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1 Introduction to Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners

What are Value Added (VA) and Distance Travelled (DT) measures?

1.1 VA and DT for 16–19 learners aim to show the progress of individual learners relative to the average progress made by similar learners nationally for the same qualification and subject, taking prior attainment into account. Here, ‘prior attainment’ refers to the qualifications attained by a learner up to the end of Key Stage 4. Statistical analysis has shown that prior attainment is the best predictor of future performance in post-16 qualifications for learners in this age group. A calculation based on prior attainment that compares learner performance for a given subject and qualification helps us to:

- predict learner attainment and, on the basis of the expected attainment, establish target grades (or pass rates) to which learners and providers may aspire

- make judgements about whether learners at a particular provider are performing at, below, or above a nationally average group of learners taking the same qualification and subject, and having the same prior attainment

1.2 VA and DT for 16–19 learners are designed to show the progress for learners on different types of qualifications. (The scope of each of the measures is described further in Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners). Although the two types of measures use somewhat different data and statistical methodologies, their calculation is based on a statistical technique known as multi-level modelling (MLM) that accounts for both learner and provider level effects. For further information about MLM, please see the annex, Multi-Level Modelling—An Introduction. Technical information about MLM is available on the LSC website’s Framework for Excellence technical pages: http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/.

1.3 The measures are intended for use by:

- providers, to help them assess and improve their performance based on information about learner progress at subject, qualification, and subject sector area levels

- Ofsted, to inform their initial ideas on the progress of learners, and to support judgements about provider performance

- the DCSF and other stakeholders, to help policy-making and performance monitoring.
The Learner Achievement Tracker

1.4
The LSC has developed the Learner Achievement Tracker (LAT) to enable providers to view their VA and DT reports for the purposes of reflection and improvement. The LAT went online in 2005, and has been used by providers and key stakeholders from across the sector since this time.

1.5
The LAT is a piece of software specifically designed to allow users to access and make use of the outputs from the calculation of VA and DT for 16–19 learners. The data from the calculations is produced as a variety of reports that show a provider's performance against national average performance. In the case of VA, the LAT also allows users to access information about individual learners' achievement. The main types of output reports are:

- summary reports, showing the average performance of the provider's cohort of learners in a subject, qualification or sector subject area, relative to national average performance, given the cohort's overall prior attainment

- national comparison reports, showing the average performance of a provider's cohort of learners in a subject, relative to national average performance, over a continuous range of prior attainment (VA only) or over a banded range of prior attainment (DT only);

- ad hoc national comparison reports (VA only)

- national chances charts, showing the chances of a learner with a given prior attainment achieving a particular outcome in a given qualification at a nationally average institution.

The above types of reports are detailed in Table 1.

1.6
Please note, the LAT is primarily designed to provide VA/DT information for each qualification subject in scope. Although some aggregation is possible, for example, by qualification type and by subject sector area, caution should be exercised when interpreting outputs at these levels. In particular, the LAT does not provide an institutional VA or DT score (that is, a single VA or DT score that covers all of the institution’s provision). In this respect, the VA and DT reports are intended to complement the Schools and Colleges contextual value added (CVA) institutional measure being piloted by the DCSF.

1.7
The LAT provides a powerful tool to assist providers, local LSCs and other stakeholders in making judgements that help answer the following questions:

- which providers are particularly effective in maximising the performance of their learners and trainees?
• is a given provider performing better (or worse) than the national average in the qualifications they offer, with respect to the prior attainment of their learners?

• are there courses/subject areas within a provider’s provision in which the provider is particularly strong or in which the provider is underperforming?

• are there areas of provision in which learners with particularly low or high prior attainment do especially well or badly?

• given their prior attainment, are learners being matched appropriately to programmes of learning?

• what levels of achievement can be expected from the current cohort of learners?

For graded qualifications, an additional question is answered:

• what are the appropriate target grades to set learners in a particular subject, given learners’ level of prior attainment?

1.8 The development of the LAT has been influenced by numerous consultations with providers from across the sector to ensure that the application and presentation of the VA and DT reports are appropriate for all intended audiences.

Using the LAT reports for quality improvement

1.9 Answering the questions posed in paragraph 1.7 helps stakeholders view a detailed picture of the strengths and weaknesses of provider performance, and which can be used to focus support on quality improvement. For instance, if the LAT shows that performance in a particular subject is lower than the national average, then stakeholders may wish to target provider resources and quality improvement planning at that subject. For a subject in which performance is particularly good, there may be opportunities to disseminate effective practice more widely across the provider. Similarly, there may be areas of provision where learners with particularly high or low prior attainment are not achieving as well as other learners within the provider, and some targeted support for individual learners may be appropriate to help them improve their achievements.

1.10 Users of the LAT will undoubtedly find other ways to use the LAT reports and data, and we have refined and extended the functionality of the LAT throughout the pilot phase. It is anticipated that outputs from the LAT reports will be also useful in:

• contributing to self-assessment reports

• setting out quality improvement strategies in development plans
• collating information about a provider’s performance to inform inspection or other quality assurance processes.

Table 1: The LAT reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary reports</th>
<th>Value Added (VA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For each provider, one report showing the VA scores for each qualification type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For each qualification type, one report showing the VA scores for each subject, as well as an overall qualification score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For all qualifications, one report showing VA scores for each Sector Subject Area (SSA).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance Travelled (DT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- For each provider, one report showing the DT scores for each qualification type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For each qualification type, one report showing the DT scores for each subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- For each qualification type, one report showing the different SSA scores within the qualification type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National comparison reports</th>
<th>VA and DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reports showing the performance of a provider's learners in a given qualification subject (for example, A-level History or NVQ Level 3 Hairdressing Services) compared to the national performance for that qualification subject, taking into account the prior attainment of the provider’s cohort of learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ad hoc national comparison reports allowing the user to select subsets of learners of each qualification aim and to produce national comparison reports for the selected learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chance charts</th>
<th>VA and DT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Charts showing the chances of learners with given prior attainments achieving a particular outcome in a given qualification at a nationally average institution (for example, the chances of a learner with a given prior attainment achieving grades A to E in A-level History or passing or failing a NVQ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.11

Within the following sections there is information about:

• the scope of the VA and DT for 16–19 learners
• the data used in VA and DT for 16–19 learners
• the interpretation and application of LAT reports
• further questions and issues.
2 Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners

What do we mean by ‘16–19 learners’?

2.1 For the purposes of the VA and DT measures, a cohort of learners is defined as those who completed their course between 1 September and 31 August in the previous academic year. For VA and DT–FE (Distance Travelled–Further Education), ‘16–19 learners’ are those learners who were aged 16, 17 or 18 on 31 August at the beginning of the year in which they completed a post-16 qualification. For DT–WBL (Distance Travelled–Work-based learning) ‘16–19 learners are those who were aged 16, 17, or 18 on 31 August at the beginning of the year in which they started a post-16 qualification.

Which post-16 qualifications are included in the scope of the VA and DT?

2.2 VA and DT cover the majority of larger qualifications approved under Section 96 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000, taken by 16–19 learners. These include vocational and non-graded qualifications. VA for 16–19 learners measures attainment in Level 3 graded qualifications. DT for 16–19 learners measures achievement and attainment in other approved qualifications at Levels 1, 2 and 3, including non-graded qualifications.

2.3 The DT measure is calculated separately for FE-funded provision and WBL-funded provision. Further information about the outcome measures for DT–FE and DT–WBL can be found in paragraph 2.20. At present, it is not possible to provide DT data for non-graded school qualifications, as schools do not make individualised learner record (ILR) returns to the LSC. The additional information in the ILR is needed to identify learners who complete but do not achieve a qualification. This issue is being taken forward in line with the development of qualification success rate for schools.

2.4 Currently (2006/07), the VA and DT reports include the qualifications listed in Table 2. Coverage of these qualifications results in approximately 90 per cent of 16–19 learners in the post-16 sector being included in the measures. Learners aged 16–19 on entry level qualifications, Entry to Employment (E2E) programmes or non-accredited provision are included in the scope of the Recognising and Recording Progression and Achievement (RARPA) extension project (REX).

2.5 The LSC has been exploring the feasibility of expanding the scope of qualifications included in the VA and DT measures, and will continue to do this on a yearly basis.
Table 2: Qualifications included in the LAT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Added</td>
<td>A-level / A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BTEC National Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BTEC National Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BTEC National Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CACHE Diploma in Child Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free Standing Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCE AS-level Double Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR National Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR National Diploma at Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational GCE AS Single Award (VCE AS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational GCE Double Award (VCE DA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational GCE Single Award (VCE A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Travelled (FE-funded provision)</td>
<td>CACHE Foundation Award in Caring for Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDEXCEL BTEC Introductory Certificates and Diplomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FE NVO Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FE NVQ Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FE NVQ Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNVQ Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNVQ Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICAA Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITEC Diploma for Beauty Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCR National Certificate in Health and Social Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short GCSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational GCSE Double Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Travelled (WBL-funded provision)</td>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL NVO Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL NVO Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QCA points

2.6 The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) has developed a system for assigning a point score to all Section 96 qualifications approved for 14–19 learners. This point score is used to measure achievement in all qualifications included within the VA 16–19 measure. The QCA point score is also used in the VA and DT for 16–19 learners’ measures to calculate prior attainment.

Inclusion of fails data in the VA measure: rebased QCA points

2.7 A standard QCA points score system would mean unequal gaps between the lowest achievement possible in a qualification and a fail (always zero points)—please see Figure 1. For this reason, the LAT uses a rebased QCA points system, approved by QCA, that allows fails to be included but which retains the scale and validity of the graded scores. For Level 3 qualifications, the rebasing procedure makes use of a scale equivalency (for example, an AS-level is equivalent to 0.5 of an A-level), and is identical to the rebasing methodology employed in the DCSF Schools and
Colleges contextual value added (CVA) measure pilot. Standard and rebased QCA point scores for some of the Level 3 qualifications included in the scope of VA are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Example of standard and rebased QCA points of outcomes in post-16 qualifications for the Value Added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-level / Vocational GCE Single Award</th>
<th>AS-level / Vocational GCE AS Single Award</th>
<th>Vocational GCE Double Award (VCE DA)</th>
<th>BTEC National Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>QCA Points</td>
<td>Rebased QCA Points</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8
As for VA, all DT qualifications have assigned QCA points. However, rebased QCA points are only used in the LAT calculation of DT scores for qualifications that have a graded outcome (that is, qualifications having other than pass/fail outcomes). In the case of GCSE and GNVQ qualifications, a scale equivalency between these qualifications is used in the calculation of prior attainment, see paragraph 2.18. In the case of NVQ, different point scores are assigned to different widths, so a range of typical scores is indicated. Table 4 shows original and rebased QCA points assigned to some of the most common post-16 qualifications in scope for the DT measure.

