

30 May 19

**DCGS**

Copy to:

Comd HC

GOC ARITC

DEandC

Hd CWA

**JUNIOR ENTRY REVIEW (JER) - FINAL REPORT**

References:

- A. Junior Entry Review: Update to ECAB dated May 18.
- B. MoD Defence Diversity and Inclusion Strategy dated Oct 18.
- C. Junior Entry Review Terms of Reference dated Feb 17.
- D. Junior Entry Review Market Research final report dated Apr 18.

**Issue**

- 1. The Junior Entry Review (JER) final report.

**Summary of Findings**

2. The findings in this paper are distinct, directly addressing the JER Terms of Reference (TORs) previously laid in the House and has been grouped into four main themes. DCGS is invited **to note**:

- a. **“Attracting the best young people.”** JE will provide 26% of Army inflow against the A2020R structure. To recruit effectively the JE model must appeal to the Main Target Audiences (MTA), females and growing Black Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) workforce. Whilst recognising an increasing Army need for Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM). Increasing STEM education for JE risks discouraging and therefore reducing the main recruiting pool (**para 5**).
- b. **“Maximise the talent of the right individuals.”** Under 18 (U18) recruits tend to serve for longer than their over-18 peers and the relatively high proportion of JE that promote to senior NCO ranks benefit and the Army and the individual. The educational attainment achieved by JE promotes social mobility (**para 7**).
- c. **Independent Market Research.** JE is performing well and is attractive. Any profound change to the Army’s current JE scheme could adversely put off elements of the Main Target Audience. JE should be better advertised. To attract more STEM-capable recruits, the Army needs to look at a ‘third way’ that would compete in attractiveness against the major national employers. This should not be considered within the current JE construct (**para 9**).
- d. **Under 18 Terms of Service (ToS).** Any 'non-enlistment' approach to U18 Service could not be introduced without negative impacts on both our U18 recruits and Army manning. The review has considered the creation of new ToS to align the minimum commitment lengths of U18 recruits to those who join over the age of 18. This change would reinforce a One Army approach and could appeal to both recruits and gatekeepers but would require more analysis before implementation to understand the impacts on Army manning and also to take account of other personnel policy assessments (**para 11**).

**Background**

3. **Terms of Reference (TOR).** The TOR (Enclosure 1) for the JER were approved by DCGS on 21 Feb 17 with the aim of “*assessing the Army’s Junior Entry Policy to ensure it attracts the best young people and continues to maximise the talent of the right individuals, to the mutual advantage of both the young person and the Army.*” The TOR identified a number of strands for review and has received input from across the Army, MoD and Partners across Government. This report summarises these findings in the following order: ‘attracting the best young people’, ‘maximising the talent of the right individuals’, findings of the independent market research and paradigm change, and an update on the creation of bespoke U18 ToS.

4. **Engagement with Partners Across Government.** Relevant to the JE cohort, the most appropriate OGDs for engagement were the Department for Education (DfE) and Ofsted. In May 18 Ofsted published their eighth independent report on welfare and duty of care in Army phase 1 and 2 training<sup>1</sup>. The overall effectiveness of welfare and duty of care provisions at Army Foundation College (Harrogate) (AFC(H)) have improved significantly since the 2016 report and are now graded outstanding. During the period of the JER, the Army discussed the apprenticeships on offer, (of which the Army is one of the largest national providers) in particular at AFC(H). The Army and DfE have also met to discuss the introduction of T-Levels. The Army complies with the Education and Skills Act 2008 in the provision of education to U18s; engagement with the Department of Education continues; a representative from the Department of Manning (Army) was included in the DfE delegation on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. The convention takes place every five years; the latest being held in May 16 in Geneva, the next scheduled for 2021 of which the Army remain part of the DfE delegation.

