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Foreword

We at the University of London are delighted to have helped support this important report. Our 17 Federation Members are proudly cosmopolitan institutions and rightly so – they attract students and faculty from around the world, and the principles they teach and truths they pursue know no borders.

Yet, universities also need to be good corporate citizens, deeply connected to and contributing meaningfully to the cities and local communities which provide their home. Over the last five years, we at the University of London have worked hard to strengthen our relations with London and local government, business, and communities. We were one of the original signatories of the London Anchors Institutions Charter – a declaration committing London’s big employers, investors, and landowners to supporting the city. And I am proud to co-chair the London Anchor’s Institution Network as well as sit on the London Partnership Board.

It’s against this background that we commissioned this report to look at how the University of London federation can do more to support apprenticeships and make better use of the Apprenticeship Levy that we all pay. As this report shows, there could be enormous gains not just to the young, and not so young people, who would benefit from apprenticeship training, but to the university employers as well, helping us to recruit to hard-to-fill posts, boost retention and develop a more inclusive and representative workforce.

This report was originally commissioned as a piece of internal consultancy. But we have decided to publish it, on the grounds that its analysis and recommendations could prove helpful to other universities, in London and beyond, interested in apprenticeships.

I would like to thank the University of London’s Convocation Trust for funding this report, Anna Ambrose from Workwhile, for producing it, Professor Ben Rogers, for directing the project and colleagues from across the University of London federation, who contributed data, insight and expertise. We look forward to working together in pushing forward with its recommendations.

Professor Wendy Thomson, CBE
Vice Chancellor, University of London
Executive summary

University of London and its 17 federated institutions¹ are keen to maximise the impact of the apprenticeship levy, aligned with wider organisational priorities. This report summarises Workwhile’s analysis of the current context, including identifying key opportunities and barriers to increasing the deployment of the levy.

Since 2017, all organisations with a UK salary bill in excess of £3 million have had to pay an apprenticeship levy, which they can use to cover the cost of apprenticeship training. Employers can also transfer up to a quarter of their levy to other (usually smaller, non-levy paying) employers. The evidence suggests that apprenticeships can bring large benefits both to apprentices themselves, but also to employers, in terms of workforce recruitment, retention, diversity and reputation.

We calculate that the combined total of apprenticeship levy contributions by University of London Federation Members is more than £10m annually². Of this, an absolute minimum of 75% – £7.5 million – is expiring unused, which could fund an additional 750 apprenticeships a year. The real proportion is likely to be significantly higher. There is considerable variation in apprenticeship levy usage across the group of Members, with one institution spending half of its levy and others spending none.

We find significant variation in the way in which decisions around apprenticeships are made, and the extent to which this is connected to wider strategic goals. A common theme is that to date, and with some notable exceptions, where apprenticeships have been offered, this has largely been responsive to staff requests rather than driven by clear strategic intent.

¹ [https://www.london.ac.uk/ways-study/study-campus-london/member-institutions](https://www.london.ac.uk/ways-study/study-campus-london/member-institutions)
² See appendix for a note on data collection and methodology.
Most apprenticeships offered – 88% – have been upskilling opportunities for existing staff, with only 12% for new hires. With some of these new hires being at mid or senior levels, just 10% of apprenticeships have gone to less qualified new recruits.

These patterns reflect an extreme instance of patterns we see in many other corporate and public sector organisations, and therefore in the national apprenticeship data – of unspent levy funds, and those that are spent benefiting older, higher-skilled and more experienced workers at the expense of entry-level apprenticeships for younger people.

Key challenges and barriers to apprenticeship growth include: staff capacity to prioritise apprenticeships and to support them at greater scale; concerns about the capacity for off-the-job training (the time an apprentice is entitled to spend away from the ‘day-job’ on learning-focused activities); and the perceived need for prior experience in entry level roles.

At the same time, we also found a growing appreciation among University of London Federation Members of the benefits of investing in apprenticeships, and an increased commitment to making better use of the levy. This is in part driven by the profound recruitment and retention challenges facing the universities – large institutions cite in excess of 500 open roles, with intense competition for in-demand roles and difficulty competing on salary and progression opportunities with London’s private sector employers.

Based on the extent of unspent levy funds, we calculate that at least £2 million annually is available for transfer to smaller organisations, which could create 200 apprenticeships each year and benefit local SMEs and residents. Only a small number of the federated institutions are currently doing so; £390,000 has been transferred in total, enabling 26 non levy paying organisations to offer 52 apprenticeships to date, benefiting low-paid, disadvantaged and marginalised Londoners.

Drawing on all these learnings, we make six recommendations for University of London Federation Members:

**Enabling success**

1. Ensure strong senior sponsorship of apprenticeships, both at a federation level and within institutions

**Internal staff apprenticeships**

2. Build-up HR staff capacity and expertise to expand and support high-quality apprenticeships
3. Maximise opportunities for structured collaborative working and best-practice sharing across the University of London
4. Undertake cross-organisational communications activity to build the reputation of and appetite for apprenticeships across Federation Members
5. Work across Federation Members to promote, recruit and support apprenticeships

**Apprenticeships in the wider community**

6. Maximise the transfer of unspent levy funds to small and medium sized businesses, enabling them to take on apprentices
Background

University of London

The University of London is a federal university, consisting of 17 independent federated members. Federation Members are self-governing institutions, setting their own entrance criteria and in some cases have their own degree awarding powers. In total, Federation Members have over 240,000 students studying over 3,700 courses.

Its members comprise very large institutions with academic offers across the subject spectrum, and smaller specialist institutions. The federation members are:

- Birkbeck, University of London *
- City, University of London *
- Courtauld Institute of Art
- Goldsmiths, University of London
- The Institute of Cancer Research, London
- King’s College London *
- London Business School
- London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
- Queen Mary University of London *
- Royal Academy of Music
- Royal Central School of Speech and Drama
- Royal Holloway, University of London *
- The Royal Veterinary College
- SOAS University of London
- St George’s, University of London *
- University College London (UCL) *

University of London is a member of the London Anchor Institutions Network, which brings together some of the capital’s biggest organisations to work collaboratively to address long-standing social and economic inequalities and the growing climate emergency. Member institutions are also represented in the Civic University Network. Several have published Civic University Agreements – civic strategies, rooted in analysis of local needs and opportunities, and co-created with local partners.

In the context of this work, it is relevant to note that several institutions in the group are themselves approved apprenticeship training providers. These are indicated by an asterisk in the list above.