Banding of QCA points

2.9
For some LAT outputs, QCA points have been split into bands in order to present the VA and DT information. National chances charts use banded prior attainment to indicate the expected performance of a learner (VA only) or a group of learners (DT only), while the DT national comparison reports show the performance of groups of learners within particular bands of prior attainment.
Figure 1: Rebasing visualised
Table 4: Example of standard and rebased QCA points for outcomes in post-16 qualifications for Distance Travelled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GCSE</th>
<th>GNVQ Foundation</th>
<th>GNVQ Intermediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>QCA Points</td>
<td>Rebased QCA Points</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is included in the calculation of a learner’s prior attainment?

2.10 The starting point for both the VA and DT calculations is the average attainment of the learner at the start of the programme of study:

- for VA, the prior attainment is calculated as the average of the learner’s attainment at Level 2 and below (that is, Key Stage 4) up to two years before the learner’s outcome for 17 and 18 year olds, and up to one year before the learner’s outcome for 16 year olds; this is converted into QCA points, as described in paragraph 2.13

- for DT, the prior attainment for all ages is calculated as the learner’s average attainment at Level 2 and below, up to and including 15 year olds (that is, Key Stage 4); this is converted into QCA points, as described in paragraph 2.13.

For an explanation of how prior attainment is calculated, see paragraph 2.14.

2.11 For purposes of the LAT, prior attainment includes all Section 96 approved qualifications at Level 2 and below taken up to Key Stage 4. Table 5 shows the scope of qualifications included for learners at different ages.
Table 5: Scope of qualifications included in prior attainment for 16–19 learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of learner*</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Prior Attainment will include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Level 2 qualifications and below up age 15 (that is up to one year before)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Level 2 qualifications and below up to age 15 (that is up to two years before)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Level 2 qualifications and below up to age 16 (that is up to two years before)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Level 2 qualifications and below up to age 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Level 2 qualifications and below up to age 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Level 2 qualifications and below up to age 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Age at the beginning of academic year in which qualification completed.

2.12
By measuring prior attainment up to two years before a learner’s outcome attainment, 18 year old learners with any attainment at Level 2 and below at age 16—for example, GCSE re-sits—will have this taken into account. Examples can be found in paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15 (Examples 1 and 2).

How is prior attainment calculated?

2.13
Prior attainment is calculated by adding together the total QCA points attained for applicable qualifications and dividing the total by the size of the qualifications completed by the learner. Please note, the prior attainment points are not rebased. A worked example can be found in paragraph 2.16 (Example 3).

Prior attainment examples

Example 1

2.14
Learner A takes 10 GCSEs at 15 and progresses to complete a Level 3 at 17. The prior attainment will be the average of the total QCA point score, divided by a volume of 10 (that is, 10 GCSEs with a size of one).

Example 2

2.15
Learner B takes four GCSEs in the academic year in which the learner turns 16 and an intermediate GNVQ. As one GNVQ is equivalent to four GCSEs, the prior attainment is the total QCA points score divided by a volume of eight (that is, four GCSEs with a size of one and one GNVQ with a size of four).
Example 3

2.16
Learner C attains two Bs, three Cs and a U at GCSE, and an intermediate GNVQ.

- First, we add together the corresponding QCA points (Table 3, on page 10. The learner’s total point score is \((2 \times 46) + (3 \times 40) + (1 \times 0) + (1 \times 160) = 372\) QCA points).
- The total is then divided by the size of the qualifications attempted: \(372 \div 10\) (GCSE=1 and intermediate GNVQ=4) = average prior attainment value of 37.2 QCA points.

Example 4

2.17
Learner D attains six GSCEs at grade C at age 15 and a merit in an intermediate GNVQ at age 16, and then progresses to take an A-level at age 18. The prior attainment for this learner is calculated for all attainment up to and including 16 (that is, GCSE and GNVQ attainment).

- All six GCSEs are assigned 40 points
- An Intermediate GNVQ merit is assigned 184 points, and is the equivalent of four GCSEs
- Total prior attainment is divided by the total size of all qualifications attempted: \(((six\ GSCEs \times 40\ QCA\ points) + (184\ for\ the\ GNVQ)) \div (six\ GSCEs +\ the\ equivalent\ of\ four\ GSCEs) = 42.4\ QCA\ points.\)

2.18
GCSEs are given a size of 1 in the QCA points system. GNVQ Levels 1 and 2 (Foundation and Intermediate) are assigned a size of four. GNVQ scores are therefore treated as if they are the equivalent of four GCSEs. A worked example of this calculation can be seen in paragraph 2.17 (Example 4).

2.19
For convenience, there is a prior attainment calculator on the LAT site for quick and easy conversion of qualifications and grades into average QCA points. This can be used in conjunction with the chances charts to predict the possible grades that learners are likely to attain based on previous attainment at the same provider. For more information on the chances charts, see Section 6: Value Added and Distance Travelled National Chances Charts.

What is the outcome measure for DT?

2.20
Two outcome measures are used for DT:

- outcomes based on success rates
- outcomes based on achievement rates.

Table 6 outlines how these outcome measures are applied to WBL- and FE-funded provision.

Table 6: Outcome measures for WBL- and FE-funded provision within the scope of DT for 16–19 learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding stream</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBL-funded provision</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Success rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE-funded provision</td>
<td>All NVQs</td>
<td>Success rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE-funded provision</td>
<td>All qualifications except NVQs</td>
<td>Achievement rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Data for Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners

Data coverage and data release

3.1
The data used to calculate VA/DT scores cover all outcomes for learners achieving post-16 qualifications that were in-scope during the prior academic year. For information on scope, please see Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners. Unamended VA data is released during October/November, and amended VA scores in January. DT data is released in late January of each year.

Data source, preparation and calculation

3.2
Figure 2 shows the data flow for the calculation of VA and DT for 16–19 learners. The data used to calculate the VA measure is obtained directly from awarding bodies. Attainment data for post-16 qualifications is subsequently matched to attainment information on pre-16 qualifications, using forename, surname, date of birth and gender. There is an opportunity for providers to amend this data as part of the DCSF’s Achievement and Attainment Tables (AAT) checking exercise (see, also, paragraph 3.6).

3.3
The process for sourcing the data for the DT measure is the same as for the VA measure, with the addition of data collected from the ILR (individualised learner record). ILR data is needed to:

- identify those learners who completed but did not achieve a qualification included in the scope of the DT measure.
- obtain attainment data excluded from awarding bodies’ datasets due to the timing of the data collection (for example, data on full Frameworks and NVQs awarded up to 1 August is collected from the ILR).

3.4
Once the data has been matched, it is credibility checked. For some qualifications, graded attainment is provided by the awarding body, and the grades converted to QCA points. For non-graded qualifications falling within the scope of the DT measure the outcome is recorded as either a pass or fail. Further information on QCA points can be found in Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners. Discounting rules are applied to the dataset to identify whether an individual has already taken a qualification in the same subject, please see paragraphs 3.7 to 3.9.
3.5
The data is then fed into the in-house multi-level modelling (MLM) unit to calculate the “national lines” that give a picture of the average national performance. The national lines are in turn fed into the LAT unit, where provider VA and DT scores based on the national data set are calculated. The national data set is loaded into the LAT, together with the national line information. These inputs form the basis of the VA and DT data produced in the LAT outputs.

Figure 2: Data source and flow for the calculation of VA and DT for 16-19 learners.

Are providers able to check the accuracy of the data used to calculate VA and DT for 16-19 learners?

3.6
Unamended VA data is made available through the LAT for initial consideration and reflection. VA data is recalculated using the amended data, once it becomes available. DT data is based largely on what is available through the ILR, and is thus available for providers to amend as part of the usual ILR data collections process.

Discounting

3.7
Some qualifications are not counted in the calculation of the VA measure. These qualifications are said to be discounted. If a qualification (for example, AS-level) can form part of a larger and/or higher level qualification (for example, an A-level), and the learner takes both qualifications during the period of study, then the lower level qualification (the AS-level) is discounted. Discounting across the programme of study of a learner ensures that the individual learner (and hence the learner’s institution) are not penalised, or credited, for the same performance twice.
3.8 Discounting is also applied to National Awards and National Certificates (as these qualifications can then be counted towards a National Diploma) and to Applied A/AS-levels (if these are used as part of an Applied A/AS-level double award). Discounting cannot be applied across qualification types, even if these are taken in the same subject. For example, a National Diploma in Engineering would not discount an Applied A-level in Engineering.

3.9 The DCSF and the QCA develop and validate the rules as to which qualifications discount which other qualifications, and in which subjects.

Treatment of AS-level qualifications in the calculation of the VA scores

3.10 VA scores for AS-levels will be generated for all 16 to 19 learners cashing in AS-level results in the relevant academic year. Awarding bodies do not currently supply results for non-cashed AS-levels.

Subject groupings in the calculation of the national average performance

3.11 The calculation of the national average performance in VA and DT is undertaken for all subjects within a qualification taken by 80 or more learners, spread across five or more different providers. Any qualification taken by less than 80 learners and/or delivered at less than five providers nationally in a given year is deemed to be a small subject. Whilst the number of learners who take small subjects is low, small subjects account for a substantial proportion of the subjects taken in most qualifications, and are offered by a relatively large number of providers.

3.12 It is not possible to generate a reliable national average performance for small subjects. Therefore, VA and DT scores for small subjects are calculated on the national average performance for all of the aims in the Sector Subject Area (SSA) for that subject. For example, if the national sample of 16–19 learners completing Level 2 NVQ in Community Development in a given year was 20, a provider’s performance in that subject and qualification will be compared to the national performance in all subjects and qualifications in the subject sector area Health, Public Services and Care.