5. **Segmentation.** Throughout the findings reference has been made to segmented groups, identified by the Market Research, across the MTA which have been divided into subgroups of those with similar attitudes and behaviours. Definitions of the principle segments interested in joining the Army are detailed below.

a. **Can-do Active Citizens.** Very active and civic-minded. Religious with a strong sense of personal and national identification. Positive and ambitious. Live in areas of rising prosperity. Can-do Active Citizens are interested in education / STEM but are currently less likely to be interested in joining the Army at 16.

b. **Get-on Community Pride.** Fairly active, not religious, with a fairly strong sense of personal and national identification. Positive about life and local area, but less ambitious. Tendency to live in poorer areas. Get-on Community Pride comprise the majority of the current JE cohort that would be likely to be de-motivated by more education, which would potentially jeopardise inflow.

## Detailed Findings

6. **“Attracting the best young people.”**

a. **Army Manning.** Army Recruiting and Initial Training Command (ARITC) estimate that 50-75% of 16-18-year olds applying to join the Army would find alternate employment should JE not exist. JE represents 22% of the Army inflow demand. This is based on a liability of 82k and considers the current shortfall of strength against liability. Should the Army’s strength match its liability JE will provide 26% of Army inflow. The JE scheme continues to be attractive to recruits; the Mar 19 intake at AFC(H) was filled to 97% (608 of 624 spaces).

b. **Attractive to a wider demographic.** The pool of 16-24-year olds is expected to rise by 5.4% per decade, notably in BAME populations. The Army must compete effectively for a

---

<sup>1</sup> [Ofsted Welfare and duty of care in Armed Forces initial training Report 2017-18.](#)

share of the principal Target Audiences, females and the rapidly growing BAME workforce in the UK. This workforce is expected to rise rapidly and the BAME population is set to make up 20% of the UK population by 2031<sup>2</sup>.

c. **The increasing need for STEM.** One-third of the Army’s roles require officers and soldiers with the aptitude for technical employment. A national shortage of suitably educated and qualified entrants into the UK job market in STEM disciplines makes managing STEM roles a core challenge. The Defence Board have recognised this risk and understand that a failure to act will threaten operational capability. 70% of AFC(H) recruits belong to a demographic titled ‘Get on Community Pride’, the independent market research (Ref C and Enclosure 2) identified that this demographic could be discouraged by more education, which could jeopardise inflow. More education/STEM would not be a ‘silver bullet’ in attracting more Get on Community Pride. A different approach would be required to attract those individuals who are motivated by further education and a full technical career.

**Junior Entry (JE) will provide 26% of Army inflow against a fully manned A2020R structure. To recruit effectively the JE model must appeal to the Main Target Audiences, females and the growing BAME workforce in the UK. There is a need for STEM within the Army’s roles, however further increasing STEM education for JE risks demotivating the main recruiting pool and reducing overall inflow.**

7. **“Maximise the talent of the right individuals.”**

a. **Serving Longer.** Taken from date of enlistment between 2012 - 17, U18 soldiers routinely serve longer than their over-18 peers by 3 years and 2 months. This looks like an average career of U18s of 11 years versus over-18s serving 7 years and 10 months.

b. **Going further.** In addition to serving for longer, Defence Statistics analysis of the proportion of each rank that enlisted into the Army when U18, indicates that U18 recruits who remain in service are more likely to promote at each rank; furthermore a proportion of U18 promotions increases at each higher rank.

<b>Paid Rank</b>	<b>Total Regular Soldier Strength (1 Apr 17)</b>	<b>... of whom had enlisted when aged under 18</b>	<b>Proportion to the Total</b>
Grand Total	70,880	21,980	31%
WO1	1,270	540	42%
WO2	3,740	1,430	38%
SSgt	5,420	2,090	39%
Sgt	7,960	2,910	37%
Cpl	12,580	3,920	31%
LCpl	13,340	3,490	26%
Pte	26,580	7,590	29%

**Table 1:** Proportion of Regular Soldiers on Strength at 1 Apr 17 Enlisted as U18s.

c. **Educational attainment.** From a study of two JE intakes (729 under 18s), approximately 140 Junior Soldiers arrived with no recognised prior qualifications in English and Maths. Of these, 52% achieved Level 2 in English by the end of the Army Foundation College (Harrogate) (AFC(H)) course and 40% achieved Level 2 in Maths. The remainder achieved Level 1 and a minority progressed to Entry Level qualifications only.

d. Within Recruiting Year 18/19 on completion of their training, every JE on the Long Course left with a GCSE equivalent (Functional Skills) in English and 95% left with the same in Maths.