Context

Since 2017, all organisations with a UK salary bill in excess of £3 million have had to pay an apprenticeship levy. These funds are then ring-fenced, available for organisations to draw down from their gov.uk digital apprenticeship service account solely for the purpose of funding apprenticeship training and assessment for their staff. Funds can also be transferred to other organisations to fund their apprenticeship training and assessment – a facility usually used to support smaller, non-levy paying businesses.

Apprenticeships are available across over 650 apprenticeship standards, from level 2 (GCSE-equivalent) to 7 (masters’ equivalent), and for new or existing staff of any age. Training is provided by a diverse range of registered training providers, including local FE colleges,
independent training providers, and HEIs. The number of both standards and providers has grown since 2017. Despite this, many levy-paying businesses across a wide range of sectors are able to use only a small proportion of their levy funds.

Whilst a level of underspend is an intended part of the levy policy, and is (theoretically at least) used within the system to fund apprenticeships in smaller businesses, the level of underspend has been a cause of concern for organisations. With levy payers keen to use as much of their levy as possible, apprenticeships at higher levels and for experienced, older and better-paid staff have risen, at the expense of those at lower levels benefiting younger people and those in lower-paid, lower-skilled work – disproportionately affecting those from disadvantaged and marginalised backgrounds. (You can read some of our earlier work on this issue here.)

Against this backdrop, generally speaking universities find utilising their apprenticeship levy contributions especially challenging. The fact that the academic staff body is largely unlikely to benefit from apprenticeships requires organisations to think strategically and creatively about how best to utilise this funding in other ways. There is also a cultural challenge, in that lifting traditional role requirements for entry-level roles is somewhat counter cultural for institutions where the role of degree qualifications for future student employment is so important.

The project brief

Workwhile3 was commissioned by the University of London, to explore and recommend ways in which Federation Members can better use their considerable apprenticeship levy contributions. Large amounts of these are expiring in institutions’ levy accounts, whilst there are a number of strategic priorities in which apprenticeships could have an important role to play, including:

- widening the diversity of the staff to better reflect local communities
- the universities’ wider civic roles as anchor institutions
- the need to address challenges recruiting and retaining staff in key operational areas

This report therefore aims to interrogate the hypothesis that there are opportunities to maximise the use of apprenticeship levy funds, in alignment with this set of wider strategic priorities.

Specifically, its objectives are:

- To fully understand apprenticeship levy utilisation across the University of London and its members, including identifying examples of best-practice
- To explore and make recommendations as to opportunities to build on best-practice to increase the universities’ levy usage, aligned with wider strategic objectives
- To implement immediate activities to increase levy usage in a way which aligns with universities’ wider strategic objectives

Recognising that this is likely to take various forms, our work has been in two strands, running concurrently:

1. Exploring with institutions the potential for transferring unspent levy funds to SMEs, to make immediate use of unspent funds. This forms part of Workwhile’s core work, and has therefore brought our existing philanthropic funding to the project.
2. Investigating opportunities to develop the use of apprenticeship levy funding within and between institutions, with a view to making a series of recommendations.

3 Formerly known as the London Progression Collaboration, 2019-summer 2023
Project methodology

This project has been conducted via:

- A series of presentations to the London Leads group, which brings together those leading on London across Federation Members, chaired by University of London Vice-Chancellor Wendy Thomson
- Desk research
- Semi-structured interviews, at both senior and operational levels, with 23 individuals
- A workshop attended by 15 participants, presenting situational analysis and soliciting feedback on draft recommendations
- Data collection via online survey (Microsoft forms)
About apprenticeships

The apprenticeship levy

The apprenticeship levy was introduced in 2017, with the intention of increasing employer investment in high-quality skills training. It is paid by all employers in England with an annual salary bill of over £3 million, at a rate of 0.5 per cent.

These funds are ringfenced in a gov.uk Apprenticeship Service account. They can be drawn down by employers only to fund apprenticeship training and assessment using approved apprenticeship standards and delivered by a training provider who is on the Register of Apprenticeship Training Providers. Apprenticeship levy funds cannot cover other costs relating to the employment of an apprentice, such as their salary or work-related equipment, or any additional training or support they might need.

Unspent apprenticeship levy funds expire from the employer’s ringfenced account after 24 months, on a ‘use it or lose it’ basis.

Apprenticeship basics

- Apprenticeships are a paid job with training.
- All apprentices should have a contract of employment with their employer, receive at least the apprenticeship minimum wage (we strongly recommend the national / London living wage as a minimum), and receive paid holiday and other employment benefits.
- All apprentices are entitled to 6 hours of ‘off the job’ training per week on average across the duration of their apprenticeship.
- All apprenticeships follow an approved apprenticeship standard, and must use an approved apprenticeship training provider.
- Apprenticeships are available to new hires or existing staff of any age, and are available at levels 2 (GCSE-equivalent) to 7 (masters’ equivalent).
- Apprenticeship training and assessment are paid for via the apprenticeship levy for large employers, and via government co-investment or levy transfer for SMEs.
- All apprentices are individually assessed via ‘end point assessment’, delivered by a specialist approved organisation (an EPAO). All apprentices who pass this assessment receive a completion certificate; some apprenticeships also include another professional qualification (e.g. HR apprenticeships include CIPD accreditation).

Apprenticeship levels and standards

All apprenticeships follow an apprenticeship standard, which has been approved by IfATE (the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education). These have superseded the previous system of apprenticeship frameworks.

Apprenticeship standards define the knowledge, skills and behaviour required of an apprentice, and the role they will be expected to perform. Each has been developed by a group of employers known as a ‘trailblazer’ group. The apprenticeship standard also determines the minimum length of the apprenticeship (from 12 months to four years), and the maximum cost of the apprenticeship training (from £2,500 to £27,000).

Apprenticeships are available at levels 2–7. These are defined by the government⁴ as:

---

⁴ [https://www.apprenticeships.gov.uk/apprentices/becoming-apprentice](https://www.apprenticeships.gov.uk/apprentices/becoming-apprentice)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apprenticeship level</th>
<th>Equivalent education level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6 and 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are over 650 approved apprenticeship standards, across everything from construction to journalism, social care to law, and hospitality to film production. This number continues to grow, and can be found [here](#).

