



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Philippa Gibbs
philippa.gibbs@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7638

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 20 May 2016

EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held on Wednesday 25 May 2016

Please see the attached report(s):

9 INFORMATION REPORTS

- **Youth Offending Team – Improvement Plan Update** (Pages 3 - 14)
- **Proposed Adult Education Curriculum for 2016/2017** (Pages 15 - 24)

Paper copies of this Information Briefing will not be available at the meeting of Education Select Committee.

Information Items will not be debated at Education Select Committee unless a member of the Committee requests a discussion be held. 24 hours notice must be given to the Clerk.

Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.
ED16033

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: **EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE**

Date: **Wednesday 25 May 2016**

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM - IMPROVEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Contact Officer: Eamon Brennan, Interim Head of Youth Offending Service
Tel: 020 8466 3080 E-mail: Eamon.Brennan2@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director: Children's Services (ECHS)

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides information to the Education Select Committee on the progress of the Youth Offending Service (YOS) Improvement Plan.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **Members of the Education Select Committee are asked to note the content of this report and the progress of the YOS Improvement Plan.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Bromley Youth Support Programme
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding: Youth Justice Board and Mainstream Funding.
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 22.3
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All Service Users.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 Background to YOS Improvement Plan

- 3.1.1 The Bromley Youth Offending Service (YOS) was subject to a Full Joint Inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) in February 2015. The outcome of the Inspection was disappointing with four out of six key judgements considered to be poor, one unsatisfactory and one satisfactory.
- 3.1.2 In response to the Inspection, the YOS, with the support of the Youth Justice Board (YJB), developed an Improvement Plan. The updated plan was presented to a Joint Education, Care Services and Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee on the 22nd of July 2015. The portfolio Holder for Education and Chair of the Education PDS asked for regular reports on the progress of the YOS Improvement Plan to be presented to the Education PDS. The Improvement Plan was subsequently updated and agreed by the YOS Management Board and the HMIP Lead Inspector.
- 3.1.3 Progress reports have been presented to the Education PDS on the 29th September 2015, the 24th of November, the 19th January 2016 and the 8th March 2016. Most actions that were listed on the 2015/16 Improvement Plan have now been completed and work has started on the proposed 2016/17 Improvement Plan.
- 3.1.4 At the YOS Management Board Annual Conference in February 2016 members of the YOS Management Board discussed and proposed priorities and ambitions for the Annual Strategic Plan for 2016 / 2017. It is proposed that this new strategic plan along with the 2016/17 Improvement Plan will replace the YOS Improvement Plan and be submitted to the Youth Justice Board for approval. This is also a condition of the YOS continuing to receive the annual grant from the YJB.
- 3.1.5 In March 2016 the Youth Justice Board carried out a case file audit of the Bromley YOS. A total of 20 cases were audited by the YJB. This represented 25% of the statutory cases the YOS was holding at that date. The quota audited therefore is comparable with the number that would be inspected during a Short Quality Inspection (SQS) by HMIP.

The audit gave details of progress in the themes inspected by HMIP as well as listing details of further improvement needed. It is proposed that the detailed proposals are represented in the new YOS Improvement Plan for 2016 / 2017.

3.2 Leadership and Partnership

- 3.2.1 Due to a reduction in the YJB grant during 2016 / 2017 and the need to meet the local savings target the Interim Head of Service has carried out a consultation process with all staff. As part of this process a consultation document outlining the changes being recommended as part of the restructure of the Service was released and disseminated to staff on the 29th of February 2016. Members of staff were given an opportunity to respond during March 2016 and the process was completed at the end of April 2016. The changes to the YOS structure detailed in the consultation document have been agreed and will now be actioned.
- 3.2.2 The Bromley YOS is currently recruiting to the posts of Operational Manager and level 2 YOS worker. Shortlisting for these posts is currently taking place with interviews expected to take place shortly. Following the sign off of the Consultation process a Senior Business Support Officer and a Business Support Officer will be recruited. The YOS will also be recruiting to the post of YOS Information Officer following a recent resignation.
- 3.2.3 The reorganisation of the Service has resulted in a reduction of full time staff to 22. The Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) programme is now delivered by YOS staff with

Bromley Youth Support staff being employed on a sessional basis at weekends. Referrals of young people for counselling or Child and Adolescent Mental Health (CAHMs) needs are now being made via Bromley Well Being. Health referrals to substance misuse and school nurse services are made directly to those services with the young people being seen at the YOS. Families in need of parenting support are being referred directly to the Bromley Children's Project.