3.13 SSA is being developed as the common subject classification for the entire sector. Table 7 shows the 15 sector subject areas. Further information about SSAs, including identification of which SSA a given subject belongs to, can be found at: http://www.ndaq.org.uk

3.14 There will be cases where the number of aims in a given qualification within an SSA will be less than 80 or where they will be spread across less than five providers. In
these circumstances, the national average performance will be based on all of the aims taken in that qualification.

Table 7: Level 1 Sector Subject Area Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSA</th>
<th>SSA Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health, Public Services and Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Engineering and Manufacturing Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction, Planning and the Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Retail and Commercial Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Leisure, Travel and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arts, Media and Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>History, Philosophy and Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Languages, Literature and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Preparing for Life and Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Business, Administration and Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15
The VA or DT scores for small subjects will be included in the aggregate VA or DT scores provided to an institution. However, such scores will be weighted by the number of aims taken.

3.16
The following Sections 4-8 detail the types of VA and DT reports available in the LAT, and provide help in the technical interpretation of the reports.
4 Value Added Summary Reports

What does the VA summary report show?

4.1 The VA summary report gives an overview of a provider’s performance across a range of provision, given a cohort’s overall prior attainment, and based on national average performance. The report is available at three levels:

- for each provider, one report showing VA scores for each subject sector area (for example, all qualifications classified as belonging to Business Administration and Law)
- for each provider, one report showing the VA scores for each qualification type (for example, all A-levels)
- for each qualification type, one report showing the VA scores for each subject (for example, all A-level subjects taken by learners in the provider); this type of summary will also show the VA score for the qualification type (for example, A-levels).

Qualification VA score and 95 percent confidence interval

4.2 Figure 3 shows part of a VA summary report for a provider’s cohort in each subject at A-level (qualification subject report). For qualification subject reports only, the top right-hand side of the report shows the VA score of the provider’s learner cohort for the selected qualification. The VA score is the number of attained QCA points above or below that predicted of the provider’s cohort in the qualification type, given the cohort’s overall prior attainment and based on national average performance.¹

4.3 In the presented example, the provider’s VA score is 3.45 points, indicating that learners taking A-level English with this provider are achieving an average of 3.45 QCA points above that expected of learners with the same prior attainment at a nationally average provider. For information on how the VA score is calculated, please see paragraphs 4.21 to 4.23. Please note, a VA score will not be produced if the learner sample size for a qualification is lower than five. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given qualification cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

¹At learner level, prior attainment is the average prior attainment for qualifications taken up to and including Key Stage 4. For example, a learner achieving five GCSEs at grade D will have an average prior attainment of 34 QCA points (that is, (34 x 5)/5). More information about prior attainment and QCA points can be found in Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners.
4.4
The header information also contains the **95 percent confidence interval** associated with the VA score for the qualification type. The interval is generated from the data used to calculate the qualification VA score, and shows the range of VA scores within which we can be confident that the provider’s VA score actually lies. In Figure 3, the upper and lower bounds of the confidence interval are 6.07 and 0.83 QCA points, respectively. The confidence interval needs to be considered when interpreting the VA score. For information on how to interpret the VA score and its associated confidence interval, please see below on *How to interpret the VA score and the 95 percent confidence interval*. For further information on the use of confidence intervals, please see Section 9: *Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions*.

**The VA summary chart**

4.5
For all reports types, a summary chart is presented below the header information. The chart shows the provider’s **VA score for each subject/qualification/SSA**, as selected. (For brevity, only subject VA scores and associated measures will be referred to from this point on). The **vertical axis** shows the provider’s VA score in terms of the difference, in QCA points, in the average attainment of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated subject, based on national performance and given the cohort’s average prior attainment. The national average performance (VA score) in each subject has been normalised, and is represented by zero (0) on the horizontal axis. This is the **national line**. Please note, if the sample size of the learners in the indicated subject is lower than five, a VA score will not be shown. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given subject cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

4.6
The white data columns, labelled along the **horizontal axis**, represent the provider’s VA score in each of the indicated subjects. (The VA score is read by reading off the top of data column against the VA measure on the vertical axis). The VA score for each is also given below the relevant column. For more information about the VA score and QCA points, please see *Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners*.

4.7
The **vertical line enclosed by two small horizontal lines** on each column (known as the confidence interval line) represents the **95 percent confidence interval** for the indicated subject. The interval is generated from the data used to calculate the VA score for the given subject. For information on how to interpret the VA score and confidence interval line, please see below, on *Interpreting the VA summary chart*. For further information on the use of confidence intervals, please see Section 9: *Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions*.

4.8
The **blue shaded area** represents one **standard deviation** from the national average result for the indicated subject. This information is generated from the national data, and shows the spread of scores over which 68 percent, or about two-thirds, of all
Figure 3: An example of a VA summary chart, showing an overview of a provider’s performance across all A-level subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output type</th>
<th>Value Added Summary Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chart type</td>
<td>Summary of Qualification Type by subject group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>A real provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification type</td>
<td>A Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>16 - 19 learners achieving in 2005/06 (amended)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VA score** = the difference in QCA points between average attainment in this organisation compared to a nationally average organisation even when prior attainment is taken into account.

We are 95% confident that this score lies between 6.07 and 0.83

Key
- A typical provider's score will fall within this range (not shown for qualifications taken by a single provider)
- 95% of the time, this provider score will fall in this range, given the same conditions

(1) Calculated against Sector Subject Area national performance, due to small national sample size for the given subject.

Data are suppressed where there are fewer than 5 achievers in a category. Columns may therefore appear to be missing in the above chart.
providers offering the same subject would lie. In this sense, the blue shaded area represents the typically performing provider for the given subject. For information about how to use the blue band in the interpretation of the charts, please see below on Interpreting the VA summary chart. For further information on the standard deviation blue shading, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

4.9
The VA summary report also includes a data table, presented below the chart, containing the following information:

- subject (or qualification type or subject sector area)
- VA score
- 95 per cent confidence intervals
- national sample size and fails
- provider sample size and fails
- national standard deviation.

How to interpret the VA score and the 95 percent confidence interval

4.10
Table 8 gives a summary on the interpretation of the VA score and the associated 95 percent confidence interval. If the VA score is positive and the confidence interval is positive, we can be confident that the provider’s VA score is, on average, positive. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated qualification is higher, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same range of prior attainment and following the same qualification.

4.11
If the VA score is negative and the confidence interval is negative, we can be confident that the VA score is, on average, negative. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated qualification is lower, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same range of prior attainment and following the same qualification.

4.12
Please note, a VA score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small. Also, it is important to note that the summary report does not indicate whether national average attainment rate for a given qualification is itself high or low. In order to fully interpret the report, the user will need to refer to qualification success rate data or the national lines of the constituent subjects (please see paragraph 4.24).
4.13 If the VA score is positive but the confidence interval includes a positive and a negative number, we cannot be certain that the provider’s VA score for the indicated qualification is positive. If the VA score is negative but the confidence interval includes a positive and negative number, we cannot be certain that the provider’s VA score for the indicated qualification is negative. In both these cases, we need to exercise caution when interpreting the VA score, and it may not be possible to make a judgement about performance in the indicated qualification.

4.14 There are several reasons why the confidence interval may include a positive and a negative number:

- the performance of the provider may be very similar to national average performance.
- the national sample size or the provider sample size may be greater than 80 learners but be still relatively small
- the distribution of results for the cohort may be skewed.

In the latter two cases, a wide confidence interval (that is, a confidence interval with large spread of upper and lower bounds) may be produced, meaning that the interval line is more likely to include a positive and a negative VA score. The VA national comparison chart for the given qualification subject may help to identify the potential reasons why the confidence interval line crosses the national line. Please see paragraph 4.25, and Section 5: Value Added National Comparison Charts and Ad hoc Reports.

Table 8: Summary of the interpretation of the VA score and the 95 percent confidence interval. (Please refer to the text for further details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA score</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Between two positive numbers</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for example, +8.0)</td>
<td>(for example, +5.0 to +11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Between two negative numbers</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for example, -8.0)</td>
<td>(for example, -5.0 to -11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Between a positive and a negative number</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 4.14 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for example, +10.0 to -1.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Between a negative and a positive number</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 4.14 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpreting the VA summary chart

4.15
The provider’s VA score and associated confidence interval, and the national line and the national standard deviation area can be combined to produce a sophisticated understanding of absolute and relative provider performance. Examples of report interpretation are given in Table 9.

4.16
If the **VA score is positive, and the bounds of the confidence interval are both positive**—shown in the summary chart as the data column and its associated confidence interval line above the national line, as in Figures 4A and 4B—we can be confident that the VA score is, on average, positive. In this case, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners is higher, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same average prior attainment. Please note, a VA score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small (please see, also, paragraphs 4.12 and 4.14).

4.17
If the **VA score is negative, and the bounds of the confidence interval both negative**—shown in the summary chart as the data column and its associated confidence interval line below the national line, as in Figures 4E and 4F—we can be confident that the VA score is, on average, negative. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners is lower, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same average prior attainment. Please note, a VA score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small (please see, also, paragraphs 4.12 and 4.14).

4.18
If the **VA score is positive, and the bounds of the confidence interval line are above the one national standard deviation area**, we can be confident that the provider’s VA score for the given learner cohort is positive, and above that of the typical provider’s VA score in the indicated subject. If the **VA score is negative, and the bounds of the confidence interval line are below the one national standard deviation area**, we can be confident that the provider’s VA score for the given learner cohort is negative, and below that of the typical provider’s VA score in the indicated subject.

4.19
If the **VA score is either positive or negative, and is within the blue shaded area, and the confidence interval is within the blue shaded area**, this indicates that the provider’s VA score for the given learner cohort is, respectively, significantly positive or negative, and that the provider’s VA score is within the spread of VA scores for a typical provider in the indicated subject. If the **VA score is either positive or negative, and is within the blue shaded area, but the confidence interval crosses the blue shaded area**, this indicates that the provider’s VA score for the given learner cohort is, respectively, significantly positive or negative, but we
cannot be certain that the provider’s VA score for the given learner cohort is within the spread of VA scores for a typical provider in the indicated subject.

4.20

If the VA score is positive, but the confidence interval includes a positive and negative number—shown in the summary chart as a data column above the line, but with an associated confidence interval that crosses the national line, as in Figures 4C and 4D—we cannot be certain that the VA score is positive. If the VA score is negative, but the confidence interval includes a positive and negative number—shown in the summary chart as a data column below the line, but with an associated confidence interval line that crosses the national line, as in Figures 4G and 4H—we cannot be certain that the VA score is negative. In both cases, we need to exercise caution when interpreting the VA score.