**Apprenticeship training providers and off-the-job training**

All employers offering an apprenticeship must select an approved apprenticeship training provider, who is on the [Apprenticeship Providers and Assessment Register](#) (previously known as RoATP or the Register of Apprenticeship Training Providers). Approved training providers include a diverse mix of local FE colleges, HEIs, and independent training providers. Indeed, seven University of London institutions are themselves approved training providers, mainly focusing on degree apprenticeships closely related to their specialisms.

All apprentices are entitled to a minimum of 6 hours off-the-job training on average across the duration of their apprenticeship. Off-the-job training is defined as time away from the apprentice’s productive job role, which must teach new knowledge, skills and behaviours relevant to the specific apprenticeship. It does not all have to be delivered by the provider or take place in a classroom setting. The DfE have recently published updated guidance, with a useful summary [here](#).

Training providers vary in the way in which they deliver training to apprentices – including in how this is delivered (online, in-person at their own site, at the employer’s site etc.), the training timetable (1 day a week, longer blocks etc.), and degree to which they are willing to work flexibly with employers. They also differ in the additional services they offer to employers e.g. recruitment support, and how much they may charge for these.

**Levy transfer**

Levy–paying employers who are not utilising their levy funds within their own organisation can also choose to transfer up to 25 per cent of funds to one or more other employers. Whilst this part of the policy was originally envisaged as enabling large employers to support SMEs in their supply chain, many who transfer funds use them to support SMEs to offer employment opportunities in their local area, to invest in specific skills, or to help address labour market challenges for disadvantaged and marginalised groups. Most levy transfer recipients are non-levy paying employers, although this is not dictated by the policy.

---

5 Employers can create trailblazer groups and propose new apprenticeship standards to IfATE for approval. However, IfATE’s preference is for employers to utilise flexibilities to tailor existing standards to specific situations, rather than develop new standards. For example, a proposed set of school leadership standards were rejected by IfATE, who believed that the existing leadership standards could be tailored enough to accommodate the education sector’s needs.

6 For example, City University offer level 7 degree apprenticeships in Senior Leadership, Advanced Clinical Practice, Data Science and Cyber Security, alongside non-degree level 7 Solicitor and level 5 Nursing Associate apprenticeships. Queen Mary University of London offer degree apprenticeships in Applied Finance, Data Analysis and Software Engineering.
Levy transfer funds cover 100% of the training and assessment costs for the receiving employer. These funds can only be used for apprenticeship training and assessment costs, and cannot therefore be directed towards SMEs’ apprenticeship recruitment or salary costs, or to fund wider apprenticeship support services.

Non-levy-paying employers who don’t access levy transfer funding to cover apprenticeship training costs are able to access apprenticeships via the government’s ‘co-investment’ scheme, whereby the employer covers 5 per cent of the total cost with the rest paid by the government. Whilst an earlier cap on the number of apprenticeships an employer can access via this route has been lifted as of April 2023 (previously set at 10 per year), the costs remain prohibitive for some businesses.

The impact of apprenticeships

There are many widely-cited benefits of apprenticeships:

- **For learners**, an opportunity to earn and learn, to build work-relevant skills, and to embark on a progression pathway – noting that earnings progression for apprentices is greatest for the most disadvantaged learners.

- **For the institutions as employers**, proven positive impact on staff recruitment and retention, an opportunity to build diversity at all levels by accessing and supporting different talent pools, a way to ‘grow your own’ talent pipeline. For example, 69% of apprentice employers say that apprenticeships have improved staff retention. Although apprenticeships have costs for employers in terms of HR capacity and accommodating off-the-job training, research consistently demonstrates a positive return on investment for employers in financial terms alone, in addition to the positive social impact.

- **For the wider local economy**, contributing to a more inclusive labour market by supporting candidates from non-traditional educational backgrounds to access roles, increased productivity through skills development, and support for businesses to navigate technological change and the transition to net zero.

- **For the institutions as levy donors**, supporting SME apprenticeships can deepen engagement with local businesses, developing skills in a particular sector or geography which is strategically meaningful, and/or supporting individuals aligned with the priorities of an organisation’s own diversity, equality and inclusion strategies.

- **For SMEs in receipt of levy transfer**, the funds enable them to take a more strategic approach to skills development, to offer multiple apprenticeships rather than just one, and to reinvest the funds saved in increased apprentice salary or work-related equipment such as a laptop to access online learning provision.

The benefits to London’s universities could be particularly great. As we set out below, London’s universities often struggle to recruit and retain staff to important positions. Their workforces don’t always reflect the diversity of London itself. And they are increasingly aware of their

7. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5ef1bb3dd3bf7f6c053a28a4/Apprenticeships_and_social_mobility_report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5ef1bb3dd3bf7f6c053a28a4/Apprenticeships_and_social_mobility_report.pdf)

responsibilities as anchor institutions and increasingly active on the ‘civic university agenda’, with apprenticeships offering a leading way of demonstrating their civic commitments and contribution.

Common barriers to apprenticeships

There are several commonly cited barriers to apprenticeships. Some are based on misconceptions, whilst others should be viewed in a broader context. For example:

- **The management of apprenticeship programmes is too great a cost for employers.** HR capacity is undoubtedly required to manage apprenticeship programmes within any organisation, for example to select training providers and manage these relationships, to recruit and onboard learners and support their journey, and to support line managers. However, taking this into account, the financial return on investment of apprenticeships is positive for employers, so this cost is outweighed by the value apprentices bring to employers in terms of improved retention, productivity etc.

- **Off-the-job training takes apprentices away from the ‘day job’ too much to be manageable.** Off-the-job training is essential to apprentices’ learning and development, enabling them to make the positive contribution outlined above. The best apprenticeship training providers are also flexible in how they manage this, in terms of when and where it takes place, and what workplace activities can be included.
Situational analysis

Levy utilisation and apprenticeship usage

This section of the report describes the federation members’ use of apprenticeships, and thus the levy, on internal apprenticeships for their own staff members.

Overview

We calculate that the combined total of apprenticeship levy contributions by the group of institutions is in excess of £10 million annually\(^9\). Of this, an absolute minimum of 75% is expiring unused, with this proportion likely to be even higher\(^10\).

Beneath these headline figures, the degree to which apprenticeships, and thus the levy, are being utilised within institutions is very varied.

Some institutions are using none of their apprenticeship levy funds at all. One of those who has been highly engaged with the project and submitted their data is in this category, and at least one more has reported verbally that this is the case. It is reasonable to assume that this is also the case for a number of those who haven’t engaged with the project.