- 3.2.4 The implementation of the Asset Plus national assessment tool has continued with the new process being loaded on to the YOS database. Comprehensive training of staff commenced on Wednesday the 4th of May. The new system will be installed in June and it is planned that all staff will be using Asset Plus by the end of June 2016.

3.3 Quality, Assessment and Planning.

- 3.3.1 The Case File Audit carried out by the YJB at the end of March 2016 is attached as Appendix 1. The YJB auditors reported their findings back using the following headlines, Assessments, Reports, Planning, Risk and Vulnerability, Management Oversight and Work with Partners.

The Auditors also listed what they found to be good practice as well as providing a list of recommendations for further improvement of the service.

The Auditors did not give the YOS an Inspection judgement as the HMIP would have done but they did conclude,

“The YOS should feel confident that the direction of improvement is upward and that with a stable, established team with clear expectations and consistency which is underpinned by good quality training and support then improvements will continue. It was pleasing to see the distance that has been travelled.”

- 3.3.2 The YOS will continue to audit both statutory and pre court cases each month. The results of the audits will be reported back to the YOS Management Board.

3.4 The Voice of the Young person and other service users.

- 3.4.1 The YOS continues to ask all young people and their families for feedback regarding the service they receive. HMIP have requested that we ask 59 young people to complete a questionnaire regarding their views on the service they receive during 2016 /2017. The YOS will feed back the results of this survey to the YOS Management Board.

- 3.4.2 The Bromley Safeguarding Children Board (BSCB) held their meeting at the YOS building in February of this year. At the end of the formal meeting a group of young people currently receiving services from the YOS met with the Chairman of the BSCB and other Board members to discuss their experiences of being young people in Bromley but also to comment on their contact with the YOS.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The YOS Head of Service and the Performance Improvement Officer are addressing the recommendations made following the recent internal financial audit.
- 4.2 The YOS was informed at the start of the financial year that the YJB grant for 2016 / 2017 has been reduced by 12.5%. This represents approximately £ 21,000 of the current grant for this year.

5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1. HMIP has a statutory duty to inspect the YOS and it is also required to make its report available to the public.

6. **PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Any personal implications arising from the improvement plan to address the issues raised by the inspection will be presented to the Portfolio Holder as appropriate.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Policy Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

This page is left intentionally blank

Case File Audit 21st – 22nd March 2016 Bromley YOS

Background

Following a poor Inspection outcome in February 2015 the YJB, with agreement from Bromley YOS and the Management Board agreed to undertake a case file audit one year post inspection. When completing this audit the YJB used the HMIP Info path tool and followed the case advice guidance used in inspections. The YOS provided a list of all cases which had commenced from 1st September 2015 as it was felt that the most significant changes would be evident from this point following the introduction of a new Deputy and Head of Service.

Audited Cases

A total of 20 cases were audited by 7 different members of YJB staff. At the time of the audit Bromley YOS held approximately 80 cases. The quota audited is comparable with the number that would be inspected during a Short Quality Screening Inspection (SQS) by HMIP.

Following the Inspection outcome in February 2015 the YJB had completed some initial case file reads and were able to identify clearly where the deficits in case management were. The YJB were able to see that there had been improvements in the quality of case management most notably that all cases had the correct documentation completed and on the system. There was greater evidence of management oversight but this still does not represent the true level of oversight according to new processes and policies.

Conclusion

The YOS should feel confident that the direction of improvement is upward and that with a stable, established team with clear expectations and consistency which is underpinned by good quality training and support then improvements will continue. It was pleasing to see the distance that has been travelled.

For ease of reading the following report has been grouped into themes.

1. Good Practice

- Case Workers knew the young people and were able to identify the needs of individuals which was pleasing to see.
- The use of a Restorative Justice Conference was impressive and the impact for both young person and victim.
- Case Workers had developed good working relationships with Electronic Monitoring Company to share information on high risk cases.
- Strong use of the in house Substance Misuse and Education workers.