<sup>2</sup> Tri-Service IET dated 24 Feb 17.

e. JE thus delivers improved social mobility and opportunity and directly supports the Ministry of Defence's 3rd Diversity and Inclusion goal (Reference B) to act as a 'force for inclusion in wider society'.

**The tendency for U18 recruits to serve for longer than their over-18 peers and the relatively high proportion of JE that promote to senior NCO ranks benefit and the Army and the individual. The educational attainment achieved by JE improves social mobility.**

8. **Independent Market Research and Profound Change.** The Army commissioned independent market research (Enclosure 2) to ensure it continues to attract the best young people and maximise their talent to mutual advantage. The aim of the research was to enhance the understanding of what motivates the 14 to 17-year-old Main Target Audience (MTA) and their respective Gatekeepers, to explore their perceptions of the JE Offer and identify if any profound changes would be required to enhance their interest without alienating those currently or potentially interested. BAME, female and differing academic abilities were also represented. The principle deductions were:

a. The current Junior Entry Scheme is not broken and remains attractive to specific under 18 segments in the MTA. Wholesale changes to the model are not required and could adversely put off elements of the key Get-on Community Pride segment and damage inflow.

b. The JE scheme is not well known or understood. It could be advertised and communicated more effectively to the MTA and their gatekeepers. Junior Soldiers would be the most effective advocates.

c. There are sufficient MTA within the Get-on Community Pride audience with the propensity to join the Army under the age of 18 to fill AFC(H) to, and potentially above capacity.

d. Can-Do Active Citizens who make up 26% of the recruit demographic are interested in education / STEM but are currently not interested in joining the Army at 16 on the Army's current offer. Attracting them as U18s would require a 'third way' that can effectively compete against the major national education/employment competitors such as manufacturer's apprentice schemes. This would be undeliverable within the current JE construct at Harrogate and any change would potentially have a negative impact on inflow from Get-on Community Pride audience.

e. In parallel to the Independent Market Research the Army considered options for profound change of the current JE model. This included considering training content, models of delivery, nomenclature (of the scheme, location, cohort and rank held by participants) and other factors that could be adjusted to deliver the optimum long-term output from JE. The supporting evidence from the Independent Market Research reinforces that fundamental change is not advisable and could impact on inflow.

**The JE scheme is performing well and remains attractive to the Main Target Audience. Profound change to the current construct would adversely put off elements of the Main Target Audience. The JE scheme should be better advertised and communicated to the Main Target Audience and their gatekeepers. Increasing STEM within AFC(H) is likely to impact on inflow. The Army needs to look at a 'third way' that would compete in attractiveness against the major national employers. This should not be considered within the current JE construct.**

9. **Under 18 Terms of Service.** External criticism has been received of U18 recruits making a decision to commit to a Return of Service while legally still children. This can commit them to up to 2 years and 3 months longer (if they joined at 16) than is required of recruits who enlist over the

age of 18. The legality of the current policy was considered under Judicial Review in June 2015 with the ruling in favour of the MoD/Army. It remains appropriate for the Army to consider the issue and concerns raised diligently, as we have done.