At the other end of the scale, London Business School are utilising 40–50% of their levy funds and are expecting to grow this substantially. Indeed, such is the growth they are forecasting, they feel it would be unwise to commit any funds to levy transfer at the moment so as not to over-stretch themselves. They are an outlier in using their funds to this degree; the next highest usage from the data collected is 18%.

The majority of institutions sit between these two extremes, using under 20% of their levy funds on a small number of apprenticeships. In most of these cases, apprenticeship usage has been driven by specific requests from colleagues – and is therefore a somewhat scatter-gun mixture of standards and levels.

What roles / disciplines are apprenticeships being used in?

Across institutions, apprenticeships are being or have previously been used in the following areas - those in bold were mentioned by more than one university:

- IT – data technician level 3, data analyst level 4
- Lab technician level 3
- Leadership & management – team leader level 3, operations / department manager level 5, & chartered manager (degree) level 6
- Coaching professional level 5
- Estates and grounds – including facilities management supervisor level 3
- Finance & accounting
- Business administration level 3
- Libraries, information and archive assistant level 3
- Publishing assistant level 3
- Marketing
- Customer service level 2/3
- HR

\(^9\) See appendix for note on data collection and methodology
\(^10\) Ditto
Safety, health and environment technician level 3

The range of areas / standards reflects not only the needs and priorities of institutions, but also the extent to which much apprenticeships usage has to date been responsive to staff requests.

Who is currently benefitting from apprenticeships?

Most apprenticeships currently offered by federation members to their staff – 88% – have been upskilling opportunities for existing staff, with only 12% for new hires. With some of these new hires being at mid or senior levels, just 10% have been new entry level hires (i.e. the most junior roles in a team, generally at levels 2–3). Even in these cases, interviewees described requiring a level of prior-experience or a degree qualification, and that those recruited broadly fitted the demographic profile of existing staff.

Whilst this reflects national trends of an increased proportion of apprenticeships benefiting older and more experienced workers following the introduction of the levy, it represents an extreme version of this pattern. It also means that it’s highly unlikely that the way in which apprenticeships have been used to date has contributed significantly to the universities’ aims to diversify their workforces and to better reflect local communities.

Opportunities for and barriers to growth in internal staff apprenticeships

What are the opportunities for apprenticeship growth?

We calculate that federation members have in excess of £7.5 million unused apprenticeship levy funds per year. Using 100% of this could fund training for an additional 750 apprenticeships11 or more each year across the University of London Federation – clearly a sizable opportunity.

Whilst this is an exciting prospect, apprenticeship growth must also be undertaken strategically and responsibly. For example, it is vital to ensuring sufficient staff capacity to create a positive learner experience. In the short term, there is therefore unlikely to be the internal resource and capacity to utilise 100% of funds for internal apprenticeships. Institutions must balance quantity with quality.

In terms of specific opportunities, universities in the group are experiencing many shared challenges in recruiting and retaining non-academic staff. As we note earlier, large institutions have large numbers of open roles, with intense competition for in-demand roles and difficulty competing on salary and progression opportunities with private sector employers. The following roles were cited as particularly challenging and/or as opportunities, with those in bold mentioned by multiple organisations – and IT, tech and data by the majority of those interviewed.

- IT, tech and data – including tech support / service desk, data analysis
- Facilities & estates, including grounds / horticulture
- Technicians
- Leadership and management
- Project management and business analysts
- Libraries

11 The average apprenticeship value of £10,000 reflects both national figures from the DfE, and our own experience.
Due to the benefits cited by apprentice employers in terms of their staff recruitment and retention, we suggest that there is a clear opportunity for institutions to grow the use of apprenticeships and the levy, in a targeted way which addresses these organisational needs.

The majority of organisations also discussed priorities around diversifying their workforce, making it more reflective of local communities, and/or aims to improve representation in specific roles e.g. women in tech. This represents an opportunity to deploy apprenticeships in some of these areas expressly to reach different and more diverse candidates – especially where the apprenticeships can be entry-level opportunities at levels 2–3.

It should be noted that the success of this approach will be dependent on ensuring that recruitment is accessible: removing unnecessary requirements, simplifying off-putting application processes, and working on the ground within local communities to promote opportunities and support applications.

What are the barriers to greater apprenticeship usage?

Common barriers emerged to greater apprenticeship usage, each cited by multiple organisations.

1. The resource and capacity both to prioritise apprenticeships, and to support them on a larger scale

Federation members identified the resource capacity available within institutions to prioritise and support apprenticeships as the greatest barrier to taking on apprenticeships. Most feel that their and/or their teams' capacity places a cap on what is possible.

Research consistently demonstrates a positive return on investment for the employers of apprentices. Nevertheless, staff resource and capacity is required to:

- Communicate the benefits of apprenticeships to leaders and line managers in order to stimulate greater appetite for apprenticeships
- Support line managers to identify suitable opportunities for apprenticeships within teams and departments, and to match these with appropriate apprenticeship standards
- Manage the selection of apprenticeship training providers, negotiate contracts, and manage ongoing provider relationships
- Support learner recruitment, onboarding and ongoing experience, including via line manager support.
- Manage capacity within teams to accommodate the off-the-job training requirement

Those interviewed noted a range of ways in which a lack of capacity is therefore seen within the federated institutions, including:

- A risk that apprenticeships drive further inequalities as they are only undertaken by those willing and able to ask and make a convincing case for them, either themselves or via their line manager
- Not being able to make the transition from a reactive to a strategic approach to apprenticeships
- Not being able to do the engagement and education work needed to make apprenticeships more attractive to reluctant line managers
- Not having capacity to successfully support an increased number of learners, line managers and providers
- Not being able to accommodate all staff requests for apprenticeship roles in their teams
Addressing this, senior staff sponsorship in some institutions has supported the team responsible to secure additional staff resource, enabling them to begin increasing apprenticeship delivery.

2. Concerns about accommodating learners’ off-the-job training entitlement

When asked what barriers existed to apprenticeship growth in the wider organisation, line-manager concerns about the capacity for off-the-job training were frequently cited. Line manager understanding of and buy-in to apprenticeships is vital to their success, so their perception that staff devoting the time required for off-the-job training is unmanageable currently presents a serious barrier.

