

Richmond Community Learning Partnership Meeting

Thursday 28th January 2016

Present: Ivana Price (Chair), Barri Ghai, Hugh Dale, Heather Mathew, Caroline Hand, Gaynor Bray, Sarah Reid Barker, Codane Brown (minutes)

Apologies: Eamonn Gilbert.

Minutes	Action
Introductions and apologies	
Eamonn sends his apologies and Ivana indicated that there is currently no representation for LBRUT.	
Welcome to new members Gaynor Bray - Vice Principal Curriculum and Learner Services who is replacing Manoj from RACC and Caroline Hand – Head of Community Services from RHP, who are new to the partnership.	
<u>Matters arising:</u> This will be Ivana’s last meeting as chair. Community Learning will be coming under Eamonn Gilbert’s services. Eamonn may eventually chair these meetings, but in the meantime an interim chair is to be elected in this meeting.	
<hr/> Declaration of interest	
IP brought up that considerations of bursaries with RACC should be assessed in the meeting, on where we join up resources.	
Whether the budget should be devolved to HD and then scrutinised and fed back at the meeting.	
GB stated that RACC have their own bursary, which was mainly used for people who cannot afford learning, such as fees for training that would help them get into something else. Therefore it can be used for a wider range of things, whereas the RCLP bursary had a much narrower focus.	
HM responded that she felt the commissioning board still	

needs to scrutinise proposals beforehand and that a two tier system was necessary as it is what has helped us get to where it is now.

GB informed the group that RACC funding, which exists in two bursaries, may be combined into one pot, with new requests not requiring the course to lead to a qualification. This will improve its availability. The details would be out in February and she would feedback to BG on this.

Family Learning

HM - Due to concentration on adult learning, Family Learning had suffered and become lost within Children's Centres. Therefore it would be good to carry out a review of family learning as the service providers have improved. In addition providers did not understand family learning, even though they had a lot to offer towards it.

SRB responded that it may be useful for this to be discussed in a sub group.

IP suggested that the review should take place before the next commissioning year, so that the partnership had a strategy in terms of what to look for. It would also be good to discuss a way of making it accessible for all the different levels of learners.

SRB added that Family Learning was very difficult for the trainers as there was too much of a range of learners.

IP to summarise, for the new commissioning year, we should look at where and how we join our resources with RACC and delivery of family learning. A focus group outside the meeting would help to identify delivery needs going forward.

CH also brought to the attention of the Partnership that Universal Credit is now being introduced. She explained that RHP had identified that several families were now in rent arrears due to the fact that very large payments are being made in lump sums directly to the claimants' and budgeting problems are now occurring. CH explained that courses may need to be run to help people manage the large sums of money being deposited into their account. IP added that it will also be an opportunity to consider our self-assessment of needs and prioritisation together, to

determine what we each add to the overall partnership.

BG suggested that the focus group should take place around April to help prepare for the next contract year.

Ofsted Update

BG stated that they are still awaiting the final draft, but had provisionally received a 'Good' grade. The key positive outcomes were:

- Quality improvement arrangements are much improved since the previous inspection. Self-assessment now makes good use of learners' achievement data to ensure robust and evaluative judgements.
- Safeguarding is effective, and the Prevent agenda is well understood by leaders and managers.
- The leadership and management of the service, continues to be good. Senior managers and partners ensure that the quality of provision for learners is good.
- The very good work of the Richmond Community Learning Partnership and of the Commissioning Board ensures a relevant and broader programme of community learning courses, increases participation of learners from diverse communities and the best use of scarce resources.
- Learners continue to benefit from good teaching, learning and assessment.
- Managers and tutors now have a much better understanding of the progress of learners and have worked well to introduce individual learning plans for all learners.
- In pursuit of becoming an 'outstanding' provider, leaders, managers, staff and partners are clear about the improvement priorities for the service and they have high expectations for themselves and their learners.

The key developments were to embed the Prevent strategy and British values into learners' development. BG added that this would be difficult, but would be addressed at the next provider's network meeting to see what ideas they came up with.

BG - add British Values declaration to the evaluation form.

