

SENSE & INSTABILITY:

Three decades of skills and employment policy

61 Secretaries of State responsible for skills policy over last 3 decades.

Between them they produced **13 major Acts of Parliament.**

The policy area has flipped between departments or been shared with multiple departments **10 times** since the 1980s.

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Overview	6
Aims and context	11
Young people	14
Employed workforce	16
Unemployed	18
What next?	21
Thank you	21
Glossary	22

FOREWORD

Constant change is the reality for those of us who work in the world of skills. We see changes to qualifications, to policies, to funding, to Government priorities, and to Government itself. Since 1981, there have been 61 Secretaries of State with responsibility for skills policy, each with their own agenda for change. Consider the impact that each and every one of these changes has had, and how they have affected those involved in the skills and employment sector: training providers, employers, awarding bodies and, most crucially, those individuals who are seeking to develop their skills in the first place.

With a General Election on the horizon, now is the time to think about the impact of these changes and learn from our past experiences. The process of producing this report itself has been telling. What we thought would be a straightforward policy review quickly turned into something far more complex, by virtue of the fact that the evidence, quite simply, is not there. It is astonishing that there is no central repository of past policies, reviews and evidence relating to skills and employment that policymakers can easily access.

This ‘collective amnesia’ surrounding past policy is a serious problem: how can effective policies be designed without understanding what has and has not worked in the past? Comparisons of policy reveal that while times have changed, the challenges have not. For example, the recent UKCES¹ recommendations for engaging employers have a lot in common with recommendations made in 1984. Clearly the past has a lot it can teach us.

Changes in Government also meant rapid changes in policy: each minister wants to leave his or her mark. While these initiatives can have positive effects, sometimes it feels like a case of change for change’s sake. When our future workforce is concerned, this is simply not acceptable. Clarity is essential and mistakes can have lasting impact on individuals and the economy. Skills and employment policies² need to be carefully designed, thoroughly tested and slowly embedded.

¹ Please refer to the glossary on page 22 for a full explanation of all acronyms

² The term ‘skills and employment policy,’ which is used throughout this report, encompasses: vocational education and training structures and policies; policies and initiatives to help people enter the workplace; and policies and initiatives to help people develop their skills in the workplace

With this in mind, we recommend three key things:

- 1.** We need to see stability through consensus in the skills and training sector. We support the current network of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and believe they should be set up on a statutory basis. From the evidence in this review, it is clear that effective partnerships between central and local administration are key if we are to see long-term, sustainable results.
- 2.** The Department for Business Innovation and Skills Select Committee should conduct an inquiry into the skills and training system, similar to that conducted by the Children, Schools and Families Committee in 2010 (*'From Baker to Balls: the foundations of the education system'*). This inquiry would seek to analyse the historical policy context in the skills and training system and provide evidence-based recommendations for future approaches to policymaking in the sector.
- 3.** The Government should establish a body with independent oversight of the skills and training sector, to ensure that changes to the system are scrutinised and tested, and that their sustainability is assured. This body should also be responsible for evaluating Government's performance against skills and training targets, and scrutinising the costs and benefits of new policy.

It is in everyone's best interest to support policies and initiatives that are considered with the benefit of hindsight. Policies should work to improve – not hinder – individuals' futures and their opportunities.

Thank you to everyone who has contributed to this report. We always encourage open and transparent discussion and we hope that this review contributes to this important ongoing conversation – in the run up to the General Election and beyond.

Chris Jones, Chief Executive of the City & Guilds Group

'In the last four decades we've actually had two longish spells of stable Government. 1979–1997 gave us 18 years of a Tory administration and 1997–2010 saw Labour in power for 13 years. Government Ministers with responsibility for skills changed during that time. That's a general feature of modern British Government, not the reason for lack of vision, ambition, construction and delivery of a clear and consistent vocational education and training system. But I believe it has been lacking and is now much needed.'

Dr Ann Limb OBE DL, Chair SEMLEP, Fellow and Councillor of the City and Guilds of London Institute

1. OVERVIEW

Over the past three decades, England has witnessed dramatic changes in the skills and employment landscape. Numerous ‘State of the Nation’ reports, skills strategies, consultations, white papers, and Acts of Parliament have been introduced – all aiming to ensure the UK has a highly-skilled workforce, which is equipped to meet the challenges of global competition. Debate surrounding the status and content of skills and employment policy continues today, with employers expressing concern over the perceived gap between the skills that they need and the skills that are provided through the system.

