

Adult and Community Learning Quality & Compliance Framework



2015-2016



European Union
European Social Fund
Investing in jobs and skills



**Skills Funding
Agency**

Version	Date Published	Amendment(s)	Approved By
1.0	19.08.2015	N/A	Liz Myatt

CONTENTS	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	3
Aim and Purpose	3
QUALITY AND COMPLIANCE MONITORING	4
PROCESS OF GRADING	4
RISK MANAGEMENT	5
RISK INTERVENTION	6
QUALITY AND COMPLIANCE FRAMEWORK	7
Performance Against Contract	7
Outcomes for Learners	8
Quality of Teaching Learning and Assessment	9
Leadership and Management	10
Compliance with Financial Penalties	11
KEY CONTACT INFORMATION	13

INTRODUCTION

Aim and Purpose

The *Adult and Community Learning Quality and Compliance Framework 2015 – 2016* provides the guidelines for the quality and compliance improvement of accredited and non-accredited learning, both delivered by ourselves as a service and as the 'Lead Provider' of provision procured by means of sub-contracts and service level agreements.

This framework forms part of the overarching Stoke-On-Trent City Council Employment & Skills Quality Strategy.

Together with our robust annual Self-Assessment Review (SAR) and Quality Improvement Development Plan (QIDP), Adult and Community Learning strive to promote excellence in teaching, learning and assessment.

The Common Inspection Framework provides the foundation for overall effectiveness, building on the principles of quality and compliance in Leadership & Management; Teaching, Learning and Assessment; Personal Development, Behaviour & Welfare and Outcomes for Learners.

The framework underpins a continuous programme of quality assurance and improvement activities throughout the academic year. Expectations and targets agreed are reviewed at regular intervals to promote cyclical improvement and development on an on-going basis.

In order to achieve quality improvement in each individual contract we will:

- Establish clear and comparable objectives for quality and compliance and share them with all providers;
- Manage performance against these objectives and risk rate against quality and compliance performance scales;
- Monitor the progress of quality and compliance improvement against actions identified between the provider and Contract and Compliance Officer at contract monitoring meetings;
- Produce an annual SAR and QIDP and share it with all providers;
- Regularly monitor progress and update identified actions in the QIDP;
- Identify and share good practice throughout the provider network via termly bulletins;
- Report provider performance to senior managers to promote effectiveness of leadership and management channels.

QUALITY AND COMPLIANCE MONITORING

Please see the *Adult and Community Learning Provider Delivery Guidance 2015 – 2016* for an outline of the monitoring process.

Performance against the quality and compliance performance scales is reviewed in contract monitoring meetings; these meetings take place on a termly basis unless more frequent meetings are deemed necessary by your Contract and Compliance Officer. Following these meetings, contract monitoring reports are compiled which document the risk ratings against each scale; an appropriate action plan will be negotiated which will be monitored against timescales attributed.

Performance and evidence will be used to contribute towards the Adult and Community Learning Self-Assessment Review (SAR) and Quality Improvement Development Plan (QIDP).

PROCESS OF GRADING

Prior to and during contract monitoring meetings, Contract and Compliance and Quality Officers will review all activity and assessment provided against each of the quality and compliance scales. An overall risk rating (RAG) will be established according to the standards set.

The aim of the framework is to provide a fair and equitable method to manage contract performance and improvement and development of quality and compliance.

RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk management falls within various stages of action and intervention depending upon the quality indicator or contract compliance criteria. It will be assessed in accordance with evidence provided either prior to or during contract monitoring meetings.