Figure 4: Examples of Value Added summary charts illustrating a variety of different interpretations.
Table 9: Examples of VA summary chart interpretations. (Please refer to the text for further details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA score</th>
<th>Confidence interval (confidence interval line)</th>
<th>National standard deviation (blue band)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is above that of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is below that of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly within the one national deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly within the one national deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses the one national deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance may or may not be within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses the one national deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance may or may not be within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 4.14 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 4.14 for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How is VA for the summary report calculated?

4.21 VA summary reports for all qualifications are produced by combining the scores from all subjects within the qualification type, and weighting these scores according to the number of learners in each qualification. The overall VA score for all subjects is then presented in each case.

4.22 The national line is calculated using multilevel modelling (MLM)—a statistical technique that accounts for both learner and provider level VA effects. For further information about MLM, please see the annex to this VA/DT guide, *Multi-Level Modelling—An Introduction*. Technical information about MLM is available on the LSC website’s Framework for Excellence technical pages: [http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/](http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/)

4.23 It is not possible to generate a reliable national average performance for qualification subjects that have relatively few learners. Therefore, VA scores for small subjects are calculated against either qualification or subject sector area—please see Section 3: Data for Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners. Please note, while VA scores for small subject sizes and subject cohorts are not shown, their data are included in the calculation of the national averages.

How can VA summary reports be used for quality improvement?

4.24 The summary reports provide an immediate and clear opportunity to assess where there are particular strengths and areas for improvement within the provision of a particular institution. It is anticipated that a wide range of users, including senior managers, governors, heads of department and staff involved in quality assurance will find these outputs invaluable in indicating where good practice might be identified and disseminated, and conversely, where there are areas which might benefit from additional quality improvement initiatives.

4.25 Summary reports provide the first indication of how particular areas have performed in a given academic year, but they only give a VA score against a cohort’s overall prior attainment—that is, they do not show how a provider’s learner cohort is performing across the range of prior attainment. For qualification subjects, this information is available in the VA national comparison reports. These reports can be used to produce a detailed picture of how the institution has performed—please see Section 5: Value Added National Comparison Charts and Ad hoc Reports.

Further Information on the VA summary reports

4.26 Further information on using the VA summary reports can be found in the Learner Achievement Tracker self-teach tutorial available via Provider Gateway Support at [http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm](http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm).
5 Value Added National Comparison Reports and Ad hoc Reports

What does the VA national comparison report show?

5.1 The VA national comparison report shows the provider’s performance in the indicated qualification subject against nationally average performance, across a continuous range of prior attainment.

5.2 A national comparison chart for a subset of learners can be obtained using the ad hoc reports link. For more information on ad hoc reports, please see paragraph 5.26.

Qualification VA score and 95 percent confidence interval

5.3 Figure 5 shows part of a VA national comparison report for a provider’s cohort in A-level English. The top right-hand corner of the report shows the number of attained QCA points above or below that predicted of the provider’s cohort in the qualification type, based on national performance and given the cohort’s overall prior attainment. In this example, the VA score is -6.85 QCA points, indicating that learners following this aim with this provider achieve, on average, about a 1/4 of an A-level grade lower than they would have achieved in a nationally average provider. (Note: 30 QCA points are equivalent to one A-level grade). Please note, a VA score will not be produced if the sample size of learners taking the qualification subject is lower than five. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given qualification subject cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

5.4 Also indicated in the top-right-hand corner is the 95 per cent confidence interval associated with the VA score for the qualification type. The interval shows the range of VA scores within which we can be confident that the provider’s score actually lies. The confidence interval needs to be considered when interpreting the VA score. For information about to interpret the VA score and its associated confidence interval, please see Section 4 of this guide (paragraphs 4.10 to 4.14, and Table 8) on How to interpret the VA score and the 95 percent confidence interval. For further information on the use of confidence intervals, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

---

2 At learner level, prior attainment is the average prior attainment for qualifications taken up to and including Key Stage 4. For example, a learner achieving five GCSEs at grade D will have an average prior attainment of 34 QCA points (that is, (34 x 5)/5). More information about prior attainment and QCA points can be found in Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners.
The VA national comparison chart

5.5
Below the header information is the national comparison chart, showing the average VA attained in the indicated subject across a continuous range of prior attainment, and which provides a more sophisticated interpretation of how the provider contributes to the attainment of learners with different levels of prior attainment.

5.6
The horizontal axis shows a continuous range of prior attainment of the cohort of learners taking the qualification subject in the previous academic year. The vertical axis shows the attainment of the cohort of learners taking the qualification subject in the previous academic year. The outcome is given as a grade, and is also shown in rebased QCA points (for example, grade C at A-level is equivalent to 90 rebased QCA points). For further information on rebased QCA points, please see Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners. Please note, a qualification subject VA score will not be produced if the sample size of learners taking the subject is lower than five. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given subject cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

5.7
The solid line is the national line, and represents the average attainment of all learners in England taking the qualification subject in the previous academic year, for the indicated range of prior attainment. For example, in Figure 5, learners with an average prior attainment of 40 QCA points (that is, an average of grade C at GCSE level or equivalent) achieved approximately 60 rebased QCA points (that is, a grade D) in A-level English. Learners with a prior attainment of 52 QCA points (that is, an average of grade A at GCSE or equivalent) achieved just over 120 rebased QCA points (that is, just above a grade B) in A-level English.

5.8
The individual points on the chart represent individual learners taking the qualification subject with the provider in the previous academic year. The points show prior attainment and achievement in the post-16 qualification. Male learners are represented by diamonds, and female learners are represented by triangles. Where two or more learners share an identical combination of prior attainment and attainment, this is presented by a square.

5.9
The dotted line is the provider line, and represents the best estimate of the provider’s performance in the qualification subject in the previous academic year, for the indicated range of prior attainment. Please note, the provider line will not be displayed if the sample size of learners for the given subject is lower than five. In these cases, the chart will only show the average national performance, and the individual points of learners. There will be an asterisk note indicating this. However, a table containing information about the provider’s cohort of learners will be shown below the chart—please see paragraph 5.12.
Figure 5: Example of a VA national comparison chart, showing a provider’s performance in A-level Mathematics, compared to the national performance across the full range of prior attainment. (Please see text for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output type</th>
<th>Value Added National Comparison Chart (fail included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>A real provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification type</td>
<td>A Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Area of Learning</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider sample size (fail shown in brackets)</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National sample size (fail shown in brackets)</td>
<td>37,663 (508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>16 - 19 learners achieving in 2005/06 (amended)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VA score = the difference in QCA points between average attainment in this organisation compared to a nationally average organisation even when prior attainment is taken into account. We are 95% confident that this score lies between -6.85 and -18.80.
5.10
The grey shaded area around the provider line represents the **95 per cent confidence interval** associated with the provider line for the qualification subject. This information is generated from the data used to produce the national line, and shows the range of VA scores for which we can be confident that a provider’s score would lie. The grey shaded area needs to be considered when interpreting the chart. For information on how to use the grey shaded area in the interpretation of the charts, please see below on *Interpreting the national comparison chart*. For further information on confidence intervals, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

5.11
The blue shaded area around the national line represents one **standard deviation** from the national line for the qualification subject (that is, one standard deviation from the nationally averaged result for this qualification subject). The standard deviation is generated from the data used to produce the national line, and shows the spread of scores over which 68 percent, or about two-thirds, of all providers offering the same qualification subject would lie. In this sense, the blue band represents the typically performing provider for the given qualification subject. For information on how to use standard deviation in the interpretation of the charts, see below on *Interpreting the national comparison chart*. For further information on the standard deviation blue band, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

5.12
The VA national comparison chart report also includes a data table, presented below the chart, containing information about:

- individual learner names
- individual learner gender
- individual learner prior attainment
- individual learner outcome attainment (rebased QCA points and grade)
- VA score for individual learners

Please note: local LSCs and Local Authorities do not have access to individual learner level data.

**Interpreting the national comparison chart**

5.13
The national and provider lines, grey shaded band (95 percent confidence interval), and the shaded blue band (national standard deviation) can be combined to produce a sophisticated understanding of absolute and relative provider performance. Examples of report interpretation are given in Table 10.
5.14 If the provider line and the grey shaded area are above the national line (for any range of prior attainment), as in Figure 6a, we can be confident that the provider’s VA score is positive (for that range of prior attainment). In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated qualification subject is higher than that of the national average performance of learners with the same range of prior attainment and following the same qualification subject. If the provider line and the grey shaded area are below the national line (for any range of prior attainment), as in Figure 6c, we can be confident that the provider’s VA score is negative. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated qualification subject is lower than that of the national average performance of learners with the same range of prior attainment and following the same qualification subject. Please note, a VA score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small.

5.15 If the provider line and the grey shaded area are above the national line, and the provider line is always above the blue shaded area (for any range of prior attainment), as in Figure 6a, then we can be confident that the provider’s VA score is positive, and that the VA score is significantly higher than that of a typically performing provider (for that range of prior attainment). If the provider line and the grey shaded area are below the national line, and the provider line is always below the blue shaded area (for any range of prior attainment), as in Figure 6c, then we can be confident that the provider’s VA score is negative, and that the VA score is significantly lower than that of a typically performing provider.

5.16 If the provider line is above or below the national line, but the grey shaded area contains the national line (for any range of prior attainment), as in Figures 6b, d, and f, we cannot be confident that the provider’s VA score is either positive or negative. In these cases, we need to exercise caution when interpreting the VA score, and it may not be possible to make a judgement about performance in the indicated qualification subject—please see paragraph 5.18, for further information.

