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Executive Summary

1 The Learning and Skills Council’s (LSC) Disability Equality Duty support programme was a national programme designed to support LSC-funded learning providers in the implementation of the Disability Equality Duty (DED). The programme was led by the Learning and Skills Network (LSN) and other partners, and was delivered between November 2006 and September 2007. The programme was targeted primarily at senior managers, heads of adult and community learning (ACL) and practitioners responsible for implementing equality legislation. It sought to support providers in implementing their disability equality schemes (DES) and in promoting disability equality in their organisations.

2 The support programme, which reached providers in nine geographical regions across England, offered three strands of activity, supported by management and core teams. The strands of activity were: a series of regional workshops, action working project activity in each LSC region, and online support and information through a virtual learning environment (VLE).

3 As an integral part of programme activities, successes and weaknesses were evaluated as a means of informing future interventions, identifying key lessons learnt and ensuring progress towards disability equality for all participants. By analysing feedback, the impact of the programme is considered in terms of supporting providers in developing and implementing DES.

4 Research findings are considered in relation to three key areas: reach, satisfaction and impact. These findings provide insight into provider experience, and also pave the way for recommendations for future support programmes to promote equality in the sector. Findings under these three areas are summarised below.
Reach

5 The programme was successful in reaching and engaging both with its target audience of senior managers and those with responsibility for implementing equality legislation in further education (FE) colleges and ACL providers, and also with a range of other providers in the sector.

6 The most effective means of communication was through the use of flyers, but providers also learned about the programme from regional LSC staff and by accessing the information through the LSN website.

7 Analysis of the usage of the VLE showed that, while participants visited the VLE regularly, and while high numbers were recorded for viewing, the numbers posting materials and messages were far lower.

8 It is crucial to attract the right people with the relevant job roles and responsibilities in an organisation to the workshops to ensure maximum impact and reach.

Satisfaction

9 The majority of providers were satisfied with the delivery and content of the programme.

10 Providers talked about the usefulness and relevance of the programme in supporting them to implement their DES.

11 Matching the needs of all providers was identified as a weakness by some providers, particularly ACL providers, who considered that the shape and some of the content of the workshops favoured the needs of FE college providers over their own.

12 Some providers wanted more support on specific aspects of implementing their schemes, for example in developing impact assessments and equality audits.

13 Comments were made on how to improve the VLE, as well as on the need for more specific training to ensure the best use of the site as an interactive tool.
Impact

14 The vast majority of respondents thought the programme had helped them to move forward in their own practice.

15 The programme was most effective in raising awareness and in maintaining momentum on disability equality in the FE sector.

16 The programme had the most impact in providing reassurance and support, information about the DED and opportunities for networking and sharing good practice.

17 Providers commented on the value of networking and of building relationships with other providers, LSC regional staff and local and regional organisations.

18 The survey data shows that, after the programme was delivered, there was a significant decrease in numbers classifying themselves as ‘just starting out’, coupled with a significant increase in those who now rated their organisation as ‘making good progress’.

19 The majority of action working providers felt they had benefited from completing their projects, and several providers considered that the work they had achieved had had a significant impact on changing organisational practices.

20 The issue was raised of having a more differentiated approach in order to address the needs of providers who are at different stages on the journey to disability equality, as well as the needs of different types of providers.

21 Some providers did not think that the programme had made a significant difference, since they considered that they were well advanced with their schemes and already had good frameworks in place.

22 Some providers commented on the limitations that hampered their progress in implementing and taking plans forward. These include funding and staffing difficulties.
An increase in the involvement and disclosure of disabled staff was referred to on numerous occasions. It was also felt that the programme had contributed towards empowering disabled people and, in particular, strengthening the voice of disabled learners.

Discussion of findings in relation to reach, satisfaction and impact led to the identification of four main themes that reoccur across data sources. These themes are: capacity building, the need to respond more closely to the situations of individual providers, future interventions, and specific contexts.

Capacity building

Findings show the importance of networking as a valued part of the programme, with providers discussing it as a type of underlying foundation that contributes to the exchange of ideas.

Action working projects were valued for the impact they had on the way people reflect on practice, as well as for the opportunity they provided to receive input from experienced project leaders and LSC staff. The projects were also useful in providing examples of good practice for the sector.

The potential value of the VLE was also commented on as playing an important role in capacity building. However, in general it was felt that, because of a lack of training and insufficient time to promote the site before its launch, it had not been used to its optimal level.

The need to respond more closely to the situations of individual providers or types of provider

ACL providers, because they do not have their own dedicated DES, and also those further along the road to disability equality felt that their needs were not fully met and hence they were unable to benefit sufficiently from the programme.

Future interventions needed to support providers in implementing equality and diversity in their organisations

Participants expressed a need for increased opportunities to network immediately following workshop events.
It was also suggested, that peer support networks could be developed, to ensure that all participants benefited from networking in a systematic way.

Participants identified the need for continued input from ambassadors. It was felt that ambassadors would be able to apply an in-depth level of knowledge effectively to support individual providers.

LSC staff, particularly partnership team staff, noted that they needed their own briefings, in parallel with providers, so that they can be confident in offering support to providers in their region.

Work-based learning (WBL) providers, although not required to produce a DES, expressed the need to encourage more employer involvement in the current national single equality scheme (SES) programme.

Context was identified as crucial to the needs of those responsible for delivering in the learning and skills sector. Although the support programme attempted, through its varied activities, to address issues surrounding what works best in specific contexts, this needs to be developed for future programmes.

An analysis of data and subsequent findings leads to the following recommendations.

- A review event would be useful as a follow-up activity to the programme, to share achievements and reflect on progress made.
- Local peer support networks should be created after the programme, to build on and share experience.
- There should be workshops on other equality duties, and there is a need for increased learner involvement.
- There is a need for increased employer involvement in the SES programme, to build on WBL provider involvement.
• Support needs to be tailored, in order to match the needs of all providers in the sector – particularly ACL providers – and there should also be some differentiation in terms of distance travelled and experience.

• More support is required for organisations on specific aspects of implementing their schemes – for example, in developing impact assessments and equality audits. There should also be support on how they might incorporate disability action plans into other equality and diversity plans.

• More training is needed to support improvements for disabled staff in organisations. At a conference in March 2008, the Commission for Disabled Staff in Lifelong Learning launched its final report, *From compliance to culture change*, in which it presented its findings on the employment of disabled staff working in the lifelong learning sector. The report is available at: www.niace.org.uk/projects/commissionfordisabledstaff/docs/Compliance-culture-summary-report.pdf.

• Use should be made of action working projects as a means of building capacity and developing examples of good practice.

• Disabled people should be involved in all aspects of intervention and support to reinforce the reasons why promoting disability equality is important.

• LSC regional staff, particularly partnership teams, should have their own briefings, so that they can build up their knowledge and support providers more effectively.
Introduction

This report provides an overall evaluation of the Learning and Skills Council’s (LSC’s) Disability Equality Duty support programme. The programme was a national programme designed to support providers in implementing the Disability Equality Duty (DED). The report builds on the interim report, which provided key learning points to inform the development of the current national programme, which is aimed at supporting providers as they implement the LSC’s single equality scheme (SES).

The main aims of the report are:

- to provide an analysis of the impact of the DED support programme that will enable the LSC to report on the success of the programme; and

- to outline recommendations, based on improvements suggested by the findings, to support the future promotion and implementation of equality and diversity across the sector.

Structure

The report begins by outlining the aims of the programme and placing it within the wider context of LSC strategy and aims. It then discusses the research methodology, commenting on both qualitative and quantitative approaches and drawing attention to data limitations.

This then leads on to a discussion of the findings, which focuses on three areas: reach, satisfaction and impact. Each section reviews the relevant data and provides a summary statement of findings. As a subsection of impact, the report considers the journey made by providers on the road to disability equality and looks at the ways in which the programme will support them in moving forward.

The report then discusses the involvement of disabled people, both learners and employees, in the programme, along with the programme’s impact on their experiences within their learning environments.
Key themes arising from the data are then discussed. This includes a consideration of future interventions to support providers as they move towards equality, as well as reflections on what works best in different contexts.

Finally, the report looks at the conclusions arising from the overall discussion, and offers recommendations for future action.

Context

The LSC DED support programme, led by the Learning and Skills Network (LSN) and other partners, was a national programme, delivered between November 2006 and September 2007, that was designed to assist further education and adult and community learning providers in implementing the DED. It sought to maintain the impetus towards achievement of disability equality, as well as to support providers in embedding disability equality within organisational policies and practice.

The programme was introduced by the LSC as part of its overall strategy for the post-16 sector, Learning for Living and Work: Improving Education and Training Opportunities for People with Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities (2006). The programme was aimed at supporting providers in implementing their disability equality schemes (DES) and in promoting disability equality in their organisations.

The programme was targeted at senior managers and practitioners responsible for implementing equality legislation. It was aimed at LSC-funded learning providers with a statutory duty to promote the DED. Part of the DED involves producing a three-year DES and action plan. Work-based learning (WBL) providers were also invited to attend (although they are not required to produce a DES, they are still covered by their legal duties under the Disability Discrimination Act).

The support programme offered three strands of activity, which were supported by management and core teams. The strands of activity were: a series of regional workshops; action working activity in each
LSC region; and online support and information through a virtual learning environment (VLE).

47 The workshops were designed to provide support on particular aspects of the DED and to encourage networking and sharing of good practice. The action working projects were aimed at supporting providers as they worked on improving a particular aspect of their practice in relation to disability equality. They were invited to work on topics relating to:

- involving disabled people in impact assessment;
- embedding disability equality in quality assurance and development planning;
- employment duties; and
- the role of the voluntary and community sector in promoting disability equality in education.

48 The programme also included a project to improve and promote the involvement of disabled people in each LSC region.

49 The VLE was designed to provide a means of communication for the programme, offering providers online support, access to resources and the opportunity to contribute to forums. It also provided information on all aspects of the programme, including on the action working projects and regional workshops.

**Methodology of evaluation**

50 In order to evaluate the programme, a number of methods were employed to ensure that a broad range of evidence was examined and analysed. Data was collected from both quantitative and qualitative sources. These included telephone interviews with providers, a quantitative survey, and the collation of comments and feedback from LSC regional equality and diversity managers. Further data can be found in Annex A and is referenced throughout this section.
Formative evaluation data
This report draws on the findings of the interim report. This includes data that was collected as part of the formative evaluation of the programme through the evaluation of the workshops, reflective and evaluative comments from the management and core teams, and reflective and evaluative comments from providers and project leaders involved in the action working activity.

Telephone interviews
Interviews were conducted with a range of providers who participated in the DED support programme. The interviewees were selected from the attendance lists of the March regional workshops (360 providers), the June regional workshops (479 providers), the action working project sites (27 completed projects) and the 310 registered users of the VLE.

The sample was selected at random, but with due care to ensure representative numbers from all regions and all types of provider. The final sample consisted of 27 further education (FE) colleges; 10 adult and community learning (ACL) centres; four WBL providers; eight sixth form colleges; and four ‘other’.

Two sets of interviews were carried out in November 2007:
- 10 interviews of approximately 45 minutes each with providers who had participated in the action working projects; and
- 43 interviews of 20–30 minutes with providers who had participated in the other activities of the programme.

The interview schedules were designed to address the participation in the programme of the two groups of interviewees mentioned above (see Appendices 1 and 2 to Annex A). The interviewees were contacted by email and invited to participate in the evaluation (see Appendix 3 to Annex A). Participants were assured of anonymity and confidentiality, in line with the guidelines of the British Educational Research Association (BERA). They were also asked to sign a consent form (Appendix 4 to Annex A).
The majority of providers were very willing to participate in the interviews. However, there were some challenges in making contact and setting up the interviews, due to the workload and busy schedule of providers. Also, one or two providers did decline to take part, as they were either unable to recall having taken part in the programme or else were unable to confirm that it was this particular programme they had attended.

