organisations whose growth objectives were to ‘grow rapidly’, stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased productivity, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 35% of participants from businesses whose growth objectives were to ‘stay the same size’.

**Figure 2.2: Business benefits - Improved business growth**
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Source: YCL Participant Survey
Increased Sales

2.9 One fifth (20%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on increased sales within the business (Figure 2.3). A further third (32%) of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on increased sales to date, or would do in the future. A third of participants (31%) stated that their programme involvement would have no influence on sales.

2.10 Again, there are some differences between the impact upon increased sales and the financial background of participant businesses. This can be seen as follows:

- 55% of participants from ‘for-profit’ organisations indicated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased sales, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 35% of participants from ‘not-for-profit’ businesses;

- 57% of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ turnover stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased sales, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 44% of participants from businesses with ‘decreasing’ turnover;
• 62% of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ profitability stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased sales, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 42% of participants from businesses with ‘static’ profitability;

• 56% of participants from organisations whose growth objectives were to ‘grow rapidly’, stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased sales, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 35% of participants from businesses whose growth objectives were to ‘stay the same size’.

Increased Profits

2.11 A quarter of participants (25%) indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on profitability in the business (Figure 2.4).

![Figure 2.4: Business benefits - Increased profits](image)
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Source: YCL Participant Survey

2.12 A further third of participants (34%) suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on improved profitability to date, or would have in the future. A quarter of participants (26%) felt that their programme involvement would have no influence on profitability within the business. Differences between the impact upon increased profitability and the financial background of participant businesses can be seen as follows:
65% of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ turnover stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased profitability, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 37% of participants from businesses with ‘decreasing’ turnover;

63% of participants from organisations whose growth objectives were to ‘grow rapidly’ stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on increased profitability, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 36% of participants from businesses whose growth objectives were to ‘stay the same size’.

**Increased Productivity**

2.13 Just under a third of participants (30%) indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on increased productivity within the business *(Figure 2.5).*

![Figure 2.5: Business benefits - Increased productivity](image)

*Number = 500*

*Source: YCL Participant Survey*

2.14 A further two-fifths (39%) of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on increased productivity at that point in time, or was likely to do so in the future.
2.15 It can be seen that a significant proportion of clients reported that their involvement in the Programme had already led to, or was expected to lead to improvements in business performance. This is a reflection of the changes that they had made in approaches to management and communication. It is, however, very difficult to isolate and quantify the impact of the Leadership and Management Programme on business performance. In many cases, it was also too early for any benefits/impact to have been realised if clients had still to complete, or had only recently completed, their development activities.

**Development of New Products/Services**

2.16 Programme involvement was not deemed to have had a major influence on the development of new products or services (Figure 2.6), which might limit the impact on further skills development in the business. Two-fifths (40%) of participants stated that their involvement would have no influence on product/service development. Just less than one fifth (17%) of clients were attributing development of new products/services to involvement in the Programme.

![Figure 2.6: Business benefits - Development of new products/services](image)
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Source: YCL Participant Survey
Introduction of New Technologies/Processes

2.17 Just under a quarter (23%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on the introduction of new technologies/processes within the business (Figure 2.7).

![Figure 2.7: Business benefits - Introduction of new technologies/processes](image)
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Source: YCL Participant Survey

2.18 Just under a third (29%) of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on bringing new technologies/processes into the business to date, or would do so in the future. Around a third (31%) of participants stated that their programme involvement would have no influence on the introduction of new technologies or processes.

2.19 Just less than half (48%) of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ profitability stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on the introduction of new technologies/processes, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 36% of participants from businesses with ‘static’ profitability.

2.20 Over half (56%) of participants from organisations whose growth objectives were to ‘grow rapidly’ stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on the introduction of new technologies/processes, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 31% of participants from businesses whose growth objectives were to ‘stay the same size’.
Increased/New Markets

2.21 Programme involvement has helped in market development in some instances (Figure 2.8). A significant minority (44%) of participants reported that their programme involvement had influenced increased/new markets. This is greater than the two-fifths (38%) of participants who stated that their involvement would have no influence on new product/service development.

![Figure 2.8: Business benefits - Increased/new markets](image_url)
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Source: YCL Participant Survey

Improved Quality Standards

2.22 The Leadership and Management Programme can be seen to have had a positive impact on the embedding of new standards/systems in the participating businesses (Figure 2.9). For example, two-fifths (40%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on improving quality standards within the business.

2.23 A further third (34%) of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on improved quality standards, or was likely to do so in the future.
2.24 Around three-quarters (73%) of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ turnover stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on the introduction of improved quality standards, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 48% of participants from businesses with ‘decreasing’ turnover.

Number = 500
Source: YCL Participant Survey

**Improved Working Practices**

2.25 Improving working practices was seen as a significant benefit as a result of involvement in the Programme (Figure 2.10). The vast majority of participants interviewed (88%) stated that their involvement in the Programme had, or is expected to lead to, improved working practices within their organisations. Just over half of interviewees (52%) saw this as a significant outcome. The development of improved working practices is a reflection of the skills gained through involvement in the Programme being embedded within organisations through new approaches and new ways of working.
2.26 Examples of these improvements were observed in the participant case studies:

**Case Study Example:**

The organisation is a jewellery manufacturing business based in North London.

The participant (Director) accessed a period of one-to-one mentoring over a three month period specifically focused on developing her communication skills. There had traditionally been a significant amount of resistance to change within the organisation.

There has since been a move to more effective working practices within the organisation. The Director encouraged each unit to appoint a spokesman to meet on a regular basis to talk about the product being developed. Any adjustments were made as a result of this dialogue and not in the actual production process. This more effective communication process was deemed to have improved efficiency and productivity.
Case Study Example:

The organisation is a family-run business selling specialist building products including pipes, equipment and fencing.

The MD has accessed support in relation to ‘developing others’ in order to delegate effectively as the company grows.

The MD perceives that his management skills have definitely improved as a result of his involvement. More effective delegation has meant that he is working more efficiently and has more time to concentrate on the overall management of the business, rather than getting heavily involved in day-to-day operational activities. As a result there has been a definite change in the culture of the organisation: “It feels like a real business now. There is a team of people striving to achieve the same results and to improve performance year on year”.

2.27 The majority (89%) of participants from organisations with ‘increasing’ turnover stated that their involvement in the Programme had a significant/some influence on improved working practices within the organisation, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to 70% of participants from businesses with ‘decreasing’ turnover.

Improved Marketing

2.28 Almost half of clients interviewed reported that their involvement in the Programme would lead to improved marketing. Around a fifth (19%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on improved marketing within the business (Figure 2.11). Just under a third (29%) of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on improved marketing at that point in time, or would do so in the future.

2.29 Improvements in marketing were most likely to be reported by participants whose businesses were already focused on growth. Over half (52%) of participants from organisations whose growth objectives were to ‘grow rapidly’, stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on improved marketing within the business, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to just over a third (36%) of participants from businesses whose growth objectives were to ‘stay the same size’.
Case Study Example:

The business is a small marketing organisation based in Central London specialising in direct mail.

The MD attended a 2-day coaching course which was tailored to his own development needs in relation to time management. The course taught him how to put time aside and plan his own time more effectively, with a real focus on identifying business priorities.

Immediately after the course, he put time aside to devote to the organisation’s own internal marketing campaign. This has been on the agenda for a while, but the MD has not had the time to put anything into action – the coaching taught him how to prioritise tasks within the business.

Directly as a result of this marketing campaign, the company managed to secure new contracts with clients, worth around £20,000 to the business.
Improved Likelihood of Company Survival

2.30 The Programme was deemed to have been important in terms of improving the likelihood of company survival (Figure 2.12). Over a third (34%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on improving the likelihood of company survival. A further 35% of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on company survival at that point in time, or would be expected to do so in the future.

![Figure 2.12: Business benefits - Improved Likelihood of company survival]
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Source: YCL Participant Survey

2.31 Nearly three-quarters (72%) of participants from organisations whose growth objectives were to ‘grow rapidly’, stated that their involvement had a significant/some influence on improved likelihood of company survival, or was likely to do so in the future. This is compared to around half (51%) of participants from businesses whose growth objectives were to ‘stay the same size’.
Increased Investment in Training and Skills

2.32 Programme involvement has had a positive impact on increased investment in training and skills for nearly three-quarters (73%) of participants. Over a quarter (28%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had, or was likely to have, a significant influence on increased investment in training and skills within the business (Figure 2.13). A further 45% of participants suggested that their involvement had ‘some’ influence on increased investment in training and skills at the time of the survey, or would do so in the future.

![Figure 2.13: Business benefits: Increased investment in training and skills](image)
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2.33 In one of the participant case studies the business had committed up to £10,000 to management development activities as a result of involvement in the Programme. The business was also putting a training and development budget in place.
Case Study Example:

The organisation is a tourist attraction in the South West of England.

The owner/manager’s approach to leadership and management has changed as a result of his training activity under the Programme, and he is putting in place a number of new processes throughout the business to improve efficiency and management.

He is going on to do more development activity through a business diagnostic programme, which is a £5,000 match-funding scheme. A business development consultant undertakes a full business diagnostic and identifies business needs. The company then pays to implement them. They perceive this to be a major investment for a small business and indicate that this would not have happened without having accessed the training under the Leadership and Management Programme.

Improved Communication Skills

2.34 Many programme participants pointed to the improved communication skills that they had obtained as a result of undertaking development activity through the Programme. Examples from the participant case studies included the following:

- ability to be able to communicate at a higher management level;
- knowledge and understanding of the importance of the use of language;
- greater reflection on communication between the manager and staff and customers (what he said and how he said it);
- improved person-management skills and dealing with individual employees.

2.35 Although it is difficult to quantify these skills in terms of the impact upon the business, they can contribute to more effective management and support organisational development and performance.
Introduction of New Standards/Awards

2.36 Around two-fifths (39%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had led to the introduction of new standards, action statements or awards within the business.

2.37 Over a quarter (26%) of these participants had developed a formal training for the business (Figure 2.14). Just under a quarter had developed a formal quality statement (24%) and formal business plan (24%), with 23% committing to the Investors in People Standard since their involvement in the Programme.

![Figure 2.14: New Standards/awards/action statements introduced](chart)
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2.38 This introduction of such standards and awards is perhaps a reflection of the participant businesses ‘maturing’, with more planned and systematic or structured management helping to support organisational performance.
Case Study Example:

The business is a private hire taxi company. It has 27 employed receptionists and three directors and the company makes use of 220 self-employed taxi drivers.

The participant Director has undertaken business counselling and training and attended a series of workshops with a solicitor on employment law and support to put contracts of employment in place.

The introduction of contracts of employment has resulted in a significant change to the way that the business operates. There is much greater clarity with regards to operational procedures and a reduction in the potential tensions that can result from a lack of appropriate systems and structures.

Awareness and Links to Other Business Support

2.39 A quarter (25%) of participants indicated that they were now more aware of other business support directly through their involvement in the Programme. In many partnership areas, participants had been directed towards other Business Link support at the re-diagnosis stage. For example, in the South East there was a target of 50% of clients being re-diagnosed. These tended to take place six to nine months after the development activity had been completed on a 'first come, first served' basis. A large proportion of these re-diagnosis sessions were carried out by Business Link advisors which enabled them to sign-post easily to other Business Link services and support.

2.40 Over a quarter (27%) of the 25% of participants that stated that they were more aware of other business support indicated that they were more aware of Employer Training Pilots (Figure 2.15) at the time of the survey, which is now a live programme through Train to Gain. 15% of these participants indicated that they were more aware of the skills brokerage approach.
2.41 In the context of clients being linked into other support, it is important to consider how the Leadership and Management Programme was organised and delivered. Clearly, it is likely to be easier to draw clients into other provision if there is clear integration of the support. It is significant to note that four-fifths (80%) of Business Links indicated that the Programme was an integrated part of the ‘total offer’ to clients, rather than a standalone service.

2.42 In London, Leadership and Management was incorporated as part of AddMore, which is the brand name for the London Employer Skills Offer. This combined Workforce Development (WFD), including Skills Brokerage and Investors in People, with the national Leadership and Management offer. The advantages of the AddMore delivery model were deemed to be four-fold:

- to give clients the best expertise for the particular WFD activity they were undertaking;
- to provide no-wrong door access;
- to bring to the programmes clients who would not normally consider training for their staff or themselves, or would not normally engage in Government sponsored development;
• in line with the national programme, to allow any external partner, company or individual consultants to engage on the Leadership and Management Programme.

2.43 In the North East, Business Link Workforce Development Advisors or Skills Brokers were the main actors responsible for engagement. The Leadership and Management Programme was therefore integrated with the total offer to businesses, as part of the regional brokerage system.

2.44 Nearly all Business Links (93%) indicated that new relationships generated via the Leadership and Management Programme had led to other positive interactions with businesses in order to address their wider business needs. This is compared to the 25% of participants who stated that they were now more aware of other business support. This suggests that the Business Links are far more positive than the participants themselves in terms of the success of the Programme in drawing additional clients to take up wider programmes of support, and further helping to strengthen the business.

2.45 Partnership feedback was that local branding can influence the extent of integration/perceived integration of the Leadership and Management Programme into other business support initiatives. For example, in Norfolk, the ‘Columbus’ brand was used to support the development of relationships with a wider audience than the Business Link brand, drawing in new clients into the system. One of the critical things underpinning the approach to delivering the Programme was the need to deliver consistent value to clients. The view was expressed that the Columbus brand was trusted by those that had engaged with it.

2.46 It could be argued that the benefit of the Leadership and Management Programme is that it puts a business advisor in front of some of the key people within the particular organisation. This should, in theory, make the selling of other workforce development programmes easier. Indeed, relationships have been formed with many MDs that should enable much easier contact in the future and hopefully open up the door for future development of their business.

2.47 The effectiveness of this linkage to other workforce development programmes depends on a number of factors including:

• branding;
• responsibility for client engagement;
• other structures and systems to link clients into other support.
2.48 Evidence would suggest that intermediaries having responsibility for signposting organisations in the direction of other Business Link workforce development initiatives has not been as effective as was hoped for. Indeed, in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole, intermediaries were not specifically ‘trained up’ in other Business Link workforce development products. The Business Link covers a large geographical area, so it would be difficult to train intermediaries in all Business Link programmes and initiatives. One of the intermediary organisations in the area also indicated that there was a danger that they could lose the Leadership and Management lead if they were perceived as trying to ‘sell too much’. To resolve this issue, the Business Link employed a specific intermediary to undertake the re-assessment stage and to make participants aware of other Business Link programmes and initiatives.

2.49 In Essex, all clients on the Programme were asked to undertake a final evaluation after claiming their funding. As part of this they were asked if they would like to meet a Business Link advisor to discuss further services offered by the Business Link – 70% of clients have agreed to this meeting. Some of these clients went through a re-assessment with the advisors and appropriate services were being taken up.

2.50 In London, in the majority of cases, if a new client had accessed the Leadership and Management Training then they would have been offered either a Sirius Holistic Diagnostic on their Business or a DTI Benchmarking – Product 10. As a result of this assessment the client would also be able to access other funded initiatives such as the Manufacturing Advisory Service and Supply London. If they had gone through a Product 10, they would then be able to access financial support for consultants to develop or implement the actions identified within the benchmarking in order to grow their business.

2.51 In the North East, a significant number of businesses initially engaged through the Leadership and Management Programme have gone onto train other managers within the business using the sub-regional Leadership and Management Programmes. In other cases, the regional Flexible Skills Fund (RDA/Single Programme) was used to support staff to undertake training at Level 3 equivalent or above.
2.52 Businesses in the region have also gone on to utilise eQ8, the North East Employer Training Pilot and ESF LLSC co-financing to enable staff to gain NVQ Level 2 Qualifications. Several businesses were also referred to Business Link Personal Business Advisors and UK Trade and Investment Advisors for support in areas other than workforce development, including business planning, marketing, international trade and business diversification. In a smaller number of cases, businesses initially engaged through the Leadership and Management Programme were also now committed to Investors in People.

2.53 Overall, in the North East, the Programme was said to have had a significant impact on the Business Links in the region. In particular, it was reported to have increased their market penetration in a region which already had high, if not the highest, penetration compared to others. In the South East it was suggested that a key benefit of the Programme had been increased customer awareness of Business Link services.

Impact on other Employees

2.54 Businesses in the target market are of a size where they need an effective management team. It is therefore important that other employees are receiving management and leadership training. The Programme has had some positive impact in terms of encouraging others to take up such training. Over two-fifths (43%) of participants indicated that their involvement in the Programme had encouraged others in their organisation to seek similar development opportunities.

2.55 This is less than the proportion of control group individuals who had been in other leadership and management development activity in the previous 5 years. Almost two thirds (62%) of those that had undertaken this training stated that it had encouraged other employees to seek similar development opportunities. It may be that the lower figure from programme participants is because it was relatively early for this to have taken place. It is important to consider whether the focus on one individual manager has limited the ‘cascade’ effect.
2.56 Figure 2.16 shows that training opportunities have been most commonly sought by other employees in relation to developing management skills (32%). 13% of other development opportunities sought have been in relation to undertaking National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs), or training or learning activity linked to leadership skills. An example from one of the case study businesses is highlighted below.

![Figure 2.16: Training or learning activities others have been encouraged to seek](chart.png)
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**Case Study Example:**

The participant (MD) accessed financial training in relation to accounting systems, reporting and planning.

Since the participant has been on the training he has used his specific trainer to deliver more general training to middle managers in the company, and NVQs to workers on the shop floor. By the end of September 2006, it is intended that all shop floor workers will have an NVQ in an engineering-related subject.

Whilst it was stated this other training would have been rolled out across the company anyway, the MD feels that his participation in the Programme has enabled this to have occurred more quickly.
2.57 Three-quarters (75%) of those participants who felt that their involvement in
the Programme had not yet encouraged others in the organisation to seek
similar development opportunities, suggested that it would encourage them
to do so in the future.

**Future Training and Learning Activity**

2.58 The majority (90%) of participants indicated that they would take part in
future leadership and management training in the future. Over three-quarters
(79%) of these participants were willing to pay for this training.

2.59 A significantly greater proportion of participants on the Leadership and
Management Programme indicated that they would take part in future training
or learning than the individuals from the control group survey who had
accessed leadership and management development activity in the previous 5
years. Three-fifths (60%) of these control group individuals would consider
further activity, compared to 90% from the Programme.

2.60 The main reasons put forward by the small number of participants who would
choose not to get involved in future Leadership and Management training
were a lack of time and funding available.

