

## Richmond Community Learning Partnership Meeting


**Monday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2015**


**Present:** Ivana Price, Barri Ghai, Hugh Dale, Heather Mathew, Manoj Nanda, Sarah Reid, Gary Nuttall, Codane Brown

**Apologies:**



Minutes		Action
<b>1. Introductions and apologies</b>	Introductions made – IP welcomed Hugh new Community Learning Co-ordinator and first RCLP meeting. Codane was also introduced, taking minutes for today's meeting	
<b>2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising</b>	<p>MOPAC bid - IP gave an update on the MOPAC bid that although it was not successful, that it may still be worthwhile maintaining a dialogue to highlight the courses they can provide to help prevent youth from reoffending.</p> <p>BG – Detailed his meeting with MN to discuss the level of bursary that would be offered and work with RACC. It was decided that the bursary would be for £15,000 and focus on those which provided a pathway into interim employment.</p> <p>IP stated that it would be useful to profile the children centres and target specific courses.</p> <p>HM – They had profiled the children centres and decided to target courses around childcare and link this with colleges, but the level available was not that which could be funded by the bursary. Believed that it would not be productive or possible to offer</p>	<p><b>MOPAC bid - Discuss with contact, adult offenders and courses to support them. IP to introduce BG to contact through email</b></p> <p><b>Send bursary list to Keval's team (Susan Kinnaimont and Priti Deshraj) and to all CC Managers with details about how to access the courses using self-</b></p>


	<p>college level course as the service was supposed to act as first steps back into employment or bridge to further development off their own initiative. MN agreed stating that taster sessions should be funded by the bursary.</p> <p>IP suggested that Strengthening families should be prioritised, to coincide with meeting the employment need of the multi-function agency. HM added that producing a refreshed offer of what was available may be useful as we have changed what we offer.</p> <p>IP stated that it would be good to have a brochure that could go out stating what exactly was on offer. However was concerned that by merely sending out the leaflet the information will get lost and so might not be useful. It may therefore be effective as well if someone were <b>to</b> talk to them specifically about the programme and on what would be available to them.</p> <p>HM recommended that it be added to the self-declaration form, so that they are aware of applying the priority.</p> <p>SR voiced her concern that some learners would not go beyond the centres to progress and that possibly a process needs to be put in place to enable them.</p> <p>MN responded that it may be good in the first instance to determine whether there were any particular reasons why they were against the idea.</p> <p>Contact Public Health Commission – HD detailed the outcome of his meeting with GN. It was decided that in terms of the service, the focus should be on those who are challenged by mental health issues as they were the most disadvantaged and to follow up on contacts provided from GN to disseminate the information. GN added that the onus should be to partner our service with what was already available.</p> <p>MN stated that the recovery college course was directed at helping people with mental health concerns connect more with mainstream courses.</p> <p>HM raised the issue of there being a grey area of what was therapeutic learning and</p>	<p><b>declaration.</b></p> <p><b>BG create Learning for Free leaflet and distribute course list to all CC managers</b></p> <p><b>BG &amp; HD to Book into a FST Meeting to update the staff/officers about Community Learning (Clive Seal is manager)</b></p> <p><b>Adapt the RACC self-declaration form to include where the referral was from. This will help inform strengthening families.</b></p>
--	---	--