The performance tables detailed within this document link clearly to the below principal risk rating:

Rating	Key	Actions
Green	Provision is within quality and compliance scales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full performance against contract; • All aspects of provision within tolerance. 	No action required
Amber	Problem has negative effect on provision performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision requires corrective action to meet quality and compliance objectives; • Issue can be dealt with by the Contract and Compliance Officer and provider; • One or more aspects of provision performance are at risk. 	Reviewed with Contract and Compliance Officer and addressed within given timescales.
Red	Significant issues with the contract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision requires corrective action to meet quality and compliance objectives; • Issue cannot be handled solely by the Contract and Compliance Officer and provider; • One or more aspects of provision performance exceed tolerances. 	Providers failing to address issues within timescale place contract at high risk-financial penalty application.
White	No evidence available at this stage; no concerns.	No action required

RISK INTERVENTION

Risk intervention is a staged process as follows:

Rating	Intervention
Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance monitoring in between contract monitoring meetings; Sustain improvement and development through QIDP; Share good practice; Sustain annual sampling in line with standards.
Amber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions agreed at contract monitoring meeting implemented; Progress towards actions monitored through additional informal contract monitoring meetings; Support improvement and development through QIDP.
Red	<p>Stage 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providers who have not met the performance and/ or quality and compliance objectives as established in the contract must provide a revised profile showing how objectives will be met within two weeks of the contract monitoring meeting; Detailed action plan agreed at contract monitoring meeting implemented; Progress towards actions closely monitored through additional formal contract monitoring meetings; Support sessions provided; Mentoring for teaching, learning and assessment; Increased quality sampling including OTLA and Learning Walks. <p>Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to address poor performance and/ or quality and compliance objectives will result in formal stage 2 alert, formally identifying difference in performance versus contract; Overarching re-profile/ vary contract, Lead Provider re-distributes funding allocation; Poor performing tutor/ assessor removed from active register; Potential financial penalties communicated. <p>Stage 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued deviation will result in formal stage 3 alert, formally confirming difference in performance versus contract; Warning issued to contract holder; Financial penalties applied; Potential funding withdrawal.

← Breach of contract
← Non-compliance
← Persistent 'reds'

QUALITY AND COMPLIANCE FRAMEWORK

Performance Against Contract (Monitored by Contract and Compliance Officer)

Primary evidence sources: delivery against profile, contract volume.

Performance Objective	Rating	Judgement Criteria
Performance against funding: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Targets met within 5% of profile
	Amber →	Targets met within 10% of profile; targets agreed to address underperformance.
	Red →	Concern that a number of targets will not be met
Delivery against funding guidance and specification: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Meets all requirements
	Amber →	Some minimal requirements require addressing
	Red →	Does not meet the requirements
Key Performance Indicators- % of new learners (25%)	Green →	% of new learners are within 5% of the KPI
	Amber →	% of new learners are within 5 – 10% of the KPI
	Red →	% of new learners is not within 10% of the KPI
Courses within scope of allocation: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	All courses within agreed scope
	Amber →	Some courses not within agreed scope
	Red →	Most courses not within agreed scope

Outcomes for Learners (Monitored by Contract and Compliance Officer)

Primary evidence sources: enrolment, retention and achievement rates (accredited and non-accredited), comparison against national and neighbouring benchmarks, differences between E&D groupings, attendance rates, RARPA audit.

Performance Objective	Rating	Judgement Criteria
Enrolment: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Targets met within 5% of profile
	Amber →	Targets met within 10% of profile; targets agreed to address underperformance.
	Red →	Concern that a number of targets will not be met
Achievement: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Evidence achievement measured as at least 80% of learning outcomes, achievement rate 94%+
	Amber →	Evidence achievement measured as at least 80% of learning outcomes, rate 90 – 94%
	Red →	Insufficient evidence achievement measured as at 80% of learning outcomes and/ or achievement below 90%
Retention: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Evidence withdrawals processed efficiently, retention rate above 93%
	Amber →	Evidence withdrawals processed efficiently, retention rate 88 – 93%
	Red →	Insufficient evidence withdrawals are processed efficiently and or retention rate below 88%
Attendance: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Evidence absences are processed efficiently and attendance rate is above 85%
	Amber →	Evidence absences are processed efficiently and/ or attendance rate 82 – 85%
	Red →	Insufficient evidence absences are processed effectively and/ or attendance rate below 82%
RARPA Audit: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	All RARPA stages are fully met
	Amber →	4 RARPA stages are fully met
	Red →	Less than 4 RARPA stages are fully met
Achievement gaps: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	Equality & Diversity data analysed and no significant differences found
	Amber →	Equality & Diversity data analysed and some significant differences found, actions in place to address
	Red →	Equality & Diversity data analysed, many significant differences found and/ or no actions in place to address
Learner Feedback: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	Learner satisfaction rate is above 94% with no safeguarding/ E&D or other significant concerns
	Amber →	Learner satisfaction rate 88 – 94%, no safeguarding/ E&D and/ or few other concerns
	Red →	Learner satisfaction rate below 88% and/ or some significant concerns