2.61 Intermediaries interviewed reported an increase in commitment to training
and learning, together with the expectation that this will be reflected in further
training and development participation among the clients they were working
with. Over three-quarters (78%) of intermediaries were in agreement that
managers were now more committed to training and learning than they were
before involvement in the Leadership and Management Programme (*Figure 2.17*).
Just under two-fifths (38%) of intermediaries ‘agreed strongly’ with this
assertion, whilst a further two-fifths (40%) ‘agreed slightly’ that managers
were more committed
2.62 The findings from the intermediary survey also reflected those from the participant survey, with the vast majority (88%) of intermediaries of the view that managers who had taken part in the Programme were likely to take part in further training activity (Figure 2.18). Over two-fifths of intermediaries ‘agreed strongly’ (43%) and agreed slightly (45%) that participants would continue to undertake training and development activity in the future.

2.63 One of the key benefits reported by one of the participant case studies was that involvement in the Leadership and Management Programme encouraged her to go on and do more personal development activity. She was going through a life coaching process at that point in time, rather than management development activities, as she recognised the need to address issues relating to work-life balance.
Figure 2.18: Managers who have taken part in the programme are likely to take part in further training activity
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Source: YCL Intermediary Survey

Capacity Building

2.64 A further benefit of the Programme is that it was deemed to have helped generate an improved and more sustainable network of employer support (Figure 2.19). Just under a third (30%) of intermediaries agreed that this has been the case to a ‘great extent’, whilst a further two-fifths (39%) agreed to ‘some extent’. Development of this support is of benefit to employers in terms of the availability of training and learning provision.
2.65 Similarly, Figure 2.20 shows that intermediaries stated that their involvement in the Programme had helped to improve their relationship with employers. Just under half (48%) of intermediaries suggested that their relationship with employers had improved to a ‘great extent’, whilst just under a third (31%) stated that this had been the case to ‘some extent’.
2.66 In the North East, the skills brokers who had previously worked on Director Development were involved in Train to Gain. As a result the brokers were well placed to consider needs in relation to management development in larger organisations, as well as the skills development needs of smaller businesses. This reflects the continued aim of supporting/delivering management development as part of a holistic offer, rather than a stand alone activity.
3 PROGRAMME SET-UP

3.1 In this Section we consider the key issues in relation to the set-up of the Leadership and Management Programme. The set-up of the Programme is crucial, as it is only if this process is right that impacts will be achieved.

Key Points – Programme Set-Up

- Just under half (45%) of intermediary organisations first became involved in the Leadership and Management Programme as a result of being approached directly by the Business Link. Around two-fifths (38%) contacted the Business Link directly.

- Two-thirds (67%) of intermediary organisations went through an assessment process prior to involvement in the Programme.

- Over half (52%) of intermediary organisations were provided with training in order to carry out their role in the Programme. Over three-quarters (78%) of intermediaries indicated that this training was effective.

- The majority of partnerships had not engaged intermediaries to deliver specific elements of the Leadership and Management Programme. Over 80% of Business Links perceived intermediaries to have been effective in their delivery roles under the Programme.

- Just less than two-thirds (65%) of participants first heard about the Leadership and Management Programme via the Business Link. The majority (94%) of participants were satisfied with the joining process.

- Around three-quarters (74%) of survey participants were ‘new’ Business Link clients.

- Around a quarter (26%) of participants indicated that they have been involved in Government-funded training prior to involvement in the Programme.

- Less than two-thirds (63%) of intermediary organisations indicated that they were aware of the requirement to target ‘new’ Business Link clients.
Intermediary Organisations

3.2 A crucial element of the Leadership and Management Programme has been the role of intermediary organisations in the delivery of the Programme. In most areas, the term ‘intermediary is used to refer to subcontractors involved in the delivery of the Programme (engagement/assessment/provision). In the original DfES Programme documentation it was suggested that ‘an intermediary can be anyone who the MD chooses to use. It may be someone from an organisation the business already deals with and trusts, e.g. their accountant, business advisor, local college, training provider, chamber, membership organisation’.

3.3 It was intended that an intermediary could perform any, or all, of the following roles:

- promote the Programme in their sector or locality, and recruit participants;
- help MDs to assess their personal development needs, by using appropriate tools;
- find appropriate provision and help MDs to access it;
- help MDs to access the funding;
- provide advice on the Programme and on other support or services relevant to the needs of the MD or their business.

3.4 It was also recognised that some intermediaries would be accredited. It was suggested that these intermediaries would need to:

- understand the Programme and be able to provide accurate advice;
- be competent in the use of their chosen assessment tools;
- know about other relevant support which may be available to MDs;
- provide management information to the local delivery organisation;
- have, and develop, a range of local and/or sector contacts.

3.5 The effectiveness of this intermediary network has been cited as a key driver of the Programme by many partnership areas. The development of a positive working relationship between the programme managers and the intermediary organisations included the following:

- involving intermediaries in the development of the Programme;
- keeping intermediary contributions at a high level throughout;
3.6 In some partnership areas, the definition of an ‘intermediary’ included both financial organisations and training providers who could carry out assessments and produce personal development plans. In others the definition was more specific. For example, in London they had a team of ‘call-off consultants’ who carried out both of the above stages. The most successful delivery was by these call-off consultants who had been able to promote their solutions to clients. The existing relationships that many of these consultants had with organisations were deemed to make it easier to engage MDs onto the Programme.

**Types of Intermediary Organisations**

3.7 The results from the intermediary survey highlight that the most common type of intermediary organisations (Figure 3.1) were management consultancy organisations (43%), followed by private training providers (29%) and training consultants (16%). A very small proportion of accountants (2%) and Further Education (FE) colleges were represented in the group of intermediaries.

3.8 Business Links indicated that they were working with an average of 33 intermediary organisations on the Leadership and Management Programme, ranging from a minimum of five, to a maximum of 94 organisations. Whilst partnerships may have engaged a significant number of intermediaries to work on the Programme, there tended to be a much reduced ‘core group’ who were prominently active.
3.9 In the earlier stages of the Programme there was evidence that managing a large number of intermediary organisations had been particularly time-consuming and resource intensive for some Business Links. This involved contacting intermediaries to ensure that they were making progress and obtaining updates on performance and chasing the necessary paperwork.

- “Constant chasing of intermediaries has proved necessary to keep things moving”;
- “Management of some intermediaries has proven to be very time consuming”.

3.10 This was less of an issue where the Business Link was working with fewer intermediaries. For example, there were only five intermediary organisations as part of the delivery arrangements in Norfolk and the Business Link had few problems in managing and working with them.

### Recruitment of Intermediaries

3.11 Just under half (45%) of intermediary organisations first became involved in the Programme as a result of being approached directly by the Business Link. Around two-fifths (38%) indicated that their involvement came about as result of them contacting the Business Link, which would suggest that organisations were keen to be involved in programme delivery.
3.12 At the interim evaluation stage, a third (33%) of Business Links indicated that they had experienced some difficulties in recruiting intermediaries to the Programme. Whilst there did not appear to have been too many problems recruiting training providers and consultants, partnerships reported some difficulties in engaging banks, accountants and solicitors, who may not have seen the value of being involved in the Programme:

- “There have been problems engaging intermediaries such as accountants and various institutes. They have been approached, but they are too slow in their response and have their own internal processes to go through to get permission to engage SMEs on this offer”;
- “Intermediaries such as banks and accountants have been unwilling to take part. They are busy and there is no short term value proposition for them”;
- “We spent a lot of time initially talking to intermediaries such as banks and accountants and delayed our own marketing approach. However, these intermediaries have not delivered leads”;
- “Banks and accountants were not interested in the role and commitment to resources to support MDs”;
- “It has been difficult to engage with intermediaries such as banks, accountants and solicitors”.

3.13 In Norfolk, the involvement of intermediaries in financial services, such as local accountants and banks, was very limited. This is attributed to the view that there was no direct benefit to them from becoming involved. Training providers and consultants, however, were perceived to be able to see the value in becoming involved in the Programme. The focus in Norfolk therefore had been on engaging a small group of quality providers who were seen to be in agreement with the ethos of the Programme.

3.14 As well as difficulties in recruiting intermediary organisations such as banks and accountants, partnerships also reported problems in terms of engaging FE Colleges on to the Programme

- “Further education colleges have also been very slow in becoming engaged with the Programme, despite regular updates and reminders”;
- “Colleges were interested initially but struggled with resources to manage MDs through their PDPs”.
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3.15 In one partnership area, the LLSC expressed some concern that the Business Link was perhaps not creative enough in terms of the intermediary market, focusing on development consultants and training providers, rather than ‘non-traditional’ intermediaries such as banks and accountants.

3.16 There was a core of intermediary provider organisations with previous involvement with the Business Links. Over two-thirds (69%) of intermediaries indicated that they had been involved in other Business Link, or Government programmes in the past three years, prior to involvement in this programme. However, the majority (97%) of BL partnerships had worked with some new organisations. In some instances, such as in the Black Country and Norfolk, almost all intermediaries were ‘new’ to the Business Link, reflecting activities to build the provider network. This is a different scenario to the North East, where a relatively well developed provider network had already been established. Even in this region, new organisations were recruited to deliver the Programme in order to meet newly identified needs.

Assessment and Training

3.17 Two-thirds (67%) of intermediary organisations indicated that they went through an assessment process prior to involvement in the Programme. This assessment process was designed to ensure the ‘suitability’ of intermediary organisations to carry out their role in terms of meeting the requirements of the Programme managers and the needs of participants.

3.18 Over half (52%) of intermediary organisations indicated that they were provided with training in order to carry out their role in the Programme. Views on the effectiveness of this training are provided in Figure 3.2.
3.19 The training provided to intermediary organisations by the Business Link/Programme Managers prior to their involvement in the Programme was deemed to be effective. Over one-third (37%) of those intermediaries that has been provided with training stated the training to be ‘very effective’, with over two-fifths (43%) indicating that the training was ‘fairly effective’ in meeting their needs.

**Intermediary Roles**

3.20 A key finding from the interim evaluation was that the majority of partnerships had engaged intermediaries to play roles across all elements of the Programme, rather than recruiting specific organisations to deliver particular elements of the Programme. It could often be the same intermediary organisation that had responsibility for client engagement and then taking the client through the key stages of the delivery process, including the needs assessment and development of the PDP. This is confirmed with the results from the intermediary survey which highlighted that the majority of intermediary organisations were responsible for a number of roles in the Programme, rather than a specific element (Figure 3.3).
3.21 Just over four fifths of intermediaries were responsible for preparing PDPs (86%) and carrying out the diagnostic (82%), whilst exactly four fifths were involved in referring organisations to the Programme (80%) and recruiting/engaging managers to take part (80%). Over three-quarters (77%) of intermediaries were involved in the mentoring/coaching of participants on the Programme, whilst over two thirds were responsible for delivering (69%) or brokering (68%) training.

3.22 The vast majority of Business Links perceived intermediaries to have been effective in their delivery roles under the Leadership and Management Programme. Four fifths (82%) of Business Links thought intermediaries to have been effective in engaging clients onto the Programme, whilst the majority (89%) of Business Links indicated that their network of intermediaries had been effective in carrying out the assessment of participant need. Over Four-fifths (85%) of Business Links perceived that intermediaries had been effective at the brokerage and development stage in terms of the training solution offered to the client.
3.23 For some partnerships, a key success factor was seen to be the effective relationship and trust that had been developed between the intermediary and programme participant. Although there may already have been an existing relationship that had been established prior to the Leadership and Management Programme, having the same intermediary organisation take the MD through from engagement to completed PDP was deemed to assist in this relationship development. This could help to reduce the risk of dropout from the Programme and thus help to maximise the draw-down of the grant.

**Participant Engagement**

3.24 A first key step in the Leadership and Management Programme involved initial contact with businesses in order to identify those MDs or key directors who would benefit from specific leadership and management development support. The guidelines provided by the Centre for Enterprise suggested that ‘engagement should involve some degree of input from businesses (e.g. attendance at seminars, briefing sessions or intermediary event) which results in a positive interaction with BLO and/or an intermediary. It is not sufficient to define engagement as marketing activity (e.g. receiving promotional literature or a telemarketing call)’.

3.25 Appendix A indicates that as of August 2006, 77% of the profiled number of client engagements had been achieved (28,059 engagements against a target of 36,210). The South East (110% of profile achieved), North West (106%), South West (104%), and North East (103%) were the best performing regions in terms of client engagement.

**Initial Awareness**

3.26 Just less than two-thirds (65%) of participants first heard about the Programme through the Business Link (*Figure 3.4*). This highlights the heavy reliance on the Business Link in raising initial awareness of the Programme. Around two-fifths (39%) of participants were contacted directly from the Business Link, whilst around a quarter (26%) of participants were made aware of the Programme as a result of a Business Link advertising or marketing campaign. Just 1% of participants first heard of the Programme via a college.
3.27 The initial survey of Business Links indicated that a local approach to marketing was most common, with three-quarters (76%) of Business Links adopting a local marketing campaign. Half (50%) of Business Links had gone for a sectoral approach, with two-fifths (40%) having undertaken a regional marketing campaign. The local marketing campaign was deemed to be far more effective than the sectoral and regional marketing approaches that had been adopted. The majority (88%) of Business Links indicated that this was the case.

3.28 The findings from the intermediary survey indicate that four-fifths (80%) of intermediaries had been involved in identifying participants themselves (Figure 3.5). Whilst the vast majority of intermediaries were involved in recruiting clients, evidence would suggest that they were only successful in introducing a small proportion of participants. Over half (52%) of intermediaries had received clients from a third party, whilst just under a fifth (17%) of intermediaries stated that they had been approached directly by clients. It is not clear what prompted this awareness, but evidence from elsewhere would suggest that it was the Business Link.
Overall, there was a high level of satisfaction with the joining process amongst participants on the Programme. Over two-thirds (69%) of participants indicated that they were ‘very satisfied’ with the joining process, with a further quarter (25%) being ‘quite satisfied’.

‘New’ Business Link Clients

A requirement of the Programme was for 80% of participants to be ‘new’ Business Link clients. Over half (53%) of participants indicated that they had had advice from the Business Link prior to involvement with the Leadership and Management Programme.

Just under half (47%) of these participants indicated that they had received advice from the Business Link in the last year (Figure 3.6). These results would suggest that around 74% of participants are ‘new’. It should be recognised however that the sample of participants for the survey was drawn from earlier clients in order to maximise their distance travelled. This is likely to over-represent existing clients when compared to the full population of participants.

A ‘new’ client is defined as a business that the BLO has not previously engaged with in a meaningful way. Organisations that have been engaged with previously, but not within the preceding 12 months, can also be defined as ‘new’ clients.
3.32 The most common advice received from the Business Link prior to involvement in this programme was in relation to the Investors in People Standard (25%) and general training (24%). However, a wide range of advice had been sought on subjects including the following:

- funding advice – 8%;
- general business advice – 8%;
- business expansion/development – 8%;
- marketing – 6%;
- business management – 5%;
- financial advice – 5%;
- human resources/employment law – 5%;
- new business start-up – 4%;
- export advice – 4%;
- strategic planning – 4%.

3.33 A third (33%) of intermediaries reported that they were unaware of the requirement to target ‘new’ Business Link clients. This, we would suggest, is significant given the stated aims of the Programme and would indicate an important issue in relation to the briefing of organisations to be involved in client engagement.
3.34 A finding from the interim evaluation was that engaging ‘new clients’ was not always a main focus in some partnership areas. For example in Norfolk, other than the size of the business, there has been no specific approach to targeting engagement activities to reach new clients or particular hard-to-reach groups. One intermediary organisation in the Black Country indicated that their approach to engaging participants was just to target all of their existing clients who they knew had 20+ employees, with no consideration of whether the Business Link had worked with them before or not.

3.35 Elsewhere, where the total population of eligible businesses is relatively small, the potential to achieve significant take-up through targeted approaches to engagement was regarded as relatively low, especially where there were high existing levels of client take-up.

3.36 It is important to recognise the extent to which the baseline of existing clients can impact on the potential to engage with new clients. For example, in the North East there was no specific approach to target the engagement of new clients. However, the eligibility criteria for the Programme meant that businesses that formed the ‘traditional’ core of the Business Link client group were too small to participate. It was therefore seen as inevitable that a high proportion of clients would be new.

3.37 Awareness of the ‘new’ Business Link client requirement affected the intermediary engagement approach to a ‘great extent’ for around a quarter (24%) of intermediary organisations (Figure 3.7). This awareness influenced the approach to ‘some extent’ for over a third (37%) of organisations, although had no influence for over a quarter (27%) of intermediaries.
**Government-funded Training**

3.38 Around a quarter (26%) of participants indicated that they had been involved in Government-funded training prior to involvement in the Programme. The most common form of government training that participants had accessed prior to involvement in this programme including general training (36%) and National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) (18%). A wide range of other support had been accessed, including in relation to the following:

- Business Management – 20%
- Investors in People – 13%;
- Funding – 6%;
- Apprenticeships – 3%;
- Marketing – 2%.

3.39 Over two-fifths (44%) of participants who had accessed this Government-funded training had done so in the last year (Figure 3.8). Around a third (34%) of participants had been involved with this training between two and three years ago, whilst involvement was over three years ago for around one-fifth (22%) of participants.
Figure 3.8: Time of involvement with Government-funded training
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4 PARTICIPANT PROFILE

4.1 In this section we present an overview of the characteristics of participants on the Leadership and Management Programme.

4.2 The data is based on the MI statistics collected by the Centre for Enterprise on those participants who had completed their PDP at the end of March 2006. Due to inaccuracies in the reporting of quarterly MI data and the failure to submit an MI return\(^8\), the statistical data does not match exactly with the cumulative number of MDs at the completed PDP stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points – Participant Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The largest ethnicity group is white, accounting for the majority (91%) of MDs at the completed PDP stage. The second largest is Asian or Asian British MDs, accounting for 4%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Males make up over two-thirds (69%) of Directors completing a PDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants were most commonly from the other social and personal care sector (17%), with this along with the manufacturing and health and social work sectors accounting for over half (51%) of businesses at the completed PDP stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over two-thirds (69%) of companies whose Directors have completed a PDP employ between 20-49 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approximately 5% of Directors at the completed PDP stage identified themselves as having some form of disability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

4.3 The Centre for Enterprise had obtained ethnicity information on 5,922 out of 6,772 participants who had completed their PDP at the end of March 2006 (Figure 4.1).

---

\(^8\) The Centre for Enterprise reported that there was a poor level of MI submission for quarter one 2006/2007 with 12 areas failing to submit a quarterly MI data return.
4.4 Information on the ethnic origins of programme participants shows that involvement in the Programme was heavily dominated by people who identified themselves as being white, with this group accounting for 91% of the total. The second largest participant group was Asian, or Asian British, although these participants accounted for just 4% of the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of MDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability

4.5 At the end of March 2006, 239 of the Directors at the completed PDP stage identified themselves as having some form of disability. This is approximately 5% of the 4,665 Directors (65%) who stated whether they had a disability.