YJB Case File Audit March 2016

Kathryn Wyatt

Amended by Natasha Richards 20.4.16

- One asset used a template for analysis which helped the author to focus on linking back to offending, re offending, risk and vulnerability.

2. Assessments

Assets were generally completed within National Standards timescales.

Authors were generally able to identify diversity needs of young people in assessments but did not follow this through into planning.

Further Improvements:

There was evidence of back dating Assets on the system which is poor practice. Where delays occur reasons for this should be noted on the case management system.

Assets contained lots of information from a range of sources however authors struggled to analyse this information and draw clear conclusions on the links with offending and reoffending.

There was little evidence of the young person's voice in assets. Whilst "What do you think" questionnaires had been completed with young people we only saw evidence in one asset where information from this had been used to inform analysis.

Authors focussed on the factors against desistance rather than those for desistance and supporting these in the work with young people.

3. Reports

Pre sentence reports (PSR) were overall of a sufficient standard - The YOS would benefit from ensuring that PSR proposals detail exactly how the proposal will address the needs identified for that individual.

Further Improvements:

- Referral Order reports - were far too long. Often 5/6 pages in length. Guidance suggests that these should be no more than 2 pages in length and should act as a platform for discussion at the panel. Referral Order reports should also not specify interventions. A suggestion would be that authors use a phrase such as "the panel may wish to consider including"
- Gate keeping - This was not always evident. There is only a gatekeeping form for PSR's which is then stored in a paper file. Auditors could not always locate the gatekeeping form or reference on the case management system that this had occurred.

4. Planning

Plans were evident on the case management system which is a significant improvement from the inspection. There was good evidence of referrals to specialists in house and their involvement which improved outcomes for the young people

Further Improvements:

- Panel members could play a greater role in the creation of Referral Order contracts and draw on community interventions and resources.
- Plans often focussed on the factors against desistence rather than supporting and building on the factors for desistence.
- Case Workers struggled to ensure plans were SMART. Most plans were not specific or had measurable outcomes and frequently used professional language that a young person would not understand.
- Whilst it was possible to see how case workers had pulled through identified needs from the asset to the plan it was not always evident how the plan was delivered through the content in contacts.
- There was a number of cases where the young person was prescribed medication to manage diagnosed conditions but refused to take. The impact of this was not fully explored by case workers to understand how this effected engagement nor supported the benefits of taking the medication.
- Plans rarely incorporated the young person's diversity needs eg: being specific as to which materials will be used to match a young person's learning style/need despite this being identified in some assessments which was positive.
- Case managers need to think more creatively about engaging young people and not just rely on standard "off the shelf" interventions. This was particularly prominent in cases where there was non compliance.
- When working with young people in custody plans very much focused on the standard work of the custodial facility and did not fully explore the resettlement needs of the young person. For example a young person who had a history of fire setting yet no targeted invention on this was considered which could have reduced the risk on release.
- There was no evidence of others plans incorporated into the YOS plan eg where a child was on a CIN plan the associated actions were not in the YOS plan.
- Reparation often appeared to be completed first on an order. It is questionable about how much impact this will have without any under pinning offending behaviour work first. It also means less contact with the case worker in the critical early stages of engagement.
- There was limited reference to exit planning and a "step down" process for when orders were ending.

5. Risk and Vulnerability

Assessment of risk was adequate in most cases which is big improvement from the previous audit.

Further Improvements:

- In the majority of cases it was felt that vulnerability was under assessed. Often this was because factors relating to a young person risk of harm were not considered to also make them vulnerable Both risk and vulnerability management plans need further attention. Too often these included cut and paste information from assets and did not specifically home in on the risks.
- Both RMP's and VMP's need to be specific. Plans should clearly state what the identified risks/concerns are and what action will/is being taken to address including specifically by whom, how and when.
- When a young person received subsequent orders too often the ROSH documents was just duplicated without any updating.
- Staff need to consider CSE in all cases, including that of young males and ensure this is referenced. HMIP see this as good practice.

6. Management Oversight

From discussions with managers and through the Improvement Board it is evident that the level of management oversight has increased however this was not always obvious in the case management system.