	<p>what was actual learning and although we receive mainly requests for therapeutic learning we have included some of the latter, for example MIND. Furthermore, that in regards to mainstream learning that tutors needed to be equipped with the skills to help bridge the gap and aid in reintegration.</p> <p>IP stated that although there may be gaps in the service, we didn't want to directly duplicate the recovery course treatment and therefore it would be useful for future commissions to do some ground research outside of the meeting on recovery based services.</p> <p>BG suggested that it should be raised with the providers beforehand that the service was to bridge to mainstream education.</p> <p>IP asked about the Festival of Learning project, to which BG responded that it may be something that is ready to be run next year.</p> <p> Borough Ethnicity Data Comparison.ppt</p> <p>Looking at data, BG stated that their demographic of learners were in line with the demographic of LBR &amp; RBK data from the last census, which has been achieved by continued focus on targeting the hard to reach ethnic groups.</p> <p>HD mentioned that he was currently working with travellers and finding out which courses they were interested in, the current consensus being dancing, nails and beauty.</p> <p>SR – the initial principle should be to establish trust and then build from there.</p> <p>BG raised the matter that a budget would need to be agreed on the needs of this</p>	<p><b>HM to contact Recovery based services and research the particular needs of the targeted group</b></p> <p><b>BG to create a proposal with costing for proposed 8 learners in travelling community and it can be agreed upon over email. BG to commission banners for vision statement and distribute to centres.</b></p>
--	---	---

	<p>priority group, and that it would possibly need to be upwards of £5,000 for around 8 learners. He realised that it may appear quite costly, but would cover all learners for all courses. Although this would be after HD had met with the group again, to create a proposal with which courses they would provide and how much it would cost.</p> <p>HM mentioned that RHP has a stake in this rather than just providing a venue and so should be involved in the establishment of courses for the targeted group.</p> <p>Matters arising – IP queried whether it would be useful to work with RHP to ensure that there is not a clash in the service which they each provide, and whether it would be necessary to have someone at strategic or community level involved.</p>	<p><b>HD to create map stating which &amp; ESOL provisions available and distribute to centres.</b></p> <p><b>Meet with Anna Chivers &amp; then Eamon Gilbert RE: explore the needs of 18 - 25 yrs olds &amp; what the SEND reform impacts are on them. Are there any gaps in provision for them? What can we provide additionally to meet these needs? Does CL need to commission specific activities to meet these identified needs?</b></p> <p><b>IP to ask RHP to be represented at the next RCLP</b></p>
<p><b>3. Performance update: 2014/2015</b></p>	<p> RCLP Aug 2015 KPI Report (2).ppt</p> <p>BG stated that the results were positive and that they were on track to meet their targets. However it was brought to attention the difficulty in obtaining the learners info. Also as expected the “soft” outcomes were greater than the “hard” outcomes. The AfC learner progression data highlights that the service is having an impact and people are kick starting their learning and going into something more accredited or something more tangible.</p>	<p><b>BG to meet MN to discuss how soft outcomes are recorded and look at the list to potentially update the feedback forms before the first courses are complete.</b></p>

	<p>HM suggested that the need to fill out the required information be highlighted in the contract, possibly adding a note in the consent section.</p> <p>BG noted that the lesson observations needed to be moderated to ensure the results were correct.</p> <p>IP Stated that she wasn't sufficiently reassured that the data was 100% accurate and queried whether some of the RACC data may have been missed out as they were not greatly comparable to the results of the community learning centres.</p> <p>MN responded that the results from RACC, included the whole college rather than just those from community learning.</p> <p>IP - Perhaps commission an independent person to sample observations or deliver moderation sessions and to prioritise new tutors in the next observations.</p> <p>In regards to 'M7% Learners Satisfaction' BG raised his concern that a number of learners omitted to complete that section. HM suggested it may be useful to discuss with the providers the necessity of supporting this.</p> <p>IP suggested possibly using incentives to encourage completion of feedback among providers. BG responded that this had been tried, however had been unsuccessful.</p> <p>In terms of the data IP asked whether it would be possible to represent the information so that from a quick glance it's evident whether targets had been met, and where it hadn't give more focus to ensure it can be assessed.</p> <p>BG noted that all the data from the Community Centres (CC) had not been added, and</p>	<p><b>BG to send out an email to all commissioned providers to reinforce the expectations of the SLA - completion of feedback form properly and personal information. Reduction of funding if they do not provide the data.</b></p> <p><b>HD to set up peer observations and a moderation meeting with MN.</b></p> <p><b>MN to provide BG with observation results of just CL at RACC</b></p> <p><b>BG discuss with MN courses for providers that target moving them from good to outstanding</b></p> <p><b>CB &amp; HD to prepare M7 data of CC solely, prioritising Stanley and Hampton.</b></p>
--	---	--