Gender

4.6 As of the end of March 2006, a greater number of male than female directors were participating in the Programme. They accounted for over two-thirds (69%) of participants involved at this stage. This is consistent with the traditional dominance of males in SME management. The Centre for Enterprise did not have gender information for 1,052 directors involved in the Programme.
Sector

4.7 Participants who had completed their PDP were most commonly from the other social and personal care sector (17%). Manufacturing (17%) and the health and social care (17%) sectors were also strongly represented (Figure 4.2). Involvement was low in the fishing, mining and quarrying and private households with employees, sectors. Regional participation was greatest in the following sectors:

- manufacturing - East of England, East Midlands, North West, Yorkshire and Humber and West Midlands;
- other social and personal services – London and North East;
- health and social work – South East and South West.

![Figure 4.2: Business Sector at Completed Stage](image-url)
Business Size

4.8 Over two-thirds (69%) of Directors that were at the completed PDP stage fell into the company size bracket 20-49 employees (Figure 4.3), with 50-99 (19%) and 100-249 (12%). This illustrates that the Programme was most popular with small businesses. The actual split of the target group across the whole economy is approximately 20-49 (64%), 50-99 (22%) and 100-49 (13%)\(^9\) and thus indicates that those participants recruited on to the Programme are fairly representative of the business population as a whole.

![Figure 4.3: Size of Business at Completed Stage](image)

4.9 It is interesting to note that the MI figures suggest that no businesses in the Programme were from outside the target size bands, despite evidence of this from the participant survey.

---

5 ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

5.1 In this Section we consider the assessment process and the development activity undertaken by participants on the Leadership and Management Programme.

Key Points – Assessment and Development Activity

- A combination of assessment methods were used to assess participant leadership and management development needs. Over four-fifths (82%) of intermediary organisations used face-to-face discussion with clients to identify development needs; two-fifths (42%) worked with managers to complete an assessment tool.

- In three-fifths (62%) of cases, the assessment process with clients was reported by intermediaries to last between one and two hours.

- The majority (90%) of participants indicated that the assessment process was effective in identifying their development needs.

- The most common development area for a third (34%) of participants was working with people. A fifth (21%) of participants indicated that the assessment identified training and learning in relation to providing direction.

- In three-fifths of cases (60%), the assessment identified at least some needs that the participant was unaware of at the time. Around two-fifths (38%) of clients reported that they were already aware of their development needs prior to undertaking the assessment.

- Three-quarters (75%) of participants indicated that they received a written statement of their development needs.

- Two-fifths (41%) of intermediaries reported that clients started their development activity within a month of their assessment; a quarter (25%) of intermediaries stated that clients began their development activity between one or two months after assessment.

- Around two-fifths (39%) of participants indicated that they had undertaken a formal course not leading to a qualification or had a period of mentoring/coaching. A third (32%) had had a one-off training session.

- Over a third (36%) of participants had developed new skills in relation to working with people. A fifth (18%) of participants had developed new skills in relation to managing self and personal skills and providing direction to staff.

- Just under two-thirds (64%) of participants indicated that they would not have gone ahead with the training and learning activity if they had not had the assessment.
• Over four-fifths (81%) of participants stated that they were able to find suitable training courses, or other learning and development opportunities to address all their leadership and management skills requirements.

• The majority (95%) of participants were satisfied that their development needs had been addressed through the training and learning activities undertaken.

• The flexibility of the Programme in terms of being able to fit around other responsibilities was deemed as being good by the majority (90%) of clients.

• The majority (87%) of clients stated that the Programme has been effective in meeting their Leadership and Management development requirements.

Assessment

5.2 This stage involved an in-depth assessment of leadership and management needs using an appropriate diagnostic tool.

Performance

5.3 Appendix A highlights that as of August 2006, 88% of the profiled number of assessments had been achieved (17,968 against a target of 20,359). The North East (110% of profiled assessments achieved), South West (102%), South East (99%) and North West (97%). The East of England was performing at 64% of profiled assessments achieved.

5.4 Discussions with the manager of the Programme in the South East highlighted that as of May 2006, 2,957 directors had had an assessment, yet there was only funding for 1,600 grants under the Programme. Hence, just over half of assessed clients would get a grant through the funding that is available, although there was an expectation that there would be client drop-out from the Programme. There was hence a large waiting list for grants – participants were told that if they didn’t progress in terms of take-up of the grant, it would be allocated to someone on the waiting list. The Programme was therefore ‘sold’ on the basis of the value of the assessment to clients.
Assessment Methods

5.5 The client survey indicates that a combination of approaches was used, in most cases, to assess their leadership and management development needs. The most common assessment methods used are highlighted in Figure 5.1. The majority (87%) of participants indicated that their development needs were identified via informal discussion. Over half (57%) of participants completed a formal questionnaire, while a fifth (22%) completed an on-line assessment.

5.6 Less than a quarter (24%) of the 34% of control group businesses who had accessed leadership and management training in the previous five years had had a diagnosis of their development needs prior to undertaking the training. The initial assessment of development need can therefore be seen as being an element of the Programme that would not normally have taken place.

![Figure 5.1: Assessment methods used in identifying Leadership and Management skills](image)
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5.7 The above results confirm the intermediary perspective on the forms of assessment used with clients (Figure 5.2). Over four-fifths (82%) of intermediary organisations highlighted that they used face-to-face discussion with clients as a means of identifying development needs. Two-fifths (42%) indicated that they worked with managers to complete an assessment tool.
5.8 The main diagnostic tool used in the assessment was the Business Link’s own tool (18%), or a diagnostic tool that the intermediary organisation had developed for their own needs (12%). Intermediaries identified a diverse range of diagnostic tools used. The most common diagnostic tools highlighted by intermediaries were as follows:

- BITE – 6%;
- SMART – 6%;
- Honey and Mumford – 5%;
- RTS Diagnostic – 3%;
- Management Perspectives – 3%.
5.9 The fragmented nature of the assessment approaches makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the most effective approach or assessment tool.

5.10 It is important to note that the design of the delivery model was such that it allowed flexibility to enable the specific needs of individual MDs to be met. Flexibility can be realised in terms of the type of assessment tool used. For example:

- “We have been as flexible as we can be within the parameters set, so that each intermediary is allowed to work to their individual strengths. We do not specify the type of assessment that must be undertaken, we are more interested in the results that appear on our assessment form and how this evolves into development of the plan”;
- “There is flexibility in terms of choice of assessment tool and choice of development activity”;
- “The Business Link have not stipulated a specific assessment, rather they have left the intermediary to decide on the most appropriate tool, dependent on the needs of the MD”.

5.11 In Norfolk the majority of assessments were built around the use of the MBTI Assessment Tool. Oxford Psychological Press were engaged in the delivery of the Programme and had been involved in work to link MBTI types to leadership competencies and the business development cycle. Participants completed an MBTI assessment (either online or in hard copy) and were then referred on to consultants who were able to review the assessment, provide assessment and support the development of the PDP. Oxford Psychological Press also provided training in the use of MBTI to other local providers and the Business Link.

5.12 In the North East, clients were offered a range of different assessments, reflecting their preferences for more or less formality. These included providers offering assessments using MAP, another who had developed an email based assessment tool and less formal interview-based training needs analysis. In the South East, the Project Manager expressed the view that the output from the assessment was key. There was therefore less concern about the specific assessment tool used. This again highlights the difficulty in making an assessment of the most effective diagnostic tools used.
5.13 It is important however that customers were given a ‘controlled choice’ in terms of the assessment tool utilised. This reflects the likelihood that MDs would not necessarily be ‘informed’ clients in selecting the most appropriate assessment approach/tool to meet their needs.

5.14 In over three-fifths (62%) of cases the assessment process with clients was reported by intermediaries to be quite short, lasting between one and two hours (Figure 5.3). Only 10% of intermediaries reported carrying out assessments requiring half a day or more of time.
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5.15 Participants have indicated a high level of satisfaction with the assessment process in terms of identifying areas for training and learning (Figure 5.4). Over half (55%) of participants felt that the assessment was ‘very effective’ in terms of identifying their development needs, with a further third (35%) suggesting that the process was ‘quite effective’.
Figure 5.4: Effectiveness of the assessment process in identifying areas for training and learning
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Areas for Development

5.16 The main areas of training or learning identified through the assessment by participants are highlighted in Figure 5.5. The most common development area for around a third (34%) of participants was working with people. A fifth (21%) of participants indicated that the assessment identified training and learning in relation to providing direction.
5.17 The two main development areas highlighted above were also those identified by intermediaries (Figure 5.6). Just under half (46%) of intermediaries indicated that the main skills for client development identified in the PDPs were in relation to providing direction. 45% of intermediaries said that the main development areas were linked to working with people.
5.18 As illustrated in Figure 5.7, around two-fifths (38%) of clients reported that they were already aware of their development needs prior to undertaking the assessment. However, in three-fifths (60%) of cases, the assessment identified at least some needs that the participant was unaware of at the time. It is important also to recognise that confirmation of a need that was already known could be beneficial in providing confidence to pursue appropriate development activities. It is also important to note that the assessment process (which in most cases took a relatively short time) led to the identification of potential approaches to address the needs. The assessment was therefore a means to an end, rather than an end in itself.

5.19 It was seen earlier that the majority of control group participants that had undertaken leadership and management training in the past five years had not had an assessment of need. There is hence a risk that their decisions, at best, were based on a partial understanding of their needs and so they may have been making sub-optimal choices. This again demonstrates the value of the assessment process.
The findings from the participant survey highlight a positive relationship between the level of qualification of the participants and awareness of their development needs prior to the assessment (Table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Level of Participant</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A greater proportion of participants (49%) with a higher level qualification (Level 5) knew of most, or all, of their development needs prior to the assessment, than participants with a qualification level below Level 5.

Three-quarters (75%) of participants indicated that they received a written statement of their development needs. The importance of the assessment is shown in the following quotes from programme participants:

- “I knew what I needed to do, but the assessment process helped to pinpoint my development areas”;
- “The assessment brought my development needs to the surface”;
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5.23 Anecdotal evidence from consultations with intermediaries also indicated that the process of going through an assessment can in itself be beneficial, providing an opportunity to reflect on skills and abilities.

Development Activity

5.24 As of April 2006, Appendix A shows that the network was running at 96% of profile in terms of agreed PDPs (16,823 achieved against a target of 17,573). Nearly all partnership areas were performing well in terms of performance against the profiled number of agreed PDPs, with the only exception being the East of England (67%). This is the critical figure at this stage, because it indicates that the targeted number of individuals had almost been reached.

Timescales

5.25 Two-fifths (41%) of intermediary organisations indicated that clients on the Programme started their training or learning activity within a month of having the assessment of their development needs (Figure 5.8). A quarter (25%) of intermediaries stated that clients started their development activity between one and two months after the assessment. It is generally suggested that the risk of drop-out from the Programme is greater if clients do not embark on their training/learning activity within two months of the assessment process. Just over a quarter (26%) of intermediaries stated that participants began their development activity after this two month period.
The Training Provider/Coach and Training Methods

5.26 Programme flexibility in terms of the freedom for clients to decide on how they could address their training needs, e.g. development approach and provider, was a key feature of the Programme and is deemed as being a key success of the Programme by some partnerships. Just over three-fifths (62%) of participants indicated that they were offered a choice of training provider or coach.

5.27 Just over a quarter (28%) of clients indicated that their training provider/coach was introduced to them, or recommended by the advisor who carried out their assessment (Figure 5.9). A similar proportion (27%) of participants identified their training provider or coach themselves, possibly as a result of an existing relationship that they had. For a fifth (20%) of clients, their training provider/coach was the advisor who carried out their assessment.
5.28 A key feature of the Programme is that clients were offered a variety of development options that were closely matched to their learning styles and their personal and business needs. Just over two-thirds (68%) of participants were offered an open choice of training methods. 56% of the control group individuals who had accessed leadership and management training in the previous 5 years were offered an open choice of training methods, thus highlighting the flexibility of the Leadership and Management Programme.

5.29 In terms of the choice of training methods offered to clients, two-thirds (67%) were offered formal learning opportunities (Figure 5.10).
5.30 Nearly three-fifths (58%) of clients were offered informal learning methods, while two-fifths (41%) were given the opportunity of having peer-to-peer support.

Training/Support Received

5.31 Results from the survey indicate that Programme participants were undertaking a number of different types of training activity, in combination, rather than a single development activity. Around two-fifths of participants indicated that they have undertaken a formal course not leading to a qualification (39%) or had a period of mentoring/coaching (38%). A third (32%) of clients had had a one-off training session. The full range of training/support received is highlighted in Figure 5.11 below.

5.32 A greater proportion of individuals from the control group survey who had undertaken leadership and management training in the past five years had undertaken a formal course leading to a qualification (50%), in comparison to participants on the Leadership and Management Programme (24%). Programme participants have generally not undertaken qualification-based training and development activity.
Feedback from participants is that the length of time it took to complete development activities ranged from four hours or less, to over 200 hours. Training and learning activity most commonly took between 20 and 40 hours in length for a third (34%) of participants. This would indicate that those involved in the Programme were generally undertaking significant levels of development activity.

It can be seen in Figure 4.1.4 above that a quarter (24%) of clients had undertaken a formal course leading to a qualification. The most popular qualifications received/receiving were as follows:

- NVQ in Management (16%);
- Diploma in Management (8%);
- Registered Managers Award (8%);

Participants were working towards a wide range of qualifications. This includes some very significant programmes, including MBAs and Masters Degrees.
5.36 Three-quarters (75%) of intermediary organisations who were delivering the training solution were undertaking some mentoring/coaching with clients (Figure 5.12). Just under half (45%) were delivering on-going private tuition, whilst around a quarter were delivering a formal course not leading to a qualification (27%), or a one-off event or activity (25%).

![Figure 5.12: Methods of training delivered](image)

Number = 150  
Source: YCL Intermediary Survey

**New Skills Developed**

5.37 Linked to the most commonly identified needs, the key area where new leadership and management skills had been acquired to date were in relation to working with people. Over a third (36%) of participants had developed new skills in this area (Figure 5.13). Around a fifth of participants indicated that they had developed new skills in relation to managing self and personal skills (20%) and providing direction to staff (18%).
5.38 Working with people is also one of the key leadership and management development areas highlighted by intermediary organisations (Figure 5.14). Over half (57%) of intermediaries had delivered training/learning in relation to working with people. A similar proportion of intermediaries had delivered new skills in providing direction. This would indicate a strong linkage between the clients’ benefits and those reported as having been delivered by intermediaries.

5.39 These new skills developed are similar to those highlighted by those control group individuals who had undertaken leadership and management training in the previous 5 years. The only significant area of difference was in relation to developing skills in relation to working with people, highlighted by 18% of the control group, but 36% of participants on the Leadership and Management Programme. It is possible that this is a reflection of the impact of the assessment on the nature of the development activities undertaken.
5.40 A significant proportion of participants expected to go on to undertake further management development activities. They had identified a broad range of leadership and management skills that they expected to develop in the future as a result of their involvement in the Programme (Figure 5.15).

Figure 5.14: Areas of leadership and management skills delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing self &amp; personal skills</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing direction</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating change</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with people</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using resources</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving results</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number = 150
Source: YCL Intermediary Survey
5.41 Around a tenth of participants expected to acquire new skills in relation to working with people (13%) and providing direction (10%).

### Added Value

5.42 The value of the assessment is highlighted by the fact that nearly two-thirds (64%) of participants indicated that they would not have gone ahead with the training and learning activity if they had not had the assessment. There was no difference between ‘new’ and ‘existing’ Business Link clients as to whether training and learning and training would have been undertaken without the assessment.
5.43 The training/support that would have been undertaken by those participants anyway without having had the assessment is shown in Figure 5.16. A greater proportion of participants would have undertaken a course leading to a formal qualification if they had not had the assessment (36%), than has occurred under the Programme (24%). Furthermore, fewer participants would have accessed a period of mentoring/coaching (14%) without the assessment than has taken place in reality (38%). This would appear to highlight the importance of the assessment in shaping the nature of development.

![Figure 5.16: Training/support that would have been undertaken without having had the assessment](chart)

Number = 129  
Source: YCL Participant Survey

**Satisfaction**

5.44 Over four-fifths (81%) of participants stated that they were able to find suitable training courses, or other learning and development opportunities to address all the leadership and management skills requirements identified during their assessment.

5.45 There was also a high level of satisfaction amongst programme participants that the content of the training and learning activities that they were involved with had addressed their development needs (Figure 5.17).
5.46 Over two thirds (70%) of participants were ‘very satisfied’ that their development needs had been addressed through the training and learning activities, with a further quarter (25%) of participants ‘quite satisfied’ that their needs had been met.

5.47 Satisfaction levels were higher amongst participants on the Leadership and Management Programme than those amongst the control group participants who had undertaken leadership and management training in the previous five years. Less than two-fifths (38%) of control group individuals were ‘very satisfied’ that the content of the training and learning activity had addressed their development needs, compared to 70% of participants on the national Programme.

5.48 The majority (90%) of clients rated the flexibility of the Programme to fit around other responsibilities as being good/very good. This flexibility of the delivery process in terms of enabling the specific needs of individual MDs to be met is a key feature of the Programme (Figure 5.18). Around two-thirds (65%) of participants indicated that the development activity that they were involved in had been ‘very good’ in terms of being able to fit it around their other responsibilities. A quarter (25%) of participants felt the training/learning to be ‘quite good’ in terms of this flexibility.
5.49 The Leadership and Management Programme is perceived to have been very effective in terms of addressing the development needs of participants (Figure 5.19). The majority (87%) of participants stated that the Programme had been effective in meeting their Leadership and Management Development requirements. Over half (55%) of participants perceived the Programme to be ‘very effective’ in terms of meeting their development needs, with a third (32%) indicating the Programme to be ‘quite effective’.
5.50 The results from the participant survey highlight that participants from smaller organisations indicated that the Programme was slightly more effective in meeting their leadership and management development requirements (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2: Effectiveness of the Programme in meeting Leadership and Management requirements (Very/quite effective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Size</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Quite effective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>Too early to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-49</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>100-249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.51 It can be seen that 88% and 90% of participants from organisations with between 21 and 49 and 50 and 99 employees respectively indicated that the Leadership and Management Programme was very/quite effective in meeting their needs, compared to 79% of participants from organisations with 100-249 employees.

