RCLP Minutes - 21 June 2016

AfC

23 November 2017

Richmond Community Learning Partnership Meeting

Tuesday 21 June 2016

Present: Heather Mathews (chair), Hugh Dale, Gaynor Bray, Lauren Robinson, Kate Shepherd, Ryan Tolmia, Codane Brown (minutes)

Apologies: Barri Ghai.

Minutes	Action
Introductions and apologies Heather was introduced as the new chair for the Richmond Community Learning Partnership.	
Declaration of interest There were no declarations of interests.	
KPI Performance update 2015/16 Children's Centre Members went through the data provided by KS KS noted that this was the first time that Children Centre's have had to provide data going outwards. They routinely collect data on ethnicity, disability of either carer or the child. This has been found to be tricky at times to collect. Although the person may be asked at the time of registration they may be unwilling to answer at that point. The figures had been added, but quite sure there are more families with disabilities than would have been recorded. It was also confirmed that physical disability should be counted in the figures of disabilities as it was also counted in the M3 data recorded by community learning. SH added that there would also be a discrepancy on the figure of recorded details as with mental disabilities. M4: Learner retention and completion	

KS stated that they found it difficult to find a standardised definition for retention and completion. Also she noted that figures could be skewed as a result of the variety of courses ran by the CC. GB suggested the principle followed by RACC where if a learner failed to attend three consecutive lessons then they were considered not retained, and also noted the fact that one day courses may inflate the figures. KS added that it then might be difficult to record due to the scope and scale.

Looking at the figures HM raised the concern regarding multi-sports which had 12 participants but had only retained three leaners, whereas Kew and Barnes had 100%. KS responded that the first three weeks where funded by CL and the figures were recorded. It was then picked up by the CC and has since seen some success, but has not been seen as continued through CL.

HM stated they were interested in what happens after they finish the course, so progression figures were important.

KS added that they had a similar problem with defining completion rate and whether it meant that they had to attend the final day or whether they needed at 80% attendance.

HM & HD to provide KS with definition for completion.

KS also queried the end of course date, and whether it was dependent on learner goals as they may not necessarily be able to collect this.

HM also clarified in response to KS' query that where only part of the course was funded the, duration of that part would be defined as the course and completed if the person finished that part and evaluation carried out at the end of that. However it would be useful to still record whether the person carried on the course for progression figures.

Progression data

KS stated that they were limited in the amount of data they could track on this. For some families and adults they would routinely collect data for different purposes, however the crossover is quite small, but did not believe the CC had the capacity to track beyond that. Therefore they would only be able to track CC learners and even then it would only be partial data and would expect the provider to follow up.

KS added that she believes some information could be collected from the provider survey, which RT received and that they could add to that.

HM noted that they did not necessarily need to know if the person actually progressed onto that, but a proportion of what they intended to do.

KS added that there might not always be a worker to collect and that she felt it would most likely be the same data that RT would be receiving.

HM suggested that going forward, the provider could collect the data and tutors should be carrying out. In addition, HM added that with the newly commissioned staff, they could have a morning with all providers outlining the basic expectations, which could then be referred back to.

Satisfaction

Queried which total number used for the percentage satisfaction figures, whether it should be the total number of retained students or rather total number of those which completed the survey.

RT stated that for CL data they used the total number of those which gave a response.

KS noted that the final numbers were quite small, and that she was unsure why, but that it could be something to tighten up on or something the CC could pick up on at later date.

HM stated that if people were capable of attending and benefited from the course, then they should be able to give a response.

HM asked what influence we had over which courses were delivered at the CC. HD responded that starting this year, the core offer was presented to them to approve.

Looking at the data HM stated that other than ESOL, Maths and English were practically non-existent. HD giving the example of Stanley, that most of the users were level three and above, and so they may have to look more closely at marketing and tutors.

HM noted that she was conscience of Ofsted and them assessing what we are putting on. We would need to prove that we have tried, which would be difficult to evidence.

LR noted that they had faced a similar issue with functional skills, having low levels of attendance, and so as a result have woven the skills into the parts of courses that they do like.

HM suggested that when commissioning for next term in courses such as cooking a budget, we may need to express through the course outline how maths and literacy are woven in.

GB noted that it should be expressed explicitly with adults that it will be involved. GB mentioned that they were starting a pilot for a points online module to help encourage Maths and English, which had been developed with Hilcroft.

HM suggested that this could be shared in the next CC Managers meeting. Also that we need to look at how we can introduce Maths and English into the courses we already run and how we can evidence this so we have a way of tracking and from September tutors should express to us how it is being brought in.

HD raised the idea of having one CC managers meeting before the end of term and to provide an opportunity for tutors to come.

GB to share results from the online module once the pilot scheme has finished.

HD add to the agenda for the next CC Managers meeting, how to build Maths and English into CC courses.

Minutes of the last meeting.

Actions:

1.Barri: Added the British declaration off the back of the Ofsted inspection. It was raised at the provider's meeting and a safeguarding statement and leaflet were produced, which will be read out to learners by the tutor.

HD asked members to send suggestions on the leaflet before it is to be sent out providers for 2016-17.

HM queried the term Government prevent duty, that most people would not be aware of what it is and whether this was used as means to prevent debate. HD responded that it

was the opposite and a means for them to carry out their duty.

GB suggested that it could be explained as a means to help promote tolerance.