Whilst testing these concerns directly with potential line managers has not been within the scope of this piece of work, it is a concern we know is commonly held within businesses. It is especially pronounced in the smaller businesses and charities who access Workwhile’s services. However, our experience is also that this perception can often be overcome by developing deeper line manager understanding of the reality of off-the-job training and the benefits of apprenticeships, and by sourcing training providers who are willing to be flexible and responsive to employer need in how they deliver the off-the-job element of the apprenticeship. We would suggest that this concern therefore reflects a lack of understanding amongst non-specialists within organisations, and therefore that this barrier relates closely to the capacity of those responsible for apprenticeships to dedicate time to educating target priority teams.

3. The need for a level of prior experience in entry level roles

In discussion about the relationship between apprenticeships and organisational aims to diversify the non-academic workforce and better reflect local communities, many of those interviewed described hiring managers’ expectations of prior experience and/or a degree qualification for many entry level roles.

Increasing numbers of businesses are reassessing traditional role requirements to ensure they are genuinely essential, to drive improved accessibility in recruitment practices and increased workforce diversity. We would hypothesise that it is especially challenging to move beyond traditional role requirements in the university environment where the role of degree qualifications for future student employment is so important.

We conclude that this barrier is again indicative of a lack of understanding from non-specialists about the potential for apprenticeships to support those without a traditional ‘package’ of experience or qualifications to excel in roles, and the rapidity with which this can be achieved.

Leadership & governance

There is little consistency of governance around apprenticeships and levy usage within organisations.

Responsibility for apprenticeships and levy usage typically sits within HR and/or organisational development teams, linking it with learning and development and people strategies as well as with wider organisational priorities. In some cases, there is very clear and active senior sponsorship, and/or structured decision-making processes involving departmental leaders, management boards and similar. In others, decision making around apprenticeship strategy and levy usage is more clearly devolved in its entirely to those with the day-to-day responsibility for delivery.
Similarly, the degree to which apprenticeships are being thought of in a wider strategic context and/or in terms of strategic workforce planning varies between institutions. Some institutions were able clearly to discuss the ways in which an apprenticeship strategy was part of delivering on priorities identified in a 5–10 year organisational strategy, for example. Others described apprenticeships strategy as part of a wider talent planning but without obvious links to broader organisational strategy. In other cases, the majority of apprenticeship decisions were described as reacting to staff requests rather than proactively planned.

These observations are not simply a function of organisation size. It is not uniformly the case that larger institutions have the most structured approach to governance and decision making, nor that it is the larger institutions who have the strongest connection between strategic intent and practical implementation.

In terms of leadership, the active support of a senior stakeholder has helped several institutions’ HR / organisation development teams to secure additional capacity to develop and deliver apprenticeships.

**Good practice**

Clear examples of good practice exist within institutions, but these are currently isolated due to a lack of routine collaboration across federated members.

The most notable examples of best practice are where there has been a focus on starting with one apprenticeship cohort in a specific in-demand / hard-to-recruit discipline, and using success from this to build demand and buy-in more widely.

In 2022, London Business School for example, recruited a cohort of c.25 tech and data analyst apprentices from their existing staff members (using the level 3 data technician and level 4 data analyst apprenticeship standards) to form a ’data academy’ programme. The success of and learnings from this have led not only to a second data cohort, but has enabled other standards to be launched internally.

> “Apprentices are more confident in using their skills and sharing their learning: 36% report a growth in confidence when using their new skills in their roles. Through the data apprenticeship programmes our staff are helping to build an insight-led culture where data is being used consistently to drive operational and strategic business decisions. The success of the programme is down to the hard work of our apprentices but also the strength of sponsorship from our senior leaders and wider data community.

> “One of the biggest challenges for us has been capacity. When people don’t have enough capacity to engage in the learning and keep up with the off-the-job demands, this has caused some people to fall behind and eventually drop out. We need to work harder at making the necessary adjustments to free up the apprentices’ capacity so they can achieve a better balance in their role which then gives them the time needed to focus on their learning.”

  Alecia Birthwright, Head of Talent Management, London Business School

Another notable success is where additional capacity has been secured to drive the implementation of apprenticeship plans. Whilst this is in its early stages, Kings College London and University of London are examples of where additional resource will allow apprenticeship practice to move from responding to staff requests – with related equity concerns – to a more strategic approach.
A common theme between these two successes is the crucial role a senior sponsor has played.

Despite these examples of good practice, there is very limited awareness of what other institutions are doing across the group. This means that opportunities to learn from, replicate and adapt what’s working – or simply to leverage simple efficiencies by avoiding duplication – are being missed.

**Levy transfer**

We asked interviewees about their approach to levy transfer. We found general enthusiasm for levy transfer from institutions in the group, although no levy transfer activity has been undertaken beyond that supported by Workwhile. Reasons cited for this include it simply not being prioritised, as well as the challenge of identifying suitable levy transfer recipients. There is also concern about the supply of funds exceeding demand from small businesses, creating unhelpful competition between anchor institutions with funds available. Below we set out examples of where levy transfer is working effectively.

The extent of levy underspend across the group of institutions means that levy transfer presents a significant opportunity for impact – with the potential for £2.5 million annually (25% of levy contributions) to be transferred in support of apprenticeship training within other organisations. This figure assumes all organisations have their full 25% available, which we know is not the case as at least one forecasts using more than 75% of their levy imminently. However, we can safely conclude that at least £2 million annually is available for transfer, which could create 200 apprenticeships each year, with more than sufficient remaining to grow organisations’ internal apprenticeship offer too.

City University and Kings College London provide two examples of how University of London institutions can transfer unspent levy funds in a way which helps their local communities and supports their own wider strategic priorities. Both are working with Workwhile to do this, with Workwhile identifying and supporting suitable levy recipients to be ‘apprenticeship ready’ through our fully-funded support service, presenting suitable requests to our levy donors and supporting the process. Queen Mary University of London and UCL have begun to transfer levy funds with Workwhile’s support more recently.

City University pledged funds to transfer in 2019/20, and have transferred in excess of £220,000 with our support, with a further £50,000 committed to SME recipients. These funds have supported a wide range of SMEs, including those in the construction, digital, social care and hospitality sectors. Kings College London pledged funds more recently in December 2022, and have so far transferred c.£50,000 to support a range of plumbing, community health and early years apprenticeships.

“City is a civic university and we place community at the heart of everything we do, for our students, our staff and our local stakeholders. That is why levy transfer is such an important part of our civic focus and being an Anchor Institution. We see it as a great opportunity to support local small businesses to deliver better employment and skills, not just through a financial transaction but by inspiring the next generation and providing opportunities for those who may otherwise have been unable to pursue an educational opportunity.