5.52 There is also a positive relationship between the current financial performance of the business (profitability) and participant views on the effectiveness of the Programme in meeting their leadership and management development needs (Table 5.3).
Table 5.3: Effectiveness of the Programme in meeting Leadership and Management requirements (Very/quite effective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profitability</th>
<th>Increasing</th>
<th>Decreasing</th>
<th>Static</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.53 Three-fifths (60%) of participants from organisations with increasing profitability stated that the Programme was effective in meeting their needs, compared to half (50%) of participants and two-fifths (40%) of participants from organisations with static, and decreasing profitability levels, respectively.
6 DELIVERY APPROACHES AND PERFORMANCE

6.1 In this Section of the report we highlight some of the key issues that have impacted upon the delivery of the Programme and performance to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points – Delivery Approaches and Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There was a slow start overall with the Leadership and Management Programme. It took partnerships time to get procedures and delivery arrangements set-up and to build up momentum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The North East, South East and London were operating regional delivery models as opposed to delivery on a local partnership level. There was no evidence to suggest that a regional delivery model was more successful than a local partnership model in terms of meeting performance targets, but benefits of this regional model were deemed to include economies of scale, supporting cost-effective delivery and facilitating cooperation between the Business Links in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In some partnership areas, training providers were allowed to carry out the assessment and provide the training and development solution to the same client. This raises questions with regard to impartiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the early stages of the Programme in particular, client progression in terms of the move from assessment to completion of PDP was much slower than anticipated. Effective client management is crucial in terms of client progression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A number of partnerships indicated that the eligibility criteria for the Leadership and Management Programme should have been extended to also include participants from organisations with less than 20 employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional versus Local Delivery Models

6.2 The North East, South East and London were operating regional delivery models as opposed to delivery on a local partnership level. There is no evidence based on the performance figures in Appendix A to say that a regional delivery model is more or less successful than a local partnership model in terms of meeting performance targets.
6.3 A benefit is that the consistency of a regional offer minimises any boundary issues that may exist. For example, in the North East there was an increasing trend towards regional delivery of programmes more generally, which was seen to help avoid intra-regional differences and disparity of offer. It can also help in developing a strong provider network at the regional level, rather than each Business Link independently seeking to develop its own networks.

6.4 Where regional delivery was less well-established prior to the introduction of the Programme, some difficulties were reported as a result of the need for a number of organisations coming together to agree processes and the way forward. One of the partners in the South East delivery model indicated that issues were not always quick to be resolved in the early stages of the Leadership and Management Programme. Indeed, they argued that decision-making can be more complex generally with a regional approach in comparison to a local delivery model due to the number of parties involved in the former arrangements. In this context, successful application of a regional delivery approach relies on a clear agreement of role and functions between all organisations involved.

6.5 A further positive element of delivery on a regional basis was deemed to be that these arrangements can offer considerable economies of scale. Benefits included being able to share good practice and information on intermediaries. It also allowed certain Business Links to concentrate on fulfilling the targets for particular priority groups and others to fulfil other targets, reflecting the make-up of the region. The regional approach also provided the potential to balance differences in performance between the sub-regions, which is more difficult with separate delivery arrangements. The transition to regional contracting for business support services through the RDAs will help to address this.

6.6 In the North East, the regional approach was seen as supporting cost-effective delivery, through, for example, single regional contracts with assessment providers and joint marketing activities. The ‘back-office’ costs were also said to have been reduced through the regional approach. For example, there was only one full-time project manager, full-time administrator, plus the support of a finance officer. This was cost-effective compared to each of the Business Links carrying out these functions.

6.7 In the South East, it was stated that the Programme had helped to facilitate greater cooperation between the six Business Links in the region. It was perceived that they came together in a more coordinated way than has occurred before.
Role of the Intermediary

6.8 An important issue that has been highlighted is whether the intermediary organisation should be allowed to carry out the assessment and provide the training and development solution to the same client if they are also a training provider. The following concerns have been raised:

- can intermediaries be truly impartial if they were responsible for both of these elements?
- were clients being provided with a sufficient choice of training provision/are they aware of other options?
- was the intermediary organisation using the Leadership and Management programme as a vehicle to gain further business for themselves?

6.9 A range of approaches had been adopted. In some partnership areas there were strict guidelines as to the role of the intermediary:

- “Our intermediaries are not allowed to be a provider to the same client”;
- “Client facing individuals can deliver both the training/development and do the assessment”;
- “Impartiality of intermediaries was built in from the outset, i.e. those involved in assessment could not then deliver training to the MD”.

6.10 In some partnership areas it was less clear cut:

- “Our strategy does not preclude intermediaries also being a deliverer of development activity, although this is closely monitored and not encouraged”;
- “The intermediary needs to refer the MD in the direction of two or three different training providers to reduce the risk of them also delivering the training. It is important to safeguard that the MD has a choice in terms of the training offer”.

6.11 Whilst intermediary organisations should have been offering a choice of training providers as a matter of course at the pre-contract stage, in many cases clients will take-up the training that they provide, largely as a result of an existing relationship or as a result of the relationship that had been developed with the MD.
6.12 This may also be explained by the fact that the reputation of the intermediary with the employer depends to a degree on the quality of the training provision that they are signposted towards. Hence there may well have been a reluctance of intermediaries to signpost their client towards other training providers. Also intermediaries may already have had their own established network of providers and so it was difficult to get some intermediaries to look outside their immediate familiar network.

6.13 These issues are highlighted in the following quotes from programme managers:

- “The decision to allow intermediaries to act as a provider has created issues, in that clients have not been given sufficient choice of training provision and the training provider has seen this as an opportunity to gain business for themselves”;
- “We have found that clients introduced through our training providers have tended to do their development through the provider and are not always aware of other options available to them”;
- “I would not allow training providers to do PDPs and assessments”;
- “Whilst we instructed intermediaries to be impartial with regards to identifying training solutions, the reality is that where they also provide training they really can’t be seen as impartial. In many cases they are small traders who can’t afford to miss out on an opportunity afforded to them to present their organisation as the training solution”.

6.14 It could be argued therefore that if an intermediary organisation was to be truly impartial, then training providers should not have been allowed to undertake the assessment:

- “I have found management consultancies to be the most competent and impartial intermediaries. Training providers find it difficult to be truly impartial. When recruiting freelance individuals not known to Business Links, there is a huge risk that they will bend the rules to make additional fees off the back of the Programme”.

6.15 There were also perceived to be potential difficulties in ensuring that the client was linked into the total Business Link ‘offer’ where the involvement of the latter was minimal.
6.16 In the North East however, the established regional brokerage model ensured that there was clear separation of roles, with Business Link staff assisting clients to identify providers in the brokerage system, following production of their PDPs by assessment organisations. The Programme Managers felt that they took a risk in allowing the assessment providers to recruit programme participants. Only around 190 clients were brought into the Programme by providers. In hindsight, the view was expressed that they should have put more time into making the assessment providers aware of how the Programme should operate and how they could bring clients into it. It should be stated however that engagement and assessment is a fairly logical grouping of tasks. They ensured clear separation between assessment and training provision, such that impartiality of the brokerage was maintained, with the Business Link brokers supporting the identification of appropriate providers, in response to the PDP.

6.17 In the South East, training providers could undertake the assessment and provide the development solution, although clients had to sign a declaration form that they had been offered alternative training providers. The Programme Managers monitored the training providers quite closely – those that delivered the training solution to seven out of ten participants were assessed and warned about this. A number of repeat offenders were removed from the delivery of the Programme.

6.18 However, there has been examples of where clients had been offered a range of suppliers and then been asked to take ownership of identifying the most appropriate training provider. There is then a risk of participants losing interest and falling out of the Programme. These delivery arrangements assume that the MD is an ‘informed buyer’. Therefore, where there is separation of responsibility for the different stages of the process, it is crucial that there is effective case management. In the North East, this role was played by the Business Links, thereby ensuring continuity. However, this does create the potential for lags to develop post-assessment. Whilst very few clients dropped-out at this post-assessment stage, this was a highly resource intensive element of the Business Link role in the delivery of the Programme.

Operational Issues

6.19 Partners have been positive with regards to the operational management arrangements under the Programme.
LSC and Business Link Communication

6.20 For many partnership areas, a positive working relationship between the LLSC and Business Link has been deemed crucial to effective delivery under the Programme. Over 90% of partnerships indicated that communication mechanisms between the LLSC and the Business Link were effective. 97% of LLSCs and 93% of Business Links indicated a positive working relationship between the two organisations;

6.21 Communication was deemed effective for a variety of reasons including formal regular contract management meetings; long established working relationships as a result of collaboration and cooperation on previous development initiatives; regular informal communication via telephone or email.

Contract Management

6.22 For the majority of partnerships, contract monitoring meetings were held monthly in the initial stages of the Programme. Three-fifths (60%) of Business Links and just under three-quarters (72%) of LLSCs indicated that they met on a monthly basis to review project performance. Efficiency of the management of the Programme is evidenced by the fact that there were examples of the regularity of contract review meetings being reduced, i.e. from a monthly to a quarterly basis.

Centre for Enterprise

6.23 Almost two-thirds (64%) of LLSCs perceived the management arrangements under the Centre for Enterprise to be effective. Over half (55%) of Business Links indicated that the Centre for Enterprise provided effective support. The main benefits of the CfE were deemed to be the responsiveness and support of the staff in dealing with issues and problems raised and the provision of regular and up-to-date information.
Intermediary and Programme Manager Communication

6.24 Intermediary perceptions of the effectiveness of communication mechanisms between themselves and the Programme managers are extremely positive (Figure 6.1). Over half (55%) of intermediaries perceived their relationship with the Programme managers to be ‘very effective’, with a further third (34%) indicating this relationship to be ‘quite effective’.

Figure 6.1: Effectiveness of communication mechanisms between intermediaries and programme managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite effective</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither/nor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number = 216
Source: YCL Intermediary Survey

Client Progress

6.25 A general issue with the Leadership and Management Programme is that there was a slow start overall. It took partnerships time to get procedures and delivery arrangements set-up and to build up momentum. Experiences in the North East illustrate the issues faced across the network as a whole. For example, they had not anticipated the amount of time that would be needed to gain momentum in terms of client awareness, understanding and take-up of the Director Development Programme. The client offer was very different to other programmes in terms of the assessment process and the focus on developing individual senior managers. This difference was perceived to be one of the key factors contributing to the slow build of momentum.
Assessment to PDP Completion

6.26 A more specific concern raised across partnerships, particularly in the early stages of the Programme, is that the move from assessment to completion of PDP was much slower than anticipated. This can be seen as follows:

- “Some aspects of performance have been good, for example the conversion of engagements to PDPs. However, progress has been slow and planned activity has not taken place”;
- “PDPs/Reviews and grants have been predictably much slower to come through”;
- “Engagement has been excellent, but there has been some difficulty in conversion to assessment and completion of PDP”;
- “Assessment to PDP is good, but slower than anticipated on completion of PDP”.

Client Management

6.27 Effective client management is crucial in terms of client progression. The key to this is good internal monitoring systems in order to support the management of the Programme. In Norfolk, a ‘dashboard’ approach was adopted to track client activities and ensure they were aware of the outstanding ‘balance’ and what had to be done to complete actions.

6.28 In Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole, it was the responsibility of the intermediary organisations to develop procedures to help prevent client drop-out. One of their larger intermediaries (training provider) was in the advantageous position of having staff resource to chase participants in order to ensure that they were completing their training activity and progressing through the Programme. Smaller organisations or freelance individuals for example, did not necessarily have the capacity to do this.

6.29 In the Black Country, the Business Link specifically recruited two intermediary organisations as a dedicated resource to pick up and contact those MDs that had stalled on accessing their training provision and to re-engage them in the Programme. It was hoped that this would help to speed up the process between assessment and completion of PDP.
6.30 In Lancashire it was felt that the achievement of timescales for individual learners to move through the process needed to take account of business issues that MDs dealt with that affected their participation at particular times. It was also perceived that communication could have been better directly with MDs. The Business Link respected the relationship between intermediaries and MDs, relying on intermediaries to take responsibility for communicating on a regular basis. This did not necessarily happen in all cases and is reflected in the fact that as of April 2006, there are still a significant proportion of clients who are still to complete their development activities.

Intermediary Management

6.31 There were also cases of intermediary organisations not meeting their contracted delivery targets which created difficulties for the Business Link in terms of the management of the intermediary network:

- “Intermediaries have failed to deliver on their contractual targets”;
- “The majority of intermediaries have failed to achieve their specified (and promised) outputs”.

6.32 This shows the importance of ensuring sufficient project management time to enable effective project delivery. For example, in Lancashire, with the benefit of hindsight the Business Link perceived that the project management time was not accurately scoped. The Programme was more intensive than was anticipated, for example, the time required to manage intermediaries.

Eligibility

6.33 A common view that has been raised is that the eligibility criteria for the Leadership and Management Programme should have been extended to also include participants from organisations with less than 20 employees. Some partnerships experienced significant demand for management training and development from this particular client group, but were not eligible for support under this programme:

- “The Business Link have experienced considerable demand from under 20 SMEs which could not be met by the Programme”;
- “The majority of SMEs in this region have fewer than 20 employees and cannot therefore participate in the Programme. However their need for leadership development is no less than that of the larger business”;

6.34 Indeed in Hertfordshire it was perceived that there was too much emphasis on the size of the participant in the eligibility criteria. It was stated that there was significant interest from businesses with less than 20 employees and so there was the need to do more work with these smaller businesses to make their management systems more effective. In the North East, the cohort of businesses in the region with 20-249 employees was relatively small. It was suggested that the Programme could have been delivered far more effectively if businesses with 10-19 employees were eligible.

6.35 The numbers from the participant survey indicate that there were at least a small number of clients that fell outside the eligibility criteria. In some regions, and individual areas (such as the South West and the North East), local funds were used to support organisations that fell outside the eligibility criteria for the national programme. The population of eligible businesses varied significantly by location. In particular, in more rural areas, the number of businesses with 20-250 employees can be very low.
7 VALUE FOR MONEY AND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GRANT

7.1 In this Section we consider the funding of the Programme and the implications of the grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points – Value for Money and the Significance of the Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is significant variation in the approaches that have been adopted to the delivery of the Programme by different partnerships, leading to widespread variations in the costs per completed PDP purely in relation to programme delivery (engagement, activities, assessments, delivery of development support and re-assessments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On average, excluding management costs and training grants, the delivery of each completed PDP cost approximately £1,112. Costs ranged from £348 per completed PDP in one partnership area, to £2,415 in another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Across the Programme as a whole, the mean total cost per completed PDP (including delivery and management costs, but excluding grants) was £1,566. This total unit cost ranged from £738 per completed PDP in one partnership area to £2,918 in another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The mean management cost per completed PDP was £542. The lowest unit cost of management was £224 per completed PDP, increasing to £1,197 in one partnership area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Across the Programme as a whole, £2.38 was spent on delivery for every £1 on project management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On average, across the country as a whole, each client completing a PDP would receive a grant of approximately £902.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over a quarter (29%) of participants indicated that they would ‘definitely not’ have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the £1,000 grant. Nearly two-fifths (37%) of participants would ‘probably not’ have gone ahead if it was not for the grant funding on offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nearly two-thirds (63%) of participants who indicated that they would have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the grant, stated that the grant enabled them to undertake development activity more quickly than they would have done otherwise. A quarter (24%) of these participants stated that the grant enabled them to undertake more development activity than they would have done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For over two-fifths (44%) of participants, £1,000 was the minimum amount of grant funding that would have prompted them to go ahead with the development activity. For a quarter (24%) of participants, £500 was the minimum amount of funding that would have prompted their involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over three-fifths (61%) of participants indicated that they had contributed additional funding towards the costs of training and learning activity on top of the grant. This additional contribution ranged from less than £100 to over £5,000, with a median/mode contribution of between £750 and £1,000.

Three-fifths (58%) of intermediary organisations indicated that the amount they had been paid had covered the cost of their involvement in the Programme. Payment was not deemed as being sufficient for two-fifths (38%) of intermediary organisations.

Value for Money of the Programme

7.2 It is not possible to report conclusively on the overall value for money of the Programme as there are still a significant number of clients who have yet to complete their development activities. The latest management information shows that a total of 5,430 clients had completed the implementation of their PDPs, which is just 38% of the 14,320 profiled, therefore indicating that there continues to be significant work in progress.

7.3 In order to build some understanding of the overall value for money of the Programme, we have therefore used the final profiles for expenditure and completed PDPs, to provide a consistent basis for comparisons.

7.4 It should be noted that the unit cost calculations have highlighted significant variations between partnerships in the costs of management and delivery. These variations are discussed below.

Total Unit Costs of Completed PDPs

7.5 Across the Programme as a whole, the mean total cost per completed PDP (including delivery and management costs, but excluding grants) was £1,566. The lowest total unit cost was £738 per completed PDP, in Gloucestershire. In Lancashire, each completed PDP is profiled to cost an average of £2,918 – just less than twice the average and around four times the unit cost in Gloucestershire.
7.6 The differences between areas in total unit costs of delivery of the Programme reflect variations across all elements of the support, including staffing, costs of marketing and engagement approaches, differences in assessment approaches (and therefore costs), and, most significantly, in the amount of support provided to participants during the implementation of their PDPs. For example, in Gloucestershire, the costing of the delivery of the Programme was heavily focused on participants using their training grants to support coaching and other development activities, with an assumption that half of clients would receive an average of two one-to-one meetings at an average cost of £150 per client.

7.7 In contrast, the approach in Lancashire involved the delivery of a range of different support elements that were funded through the Programme, including five hours of coaching per MD, at a cost of £300, development of a specific website for Leadership and Management activity in the county (on www.lifetimelearning.com) and the establishment of a network of Lancashire Leaders who have participated in the Programme, providing masterclasses on specific leadership and management issues.

7.8 It is also important to consider how the costs of the different elements of the management and delivery of the Programme break down.

**Unit Costs of Project Management**

7.9 The mean management cost per completed PDP (based on the achievement of profile) is £542. The unit costs of project management again show considerable variation across the individual delivery partnerships. The lowest unit cost of management was £224 per completed PDP, in Wiltshire and Swindon. In contrast, the management cost per completed PDP in Greater Merseyside was £1,197.

7.10 These significant variations reflect the differences in approaches and responsibilities for management of the Programme in the two areas. In Wiltshire and Swindon, management was undertaken by an individual programme co-ordinator who was employed on a part-time basis, whereas in Greater Merseyside, the Programme has been jointly managed by Business Link Greater Merseyside and KPMG. This has involved a full-time programme manager, plus other support, within the Business Link, together with a team of staff from KPMG engaged in the management of programme delivery. In Greater Merseyside, therefore, programme management has involved a larger number of staff at a generally higher cost than elsewhere.
7.11 In considering programme management costs, it is important to consider the relative cost of the regional approaches to delivery of the Programme, reflecting the suggestion that regional management of the Programme has benefits in terms of cost-effectiveness, by reducing the need to establish individual management structures. Table 7.1 shows a breakdown of costs by region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Profile of Completed PDPs</th>
<th>Total Unit Cost per completed PDP (excluding grants)</th>
<th>Management Cost per Completed PDP</th>
<th>Rank of Management Cost per Completed PDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>£1,622</td>
<td>£536</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>£1,652</td>
<td>£644</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London*</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>£2,011</td>
<td>£438</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East*</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>£1,233</td>
<td>£372</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>£2,101</td>
<td>£568</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East*</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>£1,517</td>
<td>£258</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>£1,480</td>
<td>£693</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>£1,165</td>
<td>£399</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>£1,847</td>
<td>£495</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,070</td>
<td>£1,608</td>
<td>£476</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Regional Delivery Approach

Source: YCL Analysis of Centre for Enterprise Data

7.12 Table 7.1 shows that the South East and North East had the lowest management costs per completed PDP, whilst the South West region was most costly, despite including Wiltshire and Swindon, the individual area with the lowest management costs. In both the South East and North East, there has been an individual project manager responsible for coordinating activity across the region as a whole, which has meant that the actual costs of management have been relatively low, ensuring cost effectiveness. It is worth reflecting in this context that the North East had the lowest regional volumes of activity, which would also reduce the potential economies of scale to be gained.
7.13 In London, the approach to management of the Programme has involved a small team, which is inevitably more costly than management by a single individual. Despite this, and also despite the generally higher costs of operations in London, the unit management costs were just less than 94% of the average across the country as a whole.