GB suggested that as long as the core values were instilled they could be promoted as your values.

HM added that one means could be to present a special talk on values and then get learners to sign a declaration if they understood them.

GB stated it would be worth giving tutors a means of handling challenging views, and that they may need to be skilled up.

In regards to AfC's new Prevent strategy, BG suggested that we could consider adding it to the website.

IP stated that once we had the full report back from Ofsted we would then be able to work on an improvement strategy.

She also mentioned that in the interview, the inspector stated they believed that RCL was a good service which appears to be moving forward. This highlights how far we have come.

IP thanked everyone for their hard work done, especially BG and Community Learning for the work done during the inspection.

Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

Actions from last meeting:

1. Send Bursary list to SF team – BG to follow up with Keval, possibly attend next checkpoint meeting.
 2. Learning free leaflet has been created and circulated. BG to send link to RHP.
 3. BG and HD to attend either upcoming FSS wider management meeting or FST Operational managers meeting.
-

-
4. Self-declaration form updated to include where referral originated from.
 5. Proposal for learners in travelling communities. BG consulted with travellers, and from this set up two cooking for life sessions. Useful information was gained from the consultation, so it was deemed successful, however due to impact of seasonal period; learners were unable to attend all sessions.
 6. ESOL provisions map still in development, expected to be completed and circulated by May.
 7. BG to follow up with Eamonn and Anna regarding the needs of 18 -25 year olds.
 8. BG contacted all commission providers to reinforce the expectations of SLA. Next meeting will be in February.
 9. HD set up peer observations with Paul, sharing each other's reports, finding that they were similar.
 10. BG has found that there is still an issue with learners completing the satisfactory session. Still needs to be reinforced and will be picked up at the working group meeting.
 11. BG will circulate the provider survey results after the meeting today.
 12. Fact sheet was completed by Manoj and distributed to all members.

Performance

Final KPI – Performance Monitoring Report 2014/15

M1 – Learner number targets

Enrolment targets were met, bursary and non-qualification provisions have helped. There were 1030 actual enrolments compared to the target of 1000. RACC achieved 6037 with a target of 4000.

BG – The targets for 2015/16 still need to be set.

SRB stated it would be useful for possible future Ofsted inspections if they could determine the number of learners who enrolled through community centres (CC).

M2 – Percent of learners who are from minority ethnic groups.

The data was slightly below the target, but there was a good spread of learners on different courses. AfC achieved 18.7%, just 1.3% below the target of 20%. RACC was above its target of 35%.

M3 – Learners with learning difficulties.

This had been successful and targets were reached. Both AfC and RACC achieved over the target of 20%

M4 – Learner retention and completion rates

This was slightly below the target, but felt the target for this needs to be reset. Both AfC and RACC achieved 93%, just 2% below their targets.

M5 – Learner progression/ destination rates

The results were slightly eschewed due to changes to the categories.

IP said we should also take into consideration, elderly people who may not be looking into going back into employment.

M6 – Percent of lessons graded ‘good’ or ‘better’

AfC achieved 100% on lessons graded at good or better, whilst RACC achieved 90%. Both above the 2014/15 targets.

31 tutors were observed by HG and Tina and were then validated by RACC and outside assessor.

HM suggested that to get an even more critical review of assessment, we should employ more joint assessments.

M7 – Percentage of learner satisfaction.

BG to circulate to RCLP, proposed 15/16 targets to be validated by members via email.

HD & SRB to develop mechanism to evaluate the number learners coming through community centres.

HD & GB to agree the number of joint observations.

AfC received 100% satisfaction of the course from 722 learners out of 1298 who completed the section on the evaluation form. There is still an issue with no response and it would be useful if more learners completed the section. However there has been an improvement since the last performance review.

HM suggested it would also be helpful, if on the form it was highlighted with the learner how to raise any complaints that they may have.

IP also added that it may be necessary to modify the targets for M7 for the next year.

In-year Performance Monitoring report 2015/16

Due to not having set targets, a proper analysis of the In-Year performance monitoring data cannot be done.

BG to circulate updated performance document with targets to RCLP members.

