

**AN EVALUATION OF THE 'NEW DEAL' IN FURTHER EDUCATION  
COLLEGES IN ENGLAND**

Sai Loo and Norman Lucas

Sai Loo is a lecturer at the School of Lifelong Education and International Development, Institute of Education, University of London. 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL, Tel+44 9 (0)20 7612 6727, Fax+44 9 (0)20 7612 6766. Email: [s.loo@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:s.loo@ioe.ac.uk)

Dr Norman Lucas is Director of Post-compulsory Education at the School of Lifelong Education and International Development, Institute of Education, University of London. 20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL, Tel+44 9 (0)20 7612 6761, Fax+44 9 (0)20 7612 6766. Email: [n.lucas@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:n.lucas@ioe.ac.uk)

## **ABSTRACT**

The article starts by providing a brief historical context for the introduction of the New Deal and then describes the aims and structure of the New Deal in FE colleges. Base on a small-scale research project on FE colleges in London and south east England, the article analyses issues and challenges arising from the experience of the New Deal. This article argues that the New Deal did represent something different from past schemes for the unemployed and did demonstrate a commitment on the part of New Labour to social inclusion. From our research, good practice was found when the top management in colleges was committed to New Deal and was supported by a dedicated team of New Deal tutors. Finally the paper speculates on the future shape and direction of the New Deal in the context of FE colleges.

# AN EVALUATION OF THE 'NEW DEAL' IN FURTHER EDUCATION COLLEGES IN ENGLAND

## **Introduction.**

This article is based upon a small-scale research project focusing on the full-time education and training (FTET) option of the New Deal in FE colleges. The paper sets a context for understanding the New Deal arguing that catering for unemployed youth is not new for FE colleges. The article describes the FTET New Deal options and highlights the differences between the New Deal and past initiatives suggesting that there are important differences in some respects both in the structure and the economic and political context in which the initiative was launched. The article then outlines the research findings showing the wide variety of ways the FE colleges in our sample have responded to the New Deal. Finally, the paper identifies problems, challenges and good practices. It then discusses the effectiveness and future of the New Deal in relation to FE colleges.

## **Research Methodology**

This paper is based on the research carried out by the New Deal Research and Development Group. This self-selected group consisted of seven members who were initially drawn from the London Region Post-16 Network (Network) which was based at the Institute of Education, University of London. The aims of the Network were to

provide a forum where academics, practitioners and policy makers from south east England could discuss issues of concern, disseminate innovative practice and explore future strategies. The New Deal Research and Development Group was formed as a result of one of these forums which took the form of a half-day Network event which revealed issues surrounding implementation issues of New Deal in FE colleges.

The group of seven members consisted of two academics from two London based higher education institutions, two researchers from two different tertiary establishments, the manager of the Network, a New Deal co-ordinator of an FE college and a FE lecturer.

The research was carried out over a six-month duration during the year 2000. The research methods consisted of questionnaires and interviews. Questionnaires were initially sent out to New Deal co-ordinators of twenty FE colleges in London and south east England. The sample of FE colleges for this research was based on those colleges, which were involved in the provision of New Deal and were known by the members of the research group as New Deal providers. These questionnaires were then followed up with telephone reminders. A smaller sample of twelve in-depth structured interviews with college New Deal co-ordinators from the twenty FE colleges were carried out by the members of the research group. The selection criterion of these twelve colleges was based on the quality of information from the completed questionnaires. The interview questions centred around key issues and concerns arising out of the analysis of the completed questionnaires. The research is qualitative in nature due to the small sample. We were aware that the small sample and the location represented, in general, an area of high

employment which might influence the findings. The research was conducted with adherence to the British Education and Research Association guidelines.

The findings from the analysis of the questionnaires together with in-depth structured interviews of college New Deal co-ordinators provided the basis for a half-day conference *New Deal in Colleges: Challenges for the Future*. This conference was held after the research by the London Region Post-16 Network in which the research findings were disseminated and workshops from four colleges identified during the project were included (Loo et al 2001). Tessa Jowell, the then Minister for Employment, Welfare to Work and Equal Opportunities was present and questions were put to her. A feedback paper was prepared in which the main issues of concern identified during the event was sent to Tessa Jowell's office and to the Education Select Committee (Loo et al 2001 pp 27 – 29).