7.14 The analysis of unit costs of management across the regions would suggest, therefore, that the regional approaches have enabled more cost effective management than has generally been achieved through management at the local level (whilst recognising the very cost effective approach in Wiltshire and Swindon).

**Unit Costs of Delivery**

7.15 As noted above in relation to the total unit costs, there is significant variation in the approaches that have been adopted to the delivery of the Programme by different partnerships, leading to widespread variations in the costs per completed PDP purely in relation to programme delivery (engagement activities, assessments, delivery of development support and re-assessments).

7.16 On average, excluding management costs and training grants, the delivery of each completed PDP will have cost approximately £1,112. The lowest delivery cost is £348 per completed PDP, whilst Lancashire is the highest at £2,415.

7.17 It is also useful to consider the relationship between the costs of delivery of the Programme and the costs of programme management across the different areas. The highest ratio of development costs to management costs was in Essex, where £5.09 was spent on delivery for every £1 on management. Across the Programme as a whole, £2.38 was spent on delivery for every £1 on project management.
7.18 The lowest ratio of delivery costs to project management costs was recorded in Cambridgeshire, where only £0.45 was spent on delivery for every £1 identified as a project management cost. In this case, it is clear that some costs have been allocated to project management that have been identified against delivery by other partnerships. This has included, for example, staff costs relating to marketing, support for management development networks and mapping of coaching and mentoring in the area. When these costs are re-allocated to delivery, this leads to delivery expenditure of £1.72 for every £1 spent on management.

**Client Draw-down of Training Grants**

7.19 The Programme included the availability of grants up to the value of £1,000 per client. However, the budgeted allocation of the total grant per completed PDP does vary between delivery partnerships. This is a reflection that not all clients will take up the full grant, enabling a larger number of individuals to benefit. On average across the country as a whole, each client completing a PDP will receive a grant of approximately £902.

7.20 The lowest budgeted take-up of grant per client was reported in Lancashire, where there is £500 per completed PDP.

7.21 During discussions in the South East, it was stated that the average take-up of grant per client was approximately £920, with clients made aware that any grant that they did not take up would be ‘recycled’ to enable others to benefit. This has meant that at least a further 100 clients will receive grant support. One of the issues faced in the South East was that resources were available for only just over half of clients receiving an assessment to go on to complete their PDP activities and take up the training grant. This has meant that there is now a ‘waiting list’ of clients who have had an assessment and wish to draw down a grant.

**Significance of the Grant**

7.22 The importance of the grant in encouraging participants to access the support under the Leadership and Management Programme is highlighted in Figure 7.1. Over a quarter (29%) of participants indicated that they would ‘definitely not’ have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the £1,000 grant. Nearly two-fifths (37%) of participants would ‘probably not’ have gone ahead if it was not for the grant funding on offer.
7.23 Participant perceptions on the importance of the grant can be seen as follows:

- “I wouldn’t have done it if I didn’t get the funding. It is the grant that you are first attracted to”;
- “The grant is a means of getting people into the scheme and getting them interested”;
- “With 25% of the cost being paid for, I was able to justify the cost to the rest of the directors”;
- “The £1,000 was a good incentive to take on the development activities”.

7.24 As would be expected, a greater proportion of participants from organisations who operate on a ‘for profit’ basis were likely to go ahead with the training and learning activity without the £1,000 grant. A third (34%) of participants from for-profit organisations indicated this to be the case, compared to 11% of participants from ‘not-for-profit’ businesses.
Case Study Example:

The nursery provides up to 36 places for children aged between two and five years, and also operates two after-school clubs, offering 26 places for under 8s and around 20 places for children aged 8 to 11.

Development activity for the owner-manager involved working to develop a better understanding of the nursery manager’s job roles and then develop clearer job specifications, to support the development of a management team.

The £1,000 grant was described as a ‘huge benefit to the business’. The owner-manager stated that any significant expenditure that is not directly related to the care for children can be difficult to justify. The grant was therefore of critical importance to her taking on the training. It is unlikely that she would have undergone these activities without the grant.

Case Study Example:

The business is a venue for holidays, activity residential, conferences, personal development courses, retreats and team building.

The participant (Hospitality Manager) accessed some coaching/mentoring training through the Programme focused on motivation/man-management, body language, presentational skills and reporting.

He would not have gone ahead with the activity if there had not been the £1,000 grant available. He would not have been able to fund it personally, and there would not have been enough scope in the company’s training budget to pay for the activity.

7.25 Intermediary perceptions also confirm the significance of the grant (Figure 7.2). Nearly two-thirds (65%) of intermediary organisations ‘agreed strongly’ that the £1,000 grant was a significant incentive in encouraging managers to undertake the training, coaching or learning. A fifth (21%) of intermediaries ‘agreed slightly’ that the grant acted as an incentive. Overall therefore, the majority (86%) of intermediaries agreed to some extent that the grant acted as a significant incentive in encouraging people to take on the development activities. It does however depend on how the grant is ‘sold’ to clients.
7.26 Programme Managers/Business Links have also indicated that the grant was extremely useful in recruiting participants on to the Programme

- “The grant is a major carrot for small firms and in larger organisations it generates interest” (Programme Manager);

- “The training grant has been very significant. It has positively encouraged MDs who would not otherwise engage in learning themselves to participate. This has led to them looking more widely at the workforce” (BL).

7.27 Whilst feedback from partnerships would indicate that the £1,000 grant has helped with engagement of clients, there is a risk that the grant can actually devalue the support on offer, as there is suspicion about ‘free’ training. As a result, in Norfolk, the Business Link’s approach in engagement was to de-emphasise the grant and to stress the benefits of the Programme. However, the grant was tremendously useful in encouraging MDs from smaller organisations to take part. There was not seen to be a significant number of participants in Norfolk in which leadership and management development was an embedded activity, thus emphasising the importance of the Programme in addressing this issue.
7.28 There were some concerns however that the grant could mean that participants did not value the development activity as highly as organisations that had paid the full cost of development activities. For example, in Norfolk, an MD could go through the assessment and attend a number of Masterclasses without making any cash contribution. However, some participants were going on to take on and pay for further activities, such as the Action Learning Sets and Essentials Workshops that had been developed as part of the Programme locally.

7.29 In one partnership area it was stated that the majority of clients would have taken up the support, even if the grant had not been available. However, the benefit of the grant was still recognised, as it was perceived that take-up would have been much slower without it. Feedback from clients in the survey would appear to confirm this, as shown in Figure 7.3 below.

7.30 Nearly two-thirds (63%) of participants who indicated that they would have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the grant stated that the £1,000 enabled them to undertake development activity more quickly than they would have done otherwise (Figure 6.3). A quarter (24%) of participants stated that the grant meant they were able to undertake more development than they would have done. Just over one-tenth (13%) of clients who said that they would have gone ahead with the development activity, even if the grant had not been available, stated that the grant had made no real difference to them. On this basis, the availability of the grant made no difference to less than 4% of all clients interviewed.
Figure 7.3: Impact of the grant support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undertaken activity more quickly</th>
<th>Undertaken more development</th>
<th>No real difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number = 138
Source: YCL Participant Survey

7.31 Intermediary organisations perceive that the Leadership and Management Programme enabled participants to progress more quickly in terms of their personal development (Figure 7.4). Over half (57%) of intermediary organisations ‘agreed strongly’, with a further 28% agreeing slightly’ that managers would not have undertaken training and development activity as quickly if they had not been on the Programme.
7.32 Whilst the assessment alone has been seen to be of benefit, two-thirds (66%) of intermediary organisations disagreed that participants would have undertaken, and paid for, training and development on the basis of the assessment, without the grant (Figure 7.5). Just less than a third (31%) of intermediaries ‘disagreed strongly’ that participants would have undertaken the development activity on the basis of the assessment alone, with 35% ‘disagreeing slightly’. The following quote from a programme participant confirms this intermediary view:

- “The skills assessment was useful, but without the funding you can’t do anything about it. The funding is the key element, although it is useful to know your weaknesses”.

Source: YCL Intermediary Survey

Number = 216

Figure 7.4: Managers would not have undertaken training and development activity as quickly if they had not been on the programme
Figure 7.5: Managers would have undertaken, and paid for, training and development on the basis of the free diagnostic assessment, without the grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't know/refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number = 216
Source: YCL Intermediary Survey

Level of Grant Funding

7.33 Over two-fifths (44%) of programme participants stated that £1,000 was the minimum amount of grant funding that would have prompted them to go ahead with the development activity (Figure 7.6). This is confirmed in the participant quotes below:

- “Anything less than £1000 then it is not worth it”;
- “It is an expensive course, so if the grant was less than £1,000 then I probably would not have gone ahead”.

7.34 For a quarter (24%) of participants, £500 was the minimum amount of funding that would have prompted their involvement.
Additional Funding

7.35 The majority (61%) of participants indicated that they had contributed additional funding towards the cost of training and learning activity on top of the £1,000 grant (Figure 7.7). Over half (54%) of participants said that their organisation had made this additional contribution, with 7% indicating that they had made a personal contribution.
7.36 The total amount of additional funding contributed ranged from less than £100 to over £5,000 (Figure 7.8). Our consultations also identified examples where participants have contributed over £15,000 in order to fund an MBA.
7.37 A quarter (25%) of participants contributed a further amount of between £751 and £1,000, with a fifth of participants contributing between £251 and £500 (19%) and £1,000 to £5,000 (19%). The median/mode average additional amount of funding contributed was between £750 and £1,000.

7.38 Around a third (32%) of participants contributed about a half of the total cost of the training (Figure 7.9). Over a quarter (28%) of clients contributed more than half of the total cost. Hence, three-fifths (60%) of participants had at least matched the grant with their own financial contributions, indicating potentially high levels of leverage.
### Intermediary Payment

7.39 Nearly three-fifths (58%) of intermediary organisations indicated that the amount they have been paid had covered the cost of their involvement in the Programme. Payment was not sufficient for two-fifths (38%) of intermediary organisations. This is significant in terms of the future delivery and sustainability of the Programme. If there is a heavy reliance on intermediaries to deliver, they need to be paid enough to cover their costs. Going forward there is a need to look in detail at the level of time commitment that was actually required under the Programme, versus the expectations of the required committed time in order to ensure that payment is sufficient.

7.40 In the South East, the Programme manager indicated that some of the intermediary organisations had been sub-contracting out the assessment stage to other organisations/individuals at reduced rates. There had hence been significant ‘top-slicing’ by intermediaries. This raises the question of whether they had engaged the right organisations to undertake assessments. It is possible that separating out the different roles (recruitment, assessment, client management, training delivery) could have helped them to improve the overall cost-effectiveness of the approach.
8 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATION FOR TRAIN TO GAIN

8.1 In this Section we present our conclusions and consider the implications of these conclusions for the delivery of Train to Gain.

Conclusions

8.2 Our conclusions are presented under headings linked to the key objectives of the evaluation highlighted in Section One.

Effect on participants' performance and that of the company

8.3 The Programme has had a significant positive impact on the way in which the participants lead and manage their businesses. This includes better communication between management and staff, the ability to get tasks completed more efficiently/more organised and improved awareness of the staff and the business. These changes have had a positive impact, or are expected to have a positive impact on business productivity, profitability and sales, increased investment in training and skills, improved business growth and improved quality standards. This would indicate that increased investment in leadership and management development of key managers within an organisation can have a positive impact upon business performance.

8.4 Participants perceive that their involvement in the programme has had a greater positive influence on organisational/business change than control group participants who had undertaken alternative leadership and management training. This demonstrates the potential value of the Programme in contributing to business change and development over alternative leadership and management development activity.
Impact on Company Involvement in More General Workforce Development and Business Support

8.5 The Programme has led to the development of new relationships between Business Links and businesses, with a significant number of participants becoming aware of additional business support as a result of programme involvement. The Programme has therefore been a strong potential lever into more general workforce development activity. However, Business Links need to be able to convert this new awareness into further action. This requires client follow-up at the post-PDP completion stage which is potentially resource intensive.

8.6 It is still too early to be able to identify the extent to which the Programme has led to wider involvement in leadership and management development activities. However, the lower reported levels of additional activity among participants when compared to the control group suggest that the ‘cascade’ effect has been less significant. It is possible that an ‘organisational’ leadership and management programme may have had a greater impact on wider employee involvement. Evidence from local and regional programmes that are currently being developed will help to understand this further.

Effectiveness of the Needs Assessment

8.7 The assessment process has been deemed to be effective by clients in terms of identifying their development needs. The importance of the assessment process is emphasised by the fact that in many cases, the assessment identified at least some needs that the participant was unaware of at the time, although a significant proportion of clients reported that they were already aware of their development needs prior to undertaking the assessment. Confirmation of a need that was already known could, however, be beneficial in providing confidence to pursue appropriate development activities. The assessment process also led to the identification of potential approaches to address the needs, and so the assessment was therefore a means to an end rather than an end in itself.
8.8 The majority of clients indicated that they would not have gone ahead with the training and learning activity if they had not had the assessment as part of the first stage of the Programme. However, the majority of control group participants that had undertaken leadership and management training in the past five years had not had an assessment of need. There is hence a risk that their decisions, at best, were based on a partial understanding of their needs and so they may have been making sub-optimal choices. This further demonstrates the value of the assessment process under the Programme and is evidence to suggest that assessment of need should be an essential element of future leadership and management development provision.

**Development Activity**

8.9 The flexibility of the Programme was valued highly, particularly by programme participants who had generally not undertaken qualification-based training and development activity. More than twice the proportion of control group respondents that had undertaken leadership and management development activity in the past five years had completed a course leading to a qualification, than programme participants. The focus on more informal activities had encouraged MDs to participate as they have not had to a commit to a regimented time/programme. There is a need to retain this flexibility in future provision.

**Market Penetration**

8.10 The Programme was attractive to managers of businesses that had not previously made use of business support services. Success in attracting such clients could potentially have been enhanced further by more targeted approaches to recruitment, especially where clients were being introduced to the programme by intermediaries, some of whom were unaware of the ‘new’ client targets.
Characteristics and Effectiveness of Intermediary Organisations

8.11 Partnerships have been successful in recruiting a network of intermediary organisations including management consultancy organisations, private training providers and training consultants. There have been difficulties in recruiting organisations such as banks, accountants and FE Colleges that were originally expected to play an important role. The approach to, and feasibility, of engaging such organisations to the Programme needs to be reviewed.

8.12 The majority of partnerships had not engaged particular intermediaries to deliver specific elements of the Programme. In some partnership areas, intermediary organisations were able to carry out the assessment and provide the training and development solution if they were also a training provider. It could be questioned, however, whether intermediaries can be truly impartial if training providers are also allowed to undertake the assessment. Effective case management is crucial if intermediaries are able to carry out both roles.

8.13 The recruitment of a network of intermediaries for the Leadership and Management Programme has, however, helped to develop long-term relationships for future initiatives and joint working. These relationships should be continued and built upon in terms of provision under Train to Gain.

Effectiveness of the Different Delivery Strategies and Models

8.14 An issue with the Leadership and Management Programme is that there was a slow start overall, which is often an inevitable part of establishing a new programme. It took partnerships time to get procedures and delivery arrangements set-up and to ‘get up to speed’. There is therefore a need to be realistic about the time that is required to build momentum.

8.15 A diverse range of delivery approaches have been adopted. One example is that the North East, South East and London were operating regional delivery models as opposed to delivery on a local partnership level. The specific delivery model adopted in terms of future provision must reflect capacity, capability and relationships in the area concerned.
8.16 There are significant variations in the total cost per completed PDP (excluding grants) and management costs per completed PDP across the regions and individual delivery areas. The differences between areas in total unit costs of delivery of the programme reflect variations across all elements of the support, including staffing, costs of marketing and engagement approaches, differences in assessment approaches (and therefore costs), and most significantly, in the amount of support provided to participants during the implementation of their PDPs. Future programmes should take into consideration the fact that regional approaches have enabled more cost effective management than has generally been achieved through management at a local level by reducing the need to establish individual management structures.

**Significance of the Grant in Engaging Participants**

8.17 The grant was a significant lever to participation in the programme, with two-thirds of participants indicating that they would have been unlikely to access the support under the Programme if the grant had not been available. The grant needs to be of a reasonably significant value to have an effect on participation as £1,000 was the minimum amount of grant funding that would have prompted a large proportion of clients to go ahead with the development activity.

8.18 The majority of participants who indicated that they would have gone ahead with the training and learning activity without the grant stated that the £1,000 has enabled them to undertake development activity more quickly than they would have done otherwise. A significant minority of participants who would have accessed the support anyway indicated that the grant has enabled them to undertake more development activity than they would have been able to do without it.

8.19 Whilst the grant was a significant incentive for managers to become involved in the programme, it has led to leverage of additional investment by their organisations. The majority of participants have made an additional investment for their development activities, which in most cases has at least matched the value of the grant. The Programme has therefore led to both additional investment and leadership and management development activities and would suggest that the use of such grants may be appropriate engagement mechanisms in future support programmes.
Implications for Train to Gain

8.20 Although it is intended that leadership and management development should be a ‘flexible’ element of support under Train to Gain, there is an obvious demand for this support amongst businesses. This research has also highlighted the business benefits that can be attributed to individuals undertaking leadership and management development activity. Hence, there is a clear argument to suggest that leadership and management training should be part of the core offer under Train to Gain. The following key issues should be considered in terms of leadership and management support under Train to Gain:

- effective delivery arrangements;
- regional flexibility;
- client eligibility;
- flexibility to the client;
- client progression.

Effective Delivery Arrangements

8.21 There is a need for effective, independent brokerage with on-going client relationship management for Leadership and Management Provision under Train to Gain. This must be underpinned by appropriately skilled providers that can meet the specific needs of individual client businesses.

8.22 The independence, skills and knowledge of the intermediaries deployed is paramount to the success of the Programme. Not only does the broker have to have enough experience of the sector to establish their credibility with the employer, but they must also understand how learning can contribute to business performance and make a convincing case to the employer. The intermediary must also have a good knowledge of local provision and understand the qualifications that apply.