**Feedback from LSC equality and diversity managers**

Data was gathered from the LSC regional equality and diversity managers using a variety of methods, including an invitation to managers to complete a series of questions that were distributed at one of the senior manager meetings in November 2007 and via email (see Appendix 5 to Annex A). The LSN research team also gathered feedback at the above-mentioned meeting. A small sample was also invited to be interviewed by telephone, but, due to the constraints of the timeframe for the evaluation, only two managers completed the interviews.

**Quantitative survey**

An online survey was carried out in November and December 2007, in which providers across the FE sector were invited to give feedback on their participation in the DED support programme and on the impact it may have had on their own practice, and that of their organisation, in promoting disability equality. The questionnaire was designed with the LSN evaluation team and LSN statistician. The final version was sent to the national LSC team for comment before it went ‘live’. The online survey for the DED support programme formed part of the survey for the new national LSC single equality scheme support programme (the full survey can be found at Appendix 6 to Annex A). The link to the survey, with instructions on how to complete it, was sent out to all LSC-funded providers via email (Appendix 7 to Annex A), and details and a link were also available on the LSN website.

Overall, there were 127 responses to the online survey, and 41 per cent of respondents completed the DED support programme part of the
survey. One challenge with this survey was that it was not conducted for the sole purpose of evaluating the DED support programme, but formed part of a larger survey for the foundation of the LSC’s SES support programme. This may have deterred some providers who had taken part in the DED support programme from completing the DED support programme part of the survey.

**Usage of the virtual learning environment**

The VLE was developed as a tool to support the dissemination of materials relevant to the programme, information on projects and related reports. The VLE acted as a networking tool, encouraging forum discussions among people registered on the site and the sharing of information, good practice and learning across regions. It offered providers the opportunity to post material such as documents, articles and information on relevant events on the site.

Information about the usage of the VLE was gathered and analysed to gauge its usefulness and relevance to the sector. The Moodle software supports a VLE and makes it possible for providers and facilitators to monitor usage. We were able to see how many members had registered with the VLE, and by means of their email addresses we could get some idea of what type of provider they were. We were also able to monitor activities for all roles.

There are currently 310 users registered on the DED support programme VLE. The VLE for the DED support programme is still open, although the programme has now ended (anyone who registers to use the VLE for the LSC’s SES support programme is able to access the resources for both).

**Formative evaluation data from the workshops**

Using completed evaluation forms from the workshops, data was collected in order to analyse the delivery of, and satisfaction with, the workshops (a copy of the form appears at Appendix 8 to Annex A). The forms were designed to include a combination of quantitative and
The figures below show the numbers who attended the regional workshops and the number of forms completed:

- 360 providers attended the March workshops, resulting in 220 completed forms;
- 479 providers attended the June workshops, resulting in 269 completed forms.

One difficulty presented by this data is that it is analysed from completed evaluation forms, and not all providers who attended the workshops actually completed the forms. It therefore does not represent the views of all attendees.

**Additional secondary sources**

In addition to the data received from the primary data collection sources, we also refer to, and include, examples sent by providers illustrating evidence of the impact the programme had had. The action working project reports submitted by providers are also referred to in this report.

**Analysis of data**

The interview data was recorded by note-taking, and the interviews were then written up and analysed using the key issues.

The analysis of the survey was carried out using a combination of quantitative summary data, and the issues and responses given in the qualitative responses were analysed by identifying them and grouping them into themes.

All the data was analysed using the following themes, as identified in the evaluation criteria:

- the difference the support programme has made and how it has helped and influenced activity/progress;
- the ways providers have engaged in the support programme;
• where providers are on the journey to disability equality and the distance travelled;

• plans to move forward with disability equality;

• types of further intervention providers need; and

• ways in which disabled people have been involved.

69 The analysis for the report draws on all the sources identified to provide an overall evaluation of the impact of the programme.
Findings

Reach

This section reports on the success of the programme in engaging with the further education (FE) sector. It presents details of ‘reach’ in terms of the number and the nature of providers who participated in the Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme. It also provides information on the geographical reach, as well as on the ways in which providers engaged with different aspects of the programme. The data that informs this section is drawn from the following sources: interview data, the evaluations from the March and June regional workshops, the quantitative survey of providers who participated in the programme, National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE) monitoring forms, and usage of the virtual learning environment (VLE).

Provider engagement in the DED support programme

Participants in the programme came from nine regions across England: North East, North West, Yorkshire and Humberside, East Midlands, West Midlands, South East, South West, Eastern and London. They were representative of the following types of institution/organisation: FE colleges, sixth form colleges, independent specialist colleges, work-based learning (WBL) providers, and adult and community learning (ACL) providers.

Type of provider

Evidence from the workshop attendance data shows that approximately two-thirds of those who attended each of the regional workshops came from FE colleges, with much lower numbers of ACL providers and very small numbers of WBL providers attending in all regions. In one region, however (East Midlands), the majority of the attendees at the March workshop were WBL providers, though this was reversed at the summer event, when higher numbers of FE colleges attended.
Profile of participants

73 The target audience for the events were:

- senior managers of FE colleges/heads of ACL; and
- practitioners responsible for implementing equality legislation.

74 The evidence from the quantitative data from the workshops showed that the participants at the March workshops were more likely to be those with a specialist role relating either to equality and diversity or to learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. On average, around a third of attendees had senior management responsibility. The figures for the June workshops showed a marked increase in the attendance of senior managers. In the regions of London, Yorkshire and Humberside and South East, for example, senior managers made up over half of all attendees.

75 The majority of attendees at the workshops came from the target audience outlined above. There were also small numbers of human resources (HR) managers present at the workshops: the data shows that most regions saw more attendees with these roles attending the June workshops than participated in the March events.

76 A wide range of job roles were represented, including people from learning support, administrators, senior and middle managers, chief executives, lecturers, tutors, HR managers, interpreters and advisers.

77 Monitoring forms were part of the application process for both the March and the June workshops. These provided participants with the opportunity to communicate information on ethnicity and gender (the statistics on gender and ethnicity have kindly been provided by NIACE). In relation to ethnicity, it is difficult to make any definitive statements for those booked on either the March or the June workshops, since the rate of response to this section of the form was generally very low. For example, not a single participant in one June regional workshop provided this information. Of those who did respond on other workshops, the majority described themselves as white British, with few
or no responses being supplied under the categories provided for Asian or black.

78 Failure to complete this section of the form may have been due to a feeling among participants that the information was irrelevant to the application, or that the categories provided were not relevant to individual cases. Whatever the reasons, the data is insufficient to allow any comments to be made on the ethnic composition of participants.

79 Information on the gender make-up of participants in workshop sessions is more substantial. However, caution needs to be exercised. For example, the data clearly shows that, across the regions, the majority of respondents were female. Although response rates were better than for the question about ethnicity, nevertheless a large number of participants at each event did not respond to this question either. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions as to the actual percentages of males and females who participated.

80 The data from the quantitative survey indicated that just over 80 per cent of those who took part in the survey had specialist responsibility for equality and diversity, and that over 60 per cent of those who completed the forms were senior managers.

81 The regions with the fewest responses to the survey were the North East and West Midlands, whereas the regions with the highest responses were Yorkshire and Humberside and the South West. However, these figures are for the overall survey, including the single equality scheme (SES) support programme, so the figures should be viewed with caution.

How providers learned about the programme
82 Different channels of communication were used to inform providers about the programme. These included trade unions, colleagues and word of mouth. Results from the quantitative survey show that, among the 52 respondents who completed the DED support programme survey, the most effective means of communicating the event were by pamphlet/flyer (44 per cent of survey respondents), through the
Learning and Skills Network (LSN) website (25 per cent), via LSC staff (25 per cent) and at seminar/information sessions (23 per cent). Although this group only represents a small sample of overall participants, it can be used to show the methods that are the most successful.

**Types of engagement**

83 The regional workshops held in March and June 2007 were well attended, with 360 delegates attending in March and 479 in June. Feedback from various sources suggests that at least 75 per cent of the providers who attended in March also attended in June. In addition, 27 providers were involved in the action working projects.

84 Of those who responded to the DED support programme survey, 20 per cent had been involved in the action working projects, and 60 per cent said they had attended the workshops. Some 44 per cent had used the materials and resources that were provided, but only 10 per cent had used the VLE. Nearly a third of respondents had also engaged in some kind of networking with other providers as a result of the programme.

85 An overview of members’ profiles registered on the VLE shows that participation is representative of programme regions and organisational types, and that 310 users were registered as of 20 December 2007.

86 The VLE activity between 1 December 2006 and 1 November 2007 showed peaks in activity in the run-up to workshop sessions and in the days and weeks that followed. Peaks and troughs in activity on the site are possibly a result of various factors related to initial registration and interest, training (in February and May at project leader meetings), increased use immediately following workshop sessions, low use over the summer months as institutions close, and an increase at the start of the new academic year. However, the variations are not always consistent. For example, use of the site tails off following the first set of workshops in March. Inconsistencies may reflect participants’ statements in the interviews and the survey about the need for more
training if they are to successfully navigate and use the site, and for the site to be made rather more user friendly.

87 **In summary,** the evidence indicates that the programme was successful in engaging with and reaching its target audience of FE colleges and ACL providers, and that it also reached a range of other providers in the sector. In addition, the figures for the workshops show that, as the programme went on, so engagement with the sector improved, with the result that far higher numbers attended the June workshops than those in March.

88 The target audience of senior managers and those with responsibility for implementing equality legislation was achieved, in that these two categories together made up the majority of attendees at both the March and the June workshops.

89 The most effective means of communication, as identified in the quantitative survey, was through the use of flyers, but providers also learned about the programme from regional LSC staff and by accessing the information through the LSN website.

90 Analysis of the usage of the VLE shows that, while participants visited the VLE regularly, and while high numbers were recorded for viewing, the numbers posting materials and messages were far lower. This suggests that people did register to access information and resources, but were reluctant to take part in the interactive functions of the VLE (posting messages and taking part in discussions). This could be linked to the comments that providers made about the need to make the site more user friendly and for more training to be available in how to use it to best effect.
Satisfaction

91 An initial indication of the impact of the DED support programme can be seen in the way delegates were satisfied with the programme overall. Satisfaction can be viewed as an indication of the investment participants have made in the programme, and consequently of its subsequent influence on the development of their disability equality scheme (DES) and action plans.

92 The data that informs this section is drawn from the following sources: evaluation/analysis from participants at the regional workshops, interview data from providers’ telephone interviews, the quantitative survey of providers who participated in the programme, NIACE monitoring forms, and usage of the VLE. Further data can be found in Annex B and is referenced throughout this section.

Workshops

93 Workshops were held in each region in March and June 2007. South East region held an additional workshop in March, so in total 10 workshops were held in March, and nine in June. The workshops were assessed by asking all participants to complete evaluation forms. The questions were designed to enable providers to rate the workshops on a quantitative scale and also allowed them to provide evaluative comments. The data below is collated from the evaluation forms completed at all the regional events.

March

94 From the data gathered at the March workshops, 82 per cent of delegates stated that they were very satisfied or satisfied with the overall event (a rating of 1 or 2 on a five-point scale). In total, five per cent from the 10 regional events stated that they were in some way dissatisfied (a rating of 4) and none were very dissatisfied (see Figure 1 below). Questions covered all areas of the sessions from organisation of event – diet, interest and materials used – to relevance and the involvement of people with disabilities. The results were also broken down by region (see Appendices 1 and 2 to Annex B).
Examples of the main strengths of the workshops were:

- the involvement of disabled people in the day;
- the opportunities to network and share experiences, ideas and information;
- the usefulness for organisations in terms of highlighting important factors that need to be included in DES;
- the opportunity to objectively assess organisational progress;
- the chance to receive useful and timely information;
- the quality of the delivery/facilitation/speakers;
- resources, including the VLE;
- the fact that it was ‘well organised, lots of planning evident’; and
- a good balance of presentations/interaction.
Figure 1: Overall assessment of the March 2007 workshops
June

96 The evaluations of the June workshops indicated that the results were even more positive than for the workshops held in March, with 86 per cent of delegates stating that overall they were either very satisfied or satisfied (a rating of 1 or 2) (see Appendix 3 to Annex B).