Round 2 commissioning priorities

After Round 1 commissioning we have a total of £24,000 left for round 2.

Due to the success and broad range of opportunities at Round 1, it was agreed to stick to similar commissioning priorities for Round 2. The proportion of community learning activities is currently very balanced, but there is a need to include more Family Learning courses/activities

Value added

In-kind contributions by providers have increased further since the last monitoring point– The Ofsted inspectors were impressed with the current figure of 217%

BG, regarding commissioned work, BG to add to website bullet point on Family Learning provisions.

BG to include pie chart breakdown of types of courses provided by RACC, in performance data of future meetings

CL within CC Working Group TOR

It was agreed that the focus of the group should be the operational delivery and less of a strategic overview.

All – Review TOR Vision in the next meeting.

Vision

HM questioned the use of the word “passionate” in the Vision section. The word did not come across well in parent focus groups. They apparently found it to be very patronising and overused

IP suggested that we review this in the next meeting, possibly consulting with a small sample of CL learners on how they felt about this.

Attendance

HM suggested that the CC Advisory Board Chairs be added to the attendance of the working group meetings. Although they may not be able to attend, they should be invited and sent copies of minutes from any meeting.

**HD & SRB to
amend TOR**

This will help the advisory board give feedback, as difficult if they are not involved in lower level conversations.

CL Children’s Centre Update

HD gave a short presentation on CL commissioned activity within y the Children’s Centres.

Referring to slide 2 - £30k across all CCs @ £6k each.
CC’s core offer- key elements – English, maths and ESOL for Life to be included in core offer as identified.

Slide 3- Spring term Core offer: Heathfield has no English or maths for Life. Maths for Life planned for summer term.
Barnes – recently Lowther primary have identified parents for English for Life. Both Hilary Walsh and Rachel Lazarides believe this could begin after Easter.

Slide 4 & 5 Bespoke courses to meet local needs.
Barnes – Entry Level ESOL – Castleneau Community Centre, delivered by RAAC. Rachel (Barnes) is also planning to meet with Hilary and Hugh on 5.02.16 regarding (i) ESOL for fluent conversational English speakers (professional English) and (ii) Employability Workshops (Business Start –Ups).
Heathfield - ESOL Level 1 is delivered by RAAC

Stanley CC will be seeking to identify and target families in the most deprived LSOAs for core offer. Helen McNally will be meeting with Hugh on 02.02.16 to explore adult Community Learning at Ham CC.

Hugh stressed that Centres who are unable to show they are delivering the core offer (i.e. English, maths and ESOL for Life) but wish to run 'bespoke' courses funded by the £6k will need to discuss their proposals with Community Learning.

HM – Suggested another category of learners are professionals who looking to get back into learning, such as women who after a professional career have had children and would then like to start in a different field. It would be good to look at means of possibly sign-posting to either Barnes or Stanley.

HD could look into the viability of sign-posting learners to other more relevant sites with the available courses.

CH to send BG their list of services.

In order for this to work it was stated that coordinators and learners would need to know what was available at each site, and therefore might be necessary to have a map of available services.

CH and BG discussed having a meeting outside of the partnership on what services were available.

SRB noted to the partnership that they had changed the provider for the childcare course in January.

Election of RCLP chair

Due to IP shortly relinquishing strategic management of Community Learning to Eamonn Gilbert managing a new chair for the Richmond Community Learning Partnership was elected in the interim.

IP put HM forward. No other proposals were put forward.

The partnership agreed unanimously for HM to be the new chair for the RCLP.

AOB

Learners Voice

IP questioned whether we had the right mechanisms in place for this and to possibly look at where we could make improvements. We could compare CL's with RACC's. Additionally we should ensure that we are getting enough

responses from the SFA learner's survey.

IAG

We need to make sure what our offer is robust, clear and consistent with the minimum standards. Also ensure the information and accessible to all.

HM stated that any IAG was mostly about signposting to RACC and we could possibly look at other providers as well.

HM & BG to meet to discuss developing a detailed IAG directory.

BG to discuss with RACC merits of establishing a virtual learning portal.