Further Improvements:

- Only a gatekeeping form exists for PSR's resulting in a lack of consistency across Referral Order and Breach reports.
- Where managers had identified actions these had been recorded on the case management system but no evidence of follow up to ensure they had been completed.
- Very few examples on the case management system where cases had been discussed in supervision.
- A number of cases indicated that where there should have been escalation this had not been documented and evidenced.
- Evidence from compliance panels was sparse and how this is recorded varied.
- There was limited evidence of risk panel discussions and detail as to who was involved.
- Management oversight needs to be more visual on the case management system and contacts added by managers when discussions and decisions on a case have happened.
- Managers need to ensure that when QA'ing a report they cross reference with assessment documentation to ensure no discrepancies eg: in one report the assessment of risk was different in the ROSH and PSR.

7. Work with partners

There was evidence in a number of cases that the working relationship between the YOS and the court is fractured. There was evidence that the courts disregard YOS assessments, proposals and knowledge of the young person. This had resulted in negative outcomes for the young people.

There was strong evidence of the work with both Substance Misuse and Education specialists within the team.

There was evidence of working relationships with schools and the sharing of information in a timely manner.

There was evidence that at an operational level the working relationship with children's social care is not functioning smoothly.

Further Improvements:

- Where there had been issues identified with the court there appears no clear mechanism for discussing these.
- There was little evidence of children's social care involvement with young people that straddled both services. Also there was an impression that children social care saw "the offender" rather than a child in need. This was evident in cases regarding housing, a court proposal of Remand to LA and possible child protection.
- There appears to have been no escalation in the cases audited beyond operational level to resolve any issues/barriers.

Recommendations:

- Dip sample vulnerability/safety and well-being plans bi monthly with staff to identify enhance their ability to cross reference information and the combined needs of the young person.
- Encourage case workers to think creatively about engagement and link this with the factors for desistance.
- Develop and implement gatekeeping/QA forms for breach and RO reports.
- Ensure that QA documents are scanned and attached to the case management system.
- To broaden case managers understanding of desistance and how this can be embedded into planning and delivery.
- Review the cases held by Level 1 staff to identify the need for additional management support and oversight.
- Consider when Reparation is sequenced into planning to ensure the greatest impact rather than to just tick a box.

- Ensure that the management oversight is visual by evidencing on the system and consistent.
- To ensure the outcome of compliance panels is clearly recorded on the case management system.
- All case managers to use a consistent format when writing contacts to ensure there is a link back to planned intervention e.g.: Aim, Content, Outcome, Safeguarding/Risk, Actions.
- The voice of the child needs to be enhanced in both assessments and planning. Use of the WDYT must be used for analysis rather than just reference. Plans need to be written in YP friendly language and signed.
- As a service consider how the learning and speech and language needs of YP are assessed and used to inform assessment and planning.
- Strengthen the relationship between YOS and Social Care at an Operational Level and ensure that staff feel confident to utilise the escalation processes where necessary.
- Ensure and where applicable reference CSE in all assessments to evidence this has been considered.
- Ensure that the relationship with the court is strengthened and that there is a clear chain of communication both at an operational and strategic level. (invite to management board if not a member)

London Borough of Bromley

Report to: Portfolio Holder for Education

Date: 03 May 2016

Title: Proposed Adult Education Curriculum for 2016/2017

Contact Officer: Carol Arnfield; Head of Service for Adult Education
Carol.arnfield@baec.ac.uk

Reason for report:	<p>At the meeting of the Education Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on 19 January 2016 Members requested that a further report setting out the structure of the final curriculum be considered by the Portfolio Holder.</p> <p>This report provides the Portfolio Holder with</p>
Recommendations:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Approve the proposed amendment to the fee policy with regard to non accredited provision.2. Consider & comment on curriculum currently planned for mainstream adult education offer.3. Consider and comment on curriculum proposals for the community outreach provision, including the distribution of the community learning funding across the different areas of community outreach

1 Background

- 1.1 The proposed restructure of the adult education service, including the closure of the Widmore Centre for the purpose of adult learning, was approved by the Executive Committee on 10 February 2016.
- 1.2 Managers within the adult education service reviewed the accommodation at the Kentwood and Poverest sites to identify which curriculum could be reasonably relocated to either site without undue expenditure and/or significant structural alterations.
- 1.3 On 24 March 2016 the adult education service received confirmation of its indicative funding allocation for the 2016/2017 academic year from the Skills Funding Agency (SFA). The statement showed that the service can expect to receive funding at similar levels to those it has received for the current academic year.
- 1.4 As part of the reorganisation of the adult education service it was agreed that a higher proportion of the grant for non-qualification courses should be directed towards disadvantaged adults and communities. As a consequence of this decision

there will be fewer courses on offer as part of the mainstream adult education programme (sometimes referred to as leisure courses) available for public enrolment. However, there will be an increase in the number of targeted community outreach courses including family learning.