### **How New is the New Deal for FE colleges?**

Although the New Deal is a recent initiative in the UK, schemes catering for the unemployed are not new and have been undertaken by successive governments in the UK. Traditionally FE or technical colleges were vocational institutions catering for the employed. However during the late 1970s and 1980s FE colleges became used to responding to the needs of new types of learners, including adults and school leavers, who previously would have entered directly into the labour market (Ainley and Corney 1990, Green and Lucas 1999). Although the New Deal was different to previous

initiatives in that it had a lot of support from colleges and a political will to see it work - catering for the unemployed - but it did not represent a totally new challenge for FE colleges.

During the 1980s concerns about rising levels of unemployment stimulated a series of Government initiatives such as 'A New Training Initiative' (MSC, 1981), and 'Training for Jobs' (DES, 1984). These led to the establishment of schemes like the Technical Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) aimed at schools. They followed on from a range of relatively new vocational courses such as the Youth Opportunities Programme (YOPs), which was started in the late 1970s and from there to the more ambitious Youth Training Scheme (YTS) in 1983. YTS was intended to be a modernised training scheme which was committed to providing places for all 16 and 17 year old school leavers who were out of work in order to enhance their 'employability' (Ainley, 1990). For unemployed adults there was the Training Opportunities Programme (TOPs) and later, Employment Training (ET) (Raggatt and Williams, 1999). These government initiatives reduced the levels of people registered as unemployed and some people did find employment through the schemes although this varied from region to region depending upon the local employment opportunities (Webster and Edge 1999, Martin et al 2000). To be fair to these early developments of new vocational courses in the 1980s they came about within the context of economic downturn and rising levels of unemployment and the initiatives were caught between the need to do something about unemployment and the need to develop a genuine training route (Ainley and Corney, 1990). For example as youth unemployment rose, YTS soon became stigmatised by many as a scheme for the 'less able, less

motivated and above all less employable' (Raffe, 1990 pp 63) rather than the modernised training scheme for all, that was initially envisaged. On the other hand some claim that that YTS gave many young people opportunities to acquire 'work disciplines' and gave employers space to screen young people before offering employment (Main and Shelly, 1988).

The YTS, became Youth Training (YT) in 1991 and unlike the old apprenticeships, YT gave even more priority to personal and social skill development rather than job specific skills (Ainley, 1990). Many of the courses of this era were based upon programmes of work experience, combined with inculcating work/life, or 'life preparation skills' (Pring, 1995), which were seen as transferable from one occupation to another. This was a redefinition of what had been referred to as 'life skills' and had an increased emphasis on the improvement of a young person's 'personal and coping skills'. This approach was used particularly for lower achieving students who were regarded as destined for low skill jobs in a changing labour market (Esland, 1996). In general 'preparation for work' elements on schemes such as YTS meant remedial help based on developing skills such as coping with how to conduct oneself at work, handling interviews and so forth. In this respect the 'hidden curriculum' - implicit in all education and training - of preparing people for certain work habits was not only made explicit, but became the central focus of the curriculum for those seeking mainly low paid unskilled employment. These initiatives have been described in various ways for example: the Vocational Preparation Movement (Bates et al, 1984); Vocational Education and Training (VET) (Ainley, 1990), New Vocationalism (Bates et al 1984), Pre-vocationalism (Stoney and Lines, 1987) and the

‘life preparation tradition’ (Pring, 1995). These descriptions sought to explain a range of vocationally orientated curriculum developments and reforms, which took place at a time when there was a growing realisation that the disappearance of the youth labour market and the growth of adult unemployment were not temporary phenomena.

As a consequence of catering for the needs of the unemployed, learners in FE colleges became more diverse and new programmes were developed offering a range of courses, which emphasised preparation for work in general, rather than for specific jobs. As Bloomer (1997) discusses, this development fuelled a debate that is still going on about the purpose and content of such courses.