Quality of Teaching, Learning and Assessment (Monitored by Quality Officer)

Primary evidence sources: OTLA, Learning Walks, learner feedback, achievement of professional qualifications, CPD.

Performance Objective	Rating	Judgement Criteria
Learning Walks: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	No issues identified
	Amber →	Minor issues identified, action plan to address
	Red →	Significant issues identified and/ or no actions in place to address
OTLA: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	85% grade 2 or above
	Amber →	75 – 85% grade 2 or above
	Red →	Less than 75% grade 2 or above
Performance Management of OTLA graded 3 & 4: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	All grade 3 & 4 OTLA actions have been addressed or are on track and/ or re-observation has taken place
	Red →	Insufficient evidence grade 3 & 4 OTLA actions have been addressed or are on track and/ or re-observation has not taken place
RARPA Audit Actions: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	All actions have been completed within agreed timescales and lead to the required improvements
	Amber →	Some actions either not effective or not yet completed
	Red →	Actions not effective or not completed
Information, Advice and Guidance: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	Evidence from sampling activity shows IAG is good, materials contains all required information, IAG is planned in Scheme of Work (SoW) and next steps are included in ILP
	Amber →	Evidence from sampling activity shows minor issues with IAG, materials do not contain all required information and/ or IAG is not sufficiently embedded in SoW and/ or ILP
	Red →	Insufficient evidence of IAG, materials not fit for purpose and/ or IAG is not embedded in SoW and/ or ILP

Leadership & Management (Monitored by Contract and Compliance Officer & Quality Officer)

Primary evidence sources: contract monitoring action plan response, contract compliance, reporting and response to Safeguarding and E&D issues, accurate data return, SAR, QIDP.

Performance Objective	Rating	Judgement Criteria
Venue Risk Assessments: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Evidence all risk assessments completed accurately, reporting compliant with H&S requirements (including evidence seen in Learning Walks and OTLA's)
	Red →	Insufficient evidence risk assessments completed and/ or compliant (including evidence seen in Learning Walks and OTLA's)
Approval of SAR: Term 1	Green →	All judgements agreed as validated and inclusive of range of evidence identified
	Amber →	Some judgements require review as not in reflection of evidence available
	Red →	Most judgements require review as not in reflection of evidence available
Approval of QIDP: Term 1	Green →	All actions agreed as effective in addressing the areas for improvement
	Amber →	Some actions need reviewing as not effective in addressing the areas for improvement
	Red →	Most actions need reviewing as not effective in addressing the areas for improvement
QIDP Progress: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	All actions identified are on track to be completed within the agreed timescales and effective in addressing the area for improvement
	Amber →	Most actions identified are on track to be completed within the agreed timescales and are effective in addressing the area for improvements
	Red →	Few actions identified are on track to be completed within the agreed timescales and/ or are not effective
Contract Monitoring Action Plan: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	All actions identified are satisfactorily completed within the agreed timescales
	Amber →	Most actions identified are satisfactorily completed within the agreed timescales
	Red →	Few actions identified are satisfactorily completed within the agreed timescales

Compliance with Financial Penalties (Monitored by Contract and Compliance Officer)