10. **Bespoke Terms of Service.** The JER has identified that U18 inflow could be complimented in future by the implementation of bespoke ToS. A bespoke U18 engagement would mitigate some external criticism and provide greater consistency to U18 recruits by aligning their commitment length with those joining the Army over the age of 18. Key elements of bespoke U18 ToS would include:

- a. All U18 soldiers being enlisted on a 'Type S Engagement (under 18 years of age)'. At the age of 18 years individuals will then have the right to:
  - (1) Convert their engagement to the balance of a Versatile Engagement, normally VEng (Short Career), or:
  - (2) Choose to no longer to continue to serve and be discharged.
- b. The change would recognise a soldier's service prior to their eighteenth birthday and count towards the four years' minimum length return of service. It will bring terms of service parity with those soldiers who enlist over the age of 18. It will not change the minimum age at which an U18 soldier can enlist, their right to determine service or their ability to claim Discharge As Of Right (DAOR) up until their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday.
- c. U18s will continue to have no liability for combat operations.
- d. The parent/guardian child relationship is the key factor in a decision to join the Army as an U18. Both parties need to be aligned to the concept of joining the Army. While not being sought by gatekeepers, the bespoke ToS for U18s could be deemed a positive change and are unlikely to be contentious to both a JE cohort and their gatekeepers. Indeed, any move to implement the new ToS make the process of leaving the Army as an U18 more transparent, which could bring an increase in the confidence of recruits and their gatekeepers.

11. Any further consideration of a bespoke ToS would need to fully analyse potential for second order implications and the current recruitment/manning position. The Army is currently experiencing a recruiting shortfall. In this context, the introduction of bespoke U18 ToS, allowing U18 entrants to leave at the 4-year point after attestation could have detrimental impact on operational effectiveness. It could reduce by up to two years the period during which the entrant was available to be deployed on operations. Whilst only a proportion of those may leave earlier than current ToS allow, this would still have a negative effect on the Army's numbers, especially as the Army is already struggling to recruit the number of entrants it requires. Implementation of a new, bespoke U18 ToS will need to be considered against the Army's ability to achieve manning balance along with other assessments of Length of Service.

12. **Non-Enlistment.** Non-enlistment (provision at AFC (H) stopping short of enlistment into the Army) options have been investigated. Three options were carried forward under the non-enlistment option; full time education, full time employment and technical apprenticeships, and incentivised dispersed education. The review showed:

- (1) Neither deliver effective BT or Initial Trade Training (ITT) and follow up training would be required post-enlistment.
- (2) Both would delay Gains to Trained Strength (GtTS) and Gains to Trade Trained Strength (GtTTS) by between 9 and 15 months and by-passed the opportunity to prepare Junior Soldiers (JS) better for the Combat Infantryman Course.

(3) Both would require supervisory care ratios that were higher than the current model, imposing both risk and cost. Any further education college that educates 'young people' for more than 295 days pa (42 weeks) must register as a 'children's' home' and school. The Army is not resourced for such an establishment.

(4) Non-enlisted U18s would be required to be in full-time education for at least 540 hours per year (c18 hours per week). Current JE cohort conduct the 280 Guided Learning Hours (GLH) per year (c6 hours per week). A non-enlisted cohort would only have 22 hours of week remaining of 'work' spread over 5 days (c4.5 hours per day).

b. As a result, it was agreed that non-enlistment carried too much risk to existing outputs and was rejected as an option.

**Two non-enlistment options for U18s were considered, however they carried too much risk to existing outputs and were rejected. The creation of the under 18s ToS are likely to appeal to both recruits and gatekeepers. Once the Army is moving towards Manning Balance, the implementation of the bespoke ToS may be considered within the context of wider analysis on engagements and length of service.**

## **DPers**

Enclosures:

1. Junior Entry Review – Terms of Reference dated 21 Feb 17.
2. Junior Entry Review – Market Research Key Findings and Deductions dated 18 May 18.

21 Feb 17

**JUNIOR ENTRY REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Junior Entry Review were approved by the Deputy Chief of the General Staff on 21 February 2017. These are outlined below.

The aim of the review will be to assess the Army's Junior Entry policy to ensure it attracts the best young people and continues to maximise the talent of the individual, to the mutual advantage of both the young person and the Army. The review is focused on Junior Entry policy, rather than under-18 Standard Entry policy, however they are closely linked and analysis may be expanded in some areas, in order to take a more holistic view of U18 inflow in the wider context of through-life education and training. This review will take into account broader Government policy and other drivers, such as the Government's social mobility agenda.