All of the courses for the unemployed described above have had many critics (Bates *et al*, 1984; Dale, 1985; Ainley, 1988; Gleeson, 1990) who claimed that such schemes are a means of getting young people to lower their expectations, of socialising them into ‘knowing their place’ as well as being a source of cheap labour for employers. However, as Huddleston and Unwin (1997) argued, the situation was more complex than that. The new vocationalism, and many of the new teaching techniques employed within it, was also a response to the limitations and inadequacies of the existing curricula which was sharply divided between the academic and the narrowly vocational both of which were also a ‘preparation for work’ – albeit into rather different kinds of employment. In other words much of the criticism of the new vocational courses for the unemployed could also be made of other more traditional vocational and academic courses. Furthermore, Unwin (1997) argues that the critics of such courses as YTS underestimate the importance of the

learning experiences that can be and are gained within the workplace and some of the positive outcomes of such experiences.

Therefore when the New Deal was launched in 1998, colleges already had considerable experience in catering for the unemployed. FE college management and staff attitudes towards the scheme ranged from cynicism regarding government schemes, to a genuine commitment towards the unemployed and New Labour's welfare to work policies. As we show below, the response of FE colleges varied enormously and the learning experience of the New Deal student depended in the main upon the commitment of FE managers to provide flexible provision with strong guidance and support and upon the commitment and enthusiasm of New Deal coordinators and other key staff.

### **The Aims and Structure of New Deal**

The New Labour Government elected in 1997 made their political commitment to moving people from benefits to work a central plank of their manifesto, but wished to implement the strategy in a way that would distance them from the policies of 'Old Labour'. New Labour's strategy was firmly centred on helping the long-term unemployed back to work and they attached particular importance to reaching young people who had never worked and in many cases had become dependent on benefits. One of the first announcements after the 1997 election was the New Deal for Young People as part of Labour's welfare to work programme (Millar 2000).

One of the aims of the New Deal for Young People (NDYP) and the New Deal for the Long Term Unemployed (NDLTU) programmes is to help young unemployed people into work but also to enhance their employability (Williams 2002). Employability is defined as the 'capacity to move self-sufficiently within the labour market to realise potential through sustainable employment' (Hillage and Pollard 1998 pp xi). Of those participants who were in the NDYP programme (i.e. aged 18 – 24) from January 1998 to November 2001, 68 per cent had no qualifications or had no qualification data recorded. Only one per cent had a National Vocational Qualification<sup>1</sup> (NVQ) level 4 and above, two per cent had an NVQ level 3, nine per cent had an NVQ level 2, seven per cent had an NVQ level 1 and thirteen per cent had other qualifications<sup>2</sup>.

The first rung onto New Deal, whatever the option, is through the Gateway. The purpose of this service is to provide one-to-one guidance in establishing a plan best suited to individuals' needs and circumstances. This mandatory process is for young people between the ages of 18 and 24 (NDYP) who have been unemployed and receiving Job Seekers Allowance (JSA)<sup>3</sup> for six months (Select Committee 2001). This Gateway process also applies to those who are aged 25 plus. The people who qualify for this type of New Deal (NDLTU) have to be claiming JSA for two years or more. From 1st April 2001, the duration of unemployment was reduced from two years to 18 months.

---

1

2

3

The two New Deal programmes, which relate to FE Colleges and are the focus of our research, are the young unemployed (NDYP) and the long-term unemployed (NDLTU). New Dealers, on entering the Colleges, are enrolled on recognised formal qualifications up to NVQ level 2 (or beyond if it is deemed necessary for the purposes of employment) for a period of up to one year. The participants are also provided with financial and non-financial benefits, which are stated below. The courses that New Dealers enrol on cover a range of areas including pre-vocational and basic skills, GCSE, A Levels and vocational courses such as hotel and catering, nursing, occupational health and safety, construction, civil engineering and woodworking.

From January 1998, the New Deal had four options – Employment Option (EO), Voluntary Sector Option (VSO), Environmental Taskforce option (ETF) and Full Time Education and Training Option (FTET) (i.e. NDYP and NDLTU).