97 Figure 2 below shows a breakdown of satisfaction by region. Information on overall assessment and satisfaction with specific aspects of the events can be found in Appendix 4 to Annex B.

98 The number of observations about strengths far outweighed the suggested improvements. In addition to the strengths identified for the March workshops, the main themes were:

- the opportunity to learn about and discuss what is happening in own region;

- usefulness in raising awareness of single equality issues – for example, implementing a single equality approach that encompasses all seven equality strands: age, disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, faith/belief and transgender;

- usefulness of knowledge cafés as conveyors of information;

- diversity of people/agencies giving input;

- ‘reporting of real work completed at real-time pace’;

- ‘everyone was passionate, welcoming, enthusiastic and driven’; and

- the varied modes of delivery: presentations, workshops, café.

99 The knowledge café (see box below) was repeatedly mentioned as having been a very useful learning experience and a ‘conveyor of information’. Some 72 per cent rated it very highly (giving it a 1 ‘very satisfied’ or 2 ‘satisfied’ rating).
‘Knowledge café’

This activity was offered at the June regional workshops. It was an opportunity for participants to share and exchange practice, knowledge and ideas, and to learn from each other in order to reflect on current practice. Each participant ‘hosted’ a table on a different topic or theme, and the remaining workshop participants learned more about that topic. The timeslot for the activity was divided over two sessions, with half the tables ‘hosted’ in each timeslot. This allowed those that were hosting in the first session to hear about the work of the ‘hosts’ in the second session. Participants included providers who had worked on the action working projects, local and regional voluntary and community organisations and groups of disabled young people talking about their experiences and involvement in their organisations.

Some providers in certain regions commented that the café session had been useful but rather rushed, and that there had been ‘too little time and too many tables’. However, overall the evaluations suggest that the knowledge café format is a highly effective means of sharing information quickly and efficiently.

The ability to use the knowledge café to ask questions and discuss with others was a real strength.

A very good way of giving delegates a lot of information in a short time.

Provider telephone interviews
Figure 2: June 2007 workshops – overall assessment by region
Telephone interviews with providers

101 Responses from telephone interviews measured levels of satisfaction against respondents’ expectations of the programme. These were in turn divided into three categories: information, reassurance and know-how.

102 The majority of participants were satisfied that their expectations had been met by their involvement in the workshops. Participants gave positive comments, describing workshops as both practical and supportive in bringing about significant change in their practice.

103 A minority of participants felt overall that the workshops had not been as useful as they would have liked. The most common reason given was their inability to learn enough as a consequence of having been mismatched with providers at a different stage of the disability equality journey. Providers also commented that some of the presentations had not been especially useful to them, as they had offered information they already had.

104 In addition, a recurring theme mentioned by providers was the need for templates or examples of ‘good’ schemes to support individual organisations. Many used the term ‘exemplar’ to refer to this.

The main thing I would have liked was some exemplar on a disability equality scheme that I could adapt for our own needs.

I think some of us were looking for a pro forma, which they were not going to give us.

Provider telephone interviews

105 As well as giving feedback in relation to expectations met, respondents also commented on aspects of the workshops that they considered had been useful and that hence contributed to their sense of satisfaction. Areas mentioned were: networking; the content of workshops, in particular such issues as hidden disabilities, mental health and how to involve disabled learners; interaction with facilitators; the knowledge café; and an organisation checklist to match against standards.

106 Users of the VLE expressed a general dissatisfaction over the accessibility and navigability of the tool. Use of the resource was quite limited, with only 35 per
cent of respondents having used it. Of those who commented that they had never used it, a quarter had never even heard of it.

107 Participants identified materials and resources as being ‘useful’ if they provided information on what to include in the scheme. Suggestions on further resources that would have been useful included a description of how to get on the website (VLE), how to carry out an impact assessment and how to approach an annual report.

108 One of the activities that providers spoke of as being very useful was the ‘eBay wants and offers’ activity (see box below). This activity enabled people to share practice and to network with one another, and in many cases the result was that providers in the region built and strengthened existing relationships, as well as sharing expertise on specific issues relating to disability equality. For example, one provider in the South West region followed up the contact after the workshop by providing specific staff training for another college locally.

‘eBay wants and offers’
This activity was offered at the March regional workshops to enable participants to share and exchange their ideas and practice in implementing disability equality. Participants completed two forms: one for ‘wants’ and one for ‘offers’. The ‘wants’ form was an opportunity to state the type of support or information they would like in order to make progress in their organisation. On the ‘offers’ form, they wrote the types of support they were able to offer other providers in the region. These forms were displayed over the lunch break, so that participants could read and follow up. They were also displayed on the programme VLE (with the consent of participants), which was a further opportunity to share good practice and link providers in the region.

109 One weakness that providers identified was the fact that individual organisations were at different stages on the journey to developing and implementing their DES. This point was mainly raised by ACL providers and by those providers who felt that they were much further along the journey to
disability equality than others participating in the programme. ACL providers, because they came under the broader umbrella of their local authority DES, felt that working with providers who had their own dedicated schemes was not really beneficial to them. Those further down the road felt that they had been able to learn very little from those providers who had made little progress, and hence the opportunity for further input and learning had been lost. It did not actually meet expectations as a lot of the delegates had not actually started their scheme.

Provider interview

Although questions on satisfaction were not specific in the equality and diversity managers’ questionnaires, overall the feedback did suggest that they were satisfied with the events, and particularly the range of activities, the discussion between participants and the acquisition of new knowledge (for example, a better understanding of the DED and its implementation). One respondent commented on the high quality of the trainer, and on the format and content of seminars. However, another manager commented that the examples given of best practice had come from outside their region, and that low attendance at the March workshop, coupled with a ‘stand-in’ speaker, had detracted from the satisfaction felt.

Providers attending the workshops commented that they were pleased to have had opportunities to hear about the work of those involved in the action working activity, particularly the ‘mystery shopper’ project (see box below), which involved a group of disabled learners at the workshop. The interviewees said that they had found it a powerful message, which showed that these learners were ‘at the heart of decision-making’ in their college.

Respondents were also satisfied with aspects of the programme that addressed disability equality law. The knowledge café was seen as being useful, although some ACL providers said that some of the café tables had not been relevant to them.
Feedback from the providers who were part of the action working projects was predominantly very positive. They expressed satisfaction with the support they had received from the project leaders, as well as with the outcomes they were able to produce as a result.

My project leader made it happen.

[She] was willing to engage and realistic.

The role of project leaders was crucial in supporting the providers, and it was essential that those taking on this role were fully competent and had expertise in supporting action working activity, as well as in disability equality.

The opportunity to network and share ideas and experiences was mentioned as being really important to the programme, and the majority of participants talked about the importance of this at the workshops. This came across in the interviews and the feedback from the workshops.

Those involved in the projects found the project regional network meetings very useful, bringing together as they did participating providers in the region, and providers appreciated these as a means of support and reassurance. They also supplied opportunities to consider and reflect on the distance travelled and provided an impetus to continue with their progress.

Today gave a really good framework for the next six months and has helped enormously in taking forward [the DED] … it is so easy to just stop at writing the DES, and today has given me a fresh impetus.

In summary, the evidence showed that, while the majority of providers were satisfied with the delivery and content of the programme, there were comments that will help with future support programmes by ensuring that the needs of providers are better met.
Providers talked about the usefulness of the programme in supporting them in implementing their DES. The following are some suggestions they made that could help with the recommendations for future support activities in the sector.

- They suggested that a **review event** would be useful as a follow-up activity to the programme, to share achievements and reflect on progress made. They also said that they would welcome the creation of **local peer support networks** following the programme, to build on and share experience.

- **Matching the needs of all providers** was identified as a weakness by some providers, particularly ACL providers, who considered that the shape and some of the content of the workshops favoured the needs of FE college providers over those of ACL providers. Other comments suggested the provision of workshops on other equality duties, and reflected a desire to see increased learner involvement and increased employer involvement in the single equality scheme programme, to build on WBL provider involvement.

- Some providers wanted more **support for specific aspects of implementing their schemes** – for example, in developing impact assessments and equality audits. They also identified that they would like support on how they might incorporate disability action plans into other equality and diversity plans, as well as on risk assessment and disclosure.

- Comments on the need to **improve the VLE** were made by some delegates. They also identified the need for more specific training to ensure the best use of the site as an interactive tool.

- The need was identified for **LSC regional staff**, particularly partnership teams, to have their own briefings, in parallel with providers, so that they can build up their knowledge and support providers more effectively. This need has been addressed within the new national programme to implement the LSC’s SES.

**Impact**

This section of the report discusses the impact the programme had on the sector, on providers’ practice, and on the delivery of provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. It explores these aspects through the
findings from the following data sources: the interim report, the quantitative survey, interview data from provider telephone interviews, and secondary data, including action working reports. Further details on data can be found in Annex C and are referenced throughout this section.

The difference the support programme made

The interim report

120 Early indications of the success and impact of the LSC DED support programme were already evident in the interim report produced by the LSN in September 2007. These indications were drawn from comments and evaluations made by providers at the project activity network meetings, the regional workshops and on the VLE.

121 The findings in the interim report suggested that the programme was effective in continuing to raise awareness among providers and in maintaining the momentum on disability equality in the FE sector. As one workshop attendee stated, the programme helped in ‘rolling out and embedding DED – providing practical advice in a simple, clear way’. The programme also increased the sector’s capacity to network, to build relationships and to share good practice and information, as well as to build relationships with regional LSC staff and other regional and local organisations.

Quantitative survey of providers

122 Following on from the findings of the interim report, the quantitative survey shows that 45 per cent of providers who completed the DED support programme survey graded the support programme as helping significantly in the implementation of their organisation’s DES. Some 43 per cent said that it had helped slightly, and 13 per cent stated that it had not helped (see Figure 3 below).
Among those who said that there had been change as a result of the programme, further responses were given in terms of the impact on four main areas: policies, practices, procedures and plans. Responses between ‘significant’ and ‘slight’ impact were relatively balanced, with a small tendency towards ‘slight’ impact. For example, for policies, 46 per cent recorded a significant impact, with 35 per cent rating it a slight impact. This can be compared to practices, which recorded a 33 per cent significant impact, as opposed to 57 per cent slight impact – a balance that is more reflective of the other categories (see Appendix 1 to Annex C).

The survey also provides data for the impact on practice, the institution, disabled staff, learners and users under the same headings – significant impact, small impact, no impact. Taking the mean rating (four options for this question: ‘helped significantly’; ‘helped slightly’; ‘did not help’ and ‘don’t know’) from these responses, it can be seen that the respondents noted that the greatest impact was on their own practice (a mean score of 2.45), with the least impact being recorded on disabled staff (a mean score of 1.93) (see
Appendix 2 to Annex C). This tallies with comments made by workshop participants about the need for much more work to support disabled staff in the workplace.

Telephone interviews with service providers

125 Respondents in the telephone interviews felt that the DED support programme had helped in implementing their DES overall, but some found it difficult to identify any specific activity or process that had been influenced by it. However, providers commented that it had helped them with accessibility issues in their organisations, and with issues relating to access to the curriculum, such as tutors making materials more accessible. They also said that participating in the programme had been very helpful in terms of improving their knowledge and awareness of the DED and providing them with reassurance that they were doing some things right.

It gave us the reassurance that a lot of the things we were doing were good practice, and also provided us with examples of how we can improve in other ways.

Partly had an impact through chance to talk to others and generate ideas; the case studies were also useful.

If I had not gone I would not have known where to start, where to put the emphasis, and how to start the process, made it seem simpler and doable and possible, came away feeling positive about it.

Provider interviews

126 In addition, responses seemed to indicate that significant impact was felt in terms of impact assessments, as many were now starting to work on these and had found the support from the programme useful.