The review will undertake:

- A test of the original assumptions that informed the Army's JE policy from 2010 and associated 2007 Review of Soldiers Career Training and Education to see if they are still valid;
- A detailed analysis of the Army's future inflow requirements;
- An investigation of the type of junior entry recruit required by the Army, to include an analysis of the current recruiting environment;
- An assessment of career progression and through-life skills acquisition of the U-18 cadre;
- An assessment of the needs of recruits, gatekeepers and the Army, and an evaluation of how best they can be balanced;
- Development of policy options on how Junior Entry could be delivered in the future, taking into account resource constraints, training capacity, geographic footprint and infrastructure.
- An assessment of training, education, individual development and terms of service, including an assessment of the necessity for enlistment, to provide the optimum position for Junior Entry in the recruiting market and the achievement of developmental goals for the individual;
- A canvassing of the views from subject matter experts in Defence and across partners in other Government Departments.

This review is to be led by the Army's Department of Manning and is to report its initial work to the Executive Committee of the Army Board by spring 2017, with a report to follow in due course.



<p>4. 34% on Long course and 50% on Short course have had their expectations largely/completely met. The top two aspects of the current JE courses that JS would like to change are the food and more PT.</p>	
<p><b>Main Target Audience (MTA) – Interests, Motivations and Decision-Making</b></p>	
<p>1. 25-34% of total MTA (14-17 yr olds) would consider joining the Army (boys 39% and girls 29%). 66% of gatekeepers would allow their child to join.</p>	<p>Pg 102</p>
<p>2. The 'Net Promoter Score' measures the likelihood that MTA/gatekeepers would actively recommend a career in the Army to a family member or friend. 69% of MTA would not versus 4% who would. 76% of Gatekeepers would not versus 7% who would.</p>	<p>Pg 47 and 105</p>
<p>3. Demographics are not a reliable predictor of whether MTA will join the Army. The principal predictive characteristics were attitudinal / behavioural in nature not demographic: activity/exercise, identity, civic engagement, positivity and educational aspiration. This both intriguing and problematic as interest is related more to a 'state-of-mind' and respondents' 'social environment' than their demographic and socio-economic background. Targeting the MTA and Parents/ Gatekeepers via key demographic and socioeconomic information alone will be no more effective than Above The Line (ATL) communications strategies. Consequently, it is more helpful to segment the MTA into subgroups of similar attitudes and behaviours.</p>	<p>Pg 42 and 67-68</p>
<p>4. A key determinant is knowing or meeting someone in the Army, particularly if they are in the same family/friendship network. c15% of the MTA have close friends or family serving in the Armed Forces.</p>	
<p>5. 95% of the MTA's decision-making is determined by four factors (this is an unusually small amount):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Type of career.</li> <li>b. Pay.</li> <li>c. Location of initial training/employment.</li> <li>d. Length of engagement.</li> </ul>	<p>Pg 68</p>
<p>6. The content of training (i.e. the balance of on-the-job/military training versus education) and duration of training are negligible factors in the MTA's decision-making on joining.</p>	<p>Pg 68-69</p>
<p>7. The Army brand is not attractive to the MTA. Those surveyed would on average be 2.25 times more likely to be attracted to business or technical occupations than the Army.</p>	<p>Pg 22</p>
<p>8. BAME and female. Those from the BAME community are almost 3 times as likely to select an offer that includes a Business Career Type when compared to one for the Army, and 2.7 times for a technical career. Location is a less significant driver of choice for BAME respondents than White British.</p>	<p>Pg 76-77 and 102</p>
<p>9. The motivations of male and females differ very little.</p>	<p>Pg 78-80</p>
<p>10. The parent/child relationship is a key factor in a decision to join the Army as an Under 18. Both parent and child need to be aligned to the concept of joining the Army for there to be success.</p>	<p>Pg 92-94</p>