Of the total number of the New Deal participants on the four options from the start of this programme in January 1998 to November 2001<sup>4</sup>, the FTET percentages (i.e. College pathway) have been consistent for most of the period of New Deal. The fluctuations at the start of the academic year of 1998 varied from below 30 per cent between January and March 1998 and rose to a peak of 70 per cent in mid-September before it tailed off to 50 per cent in January 1999. During the period January 1999 to November 2001, the FTET option has been consistently 30 to 50 per cent of the total number of new dealers. During the period from January 1998 to April 2000, fewer than 20 per cent of the New Dealers

---

4

entering this FTET route achieved the qualification they were aiming for and 45 per cent completed a programme and obtained a qualification. Also, a smaller proportion of leavers from this route entered employment compare to those leaving from the other three routes<sup>5</sup>.

### **The New Deal and Further Education Colleges**

The FTET New Deal Programme (NDYP and NDLTU) consists of 30 hours of learning per week in a 50-week provision and the candidates mainly enrol on a Level 2 programme. In theory, the Colleges should offer the New Dealers multiple entry points throughout the academic year. The courses, which the participants enrolled on, usually take up to 16 hours per week. In addition, the participants were offered a ‘core curriculum’. These ‘core curriculum’ sessions could add up to 14 hours per week according to individual requirements and the availability of college resources. The areas covered by these ‘core curriculum’ included job search, curriculum vitae, basic/key skills, information technology, work experience, personal support, confidence boosting sessions and self-directed learning. In some colleges, induction programmes are available for New Deal candidates in order to integrate them into the College.

On completion of a year’s programme at a college, the New Deal candidate’s Personal Advisor (PA), from the Gateway, will try to help find employment for the candidate. S/he will take into account the candidate’s newly acquired qualifications and employability

---

<sup>5</sup>

skills. This may involve career guidance service from the PA who will offer support and guidance throughout the candidate's time with the New Deal programme.

At the time of writing FE Colleges receive funding based on three cost bands – standard, intermediate and high<sup>6</sup>. For the standard cost band, the college receives £1,700 for provision of pre-vocational and basic skills (up to 20 weeks in duration), as well as GCSE A levels, AS, and GNVQs. The intermediate cost band is worth a higher amount of £2,050. The programmes include hotel and catering, social care, childcare, health care, nursing, occupational health and safety, fashion and crafts courses. The high cost band attracts an amount of £2,650. The subject areas which attract this funding include agriculture, horticulture, construction and the built environment, civil engineering, food preparation, mining and quarrying, motor vehicle, manufacturing, printing, engineering, woodwork and joinery. These types of fees are meant to cover the full cost of training, childcare provision, equipment, examination fees and travel costs. They are paid directly to the colleges in three tranches. The first, representing 20 per cent, is for assessment and commencement of the agreed education and training programme of the New Dealer. The second, representing 50 per cent, relates to the New Dealer's continued participation on the college programme and the third, representing 30 per cent, has two parts. One is related to achieving the qualification and is 20 per cent and the second – 10 per cent – is for securing employment, lasting for more than three months, within four months of leaving the college programme.

---

<sup>6</sup>

## **The FE College Response: Issues and Challenges**

Our investigation, which was carried out among colleges in London and the South East of England (Loo et al 2001) revealed that there were some problems surrounding the management, pastoral support and curriculum delivery of the New Deal programme across the colleges. The investigation showed that there was a great variety in the way colleges dealt with the challenges of New Deal, much of which depended upon the commitment of individual colleges. Where commitment of the college management was low, too much was left to the enthusiasm and hard work of the college new Deal coordinators. There was also considerable cynicism from staff as to the workability of the New Deal programme. Colleges themselves responded differently to taking on New Deal. Those colleges in more affluent areas, with aspirations to take on HE work were unsurprisingly unenthusiastic or poorly prepared for New Deal participants who themselves were few in number. Colleges situated in high unemployment areas were found to have responded more positively and constructively in meeting the needs of these clients.