8.23 There is a need to manage client relationships to a level where high levels of satisfaction can be generated. A key to programme effectiveness could be to have an independent project manager like the Business Link to ensure that clients are treated with fairness and impartiality. This removal of a vested interest provides clarity of focus as to the best needs and interest of the client. It is also essential that if the Brokerage Model required within Train to Gain is to work that on-going brokerage relations are maintained with clients who have accessed support under the Leadership and Management Programme. Effective client management is also necessary to ensure client progression through the Programme and into other support.
8.24 There is then a need for a network of providers who can meet the Leadership and Management needs of clients and their respective businesses. The Leadership and Management Programme has required the engagement of specialist providers/intermediaries in some areas. Within Train to Gain it is important that reflection on provider capacity and introduction of new providers to fill gaps takes place.

Regional Flexibility

8.25 It is important that regional delivery arrangements are sufficiently flexible to ensure that the leadership and management development needs of MDs and other key directors are most appropriately met.

Client Eligibility

8.26 Partnership feedback is that the eligibility criteria for Leadership and Management Provision under Train to Gain should be expanded to include those organisations with less than 20 employees who may also benefit from the support.

Flexibility to the Client

8.27 It is recommended that future provision must continue to provide that flexibility to clients, which has been highlighted as a key benefit of the Leadership and Management Programme. There should be flexibility in terms of the choice of assessment tool and choice of development activity, with appropriate support to enable informed decisions by clients.

Client Progression

8.28 Effective client management is essential in order to ensure client progress through the Programme and to reduce the risk of drop-out at the PDP stage. It is important to be clear about timescales for completion of the PDP in order to enable on-going management and support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENTS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>AGREED PDPs</th>
<th>COMPLETED PDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East of England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire &amp; Luton</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Midlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire &amp; Rutland</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>954</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire &amp; Warrington</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Merseyside</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>2977</td>
<td>2935</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,277</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>2,935</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth, D &amp; P</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of England</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire &amp; Swindon</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Midlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham &amp; Solihull</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Country</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry &amp; Warwickshire</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire &amp; Worcs</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,441</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yorks &amp; Humber</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Totals</td>
<td>28,059</td>
<td>17,968</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>8,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: TELEPHONE SURVEY – KEY CHARACTERISTICS
### Participant Characteristics

#### Stage of the Programme Reached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting assessment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed assessment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced a PDP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started training/learning activities</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed training/learning activities</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Job role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO, Chairman or Managing Director</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Board Level Director</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Manager</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/General Manager</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Participant Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Participant Highest Qualification Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Level Qualification (Level 5)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Foundation Degree (Level 4)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/AS Level or equivalent (Level 3)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE grades A-c/Intermediate GNVQ/First Diploma (Level 2)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE grades D-E/Foundation GNVQ (Level 1)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Achievement/Entry Level Certificate – Foundation Award</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White background</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed background</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian or Asian British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian or Asian British background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or Black British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese or other ethnic group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Business Characteristics

### Business Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process and Manufacturing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care – adult/older people</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business activities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity/Not for Profit</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (not motor)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality, leisure, travel, tourism</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, engineering, manufacturing technologies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology, telecoms, contacts centres</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social care – children and young people</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight logistics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of lifelong learning</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property services, housing, cleaning, facilities management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing, footwear, textiles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sector</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and drink manufacturing/processing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail motor industry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Transport</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental land-based industries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building services engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising, crafts, cultural heritage, design, the arts, music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, waste management, water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active leisure and learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio visual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Business Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-49</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-249</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>*%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Does the organisation operate on a ‘for profit’ basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Innovation or Technology Based?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Company Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Company Profitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce in size</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the same</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow moderately</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow rapidly</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Group Survey

In this Section we provide an overview of the key findings from the control group survey of 100 individuals from organisations who had no involvement in the Leadership and Management Programme.

Key Points – Control Group Survey

- Just under a third (29%) of control group participants were aware of the Leadership and Management Programme. Two-thirds (66%) of these organisations had heard of the programme through the Business Link.

- A third (34%) of control group participants had been involved in some form of training or learning in relation to developing their leadership and management skills in the past five years.

- Over half (57%) of these control group participants who had undertaken leadership and management training were offered an open choice of training methods (compared to 68% of programme participants).

- Control group participants most commonly accessed formal learning (74%) in order to address their leadership and management development skills (compared to 67% of programme participants).

- One-off training sessions (56%) were the most common type of leadership and management training that control group participants had accessed (compared to 32% of programme participants).

- Over three-fifths (63%) of control group participants who had accessed this leadership and management training had received a written statement of their development needs (compared to 75% of programme participants).

- Two-fifths (38%) of control group participants were ‘very satisfied’ with the content of their leadership and management development activity (compared to 70% of programme participants).

- Providing direction (24%) was the most common new/improved skill acquired to date by control group participants who had undertaken leadership and management development activity (compared to 18% of programme participants).

- Three-quarters (74%) of control group participants who had undertaken development activity had since made changes to the leadership and management of the business (compared to 77% of programme participants).

- The main benefit experienced, or likely to be experienced, by control group participants as a result of this leadership and management development activity was improved working practices.

- Three-fifths (62%) of control group participants who had undertaken leadership and management development activity stated that this had encouraged their colleagues to seek similar development opportunities (compared to 43% of programme participants).

- Three-fifths (60%) of all control group respondents were likely to take part in future training and learning activity to address their leadership and management needs (compared to 90% of programme participants).
Awareness of the Leadership and Management Programme

Just under a third (29%) of control group participants were aware of the Leadership and Management Programme. As was the case with the main participant survey, the majority of these organisations had heard of the programme through the Business Link. Two-thirds (66%) of these businesses were aware of the programme as a result of direct Business Link contact, i.e. a fifth (21%) had seen some Business Link advertising/marketing material relating to the programme.

The main reason why these control group businesses who were aware of the programme had decided not to access the available support was due to a lack of time or resource (34%). Just under two-fifths (17%) of aware organisations saw no benefit of the programme, while over a tenth (14%) of businesses indicated that they did not have any leadership or management development needs.

Leadership and Management Training

One third (34%) of control group participants had been involved in some form of training or learning, in relation to developing their leadership and management skills in the past five years. This training had taken place in the past two years for two-thirds (67%) of these participants. For around a tenth (12%) of respondents, the training was on-going.

Training Methods

Two-thirds (68%) of participants in the Leadership and Management Programme were offered an open choice of training methods, compared to 57% of those control group participants who had accessed leadership and management training and learning in the past five years.

It can be seen in Figure 1 that control group participants most commonly accessed formal learning (74%) as part of their choice of training methods, as was also the case in the main participant survey. Informal learning methods were adopted slightly less in the control group survey (47%) than in the main participant survey (58%). It can be seen however that the general pattern of training taken up by the two groups is broadly similar, although programme participants were more likely to have been involved in less formal types of development activities, action learning and networking than those in the control group.
Figure 1: Training Methods Accessed

![Figure 1: Training Methods Accessed](image)

Training Types

The types of leadership and management training that control group participants have undertaken are highlighted in Table 1. This also includes a comparison with the results from the main participant survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Control Group (N=34)</th>
<th>Participant (N=446)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal learning</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal learning</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-to-peer support</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action learning</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-off training sessions (56%) were the most common type of leadership and management training and development that control group participants had accessed, compared to a third (32%) of respondents in the main participant survey. The control group survey also saw a greater proportion of individuals undertaking a formal course leading to a qualification (50%), than was seen in the participant survey (24%). On-going private tuition, telephone support and email support was more prevalent in the participant survey than was seen in the control group survey.

This would indicate that the most common type of training in the control group is a one-off training session, compared to a formal course not leading to a qualification and mentoring/coaching among programme participants.

Training Provider

Just under half (47%) of control group participants who had accessed this leadership and management training indicated that their training provider was already known to them. A smaller proportion stated that their training provider had been recommended by a colleague or friend (15%), or via a Business Link contact (12%).
Written Statement of Development Needs

Over three-fifths (63%) of control group participants who had accessed this leadership and management training had received a written statement of their development needs. This is compared to three-quarters (75%) of respondents in the main participant survey.

Satisfaction Levels

Leadership and Management Programme participants were far more likely to report very high levels of satisfaction with the training and learning undertaken than those in the control group who had been involved in leadership and management development activities. 70% of participants in the programme were ‘very satisfied’ with the content of the development activity, compared to two-fifths (38%) of control group respondents. This would suggest that the leadership and management programme was more effectively meeting the needs of participants than this other development activity.

New/Improved Leadership and Management Skills Acquired

Providing direction (24%) was the most common new/improved skill acquired to date by control group participants who had accessed other leadership and management development activity in the past five years (Table 2). This compares to a similar proportion of main participant respondents (18%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: New/Improved Leadership and Management Skills Acquired to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing self and personal skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working with people and managing self and personal skills are the main skills that have been acquired by participants on the leadership and management programme. These have not been acquired to the same extent by control group respondents who accessed alternative leadership and management development activity.

Benefits

A similar proportion of control group participants who had undertaken development activity (74%) and main survey participants (77%) had made changes to the leadership and management of the business as a result of the skills they had gained through the training.

Table 3 highlights the extent to which development activity has influenced, or is likely to influence a number of organisational benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Very Much’</th>
<th></th>
<th>‘Some’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group (N=34)</td>
<td>Participant (N=446)</td>
<td>Control Group (N=34)</td>
<td>Participant (N=446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new products/services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of new technologies/processes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased/new markets</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality standards</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved working practices</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved marketing</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved likelihood of company survival</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved business growth</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sales</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased profits</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased productivity</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased investment in training and skills</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was also the case in the main survey, control group respondents stated that the main benefit experienced, or likely to be experienced, as a result of undertaking leadership and management development activity, was improved working practices. The majority (94%) of these control group participants indicated that their involvement in the training had a significant/some influence on the introduction of improved working practices within the organisation. The other main benefit for control group organisations is that their training involvement has influenced, or is likely to influence, the improved likelihood of company survival. Three-fifths (62%) of these organisations stated that the training and learning activities had, or was likely to have a significant/some influence on the chance of company survival.
It can be seen that the leadership and management programme is perceived to have had a greater influence, or is likely to have a greater influence on these organisational benefits than control group respondents who have been on leadership and management training activity. There are a greater proportion of Leadership and Management Programme participants reporting that the programme has had a significant influence on the organisation. This suggests that the delivery of development activities following an agreed PDP based on a formal assessment of needs can have more influence on the way an organisation operates than is the case where there is a less structured approach to needs assessment and selection of provider.

Impact upon other Employees

Two-fifths (43%) of leadership and management programme participants stated that the involvement in the programme had encouraged other employees in the organisation to seek similar development opportunities. A greater proportion (62%) of control group participants who had undertaken leadership and management development activity in the past five years stated that their training and learning had resulted in other colleagues seeking similar development opportunities. 69% of these control group participants would encourage their colleagues to access this training and learning in the future, compared to 75% of programme participants.

Future Leadership and Management Activity

Three-fifths (60%) of all respondents to the control group survey stated that they were likely to take part in future training and learning activity to address their leadership and management needs. This is less than the findings from the main participant survey, where 90% of programme participants indicated that they would undertake leadership and management development activity in the future. 83% of these control group respondents were willing to pay for this training/learning, which is a similar proportion to those participants in the leadership and management programme (79%).
APPENDIX D: LSC QUESTIONNAIRE
York Consulting

NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

LSC QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY ON BEHALF OF LSC NATIONAL OFFICE

November 2005

LSC OFFICE: ____________________________________________

NAME: ________________________________________________

TELEPHONE: __________________________________________

EMAIL: _______________________________________________

Your responses will be treated in strictest confidence and will only be seen by members of the York Consulting team. Under no circumstances will there be any disclosure of individual responses to third parties.
Section One: Operation

1. How effective are general communication mechanisms regarding the Leadership and Management Programme between yourself and the BLO? *(please tick one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Rather ineffective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. What would you say are the key reasons for this?

3. How frequent are contract monitoring meetings with the BLO? *(please tick one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two or more times a month</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Ad-hoc</th>
<th>No meetings</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How could contract management be improved, if at all?

5. What could be improved, if anything in terms of the working relationship between the LSC and the BLO?
6. How effective, or ineffective, have the management arrangements been under the Centre for Enterprise\textsuperscript{10}? \textit{(please tick one)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Rather ineffective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. How could management arrangements have been improved under the Centre for Enterprise?

---

**Section Two: Delivery Mechanisms**

8. How would you rate the performance of the Business Link with regards to the delivery of the Leadership and Management Programme? \textit{(please tick one)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Please explain your response to Q8 above?

---

10. Are there any elements of the delivery model that your Business Link has adopted that you would regard as good practice in delivery of the Leadership and Management Programme? \textit{(please tick one)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Go to Q11</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Go to Q12</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Go to Q12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} The Centre for Enterprise has been appointed to support the LSC national office in the project management and the delivery of the Leadership and Management Programme across the LSCs nine regions and 47 sub-regions.
11. If yes (to Q10 above), please give examples?

12. In your view, have there been any problems or difficulties in the delivery of the Leadership and Management Programme? (please tick one)

Yes  Go to Q13  No  Go to Q14  Don’t know  Go to Q14

13. If yes, what problems or difficulties have been experienced for both the LSC and the Business Link?

LSC:

Business Link:

14. What else, if anything, could the Centre for Enterprise do to support local delivery?

LSC:

Business Link:
Section Three: Other

15. To what extent do the LSC perceive the Leadership and Management Programme to be part of the ‘total offer’ to businesses rather than being seen as a distinct programme of support? (please tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. What would you regard as the three key lessons or issues from the Leadership and Management Programme for the development of the National Employer Training Programme?

1. 

2. 

3. 

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope or send the email version to L&M@yorkconsulting.co.uk by Monday 21st November 2005

In the event of any queries please contact Helen Barugh on 0113 222 3545, or email as above

Your responses will be treated in the strictest confidence and will only be seen by members of the York Consulting team. Under no circumstances will there be any disclosure of information to third parties.
Your responses will be treated in strictest confidence and will only be seen by members of the York Consulting team. Under no circumstances will there be any disclosure of individual responses to third parties without prior agreement.
Section One: Operation

1. How effective are general communication mechanisms regarding the Leadership and Management Programme between yourself and the LSC? *(please tick one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Rather ineffective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. What would you say are the key reasons for this?

3. How frequent are contract monitoring meetings with the LSC? *(please tick one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two or more times a month</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Ad-hoc</th>
<th>No meetings</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How could contract management be improved, if at all?

5. What could be improved, if anything, in terms of the working relationship between the BLO and the LSC?
6. How effective, or ineffective has the support provided by the Centre for Enterprise\textsuperscript{11} been? (please tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Rather ineffective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How could the support provided by the Centre for Enterprise be improved, from the Business Link perspective, if at all?

Section Two: Delivery Mechanisms

8. Has a specific ‘intermediary strategy’ been developed for your Leadership and Management Programme? (please tick one)

Yes  \[\text{Go to Q9}\]  No  \[\text{Go to Q10}\]  Don’t Know  \[\text{Go to Q10}\]

9. If yes, what are the key objectives of the strategy that have been adopted?

\textsuperscript{11} The Centre for Enterprise has been appointed to support the LSC national office in the project management and the delivery of the Leadership and Management Programme across the LSCs nine regions and 47 sub-regions.
10. What proportion of each element of the delivery model is delivered ‘in-house’ by the Business Link/externally by intermediaries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-house (Business Link)</th>
<th>Externally (Intermediaries)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How many intermediary organisations in total are you working with on the Leadership and Management Programme? 

12. Please provide a breakdown of the number of the following types of intermediary you are working with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freelance Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Consultancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1 (Please Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 2 (Please Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 3 (Please Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Are you working with intermediaries to deliver the Leadership and Management Programme that the BLO has not worked with before? *(please tick one)*

- Yes [ ] Go to Q14
- No  [ ] Go to Q15
- Don’t Know [ ] Go to Q15

14. If yes, what were the reasons for bringing in these intermediaries?
15. Have there been any difficulties in recruiting intermediaries? *(please tick one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Go to Q16</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Go to Q17</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Go to Q17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. If yes, please give details:

17. Are particular intermediaries engaged to deliver specific elements of the Leadership and Management Programme?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What are the ‘types’ of intermediaries that you are working with to deliver the Leadership and Management Programme? *(Please tick where relevant and provide the number you are working with)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freelance Individuals</th>
<th>Training Providers</th>
<th>Management Consultancies</th>
<th>Other 1 (Specify)</th>
<th>Other 2 (Specify)</th>
<th>Other 3 (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ Number:</td>
<td>~ Number:</td>
<td>~ Number:</td>
<td>~ Number:</td>
<td>~ Number:</td>
<td>~ Number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. How effective have intermediaries been in delivering the Leadership and Management Programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Rather ineffective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. What aspects of the delivery of the Programme would you say have worked particularly well?


21. What aspects of the delivery of the Programme would you say have worked less well?


Specify other(s) here:
Other 1 = ……………………….  Other 2 = ……………………….  Other 3 = ……………………….
22. Based on your experience of delivering the Programme, are there any aspects of the delivery approach that you would now do differently? *(please tick one)*

- Yes [ ]  **Go to Q23**
- No [ ]  **Go to Q24**
- Don’t know [ ]  **Go to Q24**

23. If yes, what would you do differently?

24. What else, if anything, could the Centre for Enterprise do to support delivery by the Business Link?

**Section Three: Engagement**

25. What have been the three most effective means of engaging MDs in the Programme?

1.

2.

3.
26. Has there been an explicit sectoral, regional and local approach to the marketing campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Which of these have been most effective in engaging participants in the Programme? *(please tick one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sectoral</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Four: New/'Hard to Reach’ Clients

28. What proportion of your engagements to date have been new\textsuperscript{12} Business Link clients? \textit{(please tick one)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. How have you engaged those ‘hard to reach’ businesses, or that have not previously received Government Support?

30. Is there anything that has worked particularly well in terms of the engagement of ‘hard to reach’ businesses, or those that have not previously received Government Support?

31. Is there anything that has not worked so well?

\textsuperscript{12} A ‘new’ client is defined as a business that the BLO has not previously engaged with in a meaningful way. Organisations that have been engaged with previously, but not within the preceding 12 months, can also be defined as ‘new’ clients.
Section Five: Business Assessment Tools

32. Do you carry out both an initial and in-depth assessment of business development needs? *(please tick one)*

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know  

33. What tools are being used to carry out the assessment: *(Please tick all applicable boxes)*

- IiP Management and Leadership model
- ASSESS
- Honey and Mumford
- MAP (Management Assessment of Proficiency)
- RTS Diagnostic
- Surveyshack
- The Critical Factor
- Other *(Please specify)* ……………………………………………………………………

Section Six: Benefits

34. In your view, in general terms, how satisfied have MDs been with their involvement in the Leadership and Management Programme? *(please tick one)*

- Very dissatisfied
- Rather dissatisfied
- Neither/nor
- Fairly satisfied
- Very satisfied
- Don’t know

35. In your view, what key benefits have participating businesses gained from their MDs involvement in the Programme?
36. In your view, what types of activity have been seen to generate the greatest benefit?