The challenge of achieving a holistic approach, which meets the needs of a range of stakeholders, has both informed policy and contributed to the on-going changes in the system. Each of the interventions in the skills and employment landscape has created its own legacy. Qualifications have been both a feature and instrument of policy; many were replaced, however, before they had even been implemented. There is little evaluation or evidence about what has and has not worked, or even a reliable repository of information about the initiatives and policies that have been tried before. It is clear that the most challenging aspects of skills and employment policy are not simply the content, design or delivery – the lack of consistency and the failure to learn lessons are also critical factors.

Our findings confirm that three decades of change have had an impact on the effectiveness of establishing a high-quality, highly-valued skills and employment system. In particular, the following patterns emerge:

- **Departmental changes:** The constant shifts in responsibility have defined the priorities and delivery of skills and employment policy. This has meant that different tracks within the skills and employment system have remained in place. It has also meant that, at times, a department’s wider policy remit has subsumed skills and employment policy; for example schools policy has taken priority in education departments.
- **The skills debate:** Over the period, the issue of skills – as with education generally – has gained an increasingly significant political profile.

Despite the broad political consensus in policy aims, differences emerge at the point of implementation that have contributed to the constant change. The sector has also been informed and influenced by immediate and relatively short-term priorities, such as the unemployment crisis of the 1980s and the return to a more centralised approach under New Labour.

Those working in the system have had to manage the destabilising effect of having to adjust repeatedly to new or modified structures and procedures. For the customers – employers and individuals – the changes in programmes, qualifications, funding streams and organisational structure have made the vocational route increasingly difficult to navigate. The following conclusions can be drawn:

- **Co-ordination is key:** Cross-departmental responsibilities must be co-ordinated or led at Cabinet level if important objectives are to be achieved and “turf wars” or inaction are to be avoided. In the early part of the period, the separation of vocational education from training led to lack of co-ordination.
- **Agreed roles and responsibilities:** Three decades of change have highlighted that there is a need to provide mechanisms to ensure that employers, Government, representatives of the workforce and education providers can work together effectively at national and local levels.

RECOMMENDATION 1: STABILITY THROUGH CONSENSUS

This review highlights how the frequency of structural change within the system has led to a preponderance of short-term interventions that have had a disproportionate impact on the skills and employment sector. Whether through the machinery of Government changes in Whitehall, the establishment and abolition of non-departmental bodies over the period, or ministerial change in departments, the result is a ‘collective amnesia’ about past policy. There is evidence that policy change at the centre can have unintended consequences, which can lead to a lack of clarity and coherence for those responsible for implementation. What begins as a sound policy proposal in Whitehall can often be undermined during the implementation phase through lack of planning, oversight or evaluation.

In particular, there has been a clear tension between central control and local autonomy. Major policy initiatives, such as the current Industrial Strategy, Apprenticeship Trailblazers, and Employer Ownership of Skills, require a consistent local infrastructure to support delivery and implementation, and a sound monitoring and evaluation framework to measure success. The current system should be given the opportunity to manage the implementation.

With a general cross-party consensus that Local Enterprise Partnerships should be given greater responsibility for local skills, **City & Guilds recommends that the current network of LEPs post-election should be maintained for the duration of at least one Parliament. City & Guilds also recommends that LEPs are established on a statutory basis to ensure greater accountability, and also to empower them to deliver.**

RECOMMENDATION 2: UNDERSTANDING THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT TO IMPROVE FUTURE POLICY

There have been strong policies in the past that have reaped successful results, but many of these have been dropped or amended before they could reach their full potentials. There have been failures that do not need repeating. We need policy that is informed by the successes and mistakes of the past.

The Children, Schools and Families Committee conducted an inquiry towards the end of the last Labour administration (*'From Baker to Balls: the foundations of the education system'*, March 2010³) which sought to analyse the historical policy context to better understand the present schools system and provide a guide for future policy makers. As the committee's report explained: *'It was illuminating and instructive to hear four former Secretaries of State engage in discussion with us on the principles of education policy. We encourage future select committees to take the opportunity, if and when former Ministers are willing, to hold similar evidence sessions and to gather a historical perspective.'*

³ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmchilsch/422/422.pdf>

City & Guilds recommends that the BIS Select Committee conducts a parallel inquiry in to the skills and employment system, reporting before or shortly after the 2015 General Election, to inform the next administration's skills and training programme and policymaking approach in the skills sector.