We were told that the central cause of many problems related to a mismatch between the way that colleges were organised, including their curriculum delivery patterns and the provision of pastoral support. The colleges' management information systems (MIS) were not geared towards the New Deal roll-on-roll-off programmes<sup>7</sup> but towards the FEFC funded students. These issues highlighted the need for greater flexibility required by

---

7

students coming via the New Deal route. Furthermore, an area of common concern was the relatively low level of New Deal funding, which affected the flexibility and range of programme offer for New Deal students. Colleges claimed they were losing financially from taking on New Deal Students (£350 administrative costs per students in one college compared with £150 for an FEFC funded student). Some colleges responded by limiting course option choices to areas which needed least resourcing<sup>8</sup>. The issue of infilling New Deal Clients into existing course programmes on the basis of cost effectiveness also related to a finding that in some colleges New Deal students were barred from taking more courses with high costs for materials, such as photography or art, on the grounds that it would be too expensive for the college and that in any case the one year allowed would be too short a time to complete the study programme. Cost-effective infilling often resulted in students being placed on programmes for which they were unsuitable or uninterested and was one reason cited by course co-ordinators for non-completion or drop out.

Much FE colleges time was spent attempting to fit the flexible, individually tailored programme of 30 hours a week, running for 50 weeks a year, as prescribed for a New Dealer, into an over-rigid college framework operating over a shorter academic year combined with an inflexible curriculum delivery pattern. This was not true in all the colleges investigated nor was it true across all departments within a college. Indeed some departments in some colleges had made sound flexible provision for New Dealers whilst others resisted attempts to accommodate roll-on-roll-off programmes of study.

---

8

Our research also found that these overburdened New Deal co-ordinators complained that there was some tension between the colleges' aims of providing programmes in the longer term and the Employment Department's focus on meeting job targets. It was also claimed that one year was too short a time to meet basic skills needs of participants and to complete a vocational course which could then provide progression to the next level. Some questions, which arose were; was the New Deal too focused on entering employment? Should New Dealers have access to academic courses as well as vocational ones? Is New Deal too much focused on achieving short-term job targets rather than aiming for long- term sustained employment that longer training or education programmes might provide?

Our investigation found that there was a considerable amount of rule bending by New Deal co-ordinators to get round these limitations to access in an attempt to build more flexibility into the system. Indeed we found some laudable flexibility and 'understandings' between local Employment Service personal advisers and College New Deal co-ordinators which had allowed special case individuals to be placed on Level 3, Access and HND programmes<sup>9</sup> (Loo et al 2001 pp 18).

College co-ordinators pointed to many 'New Dealers' having poor basic skills, attitudinal and motivational problems, which affected drop out rates. Some students believed the college option would be a soft option but found that they often lacked basic

---

9

skills thus needing extensive support in both basic and attitudinal skills to sustain them through a learning programme. Some inner city colleges had a high concentration of people from minority ethnic groups with English language difficulties. One college laid on Saturday ESOL classes to take them up to an employable standard. In one or two colleges, some tutors or heads of school had developed hostile attitudes to New Deal Clients owing to their failure to turn up for interviews, persistent lateness or absences. In a few cases, tutors themselves were hostile or unwelcoming to New Deal students being 'dropped' into the middle of an existing programme (Marsh 2000). Some New Dealers felt they were placed on the wrong programme of study as a result of poor advice from PAs. Others found the course programmes irrelevant to their perceived needs or too theoretical with too little work-placement or training provision. Furthermore, some New Dealers felt stigmatised because they had to sign on and off at the end of each class and did not share the half term and holiday breaks with other students.

Many reasons were given for the high drop out rates. However, getting an accurate picture of this from our limited research was difficult and complex. For example, some New Deal students found work within the time span of the programme. However, overall drop out rates were high averaging around 55 per cent. There were some noted successes (81 per cent retention in one college) with some students being placed onto Level 3 programmes of study. There were even one or two cases of New Deal students moving onto HND programmes of study where

the students left the New Deal scheme to continue their studies under Access or higher education financial support.

Our investigation found that much depended on the individual efforts and commitment of the New Deal Co-ordinators not just in dealing with students but also in spending a large amount of time dealing with administrative red tape. Other studies too found paperwork, bureaucracy and a mismatch between colleges and the education service attitudes towards client confidentiality and assessment as major barriers to good practice (LSDA 2001).

From our research, we found the good practice took place when certain basic factors were present in colleges. Good practice in colleges was identified as practice which appeared to work well in terms of completion rates of New Dealers, who were enrolled on college programmes, and/or the degree of adaptability the college had undertaken to include New Dealers as regards the flexibility of programmes, pastoral and life skills support on offer.