37. In your view, in general terms, what level of impact has involvement of MDs in the Leadership and Management Programme had on the performance of their businesses? (please tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little impact</th>
<th>Little impact</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Some impact</th>
<th>Significant impact</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Are there particular types of businesses in which the Leadership and Management Programme has been seen to have greatest impact? (please tick one)

Yes [ ] Go to Q39 No [ ] Go to Q40 Don’t know [ ] Go to Q40

39. If yes, please provide examples.

Section Seven: Other

40. To what extent does the Business Link perceive the Leadership and Management Programme to be part of the ‘total offer’ to businesses rather than being seen as a distinct Programme of support? (please tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Have new relationships generated via the Leadership and Management Programme led to other positive interactions with businesses in order to address their wider business needs? *(please tick one option)*

| Yes | Go to Q42 | No | Go to Q43 | Don’t know | Go to Q43 |

42. If yes, please provide examples:

43. What would you regard as the three key lessons or issues from the Leadership and Management Programme for the development of the National Employer Training Programme?

1. 

2. 

3. 
Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope or send the email version to L&M@yorkconsulting.co.uk by Monday 21st November 2005.

In the event of any queries please contact Helen Barugh on 0113 222 3545, or email as above.

Your response will be treated in the strictest confidence and will only be seen by members of the York Consulting team. Under no circumstances will there be any disclosure of information to third parties.

Thank you for taking part in the survey.
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - PARTICIPANTS SURVEY

Contact Sheet

Company _____________________________
Address _____________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
Postcode _____________________________
Tel No: _____________________________

OUTCOME
Telephone interview completed 1
Respondent refused 2
Secretary/Telephonist refused 3
Not available in deadline 4
Company closed/unobtainable 5
Other (SPECIFY) 6
____________________________________
____________________________________

Interviewer: _____________________________

CONTACT RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASK FOR NAMED CONTACT.

TO RESPONDENT:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ___ from McCallum Layton. We have been commissioned to carry out an evaluation of the government-funded Leadership and Management Programme, which I believe you have participated in. I understand the Programme has been called ……………… [BRAND NAME] in this area.

S1 Can I just check that you have indeed taken part in this programme? It would have involved an individual assessment of your development needs, the production of a personal development plan, and a grant of up to £1,000 to undertake training focussing on your leadership and management skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Continue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T&amp;C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No, but someone else did
The interview will take around 15 minutes, and results will be used to help the Government decide whether to keep subsidising this sort of scheme. Is this convenient now?

IF NOT, MAKE APPOINTMENT TO CALL BACK:

DAY: ___________________________

TIME: __________________________

Reassurances (Use As Necessary)

o We are members of the Market Research Society and abide at all times by their strict Code of Conduct.

o (This means that) Research results will be presented in overall, statistical form only. Nothing you say will be linked in any way with your name or that of your organisation.

o If you wish to check our credentials as bona fide market research practitioners, you can ring the Market Research Society free, on 0500 396999.

o If you wish to discuss anything to do with this project specifically, you can contact our executive responsible for this project, Charlotte Everitt, on 0113 237 5590.
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - PARTICIPANTS SURVEY

Telephone Interview

Q1a First of all, are you still involved with the Leadership and Management Programme?

Yes 1
No 2

Q1b What stage of the Programme [if Q1a = Yes/DK] have you reached [Q1a = No] did you reach? READ OUT

Awaiting assessment 1
Completed assessment 2
Produced a Personal Development Plan (PDP) 3
Started training/learning activities 4
Completed training/learning activities 5

IF NO AT Q1a AND NOT COMPLETED Q1b:

Q1c Why are you no longer involved in the Programme? DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL MENTIONED

Cost of training/learning activities 1
Lack of time/resources 2
Delay between PDP and activity 3
See no value/benefit in continuing 4

Other (SPECIFY) ____________________________________________________________ 5

Q2a Prior to this, had you ever … READ OUT FROM GRID BELOW

FOR EACH ONE CODED AT Q2a, ASK Q2b/c:

Q2b What was this for, or about?

Q2c How long ago was this? TAKE MOST RECENT INSTANCE, IF MORE THAN ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2a</th>
<th>Q2b</th>
<th>In last Year</th>
<th>Q2c 2-3 Years</th>
<th>Longer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… had advice from Business Link?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… been involved in government-funded training?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… had support from other government agencies (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of these
I’d like to ask you a bit about how you became involved in the Leadership & Management Programme.

**Q3a** How did you first hear about the Programme, and the availability of training and learning activity to improve leadership and management skills?

| Business Link advertising/marketing | 01 |
| Direct from Business Link/from Business Link contact | 02 |
| From a business network contact | 03 |
| An independent business consultant | 04 |
| Your/a bank | 05 |
| Your/an accountant | 06 |
| Your professional body or trade association | 07 |
| Your Sector Skills Council (SSC) | 08 |
| A college | 09 |
| A private training provider | 10 |
| Internet | 11 |
| Other (SPECIFY) | 12 |
| Cannot recall | 13 |

**IF COLLEGE/TRAINING PROVIDER:**

**Q3b** Was this a college/training provider you had previously had contact with, or one you didn’t know?

| Previous contact | 1 |
| Unknown previously | 2 |
| Don’t know | 3 |

**Q4** When you first heard of the Leadership & Management Programme, what types of leadership and management skills did you expect to acquire or to improve, through involvement in the Programme?

| Managing self and personal skills |  |
| Providing direction |  |
| Facilitating change |  |
| Working with people |  |
| Using resources |  |
| Achieving results |  |
Q5  How satisfied or dissatisfied would you say you were with the process for joining the scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite dissatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF AWAITING ASSESSMENT ONLY AT Q1b, SKIP TO Q26. OTHERWISE CONTINUE

Now I’d like to think about the assessment process by which your advisor identified your training and learning requirements.

Q6  Which of the following methods were used to identify the areas of leadership and management skills, where you might benefit from training or learning? READ OUT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal discussion?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal questionnaire?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An on-line diagnostic tool?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometric testing?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other methods? (SPECIFY) __________________________________________ 5

Cannot recall 6

Q7  How appropriate did you feel this/these method(s) were to your specific needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither appropriate nor inappropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very appropriate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8  And overall, how effective would you say the assessment process was, in identifying areas for training and learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite effective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9  Which of the following would you say best describes the areas for training and learning identified by the assessment? READ OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You already knew about all or most of the areas identified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You knew about some of the areas identified, but were not aware of others</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You weren’t aware of any of the areas identified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10  Which areas for training or learning did the assessment identify?

____________________________________________________________________  

____________________________________________________________________  

____________________________________________________________________  

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results

Q11  Would you have known what your development needs were, without having had the assessment?

Yes, all of them  1
Some but not others  2
No  3
Don’t know  4

Q12  Did you receive a written statement of your development needs?

Yes  1
No  2

IF COMPLETED ASSESSMENT ONLY AT Q1b, SKIP TO Q26. OTHERWISE CONTINUE

Next I would like to ask you about the training you have received, or that is planned.

Q13  Were you offered a choice of training providers and/or coaches?

Yes  1
No  2
Don’t know  3

Q14  Is your training provider or coach… READ OUT

…the advisor who carried out your assessment?  1
…someone introduced or recommended by the advisor?  2
…someone identified by the Business Link?  3
…someone you identified?  4

…or, someone else? (SPECIFY)  5

Q15a  Were you offered an open choice of training methods?

Yes  1
No  2
Don’t know  3

Q15b

Q16
IF YES:
Q15b What did this include? PROMPT IF NECESSARY. CODE ALL THAT APPLY

Formal learning 1
Informal learning 2
Peer to peer support 3
Action learning 4
Networks 5
Suitable events 6

Other (SPECIFY) ________________________________________________ 7

Q16a Which of the following have you received, or are you receiving… READ OUT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY

…a formal course leading to a qualification? 1 Q16b
…a formal course not leading to a qualification? 2
…ongoing private tuition? 3
…a one-off training session? 4
…a period of mentoring/coaching? 5
…telephone support? 6
e-mail support? 7

… anything else? (SPECIFY) ______________________________________ 8

IF LEADING TO A QUALIFICATION:
Q16b What qualification is that?

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

Q17 What is the training and/or support covering?

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

Q18a Would you have undertaken the training and learning activity, without having had the assessment?

Yes 1 Q18b
No 2
Don’t know 3

Q19
### Q18b
**What sort of activity would that have been?**

**PROMPT IF NECESSARY.**

**CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

- ...a formal course leading to a qualification?  
  1
- ...a formal course **not** leading to a qualification?  
  2
- ...on-going private tuition?  
  3
- ...a one-off training session?  
  4
- ...a period of mentoring/coaching?  
  5
- ... telephone support?  
  6
- e-mail support?  
  7
- ... anything else?  **(SPECIFY)**  
  ________________________________________  
  8

**Don't know**  
  9

### Q19
**To what extent would you say you are satisfied that the content of the training and learning activities addresses your development needs?**

- Very satisfied  
  1
- Quite satisfied  
  2
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
  3
- Quite dissatisfied  
  4
- Very dissatisfied  
  5
- Don’t know  
  6

### Q20a
**Have you been able to find suitable training courses, or other learning and development opportunities, to address all the leadership and management skills requirements identified during your assessment?**

- Yes  
  1
- No  
  2
- Don’t know  
  3

### IF NO:

**Q20b**  
**What needs have you **not** found training or learning for?**

- ________________________________________  
- ________________________________________  
- ________________________________________  

**DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:**

- Managing self and personal skills  
- Providing direction  
- Facilitating change  
- Working with people  
- Using resources  
- Achieving results
**Q21a** In total, approximately how much time will your training and learning activities have taken, when they are completed?

- 1-4 hours: 1
- 5-9 hours: 2
- 10-19 hours: 3
- 20-49 hours: 4
- 50-99 hours: 5
- 100-199 hours: 6
- 200+ hours: 7
- Don’t know: 8

**Q21b** And approximately what proportions will that break down into, between the following three categories …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Time spent in classroom situations</th>
<th>Other formal learning eg distance learning</th>
<th>Informal learning</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_________ %</td>
<td>_________ %</td>
<td>_________ %</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q22** How would you rate the flexibility of the training and learning activities you have accessed, in allowing you to fit them around your other responsibilities?

- Very good: 1
- Quite good: 2
- Neither good nor poor: 3
- Quite poor: 4
- Very poor: 5

**Q23a** Once you had had the assessment, would you have gone ahead with the training and learning activity if there had not been up to £1,000 of grant support available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Definitely | 1 |   |   |   | Q18b
| Probably  | 2 |   |   |   |   |
|Probably not| 3 |   |   |   |   |
|Definitely not| 4 |   |   |   |   |
|Don’t know | 5 |   |   |   | Q19 |

**IF SO:**

**Q23b** What difference, then, has the grant support made to you, if any – have you …

- … undertaken development activities more *quickly* than you would otherwise have done? 1
- … undertaken *more* development than you would have? 2
- … or has it not made any real difference? 3
Q24  What do you think is the minimum amount of grant funding that would have prompted you to go ahead with the development activity?

Nothing  1
£100  2
£200  3
£300  4
£400  5
£500  6
£600  7
£700  8
£800  9
£900  10
£1,000  11
Don’t know  12

Q25a  Have you personally, or has your organisation contributed any additional funding towards the cost of your training and learning activities?

Yes, personally  1  Q25b
Yes, the organisation  2  ------
No  3
Don’t know  4  Q26

IF YES:
Q25b  How much?

Write In £________

Q25c  About what proportion of the total cost of your training and learning does this represent – would you say it is… READ OUT

…more than half?  1
…about half?  2
…less than half, but more than a quarter?  3
…less than a quarter?  4
Don’t know  5

ALL RESPONDENTS

Q26  What types of new or improved leadership and management skills, if any, have you acquired to date, as a result of the Programme?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results
Q27 And what other leadership and management skills, if any, do you expect to acquire or develop in future, as a result of the Programme?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results

Q28 Overall, in your opinion how effective has the Programme been (so far) in meeting your leadership and management development requirements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite effective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too early to say</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q29a Before involvement in this Programme, had you taken part in any other training or learning in relation to developing your leadership and management skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES:

Q29b What sort of training or learning?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Q30a Do you think you will take part in further leadership and management training or learning activities, in future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES:

Q30b Would you be willing to pay for this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF NO AT Q30a:
Q30c  Why not?

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

I’d like to think now about any impact your involvement in the Programme has had on your organisation.

Q31a  Do you think that the skills you have gained through the Programme have led to any changes in the way you lead or manage the business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Q31b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too early to say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF YES:
Q31b  What changes?

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

Q32a  I’m going to read out a number of benefits you may have expected your organisation to experience as a result of involvement in the Programme. I’d like you to tell me to what extent your involvement has influenced, or is likely to influence, each of these.

**READ OUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ver y mu ch</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Development of new products and/or services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Introduction of new technologies and/or processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Increased/new markets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Improved quality standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Improved working practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Improved marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Improved likelihood of company survival</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Improved business growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Increased sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Increased profits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Increased productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I) Increased investment in training and skills

Q32b Have there been any other benefits to the organisation, or do you expect there to be, as a result of the Programme?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Q33a Has your involvement led to you introducing any new standards, action statements or awards?

Yes 1   Q33b

No 2    -

IF YES:
Q33b What?

A formal business plan 1
A formal quality statement 2
Investors in People commitment 3
Investors in People recognition 4
A formal training plan 5
ISO recognition 6

Other (SPECIFY) _____________________________ 7

Q34a Have you become aware of other business support, directly though your involvement in the Programme?

Yes 1   Q34b

No 2    -

IF YES:
Q34b What?

Skills brokerage 1
Employer Training Pilots 2
Manufacturing Advisory Service 3
DTI best practice products 4

Other (SPECIFY) _____________________________ 5

Q35a As far as you are aware, has your participation in the Programme encouraged others in your organisation to seek similar development opportunities?

Yes 1   Q35b

No 2    -

Don’t know 3  Q35c
IF YES:
Q35b What training or learning activities?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

NOW GO TO Q36

IF NO AT Q35a:
Q35c Do you think you will encourage them to, in future?

Yes 1
No 2
Don’t know 3

Q36a Overall would you say that your experience of the Programme has…

…failed to reach your expectations? 1 Q36b

…met your expectations? 2

…or exceeded your expectations? 3 Q37

IF FAILED:
Q36b In what ways?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Q37 What improvements, if any, do you think could be made to the Programme?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Finally, I have a few questions for classification purposes only.

Q38 About how many people work for your company, in total?

Up to 4 1
5-20 2
21-49 3
50-99 4
100-249 5
250 + 6
Q39  And what is your organisation’s main business activity? **WRITE IN – DP TO CODE LATER**

Property services, housing, cleaning, facilities management 01
Retail motor industry 02
Construction 03
Advertising, crafts, cultural heritage, design, the Arts, music 04
Electricity, gas, waste management, water 05
Information technology, telecoms, contact centres 06
Financial services 07
Passenger transport 08
Central government 09
Food and drink manufacturing/processing 10
Environmental, land-based industries 11
Delivery of lifelong learning 12
Hospitality, leisure, travel, tourism 13
Process and manufacturing 14
Science, engineering, manufacturing technologies 15
Clothing, footwear, textiles 16
Social care – children and young people 17
Health sector 18
Custodial care, justice, policing 19
Freight logistics 20
Active leisure and learning 21
Audio visual 22
Retail (not motor) 23
Building services engineering 24

Other (SPECIFY) _______________________ 25
Refused 26

Q40  Does your organisation operate on a ‘for profit’ basis?

Yes 1
No 2

Q41  Do you consider that you are an innovation or technology based organisation, or not?

Yes 1
No 2

Q42  Would you say that your company’s turnover at present is increasing, decreasing, or fairly static?

Increasing 1
Decreasing 2
Static 3
Don’t know 4
Refused 5

Q43  And would you say that your profitability at present is increasing, decreasing, or fairly static?

Increasing 1
Decreasing 2
Static 3
Don’t know 4
Refused 5
Q44 Which of the following best describes your growth objectives at present … READ OUT
… to reduce in size?  1
… to stay the same size?  2
… to grow moderately?  3
… or, to grow rapidly?  4
Don’t know  5

Q45 Which of the following ethnic groups are represented at all in your workforce? READ OUT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY
White  1
Mixed  2
Asian or Asian British  3
Black or Black British  4
Chinese or other ethnic groups  5
Don’t know  6
Refused  7

Q46 Can I establish your own role within the organisation – are you … READ OUT
An owner manager?  1
CEO, Chairman or Managing Director?  2
Other Board level director?  3
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________________________________  4

Q47 Into which of the following age bands do you fall? READ OUT
Up to 20  1
21-30  2
31-40  3
41-50  4
Over 50  5
Refused  6

Q48 What is your highest level of qualification?
Higher Level Qualification (Level 5)  1
Degree / Foundation Degree / HND (Level 4)  2
A/AS Level or equivalent (Level 3)  3
GCSE grades A-C / Intermediate GNVQ / First Diploma (Level 2)  4
GCSE grades D-E / Foundation GNVQ (Level 1)  5
Certificate of Achievement / Entry Level Certificate – Foundation Award  6
None  7
**Q49** To which of these ethnic groups do you consider you yourself belong? **READ OUT.**

**SINGLE CODE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Mixed background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian or Asian British background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black or Black British background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q50** Do you personally have any disability that has an impact on your ability to work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q51** We intend to undertake some further more in-depth interviews with a smaller group of individuals and their organisations, to obtain case study examples of the Programme. Would you be willing to be contacted about this, based on the answers you have given here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q52 May I finally take a note of:

Your name? _________________________________________________

Your job title? ________________________________________________

Your organisation’s address?
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

Q53 Are there any other comments you’d like to make before we close?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

THANK AND CLOSE

Q54 CODE RESPONDENT GENDER

Male 1
Female 2
APPENDIX G: INTERMEDIARIES SURVEY
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - INTERMEDIARIES SURVEY

Contact Sheet

Company _________________________
Address _________________________
___________________________
___________________________
___________________________
Postcode _________________________
Tel No: _________________________

OUTCOME

Telephone Interview completed 1
Respondent refused 2
Secretary/Telephonist refused 3
Not available in deadline 4
Company closed/unobtainable 5
Other (SPECIFY) 6

Interviewer: _________________________

CONTACT RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASK FOR NAMED CONTACT.