5.17 If the provider line crosses the national line, but the grey shaded area (for a given range of attainment) does not contain the national line (Figure 6e) then, relative to the national average, the provider’s VA score on the performance of learners in the given subject/qualification varies according to the prior attainment of these learners. In this example (6e), we can be confident that the provider’s VA score is positive in the case of learners who entered the programme with high prior attainment, but negative in the case of learners who entered the programme with low prior attainment.
Figure 6: Six examples of Value Added national comparison charts to illustrate a variety of different interpretations.
Table 10: Examples of VA national comparison chart interpretations. (Please refer to the text for further details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA score</th>
<th>Confidence interval (grey shaded area)</th>
<th>National standard deviation (blue shaded area)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Grey shaded area above national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td>Grey shaded area wholly above the one national standard deviation band</td>
<td>When prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is above that of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Grey shaded area below national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td>Grey shaded area wholly below the one national standard deviation band</td>
<td>When prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is below that of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Grey shaded area above national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td>Grey shaded area wholly within the one national deviation band</td>
<td>When prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Grey shaded area below national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td>Grey shaded area wholly within the one national deviation band</td>
<td>When prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Grey shaded area above national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td>Grey shaded area crosses the one national deviation band</td>
<td>When prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance may or may not be within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Grey shaded area below national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td>Grey shaded area crosses the one national deviation band</td>
<td>When prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance may or may not be within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Grey shaded area crosses national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 5.18 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Grey shaded area crosses national line (for any range of prior attainment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 5.18 for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several reasons why the grey shaded area may cross the national line:

- the performance of the provider may be very similar to national average performance.
- the national sample size or the provider sample size may be greater than 80 learners but be still relatively small
- the distribution of results for the cohort may be skewed.

In the latter two cases, a wide confidence interval (that is, a confidence interval with large spread of upper and lower bounds) may be produced, meaning that the interval line is more likely to include a positive and a negative VA score.

**Interpretation of the learner points on the chart**

The learner points provide information about how individual learners performed in the given subject/qualification. A learner point shown below the provider line, such as for learner A in Figure 5, indicates that the learner achieved a lower grade than would be expected, given their prior attainment. Similarly, a learner point above the provider line, for example, learner B in Figure 5, indicates that the learner achieved a higher grade than would be expected, given their prior attainment. In this respect, the distance between the learner point and the provider line indicates the VA score for the individual learner. The learner’s actual VA score is given in the data table, below the chart.

**Using the information in the VA national comparison chart for reflection and quality improvement.**

The information in national comparison charts allows providers to make judgements that assist in answering the following questions:

- are learners at this institution making better or worse progress than would be expected when compared to the national picture?
- do learners with a given prior attainment (for example a low or high prior attainment) make better or worse progress than expected?
- have any learners achieved higher or lower than expected?

Answering these questions will provide a detailed picture of the strengths and weaknesses of a provider, which can be used to focus quality improvement strategies. For example, if the national comparison chart shows that performance in a particular subject/qualification is worse than the national average, providers may wish to target resources and quality improvement in that area. Similarly, there may be areas of provision where learners with a particularly high or low prior attainment
are not achieving as well as other learners within the provider. In such cases, some targeting of learners with a given prior attainment may be appropriate to improve their achievement.

5.22 The charts will also show where there are areas of demonstrably good practice, in which learners are performing substantially better than the national average when prior attainment is taken into account. Institutions may wish to target this type of provision, and use the practice identified in this area used to drive quality improvement across the organisation.

How are VA national comparison charts calculated?

5.23 VA national comparison reports are produced by combining the scores from all subjects within the qualification type, and weighting these scores according to the number of learners in each subject. The overall VA score for all subjects is then presented in each case.

5.24 The national line is calculated using multilevel modelling (MLM)—a statistical technique that accounts for both learner and provider level VA effects. For further information about MLM, please see the annex to this VA/DT guide, *Multi-Level Modelling—An Introduction*. Technical information about MLM is available on the LSC website’s Framework for Excellence technical pages: [http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/](http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/)

5.25 It is not possible to generate a reliable national average performance for qualification subjects that have relatively few learners. In these cases, VA scores for small subjects are calculated against either qualification or subject sector area—please see Section 2: Data for Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners. Please note, while VA scores for small subject sizes and subject cohorts are not shown, their data are included in the calculation of the national averages.

Ad hoc reports

5.26 Ad hoc reports allow the user to tailor the VA national comparison chart to include subsets of learners. The user is able to flag which learners they require to be included in the calculation of VA, and compare these learners to the national average. For example, a user may want to look at learners who were taught by a particular teacher. Or, a user may wish to use the ad hoc reports facility to see if the cohort contains a learner who has performed particularly different to the other learners (an outlier). The learner could then be excluded to see what difference this would make to the overall score.
Further Information on the VA national comparison reports and ad hoc reports

5.27
Further information on using the VA national comparison charts can be found in the Learner Achievement Tracker self-teach tutorial available via Provider Gateway Support at http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm.
6 Value Added and Distance Travelled National Chances Charts

What do VA and DT national chances charts show?

6.1 A national chances chart shows the probability of an individual learner achieving a certain outcome for a given subject or qualification, according to national trends and given the learner’s prior attainment. Figure 7 shows the chances of a learner with a prior attainment between 40 and 46 QCA points achieving either grade A, B, C, D, or E in A-level English. For further information on prior attainment, see Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners.

6.2 National chances charts for a given subject/qualification are available for ten, fixed bands of prior attainment. The LAT software does not allow chances to be displayed for customised values of prior attainment.

6.3 Based on national chances chart information, predictions can be made about how learners with similar prior attainment might achieve in the future. Please note, however, national chances charts are based on the national data set, and do not take into account the difference made by a provider to a learner’s chances. In this respect, all providers see the same set of national chance charts.

6.4 The vertical axis shows the probability of achieving the outcome for the given subject/qualification, shown as a percentage. The horizontal axis shows the grades available in the subject/qualification.

6.5 Figure 7, using data from 2005/06 shows that, for that year:

- 5,977 of the learners who passed A-level English in 2005/06 had an average prior attainment of between 40.01 and 46 QCA points

- of these 5,997 learners:
  - 7 per cent achieved a grade E in A-level English
  - 28 per cent achieved a grade D in A-level English
  - 38 per cent achieved a grade C in A-level English
  - 22 per cent achieved a grade B in A-level English
• 4 per cent achieved a grade A in A-level English

• in total, over half of this group of learners achieved grade C or higher in A-level English.

6.6
Please note: fails are not indicated in the VA chances chart but are indicated by the percentage remaining from the displayed total percentage in the chart. Referring to Figure 7, the remainder of (100-(7+28+38+22+4)) = 1%: therefore, 1 percent of this group of learners failed A-level English for the given prior attainment. In the header information, the absolute number of fail grades is shown in the brackets next to the national band sample size (for Figure 7, the number of fails is 67).

How can VA and DT national chances charts be used for quality improvement?

6.7
VA and DT chances charts can be used to support learner progress by helping:

• tutors to establish challenging but realistic targets to which individual learners may aspire

• to monitor a learner’s progress throughout their course and judge whether it is in line with expectations

• to judge whether a learner is likely to need extra help and support to achieve their aims

• to help inform decisions about the selection of the most appropriate course for the individual learner.

Note: the chances charts should be used in combination with other factors, and their use is not recommended as the primary tool for recruitment.

6.8
The chances charts need careful use. Tutors will need to bring their professional judgement to the charts to ensure that the charts are used as a motivational tool, where appropriate, to encourage learners to realise their potential. The charts could have a demotivating effect on individual learners if the chance of the individual achieving the desired grade or qualification is low. Chances charts only take into account the average prior attainment of the learner: other factors will influence the actual grade that the learner attains, and a personal tutor may wish to build discussion of these factors into their motivational target-setting process. Combined with the application of the RARPA process, the VA and DT chances chart should provide a powerful tool to enable providers to track the progress of individual learners towards their given target.
Figure 7: An example of a Value Added national chances chart, showing the chances of an individual learner with average prior attainment of between 40.01 and 46 QCA points attaining each of the possible grades in A Level English.
How are VA and DT national chances charts calculated?

6.09 VA and DT chances charts are calculated in a different way from VA and DT national comparison charts. The VA and DT chances charts are based on data from learners who pass their qualification only, and do not take into account those learners who failed the given qualification. The outcome grade of each learner in their post-16 qualification within the national sample for the given subject/qualification is grouped into bands of prior attainment. The LAT then counts the number of learners achieving a particular grade for a given prior attainment band, and converts this number into a percentage of the sample size for the given prior attainment.

Further Information on the national chances charts

6.10 Further information on using the national chances charts can be found in the Learner Achievement Tracker self-teach tutorial available via Provider Gateway Support at http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm.
7 Distance Travelled Summary Reports

What does the DT summary report show?

7.1 The DT summary report gives an overview of a provider’s performance across a range of provision, given a cohort’s overall prior attainment, and based on national average performance. DT summary charts are available at the following levels:

- for each provider, one report showing the DT score for each qualification (for example, NVQ level 2, NVQ level 3, Foundation GNVQ, Intermediate NVQ)

- for each qualification, one report showing each subject group or each subject sector area (SSA) (for example, all subject groups or SSAs offered within a provider’s NVQ level 2 provision); this type of summary will also show the DT score for the given subject group/SSA

Subject group/subject sector area DT score and 95 percent confidence interval

7.2 Each report contains header information about the report type (see Figure 8, showing a summary of provision by subject group at FE NVQ Level 2). For subject group/SSA charts only, the top right-hand side of the report will show the provider’s VA score for the subject group/SSA, as selected. This score is the percentage difference in the achievement or success rate of the provider’s cohort of learners, given the cohort’s overall prior attainment, and based on national performance.³ In Figure 8, the DT score is 9.35 percentage points, meaning that the provider’s DT score over all subject groups in this qualification is, on average, 9.35 percentage points above that which could be expected of the nationally average provider for the subject group/SSA. Please note, a DT score will not be produced if the sample size of learners taking the qualification is lower than five. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given qualification cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

7.3 Also displayed is the 95 percent confidence interval generated from, and associated with, the DT score for the indicated subject group/SSA. The interval shows the range of scores within which we can be confident that the provider’s DT score actually lies. In Figure 8, the upper and lower bounds of the confidence interval are 17.20 and 1.50 percentage points, respectively. Please note, a DT score may be

---

³ At learner level, prior attainment is the average prior attainment for qualifications taken up to and including Key Stage 4. For example, a learner achieving five GCSEs at grade D will have an average prior attainment of 34 QCA points (that is, (34 x 5)/5). More information about prior attainment and QCA points can be found in Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners.
statistically significant (that is, achieve the 95 percent confidence level) and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small. For information on how to interpret the DT score and its associated confidence intervals, please see below on How to interpret the DT score and the 95 percent confidence interval. For further information on the use of confidence intervals, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

The DT summary chart

7.4 For all reports types, a summary chart is presented below the header information. The chart shows the provider’s DT score for each qualification/subject group/SSA, as selected. (For brevity, only subject group DT scores and associated measures will be referred to from this point on). The DT score, measured off the vertical axis, is the percentage difference in the provider’s achievement or success rate compared to the national average. The national average achievement or success rate for each qualification/subject group/SSA has been normalised, and is represented by zero on the vertical axis. This is the national line. Please note, if the sample size of the learners in the indicated subject group is lower than five, a DT score will not be shown. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given subject cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

7.5 The white data columns labelled along the horizontal axis represent the provider’s performance in each of the indicated subject groups. (The DT score is read by reading off the top of data column against the VA measure on the vertical axis). The DT score for each is also indicated below the relevant column.