127 Other areas where providers mentioned that the programme had helped were in terms of revising and making changes to their DES, revising some practices such as enrolment forms, revising lunchtime arrangements, relocating parking spaces, and creating an information pack for disabled learners. Providers also mentioned improving and making changes to staff training, including disability
evaluation training, and improving procedures to ensure the involvement of
disabled learners and staff.

128 Some providers felt that the programme had not yet had an impact because
they had been preoccupied with other things, but they felt well equipped to
make a difference after their engagement with the programme. A minority felt
that the support programme had not really had an impact for them.

129 Echoing the results from the quantitative survey, many who had already
completed the scheme before engaging with the programme felt that the
programme had had little impact on influencing practices. However,
respondents noted that they intended to draw on the information gathered
when reviewing their schemes.

130 Some were of the view that there had been no changes in their policies and
practices as a result of engaging with the programme, as they had already
planned a lot of the improvements.

   We would have done pretty much the same thing but felt better about it
   because of the regional support.

   Provider interview

131 For one or two providers, the impact of restructuring, organisational mergers
and staff shortages had impeded their progress and had prevented them from
making any changes since the programme.

Action working

132 Feedback from those participating in the action working activity confirmed
areas of impact revealed by other data sources, and also revealed new areas
of development. Providers talked about the importance and usefulness of
involving disabled learners in all aspects of their work, and about how crucial it
is to allow disabled learners to have a strong voice and a physical presence in
senior management meetings in their organisations. This resulted not only in
improved provision, by having learners involved in the decision-making
process, but also in increased confidence among the disabled learners
involved. Activities from the action working projects were used to facilitate
progress on other equality schemes – for example, the activity of the ‘mystery shopper’.

**The ‘mystery shopper’**

The aim of the ‘mystery shopper’ activity was to enable disabled learners to make an impact on college services and affect the processes, policy and organisation of individual institutions. This was achieved by having learners focus on a specific part of college life, in terms of how it responded to the needs of disabled learners.

In discussion with staff, different areas of institutional life were investigated. For example, in the case of one FE provider, a learner investigated how easy it was to enrol in the college gym as a visually impaired learner. The strengths and weaknesses of services were identified, and the findings were then fed back and addressed within individual college structures.

‘Mystery shopper’ projects became an important way of involving learners in the decision-making processes of their organisations.

133 A provider reported that their involvement in the project activity had resulted in an increased awareness of the DES within their organisation and had opened up communication pathways that had not previously been accessible.

134 Project participants commented that they appreciated being able to make progress from very different starting points, and this enabled them to make progress from their own current position. They found the project network meetings useful as opportunities to consider and reflect on the distance travelled and to provide impetus. Providers also commented on the value of meeting other providers, and of having them as ‘critical friends’.

135 One or two providers did struggle to complete their work, partly because of their own workload, but also because there were issues concerning the suitability of themes and matching them to their needs. Organisational restructuring also impacted on the successful completion of a small number of projects. Of the feedback collected from the action working participants, there
was only one respondent who felt so dissatisfied with the programme that they were unable to identify any impact on any area of work.

Equality and diversity managers

Equality and diversity managers were unable to comment on the evidence of impact at the time feedback was given. Comments that were made focused on impact in terms of the potential for future working relationships. For example, it was noted that a group of providers who met at the seminars were now planning to get together to explore how to work together more collaboratively. Another respondent highlighted three areas of impact: the need and usefulness of good debates, the sharing of good practice, and using the programme as a platform for the development of good practice. One respondent felt that impact was quite limited, as the programme had not succeeded in making a full range of providers aware of its existence.

Case study – action working: Involving disabled people in impact assessment (FE provider)
The college developed a project in keeping with its wider ethos of being fully inclusive without having discrete provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. The practitioner leading the project approached staff to see who would be interested in supporting learners in the project. Ten staff volunteered, followed by eight enthusiastic disabled learners.

Learners were encouraged to work with a member of staff they knew well to develop the ‘mystery shopper’ idea. As it was the time of year for the learner induction, learners decided to focus on different elements of this service to see how the needs of disabled learners were met. One example involved a deaf person asking a tutor about exam access arrangements.

The impact of the project was significant, as many lessons were learned and college practices challenged and changed. For example, as a result of the programme the college appreciates more the importance of beginning with the views of disabled learners. This helps the organisation change its procedures to benefit disabled learners.

It has been decided to sustain the ‘mystery shopper’ approach and to apply it to other areas of equality.
Secondary sources

137 Further evidence of the impact of the programme can be seen in information that was gathered through secondary source material. Examples are as follows:

- developing an approach to learning that incorporates the Disability Equality Duty – producing a pro forma and incorporating this process into the college’s equality management system;

- improving the questionnaires given to learners at the start of their programmes – taking feedback and piloting ready for September 2007;

- seeking to adapt questionnaires so that they are inclusive for learners with severe learning difficulties;

- seeking to demonstrate how initiatives related to DED form a part of the college’s quality system;

- aiming to produce concrete outputs and reports illustrating the learning processes, difficulties encountered and goals achieved.

138 Finally, attendees across regions emphasised the importance of workshop sessions for networking, the dissemination of knowledge and the sharing of knowledge, ideas and experience. This aspect of the programme can be considered to be an important element of impact, as it suggests a steady ‘trickle down’ of change and influence as partners continue to work together over time. Many identified this opportunity as being significant in providing new directions, inspiration and specific actions for informing the next steps either in the development or implementation of their organisation’s DES.

Feedback from a secondary source described impact of the programme in terms of the sharing of practice and training of staff. As a direct result of participation in the DED support programme the participant was able to work with another college on the implementation of their DES and action plan, which involved the training of 40 staff.

Provider, email communication, FE college
Would like to see other people on the journey – make a comparison – networking – it is a comfort to know there are others out there.

Provider interview, action working

139 Delegates felt strengthened in the task of working with the DED in their own institutions as a result of meeting LSC staff, receiving input and presentations from those already working in the FE sector, and building relationships with local voluntary organisations. It was felt that a better regional understanding of the implementation of the DED was gained and, as a result, a better understanding of how an individual’s work fitted into the bigger picture.

140 The wish to build upon relationships and contacts made was also expressed by participants, since they viewed this as important in supporting present work on the DED, as well as future requirements for single equality.

The journey to disability equality

141 This section considers the distance travelled on the journey to disability equality, drawing on the quantitative survey, the action working projects and the provider interviews.

Quantitative survey

The programme enabled the College to produce its DES and circulate it both inside and outside the institution, raising the profile of disability support and making reasonable adjustments and adaptations.

Participant in online survey, additional comment

142 Data from the DED aspect of the quantitative survey shows the majority of respondents (46.8 per cent) classifying themselves as ‘making good progress’ with implementation of their DES before embarking on the support programme. Some 17 per cent classified themselves as ‘just starting out’, and 2 per cent viewed themselves as being at an advanced stage of the journey (see Figure 4 below).
Figure 4: Status of organisations on the implementation of disability equality before the programme

Q3.9: As far as you are able to recall, where do you think your organisation was on the journey to disability equality before the programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just starting out</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a little progress but long way to go</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making good progress with implementation in some areas</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many successes in achieving disability equality</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143 Involvement on the programme had a significant impact on these responses, with 71 per cent of participants now classing themselves as ‘making good progress’ and 13 per cent identifying themselves as having ‘many successes’. However, 2 per cent continued to classify themselves as ‘just starting out’ (see Figure 5).

144 Arguably, the improvement in the figures could be the result of concrete change and progress, or it could be the result of participants repositioning themselves after having become aware of the experiences of other providers.
Telephone interviews
145 Telephone interviews with providers showed that the majority of participants viewed themselves as being between making good progress with implementation in some areas, and still continuing to make good progress. Only a few felt that engagement with the programme had moved them on significantly, and this applied particularly to those who felt they were ‘just starting out’. In this sense, the programme appears to have been more beneficial to starters than to those who were already advanced on the journey to disability equality.

146 One of the key issues raised was the incompatibility of providers – a result of the different stages they were at on the journey to disability equality. These comments were particularly evident in feedback given at workshop sessions. Some felt that they had been unable to benefit adequately from the sessions and to progress sufficiently along the road. To respond to this, they would have preferred it if workshops had been targeted according either to the category of the provider or according to how far they were on the journey to disability equality.
One provider stated that it was much further along the road than other providers, and as a result its overall rating of the course was not satisfactory. Reflecting this comment, it was noted in the March summary report for workshop sessions that ‘a major difficulty with doing a series of workshops such as this, is trying to manage and satisfy different needs when people are coming from different starting points with differing degrees of knowledge’.

A similar argument was presented by ACL providers, who, in relation to stages of the journey, felt that their needs differed from those of other providers, since they needed to feed into the local authority’s DES. It was felt by these providers that delivery of the workshops may have been more effective if the decision had been taken to divide providers not only into journey stages, but also according to types and needs.

There were only a small number of ACL providers, it would have been nice to share with other ACL providers, the experience of both is different, a college would have their own scheme but we work within the broader scheme of the local authority.

Provider in telephone interview, March

However, from comments and feedback from the June workshop, it was clear that participants felt steps had been taken to address the needs of providers coming from different starting points and with differing degrees of knowledge. This suggests that efforts were made by the programme team to address these different needs at the June workshops.

Action working providers

Feedback from the network meetings of action working providers offered positive comments on the contribution of the programme to giving reassurance to individual providers as they progressed along the road, and to giving them a sense of achievement. Participants commented on how the programme had helped them see how far they had travelled. They also realised how much ground they had covered between the meetings, which were held in February and May.
Very useful day – when you have so much on your plate and have now done the DES, there is a real danger that we put it to one side. This has sparked me to go and do this, and also sparked lots of ideas.

Project participant feedback, FE college

**Plans to move forward**

*Workshops*

151 Feedback from the workshops shows that the majority of participants felt that involvement in the DED support programme would be influential in moving their organisation forward on the journey to disability equality and in maintaining momentum. At both the March and the June workshops, the category ‘maintaining the momentum’ was included for satisfaction ratings. Some 74 per cent of March participants indicated that they were satisfied with the programme’s influence in moving them forward, by responding with a 1 or 2 (‘very satisfied’ and ‘satisfied’). Similar levels of satisfaction were recorded in June, with 82 per cent of participants responding with a 1 or 2 for the same category (see Appendices 3 and 4 to Annex C).

We feel confident that we will be able to point in a year to two or three at things that are obviously different.

Provider in telephone interview, March

*Quantitative survey*

152 Evaluation from the June workshops also illustrated an awareness among many providers of the different factors that could affect the successful impact of the programme on their plans to move forward with their DES. One respondent noted that impact on their progress was due to the existence of well-established internal processes in their organisation, as well as external contacts that they had acquired prior to the programme. This suggests that the impact of the programme, although potentially of significance, is highly dependent on the existing frameworks in individual establishments. Similarly, several ACL providers drew attention to the need for increased funding and staffing, as any impact on DES will depend on the institution’s ability to make adjustments and reorganise (see comments in next paragraph).
These comments, far from being negative, are valuable, since they provide information for programme developers to help them think about ways in which impact can be ensured in the context of varied environments, staffing and financial constraints.

It is very difficult for us to make the adjustments and improvements needed to our buildings and teaching resources as there is no funding available for ACL/PCDL [personal and community development learning]. We still have significant issues we are financially unable to resolve and cannot offer people (staff or learners) with disabilities access to some key facilities in some Centres and we are unable to fully use some of our estate because there is no access. This seems especially unreasonable in the context of the capital investment in FE Colleges.

Capacity – small ACL providers do not have any specialist staff; do not even have many full-time people working for them, except in management positions. So managers have to add to their existing roles. This makes trickle down to the rest of the organisation slow. The rest of the organisation is entirely part-time and dispersed, which means that despite hard work and much willingness, communication and awareness are also issues.

