

RICHMOND COMMUNITY LEARNING PARTNERSHIP MEETING - MINUTES



Date: Monday 02 December 2013 **2 – 4 pm**

Venue: 42 York Street, Twickenham



Attendees: Ivana Price (Chair), Manoj Nanda, Rod Haveland-Smith, Heather Matthew, Charis Penfold, Tina Cruise, Kathryn Barton (Minutes)



Apologies: Carol Stewart, Gaynor Bray, Robert Innes, Richard Pilkington




Agenda Item		Discussions	Actions
1.	Introductions and apologies	<p>Introductions made and apologies given.</p> <p>Introduction from Ivana – IP has taken over the chairing of these meetings from Richmond College as Community Learning now sits within Integrated Youth Services.</p>	TC to circulate TOR to group.
2.	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	<p>No minutes to review due to change in staffing.</p> <p>No matters arising.</p>	
3.	Update on commissioning CL 2013/14	<p>Changed due to service review.</p> <p>Clearer on target groups and needs.</p> <p>The local authority is not a direct provider – we act as a brokerer/commissioner. We are keen to align activities at a strategic level within the borough, especially with RACC, RUTC, the voluntary sector and children's centre's adult education.</p> <p>IP and HM already attend the children's centre board meetings and are keen to remove duplicate activities and up dual activities.</p> <p>Key strategic priorities were agreed in this group.</p> <p>The first round of commissioning was held in September and £324,000 was approved.</p> <p>The second round was held this morning (02.12.13) – it was moved forward so that it could take place before Christmas. 30 bids were reviewed at a total of £80,000, of which £33,500 were approved (this is dependant on bidders clarifying some questions the board had). The bids received were much more in line with the</p>	IP to forward strategic priorities doc to MN

Agenda Item		Discussions	Actions
		<p>priorities. The next round will be held in March.</p> <p>All commissioning information is displayed on the council’s website including round one courses that we have supported.</p> <p><i>HANDOUT – FIRST ROUND OF COMMISSIONING</i></p> <p></p> <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p> <p>Need to continue strengthening observations to feed into quality improvements.</p> <p>Relationship with RACC – community learning is the tier below RACC. CL is in place ideally to compliment and to enable learners to move onto RACC courses. Lots of bids were received for courses already running at RACC – we need to be clear on what they are offering, what bursaries are available and who the contact is for this.</p> <p><i>SECOND HANDOUT – COMPLETING APPLICATION FORM</i></p> <p></p> <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p>	<p>MN to draft a single A4 sheet on the bursaries offer & relevant criteria – forward to TC & IP before marketing</p>
4.	<p>Discussion on alignment of CL with CC/Early Years needs</p>	<p>Children’s centre’s were very much doing their own thing before and it was not hitting the needs.</p> <p>Each children’s centre needs to be treated individually and should be running courses specific to their areas of need.</p> <p>Needs found were young parents, IT competence, money matters (responding to welfare reforms).</p>	<p>CP to have a conversation with the contract commissioner, Mellissa Watson.</p>

Agenda Item		Discussions	Actions
		<p>New post coming in 'Families Information Worker'. This should help to filter through information.</p> <p>ESOL at RACC works very well – data on attendees longer term destinations/impact of course would be good. Gaynor Bray at RACC has previously agreed with this but so far we have no structure in place. MN can run searches on their database with name and postcode matches etc and then these people could be contacted.</p> <p>Discussion re grey area of 'where does the <i>support</i> finish and the community learning element start?' Some bids were largely support related so were rejected by the board.</p> <p>RACC have 3 Course Information Advisors – these did used to attend sessions at the children's centres.</p> <p>Some pediatrics courses have been funded for Summer 2014 already – no more bids came through for this, this morning but there is still the third round in which bidders have a chance to prepare for.</p> <p>Money Matters – could hold a 'train the trainer' type course. Castlenau are currently doing this through the college (commissioned themselves).</p>	<p>MN to arrange for a Course Information Advisor to attend established session at CC's – someone to broker this arrangement to CC/managers.</p>
5.	Development of financial strategy	<p>Discussion re the need to maximize resources and value for money in this current climate. SFA set the expectation that charging is put into place but with no details – case studies are available on their website.</p> <p>Some centers' are already charging participants to attend sessions/courses – we need to adopt a common approach across the borough. There are lots of anxieties re the local authority imposing charging policies i.e. it</p>	<p>Agreed by group – need to start thinking and consultation process. Next meeting have proposal drawn up for implementation September 2014</p>