7.6 The vertical line enclosed by two small horizontal lines on each column (known as the confidence interval line) represents the 95 per cent confidence interval for the indicated subject group, and is generated from the data used to calculate the subject group DT score. For information on how to interpret the DT score and confidence interval line, please see below on Interpreting the DT summary chart. For further information on the use of confidence intervals, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

7.7 The blue shading shows the national standard deviation for the given subject group. A data point within this band is within one standard deviation of nationally average performance for the indicated subject group. Approximately 68%, or about two-thirds, of data points will fall within this band and, on this basis, are deemed to indicate the performance expected of the typical provider. For more information about standard deviation and the blue shaded area, please see below on Interpreting the DT summary chart. For further information on standard deviation and the blue shaded area, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.
Figure 8: An example of a Distance Travelled summary chart, giving an overview of a provider’s performance across the range of NVQ level 2 provision. (Please see text for details).

Key:

- A typical provider’s score will fall within the range (not shown for qualifications taken by a single provider)
- 55% of the time, this provider score will fall in this range, given the same conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Subject Area</th>
<th>DT Score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration And Law</td>
<td>-5% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Planning And The Built Environment</td>
<td>-15% to 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering And Manufacturing Technologies</td>
<td>-20% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Public Services And Care</td>
<td>-10% to 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail And Commercial Enterprise</td>
<td>-5% to 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output type: Distance Travelled Sector Subject Area Chart
Chart type: Summary of provision by Sector Subject Area for FE NVQ Level 2 (2 Year)
Organisation: A Real Provider
Data source: 16-19 learners completing in 2005:06

DT score is the difference in the chances of achievement in this provider compared to the national average. This is measured in percentage points and takes prior attainment into account.

Overall DT score: 5.35
We are 95% confident that this score lies between 11.20 and 1.58
7.8
The DT summary report also includes a table, below the chart, containing the following information:

- subject group (or qualification type or SSA)
- DT score
- 95 per cent confidence intervals
- national sample size and fails
- provider sample size and fails
- national standard deviation

**How to interpret the DT score and the 95 percent confidence interval**

7.9
Table 11 gives a summary on the interpretation of the DT score and the associated 95 percent confidence interval. If the DT score is positive and the confidence interval is positive, we can be confident that the provider’s DT score is, on average, positive. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated subject group is higher, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same range of prior attainment and falling within the subject group.

7.10
If the DT score is negative and the confidence interval is negative, we can be confident that the provider’s DT score is, on average, negative. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners in the indicated subject group is lower, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same range of prior attainment and falling within the subject group.

7.11
Please note, a DT score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small. Also, it is important to note that the summary report does not indicate whether national average attainment rate for a given subject group is itself high or low. In order to fully interpret the report, the user will need to refer to qualification success rate data or the national lines of the constituent subject grouping (please see paragraph 7.21).

7.12
If the DT score is positive but the confidence interval includes a positive and a negative number, we cannot be certain that the provider’s DT score for the indicated subject group is positive. If the DT score is negative but the confidence interval includes a positive and negative number, we cannot be certain that the provider’s DT score for the indicated subject group is negative. In both these cases, we need to exercise caution when interpreting the DT score, and it may not be possible to make a judgement about performance in the indicated subject group.
There are several reasons why the confidence interval line may include a positive and a negative number:

- the performance of the provider may be very similar to national average performance.
- the national sample size or the provider sample size may be greater than 80 learners but be still relatively small.
- the distribution of results for the cohort may be skewed.

In the latter two cases, a wide confidence interval (that is, a confidence interval with large spread of upper and lower bounds) may be produced, meaning that the interval line is more likely to include a positive and a negative DT score. The DT national comparison chart for the given qualification subject may help to identify the potential reasons why the confidence interval line crosses the national line. Please see paragraph 7.21, and Section 5: Value Added National Comparison Charts and Ad hoc Reports.

Table 11: Summary of the interpretation of the DT score and the 95 percent confidence interval. (Please refer to the text for further details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DT score</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Between two positive numbers</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given subject group compared to the national average performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for example, +8.0)</td>
<td>(for example, +5.0 to +11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Between two negative numbers</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given subject group compared to the national average performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for example, -8.0)</td>
<td>(for example, -5.0 to -11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Between a positive and a negative number</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the DT score. Please see paragraph 7.13 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(for example, +10.0 to -1.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Between a negative and a positive number</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the DT score. Please see paragraph 7.13 for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting the DT summary chart

The DT score, its associated confidence interval, and the national standard deviation area can be combined to produce a sophisticated understanding of absolute and relative provider performance. Examples of report interpretation are given in Table 12.
7.15 If the DT score is positive, and the bounds of the confidence interval are both positive—shown in the summary chart as the data column and its associated confidence interval line above the national line, as in Figures 4A and 4B—we can be confident that the DT score is, on average, positive. In this case, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners is higher, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same average prior attainment. Please note, a DT score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small (please see, also, paragraphs 7.11 and 7.13).

7.16 If the DT score is negative, and the bounds of the confidence interval both negative—shown in the summary chart as the data column and its associated confidence interval line below the national line, as in Figures 4E and 4F—we can be confident that the DT score is, on average, negative. In these cases, the performance of the provider’s cohort of learners is lower, on average, than that of the national average performance of learners with the same average prior attainment. Please note, a DT score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small (please see, also, paragraphs 7.11 and 7.13).

7.17 If the DT score is positive, and the bounds of the confidence interval line are above the one national standard deviation area, we can be confident that the provider’s DT score for the given learner cohort is positive, and above that of the typical provider’s DT score in the indicated subject group. If the DT score is negative, and the bounds of the confidence interval line are below the one national standard deviation area, we can be confident that the provider’s DT score for the given learner cohort is negative, and below that of the typical provider’s DT score in the indicated subject group.

7.18 If the VA score is either positive or negative, and is within the blue shaded area, and the confidence interval is within the blue shaded area, this indicates that the provider’s DT score for the given learner cohort is, respectively, significantly positive or negative, and that the provider’s DT score is within the spread of scores for a typical provider in the indicated subject group. If the DT score is either positive or negative, and is within the blue shaded area, but the confidence interval crosses the blue shaded area, this indicates that the provider’s DT score for the given learner cohort is, respectively, significantly positive or negative, but we cannot be certain that the provider’s DT score for the given learner cohort is within the spread of scores for a typical provider in the indicated subject group.

7.19 If the DT score is positive, but the confidence interval includes a positive and negative number—shown in the summary chart as a data column above the line, but with an associated confidence interval that crosses the national line, as in Figures 4C and 4D—we cannot be certain that the DT score is positive. If the DT score is negative, but the confidence interval includes a positive and negative number—shown in the summary chart as a data column below the line, but with an associated confidence interval that crosses the national line, as in Figures 4E and 4F—we cannot be certain that the DT score is negative.
number—shown in the summary chart as a data column below the line, but with an associated confidence interval line that crosses the national line, as in Figures 4G and 4H—we cannot be certain that the DT score is negative. In both cases, we need to exercise caution when interpreting the DT score.

Figure 9: Examples of Distance Travelled summary charts illustrating a variety of different interpretations. (Please see text for details).
Table 12: Examples of DT summary chart interpretations. (Please refer to the text for further details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA score</th>
<th>Confidence interval (confidence interval line)</th>
<th>National standard deviation (blue shaded area)</th>
<th>Interpretation (for the given subject/qualification/SSA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is above that of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is below that of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly within the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly within the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance is within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly above national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance may or may not be within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line wholly below national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses the one national standard deviation area</td>
<td>On average, when prior attainment is taken into account, the provider is having a negative effect on the performance of its learners in the given qualification subject compared to the national average performance. The provider’s performance may or may not be within the spread of scores of the typically performing provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 7.13 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Confidence interval line crosses national line</td>
<td>Care needs to be exercised when interpreting the VA score. Please see paragraph 7.13 for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How can DT summary reports be used for quality improvement?

7.20
The summary reports an immediate and clear opportunity to assess where there are particular strengths and areas for improvement within the provision of a particular institution. It is anticipated that a wide range of users, including senior managers, governors, heads of department and staff involved in quality assurance will find these outputs invaluable in indicating where good practice might be identified and disseminated, and conversely, where there are areas which might benefit from additional quality improvement initiatives.

7.21
Summary reports the first indication of how particular areas have performed in a given academic year but they only give an average of the DT across the range of prior attainment, that is, they do not show how the provider performs for learners at a different level of prior attainment. For qualification type and subject grouping, this information is available in the DT national comparison reports, which can be used to produce a detailed picture of how the institution has performed across a banded range of prior attainment—please see Section 8: Distance Travelled National Comparison Reports.

How are DT summary reports calculated?

7.22
DT summary reports for all qualifications (or subject groups or SSAs) are produced by aggregating the scores from all qualifications (or subject groups or SSAs), and weighting these according to the numbers of learners in each. The aggregated difference in achievement or success rate over all qualifications (or subject groups or SSAs) is then presented in each case.

7.23
The national line is calculated using a statistical technique called multilevel modelling (MLM) that accounts for both learner and provider level VA effects. For further information about MLM, please see the annex to this VA/DT guide, Multi-Level Modelling—An Introduction. Technical information about MLM is available on the LSC website’s Framework for Excellence technical pages:
http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/

Further Information on the DT summary reports

7.24
Further information on using the DT summary reports can be found in the Learner Achievement Tracker self-teach tutorial available via Provider Gateway Support at http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm
What do DT national comparison reports show?