Quantitative survey – additional comments

**Telephone interviews**

The majority of telephone interviewees were enthusiastic about their plans for moving forward and about the influence the programme had had on shaping these. Providers discussed revising their schemes and action plans; some commented that this included changing plans to review their impact assessments in the coming year. One provider talked about raising staff awareness and ensuring active involvement to promote disability equality across the organisation. Several said they were now working on revising their schemes and action plans.

One local authority provider described how it had been inspired to develop its own action plan to dovetail with its policies on lifelong learning, rather than having disability on one desk in a shared office. The development of an action
plan had been key in cascading involvement throughout the organisation, and the provider now has a whole team of people working on the DED.

156 Other issues providers talked about, and other plans that were to be taken forward, included revising plans on timetabling for mobility-impaired learners, reviewing and revising student admission procedures, and meeting the needs of students with specific impairments; involving an advisory group in formulating their action plan for the coming 12 months; and gathering data and working with the local authority in the wider sense. One provider also said it was going to work on improving its policies and practices to ensure that disabled learners were not excluded from social and extra-curricular activities.

157 In summary, the programme was particularly effective in raising awareness and in building relationships. Providers talked about the value of networking and of building relationships with other providers, LSC regional staff and local and regional organisations. The interview data suggests that the programme had a great impact in providing reassurance and support, information about the DED, and opportunities for networking and sharing of good practice.

158 The survey data shows that the vast majority of respondents thought that the programme had helped them in some way to move forward. They also recorded that it had had an impact on their own practice. The area where it had been least effective was in supporting them to make improvements for disabled staff in their organisations. The survey data provides evidence to measure distance travelled by providers in terms of the road to disability equality. The data shows that, following participation in the programme, there was a significant decrease among those classifying themselves as ‘just starting out’ and a significant increase in those who now believed their organisation was ‘making good progress’. The improvement in the figures could be the result of concrete change and progress, or it could be the result of participants repositioning themselves after having become aware, through the programme, of the experiences of other providers – or it could be a combination of the two.
The telephone interviews appear to support the quantitative data, but suggest that those who benefited most were those with little or no experience, the ‘starting out’ category. These responses may have been from staff with little knowledge of implementing the legislation and who may also have been new to a post with responsibilities for the DES.

A few providers thought that the programme had not made a significant difference, as they considered that they were in any case well advanced with their schemes, though they still found the regional support provided by the workshops useful.

The majority of action working providers felt that they had benefited from completing their projects, and several providers considered that the work they had achieved had had a significant impact on changing organisational practices.

They thought that the process of action working, including attending the network meetings, had helped them to reflect on how far they had travelled and on how much progress they had made along the way.

What did emerge from the interviews, however, was the need for a more differentiated approach to address the requirements of providers who were at different stages on the journey to disability equality. In addition, in order to be effective, a support programme should aim to address the needs of different types of providers, as it was felt by participants that context is crucial to implementation of the legislation across the sector. The feedback from the interviews suggested that the June workshops did address these needs more effectively.

Providers had lots of comments and ideas about taking plans forward, although they did not necessarily attribute these ideas to the impact of the programme. Some providers said that they already had good frameworks in place and that the programme had supported rather than promoted these. This confirms that the impact of the programme, although potentially of significance, is of course highly dependent on the existing frameworks in individual establishments.
Also, some providers commented on issues that had an impact on their progress in implementing disability equality and in taking plans forward. These include funding and staffing difficulties. These comments are valuable, since they provide information for programme developers to help them think about ways in which impact can be ensured in the context of varied environments, staffing and financial constraints.

The involvement of disabled people – learners and staff

Telephone interviews

Participants were asked about how disabled people were involved in their region and about how useful they found this for their own practice. None were able to talk about involving disabled people in the region as a whole, and could only speak for their own practice. Some had a track record of involving disabled people and were proud of their achievements in this regard. A few were now starting to engage with disabled people. Some had started to involve disabled people since participating in the programme. Others had reworked their scheme involving disabled people, since they felt that they had not consulted disabled people sufficiently on the first scheme.

It was clear from the responses that involvement was at two levels: learner involvement and staff involvement. Many had a history of involving learners, and delegates said their participation in the programme had brought home to them the need to promote staff involvement. This was one of the main areas in which the support programme had made a difference – by highlighting a need.

In the interviews, providers discussed the various ways in which their organisation had involved disabled people. Some mentioned having set up specific working groups, including a staff disability forum, a disability advisory group with external representation, disability action working groups involving learners and staff, and an equality and diversity committee. Other providers talked about conducting telephone and individual interviews, carrying out surveys and organising focus groups among existing and past disabled staff and learners, potential learners and front-line staff.

Examples of good practice were highlighted in the feedback. One college reported having developed a toolkit for managers to help with staff who have
declared a disability. Many were engaging with the community and were linking up with external organisations. One college reported that it had commissioned a local disability group to produce an accessible easy-read version of the scheme.

170 All those who had involved disabled people found it very helpful to get the perspective of disabled people, since, as one provider said: ‘How can we provide and develop resources for people without engaging them?’ Some interviewees considered that their staff were more aware of the scheme than were learners.

171 Challenges surrounding the involvement of disabled people were also noted. One respondent referred to difficulties that can arise as a result of data protection, while another stated that it felt constricted because so many of its learners had communication difficulties.

Workshops

172 Participants in the March and June workshops commented on the highly successful involvement of disabled people during events. Particular mention was made of the ‘mystery shopper’ project – which involved disabled learners carrying out an ‘investigation’ into the physical suitability of their learning environment and how it responded to their needs, and then presenting the information to senior management – and of the group of learners who delivered a ‘powerful’ presentation at the North West event.

173 There were several comments about how the experience of being involved in the sharing and dissemination of information at the workshops was in itself a positive experience for the disabled people involved, including learners. Delegates spoke about how it had helped them to develop their skills and confidence and had made them more willing and able to be actively involved in the future. This DED project, and others involving disabled people, provided ideas for other providers to take back to their organisations. In addition, the workshops invited a wide range of voluntary and community organisations, and the presentations delivered by disabled people from them provided information and support on how to involve disabled people.
Groups of disabled learners from local organisations were also invited to come along and talk to providers. One group of disabled learners, who now support learning organisations to involve disabled people, gave a very powerful presentation in March to providers at the North West workshop. Comments from workshop attendees suggest that these presentations were rated as the most important and effective part of the day.

**Action working interviews**

Many of those involved in action working identified the increased involvement of both disabled learners and staff as one of their project aims.

Comments were made on how the programme had raised awareness of the need to include disabled staff and learners at all stages of planning and implementation. Examples were cited of the increased awareness among key staff in organisations, and of how the involvement of disabled learners in senior management meetings, for example, had given learners a ‘strong voice’ and a ‘physical presence’, as well as an increased sense of confidence. It was felt that such steps were important in making the move towards involving disabled learners at ‘the heart of the decision making’.

In terms of raising awareness, it was also stated that the programme had made different organisations aware of the potential complexities of engaging with disabled learners. In response to this, it was noted that the most relevant information for moving forward came from exchanges with individual disabled people, rather than from the larger-scale input.

Other respondents noted how, rather than making a general impact on the organisation, change had occurred in pockets. It was also noted that, in spite of increased awareness and the need to make changes, limitations, for example in funding, meant that this would be difficult in the immediate future.

Perhaps a key impact of the programme in terms of the involvement of disabled learners and staff was the increase in the disclosure rate experienced by many institutions as a result of their project. One provider mentioned the fear that had often surrounded disclosure, and, along with other providers, was pleased to see a move in the right direction, with both staff and learners happier to disclose disabilities. Examples were given of how these changes
came about, including: reviewing and redesigning questionnaires and forms, with input from disabled people; working closely with HR to identify dedicated members of the HR team to focus on encouraging support from line managers; and working with individual staff whose disabled status may have changed since they started work with the organisation.

180 Various organisations raised the issue of putting strategies in place to support people who chose to disclose, and how all staff now felt more confident about the issues.

181 In terms of the increased involvement of disabled people at the planning stage, mention was made of the use of disabled people in the action groups, as well as in helping to draft the scheme. Mention was also made of disabled people being consulted in the drafting of the impact assessment forms.

Quantitative survey
182 Respondents were asked to consider the programme in terms of its impact on a range of areas, including impact on disabled staff and learners. Based on the 52 questionnaires returned, 16 per cent considered that the programme had had a significantly positive impact on disabled staff, 61 per cent said the impact had been slightly positive, and 23 per cent responded that there had been no impact. Impact on disabled learners was seen as being more significant, with 43 per cent noting a significantly positive impact, 43 per cent seeing the impact as slightly positive, and 14 per cent claiming there had been no impact (see Figure 6).
However, respondents who specified ‘other’ did not identify how impact is measured or the nature of interventions and projects that have taken place. Impact could be the result of different things, including awareness raising, a change in attitudes, learning provision and increased involvement with policy and planning.
Key Themes

This section provides a summary of the evaluation of the Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme, which will enable the LSC to report on the success of the programme from the feedback given. It highlights key themes that arose as a result of feedback across data sources. By drawing themes together, we gain an overview of key concerns and successes of the events, which can then be discussed to support conclusions and recommendations.

Capacity building

One of the major strengths of the programme, as evidenced in all the data, was that it promoted capacity building in the sector. This was done in a variety of ways.

Networking

The importance of networking was continually referred to by participants as being one of the most useful and valuable aspects of the overall programme. Many emphasised how new contacts with other providers reassured them of the steps they had taken so far, by providing them with a benchmark of progress. They also commented on how they had moved from a position of feeling isolated to one where there was support and an exchange of ideas. Two of the workshop activities that providers said supported and encouraged this were the ‘eBay wants and offers’ and the ‘knowledge café’. The virtual learning environment (VLE) was designed with this support role in mind, but it had scored limited success due to the difficulties providers said they had in using the site.

Action working project network meetings were viewed as an important part of the overall networking experience, since they brought together participating providers in the various regions and were seen as being useful and valuable as a means of support and reassurance. They also provided opportunities to consider and reflect on progress, and, as one provider expressed it, provided an ‘impetus for focused reflections’. Participants also commented that the project network meetings had been useful in building relationships and hearing the perspectives of others. These last two points were seen by participants as being sustainable beyond the programme.
Participants’ positive views of the role and impact of networking were reflected in the data gathered from the quantitative survey, in which just over a third of respondents said that they had made use of networks and had followed up contacts. Indeed, the suggestion for the development of peer support networks as an integral part of future interventions shows the potential of networking as a key support in ensuring future partnerships and in the exchange of learning.

The above feedback demonstrates that the experience of networking needs to be viewed as a valuable part of the programme. Rather than being left to chance, it needs to be developed if it is to achieve its full potential. It would appear that its role in consolidating exchange, learning and future progress is key to ensuring the successful implementation of disability equality schemes (DES) and other equality schemes on both a regional and a national scale.

**Action working projects**

Action working was seen as a very useful tool in developing and building capacity in the sector. Providers commented on the value of being able to focus on and develop specific aspects of practice to promote disability equality in their organisations. The strengths of this way of working were identified as the support of experienced project leaders and the chance to work with other providers and LSC regional staff. Providers valued being able to work from very different starting points but with support, and they rated the network meetings highly. These meetings enabled participants to have ‘time out’ from their workplaces, to share their experiences with others, to have other providers as ‘critical friends’, and to meet their project leader. One of the criticisms providers had was that they would really have appreciated a further network meeting.

**Virtual learning environment**

As the programme’s interim report mentioned, training and the allocation of time for the VLE was important if its success is to be ensured. This comment possibly comes in recognition of the many factors that resulted in the site not being used as successfully as had been envisaged by its creators. Participants referred to a lack of training in the initial stages of the site’s launch, which resulted in a lack of confidence in its use. The ‘vastness’ of the site was also referred to, as was lack of time in a working day, and these combined to make
it hard to navigate the site effectively. There was a general feeling that the
difficulty in finding documents and an overload of information meant that
participants were likely to give up using it at an early stage. In support of these
remarks, feedback from the programme participant interviews showed that
about 65 per cent of respondents had not used the VLE (and of those, a
quarter had not even heard of it).