Firstly, good practice seemed to be where colleges had combined flexible provision alongside a tight support structure and individually tailored action plans. This was to overcome the problems associated with infilling, where New Dealers often felt scattered and unsupported as they were dropped into a variety of existing courses. One college in our investigation set up a Learning Resource Centre where New Dealers could drop in at

any time to meet and discuss issues with support staff, access job search or get further help with key skills.

A second area of good practice was when colleges had high quality guidance and support systems. Some colleges saw the Employment Service's personal advisers as unable to provide the necessary time, attention and expert guidance necessary. They were not seen by co-ordinators as sufficiently expert in the range of tasks which they were expected to perform; as counsellors, careers guidance providers, welfare advisers etc. and indeed some of these roles could conflict with the employment targets set for them by the government. One college New Deal co-ordinator reported an initial reluctance by Employment Services personal advisers to offer the full-time Education and Training Option, as they were concerned that this route would not count towards their job targets. Furthermore, there were also complaints about the amount of clerical red tape, which New Deal co-ordinators had to cope with to satisfy Employment Service regulations. One college which we investigated had liaison and contracted with the Employment Services to buy in 'private' specialist help for careers guidance in the belief that more specialist diagnosis of vocational training and career needs were of prime importance in preventing or minimising drop out rates. This need for specialist help highlights the complexity and range of tasks performed by PAs and the need for some quality benchmarking in their training. Some colleges investigated had established close links with support agencies dealing with drugs and alcohol abuse (Marsh 2000).

Thirdly, where good practice existed, we found a close partnership between the PAs and New Deal co-ordinators. In some colleges, this was achieved by placing Gateway provision, in consultation with personal advisers, within the college. Some colleges had set up basic skills assessment, induction, tasters of courses and key skills provision either within the college or in a local colleges/Employment Services consortium arrangement, in a central location, easily accessible to the general public. This type of college/Employment Services partnership helped to break down concepts in the minds of New Dealers that the PA is part of 'the establishment'

## **Conclusion**

Our research highlighted a number of challenges facing the New Deal when applied to FE colleges. These included;

- a mismatch between the way colleges organised their curriculum offer and the greater flexibility demanded by New Deal students
- relatively low levels of funding for New Deal students and the consequent limited entry of New Deal students to costly courses
- the one year programme was said to be too short a time to meet the basic skill and motivational needs of many New Deal students
- the New Deal has too narrow a focus on meeting employment targets rather than focusing on the long term needs of the individual
- the New Deal scheme was administratively cumbersome reflecting too much bureaucracy and red tape.

As well as these structural challenges our research also highlighted how in some colleges a low commitment to the New Deal scheme meant some tutors and Heads of school showed quite hostile attitudes to New Deal students.

These poor practices were contrasted by other colleges, which unsurprisingly reflected a real commitment towards the unemployed by top management and a dedicated team of New Deal tutors. Good practice often manifested itself in ‘rule bending’ to build greater flexibility by collaboration between the local employment service and the new deal college coordinator. Such collaboration produced flexible provision with a tight support structure and individually tailored learning plans and high quality guidance and learning support. All good practices we found reflected real and creative collaboration between personal advisors and new deal college coordinators.

The New Deal is part of the government’s programme to help people to get off welfare and into work while at the same time focusing on people’s personal responsibility to find employment and emphasising the ‘employability’ of individuals. It is this ‘individualisation’ of unemployment and the consequent neglect of collective and structural factors that constitute a major criticism of the whole scheme (Williams 2002, Hyland 2002, Ainley 1999, Coffield 1998).

In our view the New Deal also represents an ethical opposition to unemployment and a commitment to social inclusion with Government taking some responsibility to bring this about by giving the new dealer considerable personal advice and guidance on their options, albeit with the threat that if no choice was made the individuals job seekers allowance is taken away. However, despite these criticisms, unlike other government schemes for the unemployed the New Deal did have broad support from FE Colleges.

In considering the similarities and differences between the Labour and Conservative education and training policies, it is important to remember that New Labour initiatives have not been subject to the pressures of economic recession which were a feature of the early 1980s (Hodgson and Spours 1997). If caught in an economic recession, it is possible to imagine a scenario where Labour's New Deal could find itself in the position of its predecessors - that is shifting from being a bridge between benefit and work to becoming a means of keeping down unemployment figures.