8.1
The DT national comparison report shows the provider’s performance in the indicated qualification subject against nationally average performance, across a banded range of prior attainment.

Qualification DT score and 95 percent confidence interval

8.2
Each report contains header information about the report type. The top right-hand corner of the chart shows the DT score for the qualification type, indicated as the percentage difference achievement or success rate of the provider’s cohort of learners, given the cohort’s overall prior attainment, compared to the national average.\(^4\) Figure 10 shows part of a national comparison report for NVQ Level 2 in the subject group *Engineering, Technology and Manufacturing*. In this example, the DT score is 6.85 percent, indicating that achievements for learners following this aim with this provider are, on average, approximately 7 per cent higher than at a nationally average institution delivering the same aim. Please note, a DT score will not be produced if the sample size of learners taking the qualification subject is lower than five. This is because statistically reliable judgements about a provider’s performance in a given qualification subject cannot be made for cohort sizes less than five.

8.3
The DT score has an associated 95 per cent confidence interval. The confidence interval shows the range of DT scores within which we can be confident that the provider’s score lies. The confidence interval needs to be considered when interpreting the DT score. For information on interpreting the DT score and its associated confidence interval, please see Section 7 of this guide (paragraphs 7.9 to 7.13, and Table 11) on *How to interpret the DT score and the 95 percent confidence interval*. For further information on the use of confidence intervals, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

---

\(^4\) At learner level, prior attainment is the average prior attainment for qualifications taken up to and including Key Stage 4. For example, a learner achieving five GCSEs at grade D will have an average prior attainment of 34 QCA points (that is, \((34 \times 5)/5\)). More information about prior attainment and QCA points can be found in *Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners*. 
Figure 10: Part of a Distance Travelled national comparison chart, showing a provider's performance in NVQ level 2 Engineering, Technology and Manufacturing, in bands of prior attainment. (Please see text for details).

Output type: Distance Travelled National Comparison Chart (falls included)
Organisation: A Real provider
Qualification type: FE NVQ Level 2 (2 Year)
Subject / Subject Group: Hairdressing Services
Provider sample size (falls shown in brackets): 139 (46)
National sample size (falls shown in brackets): 13,303 (5,012)
Data source: 16 - 19 learners completing in 2005/06

DT score = the difference in the chances of achievement in this provider compared to the national average. This is measured in percentage points and takes prior attainment into account.

Overall DT score 6.85
We are 95% confident that this score lies between 14.00 and -1.00
The DT national comparison chart

8.4
Below the header information is the DT national comparison chart, showing the average DT attained in the indicated qualification or subject group subject across a banded range of prior attainment, and which provides a more sophisticated interpretation of how the provider is contributing to the attainment of learners with different levels of prior attainment.

8.5
The horizontal axis shows the banded range of prior attainment of the cohort of learners in the qualification/subject group in the previous academic year. The prior attainment is indicated in QCA points, and is the cohort’s average prior attainment (by band) for qualifications taken up to and including Key Stage 4. The vertical axis shows the attainment of the cohort of learners in the qualification/subject group in the previous academic year.

8.6
The vertical axis shows the DT score for the indicated qualification/subject group, given as the percentage difference in the provider’s achievement or success rate in the given qualification/subject group, compared to the national average, for the indicated band of prior attainment. The DT score for each band of prior attainment is also indicated below the relevant column. The national average achievement or success rate for each subject group has been normalised, and is represented by zero (0) on the horizontal axis. This is the national line.

8.7
The vertical line enclosed by two small horizontal lines on each column (known as the confidence interval line) represents the 95 per cent confidence interval for the indicated qualification/subject group. The confidence interval is generated from the data used to calculate the DT score, and shows the range of DT scores for which we can be confident that the provider’s score lies. For information on how to use the confidence interval line in the interpretation of the charts, please see below on Interpreting the DT national comparison chart. For further information about confidence intervals, please see Section 9: Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions.

Interpreting the DT national comparison chart

8.8
If the DT score is positive and the confidence interval line is above the national line (for the indicated band of prior attainment), as in Figure 11a, we can be confident that DT score is positive. In these cases, the provider is having a positive effect on the performance of its learners with the given band of prior attainment, compared to the national average performance.

8.9
If the DT score is negative and the confidence interval line is below the national line (for the indicated band of prior attainment), as in Figure 11c, we can be confident that the DT score is negative. In these cases, the provider is having a
negative effect on the performance of its learners with the given band of prior attainment, compared to the national average performance.

8.10
Please note, a VA score may achieve the 95 percent confidence level and be different from the norm, but that difference may be small. Also, it is important to note that the DT national comparison chart does not indicate whether the national average achievement or success rate is high or low. In order to fully interpret this chart, the user will need to refer to qualification success rate data to identify the level of the national average achievement or success rate.

Figure 11: Two examples of Distance Travelled national comparison charts illustrating report interpretation. (Please see text for details).
8.11 **If the DT score is positive, and the confidence interval line crosses the national line** (for the indicated band of prior attainment), as in Figure 11b, we cannot be certain that the DT score is positive. **If the DT score is negative, and the confidence interval line crosses the national line** (for the indicated band of prior attainment), as in Figure 11d, we cannot be certain that the DT score is negative. In these cases, we need to exercise caution when interpreting the DT score.

8.12 There are several reasons why the confidence interval may contain a positive and a negative DT score:

- the performance of the provider may be very similar to national average performance.
- the national sample size or the provider sample size may be greater than 80 learners but be still relatively small
- the distribution of results for the cohort may be skewed.

In the latter two cases, a wide confidence interval (that is, a confidence interval with large spread of upper and lower bounds) may be produced, meaning that the interval line is more likely to include a positive and a negative DT score.

**Using DT national comparison reports for quality improvement**

8.13 The information in the DT national comparison chart allows providers to make judgements which can answer the following questions:

- are learners at this institution making better or worse progress than would be expected when compared to the national picture?
- do groups of learners with a given band of prior attainment (for example a low or high prior attainment) make better or worse progress than expected?

8.14 Answering the questions in paragraphs 8.13 will provide a detailed picture of the strengths and weaknesses of a provider, which can be used to focus quality improvement strategies. For example, if the national comparison chart shows that performance in a particular qualification or subject group is worse than the national average, providers may wish to target resources and quality improvement in that area. Similarly, there may be areas of provision where learners with a particularly high or low prior attainment are not achieving as well as other learners within the provider and some targeting of learners with a given prior attainment may be appropriate to improve their achievement.

8.15 The charts will also show clearly where there are areas of demonstrably good practice and where learners are performing substantially better than the national
average when their prior attainment is taken into account. Institutions may wish to target this type of provision and use the practice identified in this area to drive quality improvement across the organisation.

**How are DT national comparison charts calculated?**

8.16
DT scores are expressed as the percentage difference in a provider’s cohort achievement or success rates from the national average achievement or success rate, taking prior attainment into account. The precise procedure for the calculation of graded and non-graded DT qualifications differs somewhat, although each is based on a statistical methodology called multilevel modelling (MLM). For further information about MLM, please see the annex to this VA/DT guide, *Multi-Level Modelling—An Introduction*. Technical information about MLM is available on the LSC website’s Framework for Excellence technical pages: [http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/](http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/support/va/)

**Further Information on the DT national comparison charts**

8.17
Further information on using the DT national comparison charts can be found in the Learner Achievement Tracker self-teach tutorial, available via Provider Gateway Support at [http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm](http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm)
9 Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners: Further Questions

*Why has the LSC chosen to use a subject-based methodology?*

9.1 Statistical analysis has shown that the relationship between prior attainment of learners and their actual achievement varies for different subjects and qualifications. Post-16 sector institutions offer a wide variety of subject and qualification mixes. A subject-based methodology that reflects the varied relationships between prior attainment and achievement gives the fairest picture of provision across the sector. The subject-based approach also allows providers to look at the performance of their institution in a particular subject and qualification, against the national average performance for that subject and qualification.

*If the entire programme for a school consisted of a single qualification type (such as A-levels), would the LAT’s VA score for this programme be the same as the institutional CVA score calculated by the DCSF?*

9.2 The LAT is primarily designed to provide VA/DT information for each qualification subject in scope. The LAT does not provide an institutional VA or DT score (that is, a single VA or DT score that covers all of the institution’s provision). In this respect, the VA and DT reports are intended to complement the Schools and Colleges contextual value added (CVA) institutional measure being piloted by the DCSF.

9.3 Although we could expect a school with a programme consisting only of A-levels to have a LAT VA score similar in size and direction to the institutional score produced by the DCSF’s CVA calculation, it is unlikely that the precise score would be the same for the two statistical procedures. This is partly due to certain statistical effects of aggregation, and partly because the DSCF measure incorporates contextual variables (for example, learner socio-economic background).

*Why doesn’t the calculation take into account other factors such as socio-economic grouping or gender?*

9.4 It is widely acknowledged that there are many other factors besides prior success that will affect a learner’s ability to succeed in a given subject and qualification. These factors will include gender and socio-economic grouping alongside a learner’s personal motivation and drive. However, statistically speaking, prior attainment has been found to be a far better predictor of performance in the main qualification taken than any other factor.
9.5
The lack of a robust indicator for socio-economic status and the lack of a consensus on definitions of ethnicity and learning difficulties hinder building these factors into the LAT model used. However, further work will be undertaken during 2007/08 to investigate the possible inclusion of contextual variables.

**How large does a group/class have to be to generate a reliable VA or DT score?**

9.6
Group or class sizes need to consist of more than four learners for a VA or DT score to be calculated and for a judgement to be made about the providers’ performance in that subject and qualification. The LAT outputs show the number of learners included in the national and institutional sample.

**What importance should I attach to cohort size and the VA/DT score?**

9.7
Differences in cohort size between subjects/qualifications are taken into account when calculating a VA/DT score. This means that VA scores across subjects/qualifications are directly comparable, regardless of the size of the respective learner cohort. Of course, for policy purposes, advisors, managers and inspectors may be concerned with the provision of a subject/qualification having a significantly negative VA/DT score and taking in a larger, rather than smaller, cohort size.

**Why would the number of learners shown in the LAT outputs not correspond to my group size?**

9.8
Learners need to meet a number of criteria for inclusion of the LAT dataset, for instance, have prior attainment that was obtained in England. If learners within your cohort do not meet these criteria they will be excluded. Further details of the criteria used please see Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16–19 Learners.