	<p>IP queried whether it would be possible to have the CC data represented alone as well as broken down between each individual CC.</p>	
<p><b>4. Commissioning Update: 2015/2016</b></p>	<p>             Round 1 Funded Activities 2015_16 ne         </p> <p>HM referencing the commissioned list was concerned that courses they had agreed upon were not on the list and some that they hadn't were, for example Margret Prain MENCAP course. BG responded that it was a last minute submission, of low cost, and had only agreed for one course running the computer employability.</p> <p>HM asked that if this is the case can we ensure that different learners were used this time round.</p> <p>BG stated from that data, they have commissioned £73,000 to 21 providers, although he still needs to have a budget meeting with Marzena once she was back from annual leave to determine how much is left and whether there was a possibility for a round 2.</p> <p>IP noted that it was positive to see that over the years there has been an increase in value added to projects and that this should be promoted to display the growing success of the service. IP also queried whether there was a breakdown of where the value added came from.</p> <p>BG responded yes that a large majority was from staffing, but some providers showed in their invoices where learners had contributed to the course.</p> <p>Looking at the commissioned courses pie chart BG noted that although Arts and Crafts had gone down, employability had increased and this was more in line with the Commission.</p>	<p><b>HD present to SR the courses CC want to put on, to ensure no clashes with services we have already bought into and within budget.</b></p> <p><b>BG to confirm whether we commissioned Richmond MIND and left off list?</b></p> <p><b>CB &amp; HD to produce data analysis of different courses that progressed onto Hard outcomes.</b></p> <p><b>IP put on agenda for the next meeting review of commissioned update report.</b></p>
<p><b>5. Learner Fee Charging Policy</b></p>	<p>             AfC Draft CL Charging Policy 04.03         </p> <p>HM stated that in order for the service to continue to be viable in the long term it is</p>	

	<p>necessary that a fee exist.</p> <p>GB responded that for learners who would find it difficult to afford the fees, there was a remission criteria, however the only problem was with evidencing that the person had met these.</p> <p>MN suggested self-declaration and the provider only need to confirm they had seen the relevant document and not necessary for them to keep a copy of it.</p> <p>It was agreed that the fee should be kept at £2.50 and GB noted that across the country other boroughs were charging between £4 and £6.</p> <p>IP mentioned it would be helpful to have a proposal drafted to consult members, before being put fully in policy. Also IP questioned whether it would be useful to engage learners beforehand on the matter as they are the ones being affected.</p> <p>SR responded that it would be more useful if they were given notice prior to fees coming into effect, so that they are aware.</p> <p>IP also queried if BG could provide an estimation of revenue that would be generated and benefits it would have to the service.</p>	<p><b>BG to create a proposal to go the cabinet members that outlines the fee charging; policy. Consider context, risk analysis, estimation of revenue generated and the potential benefits to CL and time frame, run past audit to check due diligence. To get political sign off</b></p>
<p>6. <b>CL Children's Centre Update</b></p>	<p> Round 1 - Providers &amp; Activities.docx</p> <p>SR informed that Barnes had had their recent Ofsted inspection and secured a requires improvement, which was good as it had progressed from inadequate. There is still a process to evidence impact and increase participants, but this was a general concern for most Children's centre.</p> <p>Children centre managers have been set the new appraisal target of having at least 20 adults being tracked and monitored over a year and can include volunteers as well people accessing community learning.</p>	

7. <b>Provider Network Meetings</b>	 RACC - ESOL Networking Meeting 2	<b>Provider meeting action - Aspects of quality control measures (observations) to be discussed with all providers</b>
8. <b>Provider Survey 2015</b>		<b>BG to circulate provider survey results to RCLP members</b>
9. <b>AOB</b>	Update on mental health project.	<b>MN – Make a fact sheet and distribute to members.</b>