However, any evaluation of New Deal in colleges is difficult because it is impossible to isolate the effects of New Deal in colleges on employment from factors such as the growth in the economy and a whole range of other welfare to work schemes. Other policies such as the introduction of a minimum wage or tax changes and benefits also need to be taken into account when evaluating the scheme (Select Committee 2001).

Although the New Deal is no longer new and the Labour Government is in its second term in the UK, there remains a commitment to the New Deal and to the welfare to work programmes. This can be verified by examining the budget allocation given to the schemes by the treasury. Some of the FE colleges that we used in our research are no longer involved with the New Deal scheme as other political and financial incentives such as the emphasis on adult basic skills has moved to the top of the agenda. Government officials responsible for the New Deal at the Department of Work and Pensions are aware that FE colleges commitments to New Deal seems to be waning. Officials informed us that some changes and rationalisation of the New Deal are being considered. Current thinking seems to be that the best way to get a job is to get into work and receive some on-the-job training. There are discussions about giving the New Deal greater local autonomy, presumably via the Local Learning and Skills Councils with a possible shift away from those on JSA towards the more long term unemployed such as people who are claiming disability allowance. This could involve the development of more long-term education and training options for FE colleges to respond to.

## Notes

1. These are vocational programmes, unlike GCE 'A' levels and General National Vocational Qualifications (GNVQs), which are offered at four different levels – 1, 2, 3 and 4 where level 1 is the foundation or the lowest level.
2. [www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/new\\_deal/ndyp\\_jan02/18finaljan02T5.pdf](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/new_deal/ndyp_jan02/18finaljan02T5.pdf) @ 27/05/02.
3. Job Seeker Allowance is state benefit for the unemployed.
4. The data consists of three sources namely; Dolton (2000) for the period Jan. 1998 to Jan. 2000, [www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/new\\_deal/T2ofR008.pdf](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/new_deal/T2ofR008.pdf) @ 27/05/02 for the period Feb. 2000 to Jul. 2001 and [www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/new\\_deal/ndyp\\_jan02/18finaljan02T2.pdf](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/new_deal/ndyp_jan02/18finaljan02T2.pdf) @27/05/02 for the period Aug. 2001 to Nov. 2001.
5. Select Committee on Education and Employment Fifth Report - New Deal: An Evaluation (2001) [www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200001/cmselect/cmduemp/58/5803.htm](http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200001/cmselect/cmduemp/58/5803.htm) @ 14/05/02.
6. [www.newdeal.gov.uk/english/statistics/statfile.asp?7](http://www.newdeal.gov.uk/english/statistics/statfile.asp?7) @ 09/01/01.
7. Roll-on-roll-off programmes are programmes, which have the flexibility to enable new students to join and leave these programmes during several entry and exit points during the duration of the programmes. The traditional programmes have only one entry point i.e. at the start of the academic year and one exit point i.e. at the end of the academic year.
8. The ND provision, which is a 30 hours/wk on a 50 week programme, is funded separately to the regular programmes, which are usually 16 hours/wk on an average of 36

week programmes, are Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) funded. The New Deal client can join the college at various times of the academic year whereas the other programmes have normally one/two entry points.

9. Access programmes are a one-year feeder programmes catering for mature learners, at level 3, who do not have a formal academic qualification and aspire to progress onto higher education. Higher National Diploma is a vocational qualification at level 4 for those, who on completion of this programme, progress onto the employment market.

## **REFERENCES**

AINLEY, P. (1988) *From School to YTS* (Buckingham, Open University Press).

AINLEY, P. (1990) *Vocational Education and Training* (London, Cassell).

AINLEY, P. (1999) *Learning Policy: Towards a Certified Society* (London, Macmillan).

AINLEY, P. & CORNEY, M. (1990) *Training for the Future: The Rise and Fall of the Manpower Services Commission* (London, Cassell).

BATES, I., CLARKE, J., COHEN, P., FINN, D., MOORE, R. & WILLIS, P. (1984), *Schooling for the dole?: The New Vocationalism* (London, Macmillan).