**How is the qualification success rate used in the DT for 16–19 learners calculation?**

9.9
The outcome measures for DT are based on achievement rate for some qualifications, and success rates for other qualifications. The DT measure for WBL-funded provision is based wholly on the qualification success rates. However, the DT measure for FE-funded provision is based on qualification success rate for NVQs, and achievement rates for all other qualifications that are in the scope of the DT–FE measure.
How does the LAT compare to other, proprietary systems for VA?

9.10 During the development of the methodology used in the VA and DT for 16–19 learners, account was taken of existing systems which cover VA for learners on graded qualifications. The most well-known of these systems are the A Level Information System (ALIS) and the A Level Performance System (ALPS) that use, respectively, linear regression and averages-based techniques. In contrast, the VA and DT for 16–19 learners measures are calculated using a multi-level modelling (MLM) regression technique, and introduction to which is provided in the annex to this guide. MLM provides the following advantages over other statistical and arithmetic techniques:

- it is robust in terms of dealing with providers with small cohorts of learners, so that more institutions can be included in the national measure
- there is clear information about how providers are performing with learners at different levels of prior attainment.

9.11 In addition, the LAT is:

- covers a wider range of learners, including vocational qualifications; and compare providers’ performance with the national sample of all learners taking a given subject or qualification
- provided free of charge to all LSC-funded providers and Local Authorities

If a VA/DT score is derived from the provider’s actual performance, why do we need confidence intervals for these scores?

9.12 The provider’s VA/DT score is generated from information from both the provider’s individual learner points and the national data sample. Specifically, in multilevel modelling, the calculation of a VA/DT score for a provider is derived from the provider’s actual performance in the context of estimated national average performance for the range of prior attainment and possible outcomes. Producing confidence intervals for the provider lines (provider VA/DT scores) is a standard statistical technique for accounting for both the error or “noise” in the calculation of the national line, and the variance of the provider’s actual score around that estimated national line.

9.13 Confidence intervals can be set at different levels of statistical confidence. A 95 per cent confidence interval tells us that 19 out of 20 times, the provider’s VA or DT score will be somewhere within the range specified.

- For example, a provider VA score for A-Level maths is +15, and the bounds of the 95 per cent confidence interval are -1 and +31. This means that 19 out of 20 times, the provider’s VA score for A Level maths will be somewhere
between -1 and +31 QCA points, but on average it will be +15 QCA points. Since the VA score will sometimes be -1 (and so, below the national average), we cannot be statistically confident that the provider’s effect on the performance of its learners in A-Level Maths is different from the national average, even though the VA score is positive.

- For example, a provider DT score for all NVQs is -4 per cent and the 95 per cent confidence intervals are -6 and -2 per cent. This means that 19 out of 20 times, the provider’s DT score for all NVQs will be somewhere between -6 and -2 per cent, but on average it will be -4 per cent. The confidence interval tells us that the DT score is not expected to be above zero, and that therefore we can be statistically confident that the provider’s effect on the performance of its learners in NVQs is lower than the national average.

What is national standard deviation, and how is it used in the LAT?

9.14 Standard deviation is a statistical term describing or measuring the spread or “deviation” of scores around the average, such that (for most types data, including VA/DT data) 68 percent of data points or scores will fall within one standard deviation of the mean, 95 percent of scores will fall within two standard deviations, and 99 per cent of scores will fall within three standard deviations. A larger standard deviation would imply a wider spread of scores, indicating more variation; a smaller standard deviation would imply that the scores are gathered more closely around the average, indicating less variation.

9.15 The adoption of standard deviation in the LAT provides a relative measure of provider performance, in terms of the provider’s VA or DT score distance from the national average. As mentioned, 68 percent or about two-thirds of data points will lie within one standard deviation of the national line (as indicated by the blue band) and, on this basis, are deemed in the LAT to indicate performance of the typical provider performance. This means that 16 percent of providers will lie above the blue band and 16 percent of providers will fall below the blue band, indicating the respective over- or under-performance of providers, compared to the typically performing provider.

Why is there no blue band (national standard deviation) in the DT national comparison charts?

9.16 The presentation of national standard deviation for the DT national comparison charts is being developed, and is anticipated to be ready for inclusion in the next release of the LAT.

Why don’t the measures use the Universal Marking Scheme (UMS)?

9.17 UMS data is not currently available for us to use in the measures and to use it would involve imposing an additional data collection burden on providers. As there is a
commitment to introduce the new measures of success without increasing the burden on providers, we need to wait until we can access this information centrally, from the awarding bodies, before it can be used. Once the data becomes available we will be able to model the use of UMS in the calculation of the measures.

Is the cashing in or not cashing in of AS-levels an issue for LAT? If so, what assumptions are made?

9.18
In regards to cashing in of AS-Levels, we only get those results which are cashed in by providers.

I am a Local Authority and would like to know if I can have a 'data dump' of value added / distance travelled data for Schools in my area. Is this possible?

9.19
A 'data dump' for all schools in your area is not possible to download in one go. You would need to log onto the LAT, and select one school at a time. Having selected a school, then click on 'Download Data'. This will allow you to select the format of your choice, which will contain the data for that school. Repeat this process for each school you require data for.

Having observed the data on the LAT, the data does not include some students. Please can you inform me how I can update the LAT records, and also an explanation as to why the student data is missing?

9.20
The data used to calculate the VA measure is obtained directly from awarding bodies. Attainment data for post-16 qualifications is subsequently matched to attainment information on pre-16 qualifications, using forename, surname, date of birth and gender. There is an opportunity for providers to amend this data as part of the DCSF Achievement and Attainment Tables (AAT) checking exercise. For further information on the non-inclusion of particular learner, please see Section 2: Scope of the VA and DT Measures for 16-19 Learners.

Is there any training or literature that I could read to gain a greater awareness of the LAT?

9.21
Training material for the LAT, including a self-teach tutorial, is available on the Provider Gateway at http://ffe.lsc.gov.uk/using/provider_gateway.htm

Is there an email address I can use for feedback and queries?

9.22
For feedback and queries, please email us via provider.gateway@lsc.gov.uk with the subject “LAT”.

Value Added and Distance Travelled for 16–19 Learners:
Learning Achievement Tracker (Release 4).
ANNEX: Multi-Level Modelling—An Introduction

Introduction

A.1
The purpose of this annex is to introduce and describe multi-level modelling (MLM).

A.2
MLM is a sophisticated statistical technique, which has the potential to provide a more valid, fair and accurate way of calculating Value Added (VA) and Distance Travelled (DT) scores than other methods.

A.3
One statistical advantage of MLM is that it considers the effects of the institution on learner outcome, in addition to the effect that learners have on their own outcome. Other statistical approaches such as linear regression and averages-based approaches do not directly recognize the impact that an institution has on an individual’s performance, as these approaches treat all learners identically, that is, as if all learners went to the same school.

A.4
Additionally, MLM allows reliable scores to be calculated for small cohorts (i.e. where few individual take that subject in that qualification). Other approaches do not have methods to make the necessary adjustments, therefore data from small cohorts tend to be aggregated into larger groups or ignored.

A.5
Currently, MLM is being adopted by the DSCF for calculating pre-16 VA and will be used for the calculation of VA and DT for 16-19 year olds.

The Interaction of Individual and Institutional effects

A.6
It is important to acknowledge that actual attainment of learners is broadly dependent upon two sorts of factors: individual effects and institutional effects. Individual factors describe the learners themselves; age, gender, previous results, etc. In the context of education, the individual factor most strongly associated with attainment is the learner’s ability which is typically measured in terms of prior attainment.

A.7
Currently, the LAT does not include contextual factors such as age and gender as an individual factor. Further work will be undertaken during 2007/08 to investigate the possible inclusion of contextual variables.
A.8 Institutional factors relate to the school, college or work based learning provider attended by learners. They can arise from differences in curriculum offered, recruitment and catchment area and a host of other considerations. To appreciate how closely these two sorts of factors interact, we first must assume that both factors are independent.

A.9 For example, if we know that every learner who ever attended institution X, achieved 4 A grade A-levels, then the fact that they attend this institution would seem to tell us all we need to know to predict their attainment. Clearly, this is not the case, since just knowing which provider a learner attended is not sufficient to predict their attainment.

A.10 Similarly, if it was only individual factors that allowed one too completely and accurately predict a person’s attainment, then there would be no need to know which provider that individual attended. Everyday experience would say that this is not true; that providers do have an impact on a learner’s attainment.

A.11 As we know that both of these factors are important in predicting attainment, we need to ensure that they are both accounted for in the model used for Value Added and Distance Travelled. The issue is trying to determine to what extent the attainment of a learner depends on their abilities and to what extent it is influenced by the institution that the learner attends.

A.12 The calculation undertaken by MLM specifically determines the institutional effect on the attainment of a learner, while at the same time taking into account the distribution of the prior attainment of all learners in the national cohort under analysis (for example, A-level Biology). In this sense, which institution attends now becomes an important variable in the calculation of predicted attainment for learners in any subject.

The case of small subjects

A.13 Another advantage of MLM is that it allows reliable scores for both VA and DT measures to be calculated when there are few learners in the institution cohort. Normally, when few learners are taking a subject in a qualification in an institution (for example, A-level Biology), other statistical approaches will tend to produce predictions that are volatile and unstable, that is they change substantially if there is any change in the data. This means that the VA or DT score of a small subject could be very high in one year, and then the next year could be very low. Such volatility is symptom that the scores are biased and they are not clear, fair or valid indicators of performance.

A.14 To solve this problem, the estimation using MLM is used to produce an adjustment factor (usually known as a shrinkage factor). This factor is a number between zero
and one, which is used in the calculation of the average of the scores of each subject, independent of the cohort size. If the cohort is large, the shrinkage factor is close to one, and thus has no effect on the results. If the cohort is small, the shrinkage factor is close to zero, and reduces the score towards the national average. By doing this, the results of small cohorts are now more reliable and less volatile, while the scores for large groups or subjects remain virtually unchanged.

Conclusion

A.15
Multi-level modelling addresses some of the main limitations of other methods of modelling value added and distance travelled. It provides a valid, fair and accurate way of calculating value added and distance travelled data for the purpose of reflection and improvement and institutional accountability.