TO RESPONDENT:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ___ from McCallum Layton. We have been commissioned to carry out an evaluation of the government-funded Leadership and Management Programme, which I believe you have participated in. I understand the Programme has been called ………………. [BRAND NAME] in this area.

S1 Can I just check, did you take part in the Leadership and Management Programme, as a delivery partner, in [INSERT REGION FROM SAMPLE]?

Yes 1 Continue
No 2 T&C
Don’t know 3

Would you be the best person to talk to about your organisation’s participation in the Programme?

IF YES, CONTINUE
IF NO, TRANSFER AND REINTRODUCE
The interview will take around 15 minutes, and results will be used to help the Government decide whether to keep subsidising this sort of scheme. Is this convenient now?

**IF NOT, MAKE APPOINTMENT TO CALL BACK:**

DAY: ___________________________

TIME: ___________________________

**Reassurances (Use As Necessary)**

- We are members of the Market Research Society and abide at all times by their strict Code of Conduct.

- (This means that) Research results will be presented in overall, statistical form only. Nothing you say will be linked in any way with your name or that of your organisation.

- If you wish to check our credentials as bona fide market research practitioners, you can ring the Market Research Society free, on 0500 396999.

- If you wish to discuss anything to do with this project specifically, you can contact our executive responsible for this project, Charlotte Everitt, on 0113 237 5590.
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - INTERMEDIARIES SURVEY

Telephone Interview

Throughout the interview, I would like you to think about your organisation’s involvement with the Programme in [INSERT REGION FROM SAMPLE] – even if you have been involved with more than one Business Link, please think about just this one.

**Q1** Which of the following best describes your organisation? **READ OUT. SINGLE CODE**

- Private training provider
- Training consultants
- Further education college
- Other educational institution
- Management consultancy
- Bank
- Accountancy firm
- Solicitor
- Investors in People advisors
- Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________________________
- Don’t know

**Q2** And how did your organisation **first** become involved in the Leadership and Management Programme?

- Approached by Business Link
- Attended a Business Link workshop event
- Contacted Business Link
- Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________________________
- Don’t know

**Q3** Before delivering any assessments or training through the Programme, did your organisation go through an assessment process with the Business Link?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

**Q4a** And did the Business Link provide your organisation with any training, to help you carry out your role in the Programme?

- **Yes**
- **No**
- Don’t know

**IF YES:**

**Q4b** How effective would you say this training was? **READ OUT**

- Very effective
- Fairly effective
- Neither effective nor ineffective
- Not very effective
- Not at all effective
- Don’t know
Q5a  Thinking about your role in the Programme so far, which of the following elements of the Programme has your organisation been involved in?  **READ OUT: CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

- Referring organisations to the Programme? 1
- Recruiting or engaging managers to take part? 2
- Carrying out the diagnostic assessment? 3
- Brokering training? 4
- Preparing Personal Development Plans? 5
- Delivering the training? 6
- Mentoring and/or coaching? 7
- None of these 8
- Don’t know 9

Q5b  Are there any other elements your organisation has been involved in? If so, what?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

IF INVOLVED IN RECRUITING MANAGERS AT Q5a:

Q6  Thinking about engaging managers to take part – in what way(s) was your organisation involved in recruiting managers to the Programme?  **PROMPT IF NECESSARY. CODE ALL MENTIONED**

- One-to-one meetings with managers 1
- Telephone discussions with managers 2
- Mailshot(s) to relevant managers 3
- Making presentations to groups of managers 4
- Other (SPECIFY) ____________________________________________ 5
- Don’t know 6

Q7  How did these managers come to be involved with your organisation?

- Identified by your organisation 1  Q8
- Referred to your organisation by a third party 2  Q9
- They came directly to your organisation 3
- Other (SPECIFY) ____________________________________________ 4
- Don’t know 5

IF IDENTIFIED BY ORGANISATION:

Q8a  Were you aware that it was a requirement of the Programme to target ‘new’ Business Link clients – i.e., one that a Business Link had not previously had any meaningful engagement with, or that had not been engaged with for a year or more?

- Yes 1  Q8b
- No 2  Q9
- Don’t know 3
IF YES:

Q8b  To what extent would you say that this requirement affected your approach to trying to recruit and engage managers to the Programme? **READ OUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9  Did you offer clients a holistic, wider package of business and training support, that included developing leadership and management skills along with other elements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF INVOLVED IN DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENTS AT Q5a:

Q10  Thinking about the diagnostic assessment process, what form of diagnostic assessment has your organisation used? **PROMPT IF NECESSARY. CODE ALL MENTIONED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to face discussions with managers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing a written report</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with managers to complete the diagnostic assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping managers to complete their own assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional tests or questionnaires</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing self-completion questionnaires</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming with managers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11  What diagnostic tool or tools do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BITE</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIP Management &amp; Leadership Model</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESS</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey &amp; Mumford</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP / Management Assessment of Proficiency</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS Diagnostic</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyshack</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Critical Factor</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12  How long does the assessment process take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than an hour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half a day</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 Thinking now about preparing Personal Development Plans (PDPs). In the main, would you say that PDPs… READ OUT

…tend(ed) to reflect issues and discussions raised through the diagnostic assessment 1
…tend(ed) to enhance or address other needs 2
…or, something else? (SPECIFY) 3

Don’t know 4

Q14 Thinking about the PDPs you have been involved with, what would you say have been the main leadership and management skills for development that have been identified?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results

Q15 How soon, on average, would you say that managers who have received their agreed PDPs start their training or learning activities?

Within a month 1
One to two months later 2
Two to three months later 3
More than three months later 4
Don’t know 5

Q16 Now, I’d like to talk about the training delivery you are/were involved in. What training methods have you used? PROMPT IF NECESSARY. CODE ALL MENTIONED

Formal course(s) leading to a qualification 1
Formal course(s) not leading to a qualification 2
Private tuition 3
A one-off event or activity 4
Period of mentoring or coaching 5
Other (SPECIFY) 6
Don’t know 7
Q17  Which leadership and management skills areas have you delivered training or coaching in?

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results

Q18  I am going to read out a few statements about how you think managers may, or may not, have been influenced by their involvement in the Programme. I would like you to tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each.

So, would you say you agree strongly, agree slightly, neither agree nor disagree, disagree slightly, or disagree strongly, that...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The grant of up to £1,000 was a significant incentive in encouraging managers to undertake the training, learning or coaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers who took part in the Programme are now more committed to training and learning than they used to be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers would probably have taken part in similar training or learning activities even if they had not been involved in the Programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers who have taken part in the Programme are likely to take part in further training activity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers would have undertaken and paid for training and development on the basis of the free diagnostic assessment, without the grant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers would not have undertaken training and development activity as quickly, if they had not been on the Programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19a  Thinking now specifically about your relationship with the managers of the Programme locally, how effective would you say the communication mechanisms have been, between you and them? Would you say… READ OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Q19b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DO NOT READ) Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19b How could that communication have been improved?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Q20 Has the amount you have been paid, covered the cost of your involvement in the Programme?

Yes 1
No 2
Don’t know 3

Q21 To what extent do you feel that the Programme has helped to generate an improved and more sustainable network of employer support?

To a great extent 1
To some extent 2
A little 3
Not at all 4
Don’t know 5

Q22 And to what extent do you feel that your involvement in the Programme has helped to improve your own relationship with employers?

To a great extent 1
To some extent 2
A little 3
Not at all 4
Don’t know 5

Q23a Has your organisation been involved in any other Business Link or government-funded programmes, in the past 3 years?

Yes 1  Q23b

No 2  Q24

Don’t know 3

Q23b What programme(s)?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Q24a Do you think that your organisation would be willing to continue to carry out the role you have played in the Programme, in the future?

Yes 1  Q25

No 2  Q24b

Don’t know 3
IF NO/DON'T KNOW:
Q24b Why do you say that?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Q25 How do you think that the Programme as a whole could be improved?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Q26 May I finally just check:
Your name? __________________________________________________________
And job title? _______________________________________________________

Q27 Are there any other comments you’d like to make before we close?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

THANK AND CLOSE
LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - CONTROL SURVEY

Contact Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>_________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>_________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Postcode | _________________________ |
| Tel No:  | _________________________ |

OUTCOME

Telephone Interview completed  1
Respondent refused  2
Secretary/Telephonist refused  3
Not available in deadline  4
Company closed/unobtainable  5
Other (SPECIFY)  6

INTERVIEWER: ______________________________________

CONTACT RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Outcome/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASK FOR NAMED CONTACT.

TO RESPONDENT:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ___ from McCallum Layton. We have been commissioned to carry out an evaluation of the government-funded Leadership and Management Programme. As part of this study, we need to talk to a sample of business leaders who have not taken part in this programme, to compare views and experiences with those who have.

S1 Can I just confirm that you have not personally received government support for a free assessment of your leadership and management skills, or a grant of up to £1,000 to undertake training focussing on leadership and management?

Confirmed – have not taken part 1
No – have taken part 2

T&C
S2 And can I establish your own role within the organisation – are you … READ OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An owner manager?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO, Chairman or Managing Director?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Board level director?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUE

TRANSFER

IF CODES 1-3, CONTINUE
IF NOT, ASK FOR SOMEONE IN ONE OF THESE ROLES AND RE-INTRODUCE

The interview will take around 15 minutes, and results will be used to help the Government decide how to support businesses that want to develop their leadership and management skills. Is this convenient now?

IF NOT, MAKE APPOINTMENT TO CALL BACK:

DAY: __________________________

TIME: __________________________

Reassurances (Use As Necessary)

- We are members of the Market Research Society and abide at all times by their strict Code of Conduct.

- (This means that) Research results will be presented in overall, statistical form only. Nothing you say will be linked in any way with your name or that of your organisation.

- If you wish to check our credentials as bona fide market research practitioners, you can ring the Market Research Society free, on 0500 396999.

- If you wish to discuss anything to do with this project specifically, you can contact our executive responsible for this project, Charlotte Everitt, on 0113 237 5590.
**LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME - CONTROL SURVEY**

**Telephone Interview**

**Q1** First of all I’d like to ask you about your awareness of the Leadership and Management Programme. This was a programme of support, which involved an individual assessment of areas where you might benefit from training on leadership and management skills, followed by the development of a Personal Development Plan, and access to a £1,000 grant to help fund training or learning activity.

Had you heard of this Programme, before I called you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF YES:**

**Q2a** How did you first hear about the Programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Link advertising/marketing</th>
<th>Direct from Business Link/from Business Link contact</th>
<th>From a business network contact</th>
<th>An independent business consultant</th>
<th>Your/a bank</th>
<th>Your/an accountant</th>
<th>Your professional body or trade association</th>
<th>Your Sector Skills Council (SSC)</th>
<th>A college</th>
<th>A private training provider</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Other (SPECIFY)</th>
<th>Cannot recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF COLLEGE/TRAINING PROVIDER:**

**Q2b** Was this a college/training provider you had previously had contact with, or a provider you didn’t know?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous contact</th>
<th>Unknown previously</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2c** Why did you choose not to access that support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of time/resource</th>
<th>Saw no benefit</th>
<th>Have no leadership and management development needs</th>
<th>Other (SPECIFY)</th>
<th>No particular reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GO TO Q4**
IF NO/DON’T KNOW AT Q1:
Q3 Is this something you would have been interested in getting involved in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 In the past 5 years, have you personally been involved in any training or learning, in relation to developing your leadership and management skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5 When did this take place? TAKE MOST RECENT INSTANCE, IF MORE THAN ONE

Still on-going 1
In the last year 2
1-2 years ago 3
3-5 years ago 4

Q6a Were you able to access an open choice of training methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6b What did this include? PROMPT IF NECESSARY. CODE ALL THAT APPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal learning</th>
<th>Informal learning</th>
<th>Peer to peer support</th>
<th>Action learning</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Suitable events</th>
<th>Other (SPECIFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7a Which of the following have you been involved in doing… READ OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>…a formal course leading to a qualification?</th>
<th>…a formal course not leading to a qualification?</th>
<th>…on-going private tuition?</th>
<th>…a one-off training session?</th>
<th>…a period of mentoring/coaching?</th>
<th>… telephone support?</th>
<th>e-mail support?</th>
<th>… anything else? (SPECIFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF LEADING TO A QUALIFICATION:

Q7b What qualification is that?

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

Q8 What has the training and/or support covered?

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

Q9 How did you identify a provider or providers for this support? DO NOT READ OUT. CODE ALL MENTIONED

[1] Internet search
[2] Via a training provider already known
[3] Via an independent business consultant
[4] Via a Business Link contact
[5] Via a business network
[6] Via a colleague or friend

Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________________

Q10a Has this training activity ever involved a diagnosis of your leadership and management development needs?

Yes 1

No 2

Q10b How was this done?

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

Q10c Did this lead to a written statement of your personal development needs?

Yes 1

No 2

Q11 To what extent would you say you have been satisfied that the content of such training and learning activities addressed your development needs?

Very satisfied 1

Quite satisfied 2

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3

Quite dissatisfied 4

Very dissatisfied 5

Don’t know 6
Q12  What types of new or improved leadership and management skills, if any, have you acquired to date, as a result of undertaking this training and learning activity?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results

Q13  And what other leadership and management skills, if any, do you expect to acquire or develop in future, as a result of undertaking this learning and training activity?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:
Managing self and personal skills
Providing direction
Facilitating change
Working with people
Using resources
Achieving results

Q14a  Do you think that the skills you have gained through the training have led to any changes in the way you lead or manage your business?

Yes 1  Q14b
No 2
Don’t know 3  Q15
Too early to say 4

IF YES:
Q14b  What changes?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Q15a  I’m going to read out a number of benefits you may have expected your organisation to experience as a result of training and learning activities. I’d like you to tell me to what extent the training we have been discussing has influenced, or is likely to influence, each of these. READ OUT
### 8.30 Very much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Development of new products and/or services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Introduction of new technologies and/or processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Increased/new markets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Improved quality standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Improved working practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Improved marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Improved likelihood of company survival</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Improved business growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Increased sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Increased profits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Increased productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Increased investment in training and skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q15b** Have there been any other benefits to the organisation, or do you expect there to be, as a result of the training?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

**Q16** How much have you or has your organisation paid for your training and learning activities?

Write in £ __________

**Q17a** As far as you are aware, has your participation in the training we have been discussing encouraged others in your organisation to seek similar development opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Q17b</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Q17c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IF YES:**

**Q17b** What training or learning activities?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

NOW GO TO Q18
**IF NO AT Q17a:**

Q17c  Do you think you will encourage them to, in future?  
- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

**ASK ALL**

Q18  How would you describe your awareness of your own development needs?  Would you say you are…

- …very aware?  
- …somewhat aware?  
- …or not very aware?  
- Don’t know

Q19a  Do you feel that you have any leadership and management development needs, at present?

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

**IF YES:**

Q19b  In what areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DP TO CODE UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADINGS:

- Managing self and personal skills
- Providing direction
- Facilitating change
- Working with people
- Using resources
- Achieving results

Q20a  Do you think you will take part in any training or learning activities, in future, to address leadership and management needs?

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

**IF YES:**

Q20b  Would you be willing to pay for this?

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

**IF YES:**

Q20c  How much?

Write in £________

**NOW**

GO TO **Q21**
IF NO AT Q18a:
Q20d Why not?

Q21 Does your company currently have, or are you in the process of developing, any of the following … READ OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Currently have</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) A formal business plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A formal quality statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Investors in People recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A formal training plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) ISO recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, I have a few questions for classification purposes only.

Q22 About how many people work for your company, in total?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-249</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23 And what is your organisation’s main business activity? WRITE IN – DP TO CODE LATER

- Property services, housing, cleaning, facilities management
- Retail motor industry
- Construction
- Advertising, crafts, cultural heritage, design, the Arts, music
- Electricity, gas, waste management, water
- Information technology, telecoms, contact centres
- Financial services
- Passenger transport
- Central government
- Food and drink manufacturing/processing
- Environmental, land-based industries
- Delivery of lifelong learning
- Hospitality, leisure, travel, tourism
- Process and manufacturing
- Science, engineering, manufacturing technologies
- Clothing, footwear, textiles
- Social care – children and young people
- Health sector
- Custodial care, justice, policing
- Freight logistics
- Active leisure and learning
- Audio visual
- Retail (not motor)
- Building services engineering

Other (SPECIFY) _________________________ 25

Refused 26

Q24 Does your organisation operate on a ‘for profit’ basis?

- Yes 1
- No 2

Q25 Do you consider that you are an innovation or technology based organisation, or not?

- Yes 1
- No 2

Q26 Would you say that your company’s turnover at present is increasing, decreasing, or fairly static?

- Increasing 1
- Decreasing 2
- Static 3
- Don’t know 4
- Refused 5

Q27 And would you say that your profitability at present is increasing, decreasing, or fairly static?

- Increasing 1
- Decreasing 2
- Static 3
- Don’t know 4
- Refused 5
Q28  Which of the following best describes your growth objectives at present … READ OUT

… to reduce in size?  1
… to stay the same size?  2
… to grow moderately?  3
… or, to grow rapidly?  4
Don’t know  5

Q29  Which of the following ethnic groups are represented at all in your workforce?  READ OUT.  CODE ALL THAT APPLY

White  1
Mixed  2
Asian or Asian British  3
Black or Black British  4
Chinese or other ethnic groups  5
Don’t know  6
Refused  7

Q30  Into which of the following age bands do you fall?  READ OUT

Up to 20  1
21-30  2
31-40  3
41-50  4
Over 50  5
Refused  6

Q31  What is your highest level of qualification?

Higher Level Qualification (Level 5)  1
Degree / Foundation Degree / HND (Level 4)  2
A/AS Level or equivalent (Level 3)  3
GCSE grades A-C / Intermediate GNVQ / First Diploma (Level 2)  4
GCSE grades D-E / Foundation GNVQ (Level 1)  5
Certificate of Achievement / Entry Level Certificate – Foundation Award  6
None  7
Q32 To which of these ethnic groups do you consider you yourself belong? READ OUT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGLE CODE</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Mixed background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian or Asian British background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black or Black British background (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33 Do you personally have any disability that has an impact on your ability to work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q34 May I finally take a note of:

- Your name: _________________________________
- Your job title: _________________________________
- Your organisation's address:
  ____________________________________________
  ____________________________________________
  ____________________________________________

Q35 Are there any other comments you’d like to make before we close?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
THANK AND CLOSE

Q36 CODE RESPONDENT GENDER

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© LSC January 2007
Published by the Learning and Skills Council.

Extracts from this publication may be reproduced for non-commercial educational or training purposes on condition that the source is acknowledged and the findings are not misrepresented.

This publication is available in an electronic form on the Learning Skills Council web site: www.lsc.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format or language please contact the LSC Help Desk: 0870 900 6800

Publication reference: LSC-P-NAT-070009