BLOOMER, M. (1997) *Curriculum Making in Post-16 Education* (London, Routledge).

DALE, R. (1985) *Education, Training and Employment: Towards a New Vocationalism* (Oxford, Pergamon).

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, (DES) (1984) *Training for Jobs* (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office).

DOLTON, P. (2000) *Does the New Deal Match Up?* (Unpublished) (University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne).

ESLAND, G. (1996) Education and Training and Nation State Capitalism: Britain's Falling Strategy in R, EDWARDS, A. HANSON & P. RAGGATT (Eds) *Boundaries of Adult Learning* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).

GLEESON, D. (Ed) (1990) *Skills Training and its Alternatives* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).

GREEN, A. & LUCAS, N. (Eds) (1999) *FE and Lifelong Learning: Realigning the Sector for the Twenty-first Century* (London, Bedford Way Papers, Institute of Education, University of London).

HILLAGE, J. & POLLARD, E. (1998) *Employability: Developing a Framework for Policy Analysis* (London, Department for Employment and Education).

HODGSON A. & SPOURS K. (1997) (Eds) *Dearing and Beyond: 14 – 19 Qualifications, Frameworks and Systems* (London: Kogan & Page).

HUDDLESTON, P. & UNWIN, L. (1997) *Teaching and Learning in Further Education: Diversity and change* (London and New York, Routledge).

HYLAND, T (2000) Vocational Education and Training under the New Deal; Towards a social theory of lifelong learning in the post-school sector. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, Vol. 52, No. 3 pp 395 - 411

HYLAND. T. (2002) Third Way values and Post school policy, *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 17, No. 2 pp 245 - 258.

LEARNING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (LSDA) (2001) *Developing Good Practice in New Deal In Colleges* (London, LSDA).

LOO, S., LUCAS, N. & MARSH, K. (2001) *New Deal and the Colleges* (London, Lifelong Learning Group, Institute of Education, University of London, Working Paper 1).

MAIN B. G. M., & SHELLY M. A. (1988) Does it pay Young people to go on YTS? In RAFFE, D (ed) *Youth and the Labour Market* (London, Falmer Press).

COFFIELD, F. (1998) *Going into Labour, but giving birth to a Tory child?* (Parliamentary Brief, May, pp 25-26).

MANPOWER SERVICES COMMISSION (MSC) (1981) *A New Training Initiative* (London, MSC).

MARSH, K. (2000) New Deal and Colleges in L. HALL & K. MARSH (Eds) *Professionalism Policies and Values* (London, University of Greenwich).

MARTIN, R., NATIVEL, C. & SUNLEY, P. (2000) *The local impact of the New Deal: does geography make a difference?* a paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Institute of British Geographers, University of Sussex.

MILLAR, J. (2000) *Keeping track of welfare reform: The New Deal programmes* (York, The Joseph Rowntree Foundation).

PRING, R. (1995) *Closing the Gap: Liberal Education and Vocational Preparation* (London, Hodder & Stoughton).

RAFFE, D. (1990) The Context of the Youth Training Scheme: an analysis of its strategy and development in D. GLEESON (Ed) *Skills Training and its Alternatives* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).

RAGGATT, P. & WILLIAMS, S. (1999) *Government Markets and Vocational Qualifications* (London, Falmer Press).

SELECT COMMITTEE (2001) *Fifth Report of the Select Committee on Education and Employment* (House of Commons, London, HMSO).

STONE, S. & LINES, A. (1987) *YTS: The Impact on FE* (Windsor, NFER-Nelson).

UNWIN, L. (1997) Reforming the Work-Based Route: Problems and Potential for Change in A. HODGSON & K. SPOURS (Eds) *Dearing and Beyond: 14 – 19 Qualifications, Frameworks and Systems* (London: Kogan & Page).

UNWIN, L. & WELLINGTON, J. (2001) *Young People's Perspectives on Education, Training and Unemployment* (London, Kogan Page).

WEBSTER, D. & EDGE, N. (1999) *The Jobs Gap in Britain's Cities: Employment Loss and Labour Market Consequences* (Bristol, Policy Press).

WILLIAMS, S. (2002) Individual Agency and the Experience of the New Deal, *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol 15, No 1. pp 53 - 74.