“We meet with every prospective SME, to learn about their background and their aspirations, which has been such a valuable experience. It enables us to explain a little bit about City, and also offer opportunities for further support – for example connecting with our subject experts, visiting campus or offering support via staff volunteering or student
placements. Our transfers have varied hugely with a diverse pool of apprentices in a range of sectors. I would wholeheartedly recommend levy transfer to any other large organisation.”

Anne Payne, Head of Organisational Development, City University

Whilst there is some nuance differentiating individual organisations, there is a clear set of priorities to support good-quality work for local residents, with a particular focus on disadvantaged and marginalised groups.

Universities’ roles as training providers

As noted above, seven of the federated institutions are themselves approved apprenticeship training providers. There is, however, a lack of awareness of the apprenticeship programmes delivered by University of London member institutions amongst others in the group, meaning that opportunities for universities to use each other’s provision will be missed.

In terms of levy transfer, universities cannot transfer their unspent funds to SMEs who are accessing their own training provision (ie effectively paying themselves). However, other institutions in the group could theoretically do this, thus supporting University of London’s apprenticeship providers as well as the SMEs in receipt of funds. This is obviously appealing in terms of keeping levy funds within the federation. However, it is not believed to be a sizable opportunity at present, as SMEs are not the core clients for any of the training provider universities in the group.
Recommendations

In this final section of the report, we build on our findings to set out a series of recommendations for the University of London and the federated members. Having set out the case for responsible apprenticeship expansion and the design principles we applied to this work, we make recommendations to enable success, for internal staff apprenticeships, and to support apprenticeships in the wider community.

RESPONSIBLE APPRENTICESHIP EXPANSION

We have laid out the scale of the opportunity when it comes to apprenticeships across the University of London: more than £10 million levy contributions per year, of which £7.5 million is currently unpent, representing the potential to fund training for an additional 750 apprentices.

There is nevertheless the need to ensure apprenticeships are delivered responsibly by employers within the group – a point highlighted at the workshop we held with Federation Members. Institutions must have sufficient capacity and expertise to ensure programmes are well managed, especially regarding learner experience and support. To neglect this would be both irresponsible as employers, and counterproductive to the longer-term prospects of apprenticeship take up.

From the perspective of Workwhile and our mission, we would also urge organisations not simply to use up as much funding as possible for the sake of it by prioritising the highest level, highest value apprenticeships. It is this ‘unintended consequence’ of the levy system which has led to a vast increase in apprenticeships for older and more highly qualified workers, at the expense of entry-level apprenticeships for young people – affecting disadvantaged and marginalised groups the most.

We would therefore urge the University of London federation to view the opportunity not simply in terms of the increased number of apprenticeships and value of levy funds utilised, but against a wider set of quality and social value principles.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

We were asked to recommend ways in which apprenticeships can support universities’ wider strategic priorities, including recruiting a more diverse workforce that is more reflective of local communities, and the universities roles as anchor institutions.

In making these recommendations, we have therefore prioritised opportunities for creating apprenticeships which:

- Are accessible to local communities
- Create good jobs for local communities
- Support local businesses

We recommend that University of London and its federated member institutions adopt similar design principles in all their apprenticeships activity.

Enabling success

RECOMMENDATION 1: Ensure strong senior sponsorship of apprenticeships, both at a federation level and within institutions
Strong senior sponsorship is important:
1. to make apprenticeship growth a strategic priority
2. to link apprenticeships effectively with wider organisational goals, and
3. to balance apprenticeship growth with apprenticeship quality.

These factors underpin institutions’ ability and willingness to devote the capacity and resource needed to ensure success. Unless apprenticeships become more of a consistent strategic priority across the group of institutions, apprenticeship growth is most likely to remain piecemeal, and is unlikely to successfully support wider objectives.

Given that our later recommendations also focus on the potential for collaboration to yield results which would be difficult for institutions acting alone, senior sponsorship can also model a culture of collaboration between institutions. We currently see barriers to collaboration (e.g. workshop participants were unsure of their institution’s willingness to share documents), which will be best overcome with senior sponsorship.

In practice, this would entail:
- a named individual appointed as senior sponsor within each institution
- a named individual appointed as senior sponsor at a federation level
- senior sponsors meeting with each other as a group regularly, modelling and facilitating collaboration
- senior sponsors playing an active role in driving apprenticeship activity within their organisations

Internal staff apprenticeships

Recommendations 2–5 concern apprenticeships offered within federation members to their own staff.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Build-up HR staff capacity and expertise to expand and support high-quality apprenticeships

We recommend that all institutions increase their HR staff capacity and expertise to expand and support high-quality apprenticeships.

This is important because it will not be possible for levy usage to increase successfully and in support of wider priorities without the staff resource and capacity to do so. Increased capacity is a vital enabler of further actions, at an individual organisational level and collaboratively. All the institutions interviewed and those at the workshop cited capacity as a key barrier to greater apprenticeship usage, with many unable to prioritise apprenticeships or to promote them more for fear of generating interest that proved impossible to service.

Federation members should draw on the successful business cases made by University of London, Kings College London and others to secure one or more dedicated new roles. These roles would, for example, enable greater pro-active cultivation of the appetite for apprenticeships in teams where they are most strategically important, and would ensure the increased number of learners and their line managers are then appropriately supported.

Together, this increased capacity will enable a more strategic, pro-active and collaborative approach to responsibly increasing the proportion of levy used. A step-change is unlikely to be achievable without this capacity, meaning that more levy than necessary will continue to be wasted.
Recognising that this will take some time, and to facilitate this report’s other recommendations in short term, we suggest that some shared staff capacity may be provided by University of London and/or bringing in consultancy capacity as an interim solution.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Maximise opportunities for structured collaborative working and best-practice sharing across the University of London

Recognising that regular meetings involving some institutions already exist, **we recommend maximising these opportunities by implementing a formalised, structured approach to collaboration.**

Through our research, we clearly identified a collaboration deficit and knowledge gap, where some organisations lack awareness of others’ apprenticeship activity and therefore miss opportunities to increase efficiency and learn from each other. Whilst there is appetite to remedy this, and to provide and access peer support, we believe that a formalised approach is necessary to translate good intentions into reality.