Performance Objective	Rating	Judgement Criteria	Risk Management Actions
Course details for SOTCC website and provider directory Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	All course details fully completed and submitted within contractual timescales	No action required
	Red →	Course details not fully completed and/or submitted within contractual timescales	10% financial penalty applied
New tutor/ assessor approval: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	New tutors declared and registered, CV and certificates submitted to evidence competence against assessment strategy	No action required
	Red →	New tutors not declared and/ or registered, no submission to evidence competence against assessment strategy	10% financial penalty applied
Professional Qualifications: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	100% staff hold 'Passport to Teach', trained in Safeguarding and E&D within last two years; tutors/ assessors hold or working towards minimum Level 3 Award in Education & Training	No action required
	Red →	Less than 100% staff hold 'Passport to Teach'/ trained in Safeguarding and E&D within last two years; tutors/ assessors do not hold/ are not working towards minimum Level 3 Award in Education & Training	10% financial penalty applied
Learning Walks & OTLA: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	Fully completed, access promoted	No action required
	Red →	Not completed, access denied	10% financial penalty applied
SAR & QIDP: Term 3	Green →	Fully completed and submitted	No action required
	Red →	Not fully completed and/ or not submitted	10% financial penalty applied
Data Returns: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Up to date and accurate data return submitted	No action required
	Red →	Up to date and accurate data return not submitted	10% financial penalty applied
Registers and ILP Returns: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Up to date and accurate registers and ILP submitted within 2 weeks of course end date	No action required
	Red →	Up to date and accurate registers and ILP not submitted within 2 weeks of course end date	10% financial penalty applied

Performance Objective	Rating	Judgement Criteria	Risk Management Actions
Learner Case Study Return: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Fully completed and submitted	No action required
	Red →	Not fully completed and/ or not submitted	10% financial penalty applied
Course Evaluation: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Course evaluation completed and submitted within 2 weeks of course end date	No action required
	Red →	Course evaluation not completed and/ or submitted within 2 weeks of course end date	10% financial penalty applied
Standardisation Attendance: In accordance with sampling plan	Green →	Attended standardisation meetings as required	No action required
	Red →	Did not attend standardisation meetings as required	10% financial penalty applied
CPD: Terms 1, 2 & 3	Green →	Evidence of job proportionate CPD attendance and achievement	No action required
	Red →	No evidence of job proportionate CPD attendance and achievement	10% financial penalty applied

KEY CONTACT INFORMATION

Adult and Community Learning form part of Stoke-On-Trent City Council's Employment and Skills Team:

15, Trinity Street, Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, ST1 5PH

01782 234775 (Monday – Friday, 9am – 5pm)

adult.learning@stoke.gov.uk

www.facebook.com/AdultLearningStoke

Curriculum	<p>Rob Blackshaw: Post-16 Learning and Skills Manager 01782 233499 rob.blackshaw@stoke.gov.uk</p> <p>Gemma Pilling: Adult Skills and Community Learning Manager 01782 238035 gemma.pilling@stoke.gov.uk</p>
Quality, Funding & Compliance	<p>Liz Myatt: Quality, Funding and Compliance Manager 01782 238338 liz.myatt@stoke.gov.uk</p> <p>Peter Brayford: Quality Officer 01782 233476 peter.brayford@stoke.gov.uk</p> <p>Daniel Shaw: Contract & Compliance Manager 01782 232446 daniel.shaw@stoke.gov.uk</p> <p>Hazel Scoffin: Contract & Compliance Officer 01782 235655 hazel.scoffin@stoke.gov.uk</p>
Area Leads	<p>David Bloor: ICT and E-Curriculum Lead 01782 233085 david.bloor2@stoke.gov.uk</p> <p>Beverley Ashley: Safeguarding Champion 01782 238291 beverley.ashley@stoke.gov.uk</p> <p>Peter Brayford: Equality and Diversity Champion Details as above</p>