RECOMMENDATION 3: COHERENCE THROUGH INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT

The review has highlighted a potential mismatch between labour market analysis and subsequent policy interventions and funding commitments. A better understanding of these fundamental assumptions is required to create more continuity and stability within the system, and to ensure that public funding is not wasted on short-term policy measures. Policy and funding decisions should be built on a robust evidence base. An independent impact analysis of future labour market assumptions is therefore required to improve long-term decision-making.

City & Guilds recommends that the Government establishes an equivalent body to the Office for Budgetary Responsibility (OBR), to provide independent and authoritative analysis of the UK's skills and employment sector. This body would be responsible for the following functions:

- Conducting independent evaluation of the Government's performance against its Skills and Training targets
- Providing independent Labour Market Information forecasts in conjunction with the OBR's five-year forecasts for the economy
- Scrutinising of the Government's Skills and Training policy costings
- Assessing the long term sustainability of the Skills and Training landscape.

‘The elusive goal of policy has been to develop a skills system that gives opportunities for many young people and adults, as well as the skills that employers and the economy need. The main achievement of this period has been to broaden access but we still need to improve quality, make the system easy to understand and build an inseparable bond between skills and employers.’

Peter Lauener, Chief Executive and Accounting Officer of the Education Funding Agency and Fellow of the City and Guilds of London Institute

2. AIMS AND CONTEXT

This review aims to:

- Learn from past reviews and policy implementation by exploring what has been successful and what has stood the test of time.
- Define the problems that have been most intractable over the long term and assess how they might be dealt with.
- Define the structures and mechanisms that are most effective in the delivery of policy aims.
- Assess which aspects of the system have been short-lived and caused instability.
- Determine what we can do to create stability and to allow policy to be implemented more effectively, on the basis of evidence and experience.

Three defined areas of skills and employment policy are analysed: VET for young people, for unemployed adults, and for employed adults. As a major feature of skills and employment policy, the report also includes an overview of changes to the vocational qualifications and governance structures. It is important to note that this review focuses primarily on England, recognising that policies and approaches have differed in the devolved administrations of Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

The focus of this review is selective and has only included a limited range of policies and initiatives; simply because including all of them would require a significantly lengthier review. Finally, it must be noted that the focus on shifts in the skills and employment landscape does not imply that academic education has not also been subject to the same challenges; again, to consider education policy as a whole would require a far more substantial review.

A key finding of this report focuses on the sheer breadth of change that has occurred within the skills landscape over the past forty years. A snapshot of these changes includes:

- **Ministerial Change:** Since 1981, there have been 61 Secretaries of State with responsibility for skills and employment. This includes Secretaries of State within both education and employment ministerial departments.
- **Major Reports and Policy Papers:** Key reviews of skills and employment policy include the Dearing, Beaumont, Cassel, Tomlinson, Leitch, Wolf and Richard Reviews.
- **Acts of Parliament:** Since 1981 there have been 28 major Acts related to the development, organisation and structure of the skills and employment system. These Acts include the Employment and Training Act 1981; Further Education Act 1985; Education Reform Act 1988; Further and Higher Education Act 1992; Learning and Skills Act 2000; Further Education and Training Act 2007; Education and Skills Act 2008; Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009 and the Education Act 2011.
- **Machinery of Government Changes:** As well as ministerial change, skills and employment policy has changed departments or been shared with different departments in no fewer than 10 instances since the 1980s. In sum, there have been six different ministerial departments with overall responsibility for education since 1981 comprising the Department for Education (since 2010); Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2007-2010); Department for Education and Skills (2001-2007); Department for Education and Employment (1995-2001); Department for Education (1992-1995) and Department for Education and Science (1964-1992). In the same period, there have also been five different ministerial departments with responsibility for employment, skills and training comprising the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (since 2009); Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (2007-2009); Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (2007-2009) and the Department of Trade and Industry (1970-2007), and the Department for Work & Pensions (since 2001).
- **Programmes:** There have been numerous programmes and initiatives, many of which have now been redefined or abolished altogether. Key initiatives include: YTS, TOPs, YT, Apprenticeships (under various names), Traineeships, Train to Gain, E2E, Skills for Life, Adult Basic Skills, EMA, Employer Ownership of Skills.