A working group should therefore involve as many institutions as possible, meet on a regular basis to share current practice, undertake relevant cross-organisational work, and use an ‘action learning set’ model (or similar) to navigate challenges together. This will:

- achieve efficiency by avoiding duplication
- enable institutions and individuals to learn from others rather than starting from scratch or ‘re-inventing the wheel’
- provide the opportunity to identify additional areas of collaboration

The ability of this group to draw on University of London’s federated structure, including a culture of collaboration set by senior sponsors, will enable it to deliver practical joint outcomes as well as simply share information.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Undertake cross-organisational communications activity to build the reputation of and appetite for apprenticeships across Federation Members.

**We recommend undertaking a cross-organisational approach to communications about apprenticeships, capitalising on economies of scale and leveraging stories of success.**

Universities cited shared challenges around line-managers’ understanding of and appetite for apprenticeships, especially around how to manage off-the-job training commitments. This recommendation therefore aims to secure economies of scale in addressing some of the key barriers and challenges cited during our research, as well as leveraging stories of success from across the group. It offers the chance for all in the group to benefit from each other’s positive stories, to build the reputation of and appetite for apprenticeships.

This activity might include:

- Producing case studies which can be utilised across the group of universities to demonstrate the positive impact of apprenticeships – enabling those with less track record to build on successes within other organisations
- Creating communications materials for apprenticeships staff within institutions to deploy, which might include copy banks, presentation decks, info flyers etc. These should be flexible in order to be adapted as required by institutions’ own branding.
• Recruiting apprentice champions from across the universities, enabling those with positive personal experiences of apprenticeships to act as advocates at events, meetings etc.
• Cross-organisational apprenticeship marketing campaigns aimed at target priority groups of staff (e.g. line managers in specific teams) using internal channels

Strong senior sponsorship will enable this to be prioritised by internal communications colleagues as well as HR teams. To be successful, it also requires the staff capacity not only to implement the activity itself, but also to support increased demand for apprenticeships effectively.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Work across Federation Members to promote, recruit and support apprenticeships

We recommend creating one or more combined apprentice cohorts from across multiple universities, focusing on roles where institutions share recruitment and retention challenges.

Our interviews identified that universities across the group share skills gaps and challenges with recruitment and retention in specific teams and roles – most notably IT & data, technicians, and facilities and estates. By working collaboratively to use apprenticeships to address these issues, this “cohort model” enables institutions to better leverage the recognised benefits of apprenticeships.

This approach has multiple additional benefits, including:
• Driving strategic action to address hiring challenges and skills gaps across the group of universities
• Enabling institutions only able to offer one or two apprenticeships to be part of a larger cohort
• Supporting institutions who have had little or no apprenticeships experience with the expertise of those who have more established programmes
• Improving provider procurement, where increased scale gives greater potential to negotiate and influence provision
• Giving apprentices an insight into a wider group of employers and a broader peer network
• Economies of scale in terms of recruitment tactics

In practice, this level of collaboration could range from simply creating an apprentice peer network across institutions, to a much deeper level of collaboration to create a programme where apprentices rotate around several institutions within the group. A middle ground might entail:
• Collaborative decision made re the standard/s to work on, the schedule etc.
• Joint activity to promote, engage, and secure sign up
• Provider selected by the group / delegated sub-group
• Candidates recruited – scale enables new tactics
• Apprentices begin & enroll simultaneously

This recommendation builds on Workwhile’s successful work with other groups of organisations, bringing together cohorts of youth worker apprentices from across London Youth’s member organisations, and of community health workers working in small frontline organisations in Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster.

Apprenticeships in the wider community
This final recommendation concerns the use of unspent levy funds to support apprenticeships in other organisations.

**RECOMMENDATION 6: Maximise the transfer of unspent levy funds to small and medium sized businesses, enabling them to take on apprentices**

We recommend that institutions with levy funds available draw on Workwhile’s support to transfer funds to SMEs.

This is important because it enables federated members to drive impact through their apprenticeship funds beyond what their own organisations can responsibly sustain internally. Levy transfer has the proven potential to support local residents to access opportunities and local businesses to build the skills they need to thrive, aligning effectively with the universities’ civic role. There is also the opportunity to build deeper partnerships with employers supported in this way.

We calculate that the institutions have at least £2 million available to transfer each year. Even with internal apprenticeships growing, this represents the potential to support a sizeable number of SME apprenticeships, which enable local businesses to build their skills and can create local employment opportunities.

From organisations with funds available, there were no significant barriers raised to engaging in levy transfer with Workwhile’s ongoing support, beyond concerns regarding the demand for funds from SMEs.

To maximise the combined impact of this work, we recommend that institutions sign off a shared set of levy transfer criteria, supporting apprenticeships which:

- offer disadvantaged and marginalised Londoners in local communities the opportunity to get into and progress in work
- support the sectors which the federations people and communities depend on
- support small and medium sized employers to build skills in shortage areas

The mechanics of this process are outlined in appendix 3.

**Other approaches**

Whilst we do not believe that the following approaches meet the design criteria we applied to this piece of work, institutions keen to utilise levy funds may nevertheless wish to consider them.

**Apprenticeships for academic staff**

Other universities are known to be utilising the level 7 academic professional apprenticeship standard for newly recruited academic staff / early career researchers on contracts of more than 18 months (the minimum duration for the apprenticeship).

Whilst this is unlikely to meet the design principles of this work, it is undoubtedly an opportunity to use more levy funds internally. It might also be considered as a means of supporting applicants to academic roles from less traditional backgrounds, thus further fulfilling EDI objectives.
It should also be noted that this is an apprenticeship standard which Queen Mary University of London has delivered as an apprenticeship training provider, in this case tailored to a clinical education setting (more details here).

Similarly, the potential to utilise apprenticeships as a training route for academic staff who step into first-time line management roles has been identified by at least one institution.

Leadership and management

The need to support the talent pipeline of non-academic leaders was cited as a workforce priority by several institutions. This offers another opportunity to utilise significant sums of levy funds on more senior staff, with the potential for cross-organisational cohorts using the level 7 senior leader apprenticeship.
Conclusion

The sums of apprenticeship levy which currently unused by University of London and its 17 federated institutions amount to at least £7.5 million per year. Whilst apprenticeship expansion must be undertaken responsibly, this nevertheless represents a significant opportunity.

The greatest benefit will be realised by aligning apprenticeship expansion with wider strategic objectives, creating accessible employment opportunities for diverse local communities, as well as by addressing the most pressing recruitment and retention challenges facing the institutions.

Individual institutions are very varied in their current apprenticeship usage. Whilst many are planning to expand their offer to existing and new staff, for most this is in its infancy.