Agenda Item	Discussions	Actions
	<p>could disadvantage learners and discourage them from attending. We would need to evidence that this would not be putting of learners who can't afford the course.</p> <p>Children's centre's will be charging in future – RBK have already been doing this for a couple of years and it seems to have worked well and not been a barrier to learning.</p> <p>Fees will need to be dependant upon the course i.e. 'job help' type courses would need to be cheaper. This money would not be local authority income.</p> <p>Could use children's centre charging policy as a base and also RACC's hourly rate for community learning.</p> <p>Charges would be asked for at point of bidding.</p>	
6.	<p>Community consultation process</p>	<p>Some of these feedback processes are already being done.</p> <p><i>HANDOUTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND PROPOSAL FOR DISCUSSION:</i></p> <div data-bbox="583 915 1094 1036">  <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meetin</p>  <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meetin</p> </div> <p>This will be available as hard copy and also online through the borough's gateway. Focus groups will be held for hard to reach groups – will need to consider the facilitator carefully.</p> <p>Ideas for focus group facilitator to IP</p> <p>TC to share list of focus group attendees for HM to add to</p> <p>Once confirmed – schedule to be shared on focus groups</p>

Agenda Item	Discussions	Actions
	<p>Points on questionnaire</p> <p>Main points on whole document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire could be modified when the cohort of people is known i.e. have a separate questionnaire for current learners. • Timing must be tactical so that it doesn't clash with other feedback forms and processes already in place – we do not want to duplicate information. • Add in something to test commitment of learners otherwise there is no point to holding the questionnaire! <p>See attached for amendments to be made to questionnaire:</p> <p><i>HANDOUT</i></p>  <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p>	<p>IP/TC to make amendments and then send to group for final comments</p>
7.	<p>Report on Annual CL partner and tutor survey</p>	<p><i>HANDOUT- KEY FINDINGS</i></p>  <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p> <p>Discussion re handout above. This is the eighth year this has taken place so trends can be observed. Response rate doubled from last year.</p> <p>Number of opportunities for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partners would welcome more guidance re authorities priorities • partnership work and frequent conversations regarding authorities plans, strategies, priorities and targets • reminders of things that have been changed i.e. 'you said, we did'. • Reminders of the website <p>HM feels this is very positive – feels we have done most of these already.</p>

Agenda Item		Discussions	Actions
		<p>Discussion re attendance at providers meeting – once all the money has been commissioned the attendance becomes very low. Need to reiterate value of attending these meetings.</p> <p>Need to ensure the agenda reflects what they find useful. Themes to be included i.e. teaching and learning, using ILP's, different providers could lead the meetings.</p> <p>This is the first year a significant area for development hasn't been included in the report.</p> <p><i>FULL REPORT BELOW – NOTE: THIS WAS NOT DISCUSSED IN THIS MEETING</i></p> <p></p> <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p>	
8.	<p>Report on final outturn performance against the key performance indicators for 2012/13</p> <p>Target setting for 2013/14</p>	<p><i>HANDOUT FINAL OUTTURN FOR DISCUSSION</i></p> <p></p> <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• M5: RACC and LBRuT need to be mirrored in terms of what is measured against. Hard/soft outcomes recorded? <p><i>HANDOUT TARGET SETTING FOR DISCUSSION</i></p> <p></p> <p>P:\42\Meetings & Minutes\RCLP Meeting</p>	<p>RHS to complete a review on other providers reporting for destination data. TC to send RHS the categories.</p>

Agenda Item		Discussions	Actions
		<p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be good to include more notes on why a target was reached • MN to take back M1 target to SMT • M2&M3: LBRuT have shifted target to align with census information • M4: change both to 92% • M5: need to think about what outcomes are measured i.e. hard and soft outcomes and how many needs to be achieved in order for it to count. Lots are not completing this part of the form so it has been hard to capture. • M6: Need to agree minimum percentage of observations – each community learning project will have at least one internal observation. Data will differ as the providers are not consistent - a lot of the CL funded projects are run by volunteers as apposed to qualified tutors. • M7: target re how many to get back – need to include percentage of participation. Local target agreed of 40% - 45% for responses. 	
9.	Matters arising from the CL Provider Forum	Carried forward to next meeting as nothing to currently report on.	
10.	AOB	<p>Nothing to report.</p> <p>Date of next meeting: Thursday 6 March 2-4pm</p>	