- **Agencies:** In the same lifespan as the Manpower Services Commission we have seen seven successor agencies responsible for this remit (Training Commission, Training Agency, Training and Enterprise Councils, LSC, YPLA, SFA, EFA). As well as these, a number of related bodies have come and gone (e.g. Basic Skills Agency, LSIS). We have also seen a change from 25 statutory sectoral Industry Training Boards, to mainly voluntary ITOs: Lead Bodies, Occupational Standards Councils, then NTOs, SSCs and now Industry Partnerships and other employer groups responsible for setting national standards of occupational competence. These sectoral organisations were initially coordinated by the relevant Government department, followed by the SSSA and currently by the UKCES. From 1998 we also saw the involvement of the Regional Development Agencies and now the LEP network. During the same period there have been three changes in inspectorate from the introduction of the Training Standards Council, the brief period of the Adult Learning Inspectorate and now Ofsted.

‘Much of this report echoes what we are saying as 157 Group and in our own narrative on FE Colleges. It is robustly evidenced and well-written. What is needed now is a set of agreed values and outcomes for education as a whole, based on clear values, philosophies and policies that are clearly articulated and shared.’

Dr Lynne Sedgmore CBE, Executive Director of 157 Group

3. YOUNG PEOPLE

Our report considers policies that focused on:

- Qualification reform
- Increasing participation in education and training for post 16-year-olds
- Providing learners with a choice of equally valued routes.

Qualification reform has been characterised over the period of this review by frequent change. The introduction of NVQs in 1986 aimed to increase participation among young people and also to align qualifications with occupational competence. Only six years later, however, GNVQs were introduced amidst criticisms that occupation-specific qualifications would limit young people's career prospects⁴. GNVQs underwent further iterations as AVCEs and Applied GCEs before being phased out between 2005 and 2007⁵. Political influence on qualification reform has also been significant, as demonstrated by the shifts and confusion surrounding the introduction of Diplomas: commonly viewed as being a flagship policy of the Labour Government, and ultimately rejected by the academic leanings of the current Conservative Government⁶.

Apprenticeships have been a constant feature of skills policy regarding young people over the period of this review, from the Youth Training Scheme in 1983 (later simply Youth Training) to Modern Apprenticeships in 1994 and the upcoming changes resulting from the Richard Review in 2013. Criticisms of the apprenticeship system have focused on the lack of pathways to employment and/or further training provided⁷; additionally, excessive bureaucracy and a lack of employer engagement was noted as a failing by the Dearing Review⁸.

⁴ *Education and Training for 21st Century* White Paper, published, 1990

⁵ http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20081112025634/direct.gov.uk/en/EducationAndLearning/QualificationsExplained/DG_10039029

⁶ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/7625483.stm>

⁷ <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/youth-training-scheme-a-failure-and-a-disgrace-labour-says-1572820.html>

⁸ HL Deb 14 November 2001 vol 628 cc618-56

As with qualifications reform, shifts in Government policy have had a significant, negative impact on the apprenticeship system. In 2007, the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee reported that the system has suffered from poor leadership and a string of initiatives that have not been implemented successfully⁹.

Key findings

- There has been significant and ongoing political tinkering in the system.
- There exists a fundamental conflict between political incentives to make quick changes and the stability required by the skills and employment system.
- Consistent churn in the system has created a collective amnesia and growing lack of organisational memory at political and official levels.
- There has been a preponderance of scheme and qualification name changes linked to a desire to rebrand, which has often led to confusion and frustration among employers and learners.
- The proclivity of policy makers to cherry pick from review recommendations has also led to greater confusion in skills.
- The history of policy in this area demonstrates an unhappy compromise between two conflicting aims: training people to work in a specific occupation, and ensuring that individuals' training is broad enough so that their occupational choices are not limited.

⁹ House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee, *Apprenticeships: a key route to skill*, HL 138-I 2006-07, 20 July 2007

4. EMPLOYED WORKFORCE

Ensuring that the UK has a strong skills base for economic growth and prosperity is at the heart of skills and employment policy. Filling the 'skills gap' and improving employer attitudes to training are consistent themes that occur throughout the period of this review. We have considered two specific objectives that aim to address these issues:

- Raising the skills and qualification levels of those in the workforce
- Improving employer engagement.