Collaborative working offers the opportunity to achieve more than any institution can do alone. To do this successfully, strong leadership is required to secure the capacity needed and to nurture a culture of increased collaboration.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Data collection and methodology

Data was collected via online survey from 7 institutions – 39% of the total. This asked for:

- Levy funds paid in (monthly)
- Levy funds used for own staff apprenticeships (monthly)
- Levy funds transferred (monthly)
- Levy funds expiring (monthly)
- Number of staff currently enrolled on an apprenticeship
- The proportion of these which are new hires / upskilling existing staff
- The proportion of these which are entry / mid / senior level roles

After testing a range of methods, total levy paid in for the full group has been extrapolated on the basis of the relative size of each institution’s student body, using publicly available student numbers. This method was chosen because, with the exception of one outlier with a much higher proportion of postgraduate students than other institutions, the correlation between student numbers and levy contribution (ie staff salary bill) was consistent.

The data collected represents 64% of the total students across University of London; from this, the total levy collected was therefore extrapolated.

The % funds being used, transferred and expiring were assumed to be reasonably accurate for the wider group and have therefore been used to calculate these figures. It is likely that those not engaged with the research are less interested in apprenticeships, and therefore that levy usage will be slightly over-estimated and expiry under-estimated.
APPENDIX 2: Apprenticeships supported by levy transfer

The following apprenticeships have been supported, to date, by unspent levy funds transferred by University of London federated institutions to the SMEs employing apprentices. This has taken place with the support of Workwhile. The table below includes levy transfer support which has been specifically committed to SMEs whose apprentices who will enrol in the coming months, as well as those who have already started – and in some cases now completed – their apprenticeships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer name</th>
<th>Apprenticeship/s</th>
<th>Levy donor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Community Association Ltd</td>
<td>Community Health and Wellbeing Officer x1, level 3</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS Construction</td>
<td>Carpentry &amp; Joinery x1, level 2</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample Access Support Services</td>
<td>Adult Care Worker x1, level 2</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample Access Support Services</td>
<td>Lead Adult Care Worker x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Young Futures</td>
<td>Children Young People and Families Practitioner x6, level 4</td>
<td>Queen Mary, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Angelz Daycare</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Angelz Daycare</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x2, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Angelz Daycare</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands Day Nursery</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x1, level 3</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands Day Nursery</td>
<td>Early Years Practitioner x1, level 2</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands Day Nursery</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x2, level 3</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands Day Nursery</td>
<td>Early Years Lead Practitioner x1, level 5</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands Day Nursery</td>
<td>Early Years Lead Practitioner x1, level 5</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etec Contract Services Ltd</td>
<td>Construction Quantity Surveying Technician x1, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations Youth Support Services</td>
<td>Children Young People and Families Practitioner x1, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations Youth Support Services</td>
<td>Children Young People and Families Practitioner x1, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giotech Ltd</td>
<td>Network Engineer x1, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In and Out Ltd</td>
<td>L3 Business Admin x2, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In and Out Ltd</td>
<td>L3 Hospitality supervisor x2, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In and Out Ltd</td>
<td>L3 Team Leader x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In and Out Ltd</td>
<td>L5 Operations Manager x2, level 5</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Brennan Training</td>
<td>Installation Electrician &amp; Maintenance Electrician x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Brennan Training</td>
<td>Installation Electrician &amp; Maintenance Electrician x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Jungle - School of Early Childhood</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x1, level 3</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Academy of Excellence Tottenham (LAET)</td>
<td>Laboratory Technician x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Time Count Today Ltd</td>
<td>Digital Support Technician x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Family Club</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x2, level 3</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Family Club</td>
<td>Early Years Educator x1, level 3</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Family Club</td>
<td>Early Years Lead Practitioner x1, level 5</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Family Club</td>
<td>Learning and Skills Mentor x1, level 4</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Family Club</td>
<td>Production Chef x2, level 2</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Family Club</td>
<td>Senior production chef x1, level 3</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary Development Ltd</td>
<td>Artificial Intelligence Data Specialist x1, level 7</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking People (UK) Ltd</td>
<td>Professional accounting or taxation technician x1, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Riordan Property Services LTD</td>
<td>Plumbing &amp; Domestic heating technician x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington Development Trust</td>
<td>Community health and wellbeing worker x3, level 3</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pias UK</td>
<td>Digital Marketer x3, level 3</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimlico Plumbers Ltd</td>
<td>Business administrator x1, level 3</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimlico Plumbers Ltd</td>
<td>Learning and Development Practitioner x1, level 3</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Brick Road Limited</td>
<td>Associate Project Manager x3, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing and Growing Nursery</td>
<td>Early Years Practitioner x1, level 2</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Union Jack club</td>
<td>Commis Chef x1, level 2</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Union Jack club</td>
<td>Senior Production Chef x1, level 3</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Zetter Group</td>
<td>Operations / departmental manager x1, level 5</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoise Media Limited</td>
<td>Software Developer x1, level 4</td>
<td>City, University of London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: Levy transfer mechanics

The points below are a brief summary of how institutions can work with Workwhile to access our support to transfer unspent apprenticeship levy funds to SMEs, and to access levy transfer funding should their own funds be fully spent at any point or should they wish to signpost an SME to our support. This levy transfer brokerage service is currently fully-funded for both levy-paying employers and SMEs by our philanthropic funders.

- **Institutions who are not already transferring levy with Workwhile** can use our levy transfer proposal slide deck to secure internal sign off, and complete our online pledge form to confirm the funds they are able to transfer and any additional criteria. The Workwhile team are available to support this planning and sign off process.

- **Institutions who are apprenticeship training providers** should instruct any non-levy paying businesses with whom they work who would like levy transfer funding to use this online request form, indicating that their training provider is a University of London member. We will seek to match them with another institution from within the group, ensuring that funds can support institutions’ own provision as well as external businesses.

- Similarly, **if an institution in the group does not have sufficient funds** to cover the apprenticeships they wish to offer their own staff, they should use this online request form, indicating that they are a University of London member. Again, we will seek to match them with another institution from within the group, keeping funds within the group if required.

Workwhile matches levy payers with funds to spare with SMEs who are in need of funding – some of whom are referred to us by their training providers, and others of whom we support more broadly to navigate the apprenticeships system. We work with over 100 levy payers to match their funds with recipients who match their specific priorities. Once matched, the technical transfer process on the digital apprenticeship service (gov.uk) portal is very straightforward, and we support both donor and recipient to ensure this is completed successfully.