<p><b>Potential Changes to the Offer</b></p> <p>11. <b>MTA and Gatekeepers.</b></p> <p>a. More education to GCSE/A level, including in STEM, would be attractive to some MTA and make them more likely to join (36% of those surveyed). However any positive impact on attraction and inflow would be negligible compared to the impact of pay, location and engagement length. Importantly, introducing more education/STEM into the JE scheme could potentially damage levels of attraction among the existing core MTA.</p> <p>b. Shorter engagement lengths are more popular than longer engagements, apart from the JE (Long) cohort.</p> <p>c. 29% of the MTA would be more likely to join if a non-enlistment was offered.</p> <p>d. The pattern of responses among gatekeepers is very consistent with those of the MTA.</p> <p>12. <b>Junior Soldiers.</b></p> <p>a. The offer of additional STEM to GCSE/A-Level is an attractive proposition for 73% (Long 68%, Short 79%), a significantly greater proportion than for the MTA and gatekeepers (at c36%). This reinforces the findings from the qualitative phase of research, which suggested that the offer of optional additional STEM would likely prove popular for current Junior Soldiers. However this must be contrasted with the general antipathy of those JS on the Long course for additional education and any potential negative consequence on inflow of imposing more education.</p> <p>b. Non-enlistment options are not popular with Junior Soldiers (only 25% attraction). There is a risk of alienating this cohort if a non-enlistment option was pursued.</p>	<p>Pg 38-40</p>
<p><b>Segmentation of MTA</b></p> <p>13. Of five identified segments, two show marked higher propensities to join the Army – <b>Can-Do Active Citizens</b> (CAC) and <b>Get On Community Pride</b> (GCP):</p> <p>a. <b>Can-Do Active Citizens.</b> CAC are geographically located in cities and along commuter belts and areas of rising prosperity, are positive and ambitious with a strong sense of personal and national identification.</p> <p>(1) The prime motivators for job choice are: type of career (32%) and pay (31%), followed by location (17%) and length of stay in job (13%).</p> <p>(2) CAC show the greatest preference for more education and STEM, unlike all other segments.</p> <p>b. <b>Get on Community Pride.</b> GCP have a strong sense of personal and national identification and are positive but are unambitious and live in poorer areas such as post-industrial towns with poor national infrastructure.</p>	<p>Pg 40-63</p>

(1) The prime motivators for job choice are: location (28%), type of career (27%), followed closely by pay (21%) and length of stay in the job (15%).

(2) Importantly, the geographical location of GCP broadly matches that of the current Junior Soldier cohort.

(3) The location of training is a key factor for GCP, unlike other segments. The more local the training the better.

c. Both CAC and GCP show significantly higher levels of attitudinal consistency with their parents than other segments (94% and 65%). Where parents and children are aligned in attitude, children are more likely to be interested in an Army career (and the converse is also true).

d. Also, unlike all other segments, CAC and GCP willingness to join the Army *increases* after being exposed to the 75 sec trailer for AFC(H).

14. **Other segments** were: Strivers Lacking Belonging (SLB), Ambitious & Affluent Clique (AAC), and Feckless, Poor and Pessimistic (FPP). These three segments have been excluded from further analysis due to the small size of their interested cohort (3%, 6%, 1% of the overall MTA respectively).

15. **Volumes – CAC and GCP.** Of the two segments showing a higher propensity to join, the *maximum* total annual MTA showing an interest is estimated at c170k or 24% of MTA per annum.

a. **CAC.** CAC comprise 26% of the overall MTA, of which 48% would consider applying to join the Army. This cohort represents 12% of the overall MTA or 75k in each year group between 14-17. Therefore CAC shows the greatest propensity to consider an Army career and also accounts for the largest proportion of the overall MTA.

b. **GCP.** GCP comprise 36% of the MTA, of which 31% would consider applying to join the Army. This cohort represents 11% of the overall MTA or c95k in each year group between 14-17.

16. **Prevalence of segments in the current JE population.**

a. Importantly, there is strong evidence to suggest the existing JS cohort offer is already attracting disproportionately more recruits from the key segment of GCP. The vast majority of Junior Soldiers (c70%) are classified as GCP. There are marginally more GCP on the Long course than Short.

b. Despite CAC's higher interest in the Army, currently both the Long and Short courses show significantly lower levels of CAC membership.

c. The Long course has more than twice the proportion of FPP segment than in the MTA population. However the numbers are very small.

d. The Long course also shows very low levels of AAC segment membership when compared to the wider MTA population.