Initiatives to improve skills levels have included employer-driven schemes such as Investors in People, and policy-led schemes such as the Skills Pledge and Train to Gain. Investors in People, now entirely commercially funded, has had not only longevity but also a strikingly high satisfaction rate amongst employers¹⁰. The Skills Pledge, while still in existence, faced criticism for a lack of clarity about its objectives and its quantitative targets, which it was feared would compromise on quality. Train to Gain, which was criticised for a failure to link qualifications with the needs of industry, was discontinued in 2010, having been described as a 'deadweight cost'¹¹.

UKCES, established in 2008, has been a successful example of employer-led infrastructure in the UK; its 2013 recommendations for employer engagement with skills development include¹²:

- Transferring funding for apprenticeships from provider grants to employers
- Ensuring that training providers emphasise labour market outcomes in assessments

¹⁰ Research to support the evaluation of Investors in People: Employer Survey (Year 2): Executive Summary (2013), UK Commission for Employment and Skills.

¹¹ Louisa Peacock, The Telegraph, 22 Jul 2010, *Train to Gain reaches the end of the track* <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/jobs/7905158/Train-to-Gain-reaches-the-end-of-the-track.html>

¹² https://www.gov.uk/Government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/305784/employer-ownership-of-skills-building-the-momentum.pdf

- Collating data to create labour market information for employers
- Measuring the benefits of investment in people
- Forming industrial partnerships between groups of employers
- Ensuring that adult qualifications are relevant to industry
- Providing work experience as a central part of vocational training
- Incentivising employers to invest in training institutions.

Key findings

- Not much is new under the sun; current policies contain echoes of those developed 30 years ago.
- Investors in People remains popular and has been a successful means of ensuring employer commitment to training and adherence to an external quality standard.
- Quantitative training targets can have adverse effects by encouraging the misreporting of results and compromises on quality.
- Linkages between training targets and labour market needs are essential, and this requires relevant, local labour market information.
- Employers will fund training that is useful and relevant.
- Employer-led infrastructure is critical to ensure that training is relevant and that buy-in from industry is achieved.
- Occupational regulation is valuable in developing a skilled workforce and is growing steadily as a part of the UK skills infrastructure.

5. UNEMPLOYED

The third area of skills and employment policy this report considers relates to skills development for unemployed adults. The key focus points include:

- The distinction between the skills and welfare aspects of policy.
- The changing roles and responsibilities for managing funding and delivering programmes.

Work training schemes considered for this review, such as Skillcentres and the current Work Programme scheme, illustrate the impact of insufficiently planned policies. Skillcentres, which offered training and training allowances that were higher than unemployment benefits, had unforeseen demand as workers proved willing to leave their jobs to access higher-level skills training. Skillcentres were privatised in 1990 but went into receivership after three years; this was due to insufficient funding from employers. The current Work Programme scheme aims to support the long-term unemployed into work; one of the most controversial options is training provided through work placements, and the provision of financial incentives for private contractors placing people into jobs. Criticism of the scheme has included a lack of rigour around the incentives process and errors in contracting arrangements¹³.

Another criticism of the current Work Programme has been the fact that there is a false assumption that the right quantity and quality of jobs are available for the unemployed; this assumption was also evident in Labour's New Deals. Evaluation of the 1997 scheme indicated that while jobs were available, they were not jobs that were suitable for (or appealing to) young people. Some training for work initiatives had successful outcomes, however: training vouchers formed part of the Open Learning Credits pilot (1993-4), which was distinctive in having a robust evaluation process. The pilot findings indicated that giving individuals ownership of their training was a positive benefit, and that there was also a positive impact on the quality of employment¹⁴.

¹³ <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/jul/02/work-programme-department-work-pensions-bonuses>

¹⁴ <http://vital.new.voced.edu.au/vital/access/services/Download/ngv:31031/SOURCE2>

Welfare to work schemes have played central roles in employment policy over the last decade; the more recent introduction of the austerity measures of the Coalition, however, may be creating unanticipated negative impact. While the most recent evaluation of the scheme has not yet been published, recent figures indicate that targets have not been met: official figures from the first year of Work Programme operation showed that only 3.5% of jobseekers had remained in a job for six months or more following their participation in the scheme, against a target of 5.5%. However, the Social Market Foundation queried these official figures, stating that strict 12 month analysis revealed that success rates were as low as 2.3% (as opposed to the 14 month period that official figures were based upon).