I did not find the VLE immediately easy to navigate…maybe a structure
diagram, divided up in projects would be useful.

Provider interview

Indeed, as was discussed earlier in this report, use of the VLE has been far
from consistent, and it could even be argued that the site has, in general, not
been used to its optimal level. However, problems with its use have not been
ignored, and programme developers are seeking to redress the balance
through increased promotion of the VLE and more training for the new national
LSC single equality scheme (SES) support programme.

In spite of improvements in use and increasingly positive feedback, the need
for training as future VLE programmes are set up cannot be underestimated if
this tool is to fulfil its potential as a space for exchange, learning and
networking.

Furthermore, in relation to networking and capacity building, it must be noted
that this aspect of the VLE’s role was remarked upon by a number of
participants who had had a positive experience of the site. It can be argued
that this must be taken into consideration in the promotion of future sites, as
the VLE fulfils a vital role.

From what has been said above, it may be concluded that the VLE and similar
sites are potentially a very useful tool in supporting the aims of a programme
such as the DED support programme. However, preparation for use of the site
needs to be carefully considered. Rather than seeing it as a vast un-navigable
space and a time-consuming tool, participants should view a resource of this
kind as a fundamental element in ensuring the promotion of good practice and
as a strong communicative link between providers.
Meeting the needs of the sector

As is the case with any programme that has to cater for a wide range of provider needs and situations, participants often commented on this programme’s failure to meet the needs of individual providers or types of provider. As a result, dissatisfaction was expressed over the composition of delegates and the way in which ‘mismatched’ delegates were obliged to work together.

Such reflections were made particularly by adult and community learning (ACL) providers and by providers who were further along the journey towards disability equality. In both cases, the comments are fully justified, as ACL providers, far from having their own DES, work within the broader scheme of the local authority. This sometimes led to ACL providers feeling that their needs were not being met, as they had to work with providers who had their own dedicated scheme. For those providers who were further along the journey, it was felt that the exchange of knowledge was unbalanced, as they had very little to learn and would have benefited from one-to-one consultancy from a visiting expert or greater exchange with those providers that were at the same stage as they were.

From the point of view of the design and promotion of the DED support programme, based on overall feedback from course participants it can be argued that the aims of the programme were achieved – that is, to support LSC-funded learning providers with a statutory duty to promote the DED. Arguably, within the broader aims, it is difficult to respond to individual provider requirements, and participants perhaps need to consider and appreciate this throughout their involvement in the programme.

The success of the action working activity showed that it is a tool that can be used effectively to address the varied experiences of participants. It does so by being able to acknowledge that people are at very different starting points, and it enables them to make progress from their current position.

Nevertheless, further efforts are required to maximise the participation of providers on future programmes.
Future interventions

Providers were asked what types of further support they would welcome to support them in implementing equality and diversity in their organisations.

Increased opportunities for immediate networking

Participants felt the opportunity for networking was the outstandingly valuable feature of the programme. Although this aspect of the programme received overall positive feedback, participants requested more opportunities immediately following the workshop events to engage with other providers and facilitators. This could be achieved by providing time for this as an integral part of the programme and by ensuring that facilitators have no other responsibilities at this time that would otherwise distract them (this was noted by one provider as a failing of his workshop).

Peer support networks

Closely related to this is the desire of participants to see the structures of networking made more effective through the use of organised peer support networks. Such groups could be developed to ensure that all providers who wish to benefit from the support of other providers and experts could be included in a systematic manner. This could maximise exchange and ensure the continuous development of partnerships.

The use of ambassadors

The request for continued input from experts or from those further along the road to equality is expressed in the thinking around the concept of ‘ambassadors’. Respondents felt that involvement in the workshops was not sufficient for them to acquire the depth of knowledge they required and to apply it effectively. It was suggested that there should be a system of ambassadors – experts in the field – and that interventions could be in the form of consultant-type support on a one-to-one basis. Further suggestions that dovetailed with this included setting up a kind of ‘helpline’ or online support to provide expert advice. This could be achieved through the VLE. The need for expert consultants was further emphasised in the data of the quantitative survey. Although these findings only represent 52 participants from the overall programme, when asked to comment on future support in
implementing equality and diversity in their organisations, some 21 per cent were in favour of consultancy/one-to-one support (see Figure 7 below).

**Figure 7: Further support needs as identified by provider to promote equality and diversity**

The briefing of LSC staff in parallel with providers

The observation by LSC staff, and particularly partnership team staff, that they needed to be briefed in parallel with providers reflects the need to ensure that LSC staff feel confident in the support that they are able to provide. One respondent expressed the hope that this would be addressed in the design of the SES support programme.

Increased employer involvement for the single equality scheme programme

Although work-based learning (WBL) providers are not required to produce a DES, they are still covered by the legal duties under the Disability Discrimination Act. Two WBL providers commented on the need to encourage more employer involvement in the current national SES programme. It was felt that there was a need for employers to better understand the legislation and the impact it may have on their own practice, particularly in terms of linking with WBL providers by providing work placements for disabled learners. It was thought that encouraging more employer involvement would improve provision
for disabled learners and create a much better understanding, and better
relationships, between providers and employers.

**Examples of what works best for whom and in what contexts**

207 In the workshops, context needs to be tailored to address the provider needs.

208 One of the themes that emerged from the workshop evaluations and the interviews was the need for clear and useful examples of what works best, related specifically to context. Context was identified as crucial to the needs of those responsible for delivering in the learning and skills sector. For example, what works best for a large FE college is not easily transferable or relevant to the requirements of a small ACL provider. Although the DED support programme did try to address this through activities that revolved around sharing practice and by inviting a range of providers to work on specific aspects of their action working projects, it is clear that future support mechanisms and interventions need to continue to build on this to address the needs of the different contexts and to ensure that they relate to one another.
Conclusions

209 The following are some of the conclusions that have been drawn from all the evidence collected to show the impact of the Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme on the sector.

Reach

210 The programme was successful in engaging with and reaching both its target audience – FE colleges and adult community learning (ACL) providers – and also a range of other providers in the sector. The figures for the workshops show that, as the programme went on, engagement with the sector improved, with greater numbers attending the June workshops than those in March.

211 There was success in reaching the target audience of senior managers and those with responsibility for implementing equality legislation – these two categories together made up the majority of attendees at both the March and the June workshops.

212 It is crucial to attract the people with the relevant job role and level of responsibilities in the organisation to ensure maximum impact and reach.

213 The most effective means of communication was through the use of flyers, but providers also learned about the programme from regional LSC staff and by accessing the Learning and Skills Network (LSN) website.

214 Analysis of the usage of the virtual learning environment (VLE) showed that, while participants did visit the VLE regularly, and while high numbers were recorded for viewing, the numbers posting materials and messages were far lower. This suggests that people did register to access information and resources, but were reluctant to take part in the interactive functions of the VLE, for example posting messages and taking part in discussions. This could be linked to the comments that providers made about the need to make the site more user friendly and the need for more training in how to use it to best effect.

Satisfaction

215 The majority of providers were satisfied with the delivery and content of the programme.
Providers talked about the usefulness and relevance of the programme in supporting them in implementing their disability equality scheme (DES).

Matching the needs of all providers was identified as a weakness by some providers, particularly ACL providers, who considered that the shape and some of the content of the workshops favoured the needs of FE college providers over those of ACL providers.

Some providers wanted more support on specific aspects of implementing their schemes – for example, in developing impact assessments and equality audits. They also identified that they would like support on how they might incorporate disability action plans into other equality and diversity plans, risk assessments and disclosure.

Comments on improving the VLE were made by some participants, who also identified the need for more specific training to ensure the best use of the site as an interactive tool.

**Impact**

The programme was very effective in raising awareness and in maintaining momentum on disability equality in the FE sector.

Providers commented on the value of networking and of building relationships with other providers, LSC regional staff and local and regional organisations.

The programme had a great impact in providing reassurance and support, information about the DED and opportunities for networking and sharing good practice.

The vast majority of survey respondents thought that the programme had helped them in some way to move forward. They also recorded that it had had an impact on their own practice. The area where they felt it had been least effective was in supporting them to make improvements for disabled staff in their organisations.

The survey data provides evidence to measure distance travelled by providers in terms of the journey to disability equality. The data shows that after the programme was delivered there was a significant decrease in numbers.
classifying themselves as ‘just starting out’, coupled with a significant increase in those who now rated their organisation as ‘making good progress’.

225 The telephone interviews support the quantitative data, but suggest that those who benefited most were those that had had little or no experience – the ‘starting out’ category. These responses may have been from staff with little knowledge of implementing the legislation, and who may also have been new to a post with responsibilities for the DES.

226 A few providers thought that the programme had not made a significant difference, as they considered that they were well advanced with their schemes. Nevertheless, they still found the regional support provided by the workshops useful.

227 The majority of action working providers felt that they had benefited from completing their projects, and several providers considered that the work they had achieved had had a significant impact on changing organisational practices.

228 They thought that the process of action working, including attending the network meetings, had helped them to reflect on how far they had travelled and how much progress they had made along the way. It was seen as a positive way of enabling providers to embed particular aspects of disability equality working and to work from different starting points.

229 Where there is engagement with disabled people, this not only benefits the providers by bringing home to them the real issues involved, but it also develops the confidence and capacity of the contributors, for example disabled learners.

230 There is a need for a more differentiated approach to addressing the needs of providers who are at different stages on the journey to disability equality. In addition, in order to achieve the best impact, a support programme should aim to address the needs of the different types of providers. It was felt that context was crucial in implementing the legislation most effectively across the sector. The interviews suggest that the June workshops did address these needs more effectively.
Providers had lots of comments and ideas about taking plans forward, although they did not necessarily attribute this to the impact of the programme. Some providers said that they already had good frameworks in place and that the programme had supported rather than promoted these. This confirms that the impact of the project on individual providers depends on the systems, funding and frameworks already established in the organisation.

Also, some providers commented on the limitations that hampered their progress in implementing and taking plans forward. These include funding and staffing difficulties. These comments are valuable, as they provide information that enables programme developers to think about ways in which impact can be ensured in the context of varied environments, staffing and financial constraints.
## Recommendations

Below are recommendations for future interventions that will improve the implementation of equality and diversity across the sector and the ways in which the LSC’s current single equality scheme (SES) programme stands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A review event would be useful as a follow-up activity to the programme, to share achievements and reflect on progress made</td>
<td>No review event has been organised. The new SES programme will provide some opportunities to share existing good practice and achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local peer support networks should be created after the programme, to build on and share experience</td>
<td>No specific plans to create local peer support networks (except in the South West through its own SES programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be workshops on other equality duties, and there is a need for increased learner involvement</td>
<td>The SES programme held three January briefing events. There is also to be a series of seminars, one per region, in June/July. Learner involvement is to be a theme at the above seminars, also through action working projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support needs to be tailored in order to match the needs of all providers in the sector – particularly ACL providers – and there should be some differentiation in terms of distance travelled and experience</td>
<td>The programme is designed to meet the needs of all providers through the implementation of the LSC’s SES, rather than specifically to meet the legal duties. Action working projects will enable a full range of providers to participate from their own starting points. This will enable them to consider distance travelled according to their experience. The VLE will provide a range of materials to meet providers’ different needs, and is a forum for providers to gain support/ask questions about their own specific practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More support is required for organisations on specific aspects of implementing their schemes – for example, in developing impact assessments and equality audits. There should also be support on how they might incorporate disability action plans into other equality and diversity plans</td>
<td>These issues will be covered across all the equality and diversity strands through action working and the subsequent materials that are to be produced. They should also be covered at the summer seminars, as well as in material and information disseminated via the VLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training is needed to support improvements for disabled staff in organisations</td>
<td>This aspect is not being covered specifically, but may be picked up via the projects and through the seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use should be made of action working projects as a means of building capacity and developing examples of good practice. Disabled people should be involved in all aspects of intervention and support</td>
<td>Action working projects are an integral part of the programme, and the outcomes of these will be shared at the summer seminars, via the VLE and through the production of materials. Involving disabled people across all the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to reinforce the reasons why promoting disability equality is important</td>
<td>equality strands is a theme that is being developed through the action working activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC regional staff, particularly partnership teams, should have their own briefings in parallel with providers, so that they can be confident in offering support to providers in their region</td>
<td>Briefings for LSC staff, tailored to the needs identified in each of the nine regions, will be designed and delivered in April/May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for increased employer involvement in the SES programme, to build on work-based learning provider involvement</td>
<td>We intend to engage work-based learning providers in the SES programme, and we would hope that the theme of increased employer involvement is one that will be developed through the action working activity. Assuming that action working projects address this theme, it may be a theme that is covered at the summer seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexes

Annex A: Methodology

Appendix 1: Interview schedule action working group provider

Introduce yourself (researcher)

Introduce project

You recently received an email inviting you to take part in the evaluation of the LSC Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme. The LSC has commissioned the Learning and Skills Network (LSN) to conduct this evaluation to assess the impact of the programme on practice in the sector. In doing so, it will help to identify its effectiveness and provide information on how the delivery of the programme may be improved.