HM questioned whether we should want to encourage debate as it might be too complex an issue to be discussed by a tutor with a limited course focus.

HM also suggested the correction of "motion" to be replaced with "notion" and that the word "fundamental" should be removed.

GB proposed that members could send in their suggestion to HD outside of this meeting.

KS noted that the second sentence "I am required…" made it appear, forced.

HM questioned whether this was an attempt to distance the tutor. She suggested that "I am required…" should be used in regards to the prevent duty further down, and "we are required…" used in the second sentence.

HM also noted the "Any concern" section on the flyer, raising that it may be an opportunity to highlight safeguarding of vulnerable adults. In addition the Adult Safeguarding point of access should be added and to be wary not to suggest SPA is just for radicalisation.

2. Barri has completed the proposed targets for 2016.
3. KS' presentation of CC data will be used as a mechanism to showcase their data.
4. Number of joint observations has been agreed and two have been completed so far.
5. Updated performance slides are to be presented later in the meeting.
6. Family learning bullet point has been added to the website.
7. Terms of reference will be reviewed in this meeting, the word "passionate" has been taken out, and operational delivery working group has been set up.

8. LR RHC has two premises – Hounslow Heath, which has been given to Richmond College and another at Dean road, but she will also send info around. There is space in their

offices, however she would have to look into how often they may be used. Once this has been collated, she will share the info.

Richmond Upon Thames college is now working with RHP, offering construction, however there is a concern that they will not offer the course to adults and focus on young adults. So they are trying to do separate adults course, just to open up more opportunities.

HM asked whether there has been anything for computing skills. LR responded that her team are running a digital champions scheme, however currently, it is only available to RHP residents. Any computer illiterate resident will be able to attend and gain basic skills, in response to RHP plans on moving completely online, though she felt there might be some people they may not be able to capture.

LR once all information is collated, to share with the partnership.

9. IAG was discussed in the result of the Matrix Assessment.

GB and Barri discussed a virtual learning portal. They are still looking for something that will help learners engage. As an interim to increase their offer, HD suggested putting together a list of links, which could then be added to the adult learning page.

HM to send a list of links (if anyone else has any, please share).

LR also suggested whether it would be possible also do something similar through the taster session, where the tutor could advise learners on any other available courses moving forward, or to sign post.

Matrix Assessment – completed

It was suggested from the assessment that their longitude tracking required improvement, and setting up a volunteering project to assist with this.

HM could not see the point of setting it up as a volunteering scheme as there was no self-fulfilment and too small of a role to be attractive to anyone. You would have to be very clear what the partnership and the volunteer would be getting out of it.

KPI Performance update

M1

The targets are separate.

1050 (477) – The course is still running so there will still be more data to go on.

M2 – Ethnicity

20 % (21%) – There is still more data to come from MATAS.

M3 – Disabilities

Corse data is still to be entered as there are courses still to be concluded. HD also noted that there was some difficulty with learners being unwilling to declare their disability, a similar issue also being experienced at RACC.

M4

Good

M5 – Progression and retention

2% have progressed onto hard outcomes, with the current target being 5%. This should go up, but there is a bias against soft outcomes. HD also noted that these were intended outcomes, so not confirmed.

Regarding the pie chart, HM suggested from the selection of volunteering, the removal of the word "start" as a lot of learners may already be carrying out volunteer work.

M6 – Observed lessons

91% Really good. Completed between RCL and RACC. Moderation process was very good, two joint observations, which have produced similar outcomes.

HD noted that they would be meeting on Thursday to discuss carrying out more than just two joint outcomes.

RACC – 92%. They do not want the results to be too high and it is expected that it will change, following more standardisation.

HM suggested the removal of the additional notes on the slides as it's not accurate. They should not have been moving to 2:1 and should be at 2:1. Also it should be anonymised in the future.

M7 – Learner Satisfaction

Moving forward, the aim is to identify the learners not satisfied to get their views.

HM added we should quantify the percent of those that did not respond.

Commissioned courses 2016-17

09/06/16, seven applications were approved.

GB noted that RACC had commissioned were piloting a scheme for people diagnosed with a mental health issue gaining access to any course. If person self declares then they will be entitled to 50% off the course fee, and if they complete the form and meet a specific score, could be entitled to do attend the course for free. However there have been some issues regarding the form not being appropriate. GB agreed to bring the outcomes of the project to the group.

HM added that it would be useful to add this to the community and learning pages.

HD offered some key points on the courses they were offering. The more popular ones were Paediatric first aid (basic two week course, and they could then be sign posted onto other available ones), ESOL level 1, ESOL for Life (regarded as very useful), Family Fitness and cooking on a budget.

The bespoke courses were developed in Children's Centres.

Good Partnership sharing
The overall response from CC has been good this year and the relationship between CL and CC has been very positive. This has also benefited from the instituted budget monitoring processes and working groups.

HD made a proposal to add £10,000 to the already allocated

budget for CC. This would amount to an additional £2,000 extra to each CC and go towards the nurture of provisions and they would then be able to step up in terms of what they could offer.

HM suggested that this would be a discussion better suited for the commission meeting.

KS added that it would enable a more targeted response in terms of the needs of the area.

HD mentioned he had a discussion with Rachel regarding incorporating the views of the users in commissioning.

HM the only concern being that only the very articulate users will get courses and as discovered with ESOL, many needed the course.