While providers continued to fall short of the required target of 27.5% in the second year of the programme's operation, the best performing providers boast success rates almost double that of the worst performing providers. This suggests that the programme itself has potential if lessons can be learned and implemented¹⁵.

Key findings

- Privatisation of training bears significant risks, as income and training targets could possibly override quality considerations.
- Funding is administered effectively at local levels.
- Allowing individuals to combine job seeking with training through Open Learning schemes is effective.
- The JobCentre Plus scheme has been effective in meeting targets.
- Welfare to Work schemes are not necessarily effective when the incentive to work is created by the reduction of other benefits.
- It is not enough to prepare individuals for work; ensuring that quality jobs are available is an important determinant of people seeking and accepting employment.

¹⁵ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-20499836>

‘A pattern in the changes is the apparent, consistent lack of willingness of UK employers to pay for training. If employers are unwilling to engage with Government initiatives thus far, that explains why we have seen repeated failures of initiatives aimed at employer investment and engagement. This may be because they are guided by a short-term view on return on investment, rather than looking at the longer term impact on both business and society. Licenses to practise may provide a more reliable framework for employer investment.’

Martin Doel, Chief Executive, Association of Colleges

WHAT NEXT?

After considering the insights and evidence gathered for this report, City & Guilds now challenges all political parties to address the report's main recommendations:

- **Better long term planning** for skills policy that is linked to long term economic forecasts
- **Greater coherence** between central Government policy making and local implementation
- **Greater scrutiny** of changes to skills programmes to deliver better taxpayer value for money
- **Better checks and balances** to remove the risk of politics influencing policy decisions.

THANK YOU

This report wouldn't have been possible without the input and support of a number of individuals from within the skills, education, and employment sectors. Thank you to all of those who contributed.

To read the full report, bibliography and list of contributors, please visit www.cityandguilds.com/skillspolicyreview

GLOSSARY

Acronym Full Version

AVCE	Advanced Vocational Certificates of Education
BERR	Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform
BIS	Department for Business Innovation and Skills
BTEC	Business and Technology Education Council
CBI	Confederation of British Industry
DCSF	Department for Children, School and Families
DE	Department of Employment
DES	Department for Education and Science
DfE	Department for Education
DfEE	Department for Education and Employment
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
DIUS	Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills
DOE	Department of the Environment
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
E2E	Entry to Employment
EBAC	English Baccalaureate
EFA	Education Funding Agency
EMA	Education Maintenance Allowance
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ET	Employment Training
FE	Further Education
FEFC	Further Education Funding Council
FHEQ	Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
GCE	General Certificate of Education
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
GNVQ	General National Vocational Qualification
HNC	Higher National Certificate
HND	Higher National Diploma
IB	Inactive Benefit
iiP	Investors in People
ITB	Industry Training Board
ITO	Industry Training Organisation

JC+	Jobcentre Plus
LA	Local Authority
LEA	Local Education Authority
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership
LMI	Labour Market Information
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
LSIS	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
MA	Modern Apprenticeship
MSC	Manpower Services Commission
NAS	National Apprenticeship Service
NCVQ	National Council for Vocational Qualifications
NEET	Not in Education, Employment, or Training
NI	National Insurance
NOS	National Occupational Standard
NTI	New Training Initiative
NTO	National Training Organisation
NVQ	National Vocational Qualification
OSC	Occupational Standards Council
PAYE	Pay As You Earn
PLA	Programme-Led Apprenticeship
PSA	Public Service Agreement
QCF	Qualifications and Credit Framework
SCAA	Schools Curriculum and Assessment Authority
SFA	Skills Funding Agency
SSC	Sector Skills Council
SSDA	Sector Skills Development Agency
TC	Training Commission
TEC	Training and Enterprise Council
TtG	Train to Gain
TUC	Trade Union Congress
TVEI	Technical and Vocational Initiative
UKCES	UK Commission for Employment and Skills
VET	Vocational Education and Training
YPLA	Young People's Learning Agency
YT	Youth Training
YTS	Youth Training Scheme

‘This report provides a helpful review of the history and repeated missed opportunities to get our system right. It shows we know the answers, but must stop the churn and turbulence.’

Andy Smyth, Accredited Programmes Development Manager at TUI UK and Trustee Board Member for the City and Guilds of London Institute