As part of the evaluation, we are interviewing a range of people who have engaged with the programme across all types of providers and across all regions. The interviews will complement information gathered through the baseline survey for a new support programme we are carrying out for the LSC, in partnership with NIACE. The new support programme has been set up to support providers to deliver the LSC’s single equality scheme.

Ask them to be an interviewee

As a provider who was involved in the action working project activity in the (region), we would really appreciate you taking part in this evaluation. I would like to set up a time with you when we are able to conduct a telephone interview. In the interview, I would like to explore how the support programme may have helped you and your organisation in taking forward a particular aspect of disability equality, and also to consider what impact the programme has had on your practice. The interview should take up to 45 minutes.

If you have time, we could conduct the interview now, or alternatively I am happy to arrange a time that is convenient to you when I call back to do the interview. The interview will be completely confidential and your comments will be anonymised and not be attributed to you in any way.

Thank you very much for your help with this project.

About you/your organisation

(Note to researcher – you will not need to ask the person some of the questions below, as you will already have that information – the questions are there so you can write the info for your notes.)

1. What kind of provider (i.e. FE, WBL, ACL, sixth form, etc.)?
2. What region are you working in?
3. Please can you briefly describe your role and your responsibilities in relation to the disability equality scheme (DES) for your organisation?
4. How did you hear about the DED support programme?
Involvement in the action working project activity

5. Please can you tell me briefly about the action working project you were involved with/the topic area:

6. Did this project have an impact on your organisation – *(if yes, ask how, details etc.)*?

7. What were the outcomes? *Can you give an example/describe?*

8. Have you shared your outcomes with any other organisation/across your organisation? If so, *can you say more about how it worked?*

9. Is it something that is still progressing? *If not, are there any particular reasons/obstacles why?*

10. Did being involved in the programme enable you to implement/move forward with something that you might otherwise not have been able to do?

11. What were the benefits of being involved in the action working project?

12. What were the negatives?

13. What difference has it made for: a) you; b) your organisation; c) disabled people in your organisation?

14. If you were involved in this kind of project again do you have any suggestions for how it may be improved?

Workshops

15. Did you attend the workshops? (March & June) *If only one is there any particular reason why you only attended one and not both?*

16. What did you hope to get out of the workshops?

17. What did you get out of the workshops? *Was it what you expected?*

18. What didn't you get that you would have wanted?

19. What did you find most useful about the workshops? *(Suggestions: the networking with other providers, etc., availability of resources, sharing experiences with others; activities such as knowledge café, self-assessment audit tool, ‘ebay’ activity ‘wants & offers’, the inputs from disabled people, etc.)*

VLE (virtual learning environment)

20. Did you use the VLE? If no, any particular reason why not?

21. If yes, how useful and in what ways did you find it useful?

22. Briefly describe the ways you used it – *i.e. to leave comments, share ideas, access resources/information, find out about the programme and workshop details.*
Materials and resources

23. How useful were these to you/your organisation in informing and improving your practice?

24. Please can you say more about what you used and how it helped?

25. Was there anything further that the programme could have provided in the way of resources that you would have found helpful?

Involving disabled people in the programme

26. The LSC were very keen that disabled people were involved in the programme; please can you say how disabled people were involved in your region? This includes disabled learners and disabled staff. How did you find this useful for your own practice?

Impact of the programme

27. Do you consider that the DED support programme has helped in implementing your disability equality scheme in your organisation? If so, please describe briefly how it has helped and perhaps influenced some activity and/or process.

28. Have there been changes in your organisation as a result of participating in the programme? (i.e. in your policies, practices, procedures or plans?) Please can you say how? (give example(s))

29. If not, what would you have found useful that was not offered, please state ______________. Please can you say more about how, and why?

30. As far as you are able to recall, where do you think your organisation was on the journey to disability equality before the programme?
   - Just starting out.
   - Made a little progress but long way to go.
   - Making good progress with implementation in some areas.
   - Many successes in achieving disability equality and could help and advise others.

31. Which one of the following best describes where your organisation is on the journey to disability equality after engaging with the support programme?
   - Just starting out.
   - Made a little progress but long way to go.
   - Making good progress.
   - Many successes in achieving disability equality and could help and advise others.

32. Do you have plans to move forward with this work? Please can you say a little about what they are?
33. What further support would you welcome? (What works best for you?)
(possible suggestions: further resources/materials, workshops, helpline/online support, consultancy/1-2-1 support, seminars, discussion forum).

34. Any other comments?

Thank you very much for taking part in this interview.
Appendix 2: Interview schedule for providers who were not action working sites

Introduce yourself (researcher)

Introduce project

You recently received an email inviting you to take part in the evaluation of the LSC Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme. The LSC has commissioned the Learning and Skills Network (LSN) to conduct this evaluation to assess the impact of the programme on practice in the sector. In doing so, it will help to identify its effectiveness and provide information on how the delivery of the programme may be improved.

As part of the evaluation, we are interviewing a range of people who have engaged with the programme across all types of providers and across all regions. The interviews will complement information gathered through the baseline survey for a new support programme we are carrying out for the LSC, in partnership with NIACE. The new support programme has been set up to support providers to deliver the LSC’s single equality scheme.

Ask them to be an interviewee

As a provider who engaged with the DED support programme in the (region), we would really appreciate you taking part in this evaluation. I would like to set up a time with you when we are able to conduct a telephone interview. In the interview, I would like to explore how the support programme may have helped you and your organisation in implementing disability equality, and also to consider the impact of the programme on your practice. The interview should take up to 30 minutes.

If you have time, we could conduct the interview now, or alternatively I am happy to arrange a time that is convenient to you when I call back to do the interview. The interview will be completely confidential and your comments will be anonymised and will not be attributed to you in any way.

Thank you very much for your help with this project.

About you/your organisation

(Note to researcher – you will not need to ask the person some of the questions below, as you will already have that information – the questions are there so you can write the info for your notes.)

1. What kind of provider (i.e. FE, WBL, ACL, sixth form, etc.)?
2. What region are you working in?
3. Please can you briefly describe your role and your responsibilities in relation to the disability equality scheme (DES) for your organisation?
4. How did you hear about the DED support programme?
   LSN website; LSC staff; LSC website; word of mouth; flyer; other.
Workshops

5. Did you attend the workshops? (March & June) If only one, is there any particular reason why you only attended one and not both?

6. What did you hope to get out of the workshops?

7. What did you get out of the workshops? Was it what you expected?

8. What didn’t you get that you would have wanted?

9. What did you find most useful about the workshops? (Suggestions: the networking with other providers, etc., availability of resources, sharing experiences with others; activities such as knowledge café, self-assessment audit tool, ‘ebay’ activity ‘wants & offers’, the inputs from disabled people, etc.).

VLE (virtual learning environment)

10. Did you use the VLE? If no, any particular reason why not?

11. If yes, how useful and in what ways did you find it useful?

12. Briefly describe the ways you used it – i.e. to leave comments, share ideas, access resources/information, find out about the programme and workshop details.

Materials and resources

13. How useful were these to you/your organisation in informing and improving your practice?

14. Please can you say more about what you used/and how it helped?

15. Was there anything further that the programme could have provided in the way of resources that you would have found helpful?

Involving disabled people in the programme

16. The LSC were very keen that disabled people were involved in the programme; please can you say how disabled people were involved in your region? This includes disabled learners and disabled staff. How did you find this useful for your own practice?

Impact of the programme

17. Do you consider that the DED support programme has helped in implementing your disability equality scheme in your organisation? If so, please describe briefly how it has helped and perhaps influenced some activity and/or process.

18. Have there been changes in your organisation as a result of participating in the programme? (i.e. in your policies, practices, procedures or plans?) Please can you say how? (give example(s))

19. If not, what would you have found useful that was not offered, please state _______________. Please can you say more about how, and why?
20. As far as you are able to recall, where do you think your organisation was on the journey to disability equality before the programme?
   
   - Just starting out.
   - Made a little progress but long way to go.
   - Making good progress with implementation in some areas.
   - Many successes in achieving disability equality and could help and advise others.

21. Which one of the following best describes where your organisation is on the journey to disability equality after engaging with the support programme?

   - Just starting out.
   - Made a little progress but long way to go.
   - Making good progress.
   - Many successes in achieving disability equality and could help and advise others.

22. Do you have plans to move forward with this work? Please can you say a little about what they are?

23. What further support would you welcome? (What works best for you?) (possible suggestions: further resources/materials, workshops, helpline/online support, consultancy/1-2-1 support, seminars, discussion forum).

24. Any other comments?

Thank you very much for taking part in this interview.
Appendix 3: Email invitation for interview

Dear Colleague,

Evaluation of the LSC Disability Equality Duty support programme

We would like to invite you to take part in the evaluation of the Learning and Skills Council’s Disability Equality Duty support programme. The LSC has commissioned LSN to conduct this evaluation to assess the impact of the programme on practice in the sector. In doing so, it will help to identify its effectiveness and provide information on how the delivery of the programme may be improved.

We would like to seek your agreement and set up a time when we are able to conduct a short telephone interview. It is not anticipated that the interview will take longer than approximately 20–30 minutes. The interviews will complement information gathered through the baseline survey for a new support programme we, in partnership with NIACE, are carrying out for the LSC. The new support programme is to support providers to deliver the LSC’s single equality scheme.

From 5 November, we will be contacting you by phone to seek your agreement and to arrange a convenient time to conduct the interview. If you would prefer, you can always reply to this email with some suggested dates/times and we will do our best to fit in with your schedule.

If you have any queries about the project, please don’t hesitate to contact either myself or the research team via Al Lockhart Smith, asmith@LSNeducation.org.uk

Thank you very much for your help with this project.

Kind Regards,
Appendix 4: Permission form for interviews

Evaluation of Learning and Skills Council’s Disability Equality Duty support programme

Permission form

The LSC has commissioned LSN to conduct an evaluation of the Disability Equality Duty support programme to assess the impact of the programme on practice in the sector. In doing so, it will help to identify its effectiveness and provide information on how the delivery of the programme may be improved.

As part of the evaluation, we are interviewing a range of people who have engaged with the programme across all types of providers and across all regions. The interviews will complement information gathered through the baseline survey for a new support programme we are carrying out for the LSC, in partnership with NIACE. The new support programme has been set up to support providers to deliver the LSC’s single equality scheme.

As a provider who engaged with the DED support programme, we would really appreciate you taking part in this evaluation. If you agree to participate, you will take part in an interview with a researcher. The researcher will ask about your views and experiences. The researcher will take notes during the interview to help to analyse what you have said. The information you give will only be used for the purposes of the research project described above.