Pg 46

**Attraction / Recruitment**

17. **Recruitment into the current JE scheme** could be enhanced:

Throughout

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>a. The communications strategy must be aimed equally at MTA and their gatekeepers who will be critical in supporting the MTA to make their decision. Gatekeepers may see the offer as positive for social mobility or offering stability in a young person's life.</p> <p>b. Advocacy from trusted sources i.e. family and friends, trusted influencers in the community. The Army should improve the brand and awareness of the Army and of the JE scheme through promotion of real examples by convincing advocates. The most convincing advocate would be Junior Soldiers (i.e. JS are the best advert for JE).</p> <p>c. Optimise communication and information sources, particularly using the internet to show real experiences.</p> <p>(1) Facilities, friendship, camaraderie and life experiences are very attractive to the MTA.</p> <p>(2) While fitness, hard work and discipline are a turn-off for most, they are not a major turn-off for the key segment (GCP). Therefore it must be part of the communications offer.</p> <p>d. The introduction of more STEM may attract more of the key segments, but critical to this will be the level at which they would be able to take STEM; especially given that they will move on to their regiment to complete more job-related STEM. There may be some merit in trying to attract those classed as CAC as U18s through a separate and significantly enhanced offer, but there is no evidence that waiting for, and developing a bespoke enhanced Further Education offer for post-18 will improve interest significantly.</p> <p>e. Exploit youth groups that show a propensity to support the Army rather than only schools. Don't rely on teachers as influencers, who generally have little exposure to or experience of the Army.</p> <p>f. BAME and female inflow could be increased through targeted communication using advocates, including to gatekeepers, and greater representation in recruiting material. Advocates in religious groups would likely be valuable in attracting BAME.</p> |  |
|--|--|

### Provisional Deductions

1. The current JE scheme is not broken and remains attractive to specific U18 segments in the MTA. Wholesale changes to the model are not required, and could potentially put off elements of the key GCP segment and damage inflow. Optimisation of the current model would potentially attract more GCP segment.
2. The JE scheme is not well known or understood. It could be advertised and communicated more effectively to both MTA and their gatekeepers, using internet and advocates, and particularly to the GCP segment. JS would be the most effective advocates.
3. There are sufficient MTA in the GCP segment with a propensity to join the Army U18 to fill AFC(H) to capacity and potentially above capacity.
4. There are two key segments interested in joining the Army however they have different outlooks and motivations:

a. CAC are interested in education / STEM but are currently not interested in joining the Army at 16 on the Army's current offer. CAC are aspirational and intent on achieving academic qualifications. Attracting them as U18s would require a new and sufficiently attractive offer that can effectively compete against the major national education/employment competitors. This would likely be undeliverable within the current JE construct and any change would potentially have a negative impact on inflow from GCP.

b. GCP comprise the majority of the current JE cohort and would be de-motivated by more education, which would potentially jeopardise inflow. Despite the current JE cohort's interest in more STEM, changing the content of JE training to introduce more education would only have a marginal impact in attracting more GCP compared to paying more salary, shortening the length of engagement, more localised training etc. More education / STEM would not be a 'silver bullet' in attracting more GCP.

5. A different approach is required to attracting CAC and GCP as Under 18s:

a. Attract more GCP by: continuing to optimise the current model at AFC(H), focusing on military content rather than education, offering a second training location or more localised / regional training models, and shortening the engagement length. This would be enabled by enhanced marketing through more effective use of advocates and the internet.

b. Attract CAC by: offering a separate, significantly-enhanced U18 offer focused on education/STEM at A-level through to degree level and then into a full technical career. To attract CAC into the Army at U18, the offer would need to be sufficiently attractive and competing with the likes of Jaguar Apprentice Scheme.