Confidentiality

Everything you say in the interview will be strictly confidential. You will remain anonymous, which means your name and personal details will not appear on any records, information, reports or publications that result from this research.

Any questions?

Please ask any questions you may have about this study before you return this consent form.

Consent

I agree to participate in an interview, which is part of an evaluation of the LSC’s Disability Equality Duty support programme being conducted by LSN. I have read and understood the information about the evaluation, as given on this form. I agree to the way in which my contribution will be used for the purposes stated above.

Name:

Date:

Questions or concerns about the research can be addressed to: Liz Walker, lwalker@lsneducation.org.uk at the Learning and Skills Network.

Thank you very much for your assistance with this important work.
Appendix 5: LSC equality and diversity managers’ questionnaire

Evaluation of Learning and Skills Council’s Disability Equality Duty support programme for providers in the learning and skills sector

LSC Equality & Diversity managers’ meeting

LSC National Office, Coventry

Thursday 8 November 2007

Feedback from the questions below will contribute to the evaluation of the LSC’s Disability Equality Duty support programme led by LSN. The answers will also assist NIACE and LSN in the delivery of the LSC’s single equality scheme support programme.

1. How were you engaged with the programme?

2. What do you think you gained as a result?

3. What worked well in the programme?

4. Were there things about the programme that you consider could have been improved on?

5. What are your perceptions of the impact the programme had in your region?

6. Do you have any evidence/feedback/feedback of impact on providers in the sector in your region?

7. What would you like to see in terms of the delivery of the support programme for the single equality scheme?

8. Are there any other issues or comments that you would like to add?
Appendix 6: Quantitative survey single equality scheme

The survey is for all providers in the learning and skills sector. It is structured under 3 key sections:

Section 1: About you

Section 2: Implementing a single equality approach

Section 3: Evaluation of the LSC Disability Equality Duty support programme

The survey should not take more than 10 minutes to complete. All your answers will be treated in strict confidence by the research team and will not be attributed to you in any way.

The closing date to submit responses is Monday 3rd December.

For further information regarding this questionnaire, please contact Mary Subramanian (Researcher, Research and Evaluation Unit, 020 7492 5185, MSubramanian@lsneducation.org.uk).

Thank you for participating in this survey, it is much appreciated.

Regards,

Dr Liz Walker

Acting Head of Research
Learning & Skills Network
020 7492 5184
lwalker@lsneducation.org.uk
Section 1: About you

Q1.1 Please indicate which type of organisation you work for:
   (please select one)
   - Further education (FE) college
   - Sixth form college
   - Independent specialist college
   - Work-based learning (WBL) provider
   - Adult and community learning (ACL) provider
   - Other, please specify

Q1.2 Which one of the following best describes your main job role?
   (please select one)
   - Administrator
   - Learning support
   - Tutor/lecturer/trainer/assessor
   - Middle manager
   - Senior manager
   - Principal/chief executive
   - Other, please specify

Q1.3 As part of your job role, do you have a specialist responsibility in equality and diversity?
   - Yes
   - No

Q1.4 Please indicate which of the following LSC regions you are in:
   (please select one)
   - North East
   - North West
   - Yorkshire & Humberside
   - East Midlands
   - West Midlands
   - South East
   - South West
   - Eastern
   - London

Q1.5 What is the size of your organisation/institution in terms of employee numbers?
   (please select one)
   - Less than 50 employees
   - 51–100 employees
   - 101–250 employees
   - More than 250 employees
## Section 2: Implementing a single equality approach

### Q2.1a Does your organisation have a single equality scheme?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don’t know

### Q2.1b If yes, do you have separate sections for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2.2 Does your organisation have a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability equality scheme</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality scheme</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race equality policy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q2.3a Has your organisation set equality targets in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.3b If you have indicated that your organisation has set equality targets for any of the above, please provide a brief description of what they are in the space provided.

Age
Disability
Gender
Transgender
Race
Religion
Sexual

Q2.4 Has your organisation carried out 'health checks' on your equality schemes?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know

Q2.5 How effective do you think your organisation is in...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Powerful effective</th>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carrying out equality impact assessments
Involving people from diverse backgrounds in developing, implementing and monitoring your scheme(s)
Engaging the whole workforce in implementing equality
Collecting and using data effectively in relation to equality
Accessing specialist support as required
Embedding equality & diversity in self assessment and development planning

Q2.6 Which one of the following best describes where your organisation is in implementing a single equality approach?

☐ Just starting out
☐ Made a little progress but a long way to go
☐ Making good progress
☐ Many successes in achieving equality and could help and advise others
Section 3: The LSC Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme

The LSC Disability Equality Duty (DED) support programme was commissioned to support providers to meet the requirements of the DED and to implement their disability equality schemes. The programme ran from November 2006 to September 2007.

Q3.0a Did your organisation participate in this programme?
   ☐ Yes (please continue to the following section)
   ☐ No (the survey is now complete, thank you for your participation)

If ‘Yes’, we would be grateful if you could complete the following section based on your organisation’s experience of the LSC Disability Equality Duty Support Programme in consultation with the appropriate colleague.

Q3.1 How did you hear about the DED Support Programme?
(Please select all that apply)
   ☐ LSN website
   ☐ LSC website
   ☐ LSC staff
   ☐ Colleagues
   ☐ Word of mouth
   ☐ Seminar/Information session
   ☐ Pamphlet/flyer
   ☐ Trade unions
   ☐ Other (please specify)__________________ ___________________________________

Q3.2 How did your organisation engage with the DED Support Programme?
(Please select all that apply)
   ☐ Participated in action working projects
   ☐ Attended workshops in March 07
   ☐ Attended workshops in June 07
   ☐ Used the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)
   ☐ Used materials & resources
   ☐ Networked and followed up contacts
   ☐ Other (please specify)__________________ ___________________________________
Q3.3 From your selection above, which did you find the most useful? Please use the space provided to specify your answer and the reasons why.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Q3.4 Is there anything else you would have liked to assist you from the DED Support Programme but was not available? If so, please describe below.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Q3.5 To what extent did the DED support programme help in implementing your Disability Equality Scheme in your organisation?

☐ Helped significantly
☐ Helped slightly
☐ Did not help
☐ Don’t know

Q3.6 Where there have been changes following participation in the DED support programme, to what extent has the support programme had an impact on the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significant impact</th>
<th>Small impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>N/A There have been no changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.7 Please describe any particular successes
Q3.8 In relation to promoting disability equality, what impact do you consider that the Disability Equality Duty support programme has had on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significantly positive</th>
<th>Slightly positive</th>
<th>No impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your colleagues’ practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled service users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.9 As far as you are able to recall, where do you think your organisation was on the journey to disability equality before the programme?

- Just starting out
- Made a little progress but long way to go
- Making good progress with implementation in some areas
- Many successes in achieving disability equality and could help and advise others

Q3.10 Which one of the following best describes where your organisation is on the journey to disability equality after engaging with the support programme:

- Just starting out
- Made a little progress but long way to go
- Making good progress
- Many successes in achieving disability equality and could help and advise others

Please add any comments about the reason for your response to this question.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Q3.11 What further support do you need in promoting and implementing equality and diversity in your organisation?

- Resources/materials
- Workshops
- Helpline/online support
- Consultancy/1-2-1 support
- Seminars
- Discussion forum
- Training
- Other (please specify)

Q3.12 On the basis of your experience with the DED Support Programme, what advice would you give NIACE/LSN for planning and providing the SES Support Programme so that it offers a high quality service?

(Please use the space provided)

Thank you
Many thanks for taking the time to complete the questionnaire
Appendix 7: Email to accompany survey

Dear Colleague,

Following the recent delivery of the national support programme to help providers in implementing the Disability Equality Duty, the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) has commissioned NIACE and LSN to deliver a new support programme for the learning and skills sector. This programme is aimed at supporting providers to implement the LSC’s single equality scheme.

This survey is an important part of the programme to help establish the progress and distance travelled by providers in the learning and skills sector and to measure the impact of the support programme.

In addition to the survey, the LSC’s single equality scheme support programme will have action working projects on aspects of implementing single equality. If you are interested in participating in a project, please contact Al Lockhart Smith, asmith@lsneducation.org.uk. There will be further information at briefing events in January 2008.

This survey is for all providers in the learning and skills sector. It is structured under 3 key sections. The third section is part of the evaluation of the LSC Disability Equality Duty support programme, which ran from November 2006 to September 2007. We would appreciate one questionnaire to be submitted per provider and therefore recommend that the survey is completed in consultation with the appropriate expert colleagues in single equality and disability equality.

The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. All your answers will be treated in strict confidence and will not be attributed to you in any way. The closing date to submit responses is Monday, 3 December.

This survey is designed to be completed online; however, paper versions can be forwarded on request by contacting Al Lockhart Smith on the details provided above. For further information regarding this questionnaire, please contact Mary Subramanian (Researcher, Research and Evaluation Unit, 020 7492 5185, MSubramanian@lsneducation.org.uk).

We hope that you find it useful to reflect on the progress of your organisation in relation to implementing a single equality approach.

Thank you for participating in this survey, it is much appreciated.

Regards,

Dr Liz Walker
Acting Head of Research
Learning & Skills Network
020 7492 5184 lwalker@lsneducation.org.uk
Appendix 8: Workshop evaluation form

Name:

Name of your organisation:

London regional workshop – Thursday, 14 June 2007

Location – Avonmouth House, 6 Avonmouth Street, London

Host of event – LSN

How satisfied were you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Very satisfied</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the organisation of the event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the venue and facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the relevance of topic areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the appropriateness of the meeting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the presentations and activities were stimulating?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the pace of the event was challenging and sustained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the learning strategies used were productive?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the learning materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That your access/dietary requirements were met?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you were not satisfied with any aspect, please indicate the reason:

What is your overall assessment of today’s conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very good</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Please rate each session – what is your overall assessment of:

single equality and disability equality: implications and issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very good</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Leading change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very good</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
### DRC guidance for post-16 education providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 Very Good</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**

### Knowledge café – overall rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 Very Good</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Which sessions did you find most interesting and/or useful? Why?**

**Which sessions did you find least interesting and/or useful? Why?**

### Moving forward: maintaining the momentum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 Very Good</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**
What were the main strengths of the event?

What were the main weaknesses of the event?

To help us gauge how well disability equality is being promoted, what stage have you reached:
Our disability equality scheme is (tick appropriate box):

- just starting out
- scheme is published but little progress so far on our action plan
- underway with implementation in some areas
- good progress – we could help and advise others

What further support do you need?

Thank you for completing this evaluation form. Please hand this form in to the reception desk on departure.
Annex B: Satisfaction

Appendix 1: Satisfaction levels – March workshops
Appendix 2: Overall assessment, by region, for the March workshops

Appendix 3: Overall assessment – June workshops
Note: this figure excludes 'not applicable' responses.
Appendix 4: Satisfaction levels – June workshops

Note: this figure excludes ‘not applicable’ responses.
Annex C: Impact

Appendix 1: Impact of participation in the programme on policies, practices, procedures and plans

Q3.6: Where there have been changes following participation in the DED support programme, to what extent has the support programme had an impact on the following?

- Significant impact
- Small impact
- No impact

[Bar chart showing the impact of participation on policies, practices, procedures, and plans]
Appendix 2: Impact of the programme across the organisation

Q3.8: In relation to promoting disability equality, what impact do you consider that the Disability Equality Duty support programme has had on the following?

(Mean rating: 3 = Significantly positive, 2 = Slightly positive, 1 = No impact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your practice</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your colleagues’ practice</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your institution</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled staff</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled learners</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled service users</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Overall assessment of workshop agenda items – March 2007
Appendix 4: Overall assessment of workshop agenda items – June 2007

- Single equality and disability equality: implications and issues
- Leading change
- Disability Rights Commission guidance for post-16 education providers
- Knowledge café
- Maintaining the momentum

Per cent

1 Very satisfied
2
3
4
5 Very dissatisfied
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