- 1.5 As the funding for the qualification courses has remained at a similar level to that of 2015/16, much of the previous offer remains. Where qualification courses have been withdrawn, this is as a result of declining demand for the subject, difficulties in relocating specialist resources or the qualification being removed from the list of those approved for public funding.

2 Changes to the fee policy for 2016/17, non accredited provision only

- 2.1 Although students pay course fees, mainstream non qualification courses are usually subsidised by the Community Learning portion of the grant from the Skills Funding Agency. Historically in Bromley this has been based on the assumption that learners pay 50% of the true costs and the remainder is covered by the grant.
- 2.2 In practice this has meant that where courses have been fully subscribed (usually over 16 in a class) they have required a lower level of subsidy whilst those courses with lower enrolments have required a higher level of subsidy to cover the costs.
- 2.3 In previous years the fee policy for the non-qualification courses has been split into 4 main bands:

Table 1

Standard short course	Standard rate applied to those courses that take place in a standard classroom setting, e.g. languages, art appreciation.
Standard long course	
Specialist short course	Specialist rate applied to those courses that require specialist facilities e.g. cookery, ICT.
Specialist long course	

- 2.4 Long courses were defined as those that spread across 2 terms or more, usually for a period of 28 weeks.
- 2.5 Each time a student enrolls on a course there are various costs that are associated with that enrolment. When a student enrolls on a long course that spans across academic year there is only one occurrence of those associated costs. However if a student enrolls on three short courses spread across the academic year then there are three occurrences of those costs even if the total number of learning hours amount to the same as that of a long course. For this reason the two course length related bands were established many years ago.
- 2.6 Curriculum managers are now required to implement greater levels of scrutiny and monitoring of the use of the Community Learning fund and it is essential that they seek to maximise the impact that the limited funding can have on local communities and residents.
- 2.7 Recent evidence shows that long courses use a higher proportion of the SFA allocation than short courses. For example, a general drawing and painting 28 week course with full occupancy will require subsidising to 36% of the total costs, compared to a general drawing and painting short course with full occupancy, where only a 29% subsidy is required to cover all costs. A yoga 28 week course with minimum occupancy would need to be subsidised at 57% of costs, compared to a

yoga short course with minimum occupancy where the subsidy level would be at 36%.

- 2.8 Therefore in order to maximise the funding available to support mainstream adult education courses, officers propose to charge the same fee per hour for short and long courses. This would be set at £4.90 per hour for a standard course and £5.20 per hour for a specialist course. These rates will continue to compare favourably with Croydon and Bexley adult education services at £5.25 and £5.50 per hour regardless of the length of course.
- 2.9 By simplifying the fee structure and introducing parity between long and short courses, officers can improve how they manage the provision of fee-paying courses within the reduced 2016/17 budget and provide a higher number of courses than would have been possible under the previous fee structure. Reducing the number of fee rates allows for a more transparent fee pricing structure that is simpler for service users to understand.
- 2.10 To prevent low income from being a barrier to participation, the impact on the public could be abated by allowing learners to pay their course fees in instalments. The average instalment would be similar to the fee for a short course. Curriculum managers have planned to run a higher percentage of short courses than in previous years, splitting the year into two halves and therefore alleviating the larger upfront fee burden for many learners.
- 2.11 A very small number of specialist courses would attract a higher fee due to small numbers and/or tutor higher rates of pay. For example, in an advanced level language course where class numbers are lower than average and the tutors are paid at a higher rate, the proposed fee is £5.43 per hour. In the current academic year these courses with full occupancy require a 29% level of subsidy. Learners on these specialist courses who responded to the consultation indicated that they are willing to pay more towards the cost of their course.

3 Proposed Curriculum – Mainstream Provision

- 3.1 Mainstream provision open to public enrolment and promoted by the BAEC website, also encompasses those courses which generate a fee income for the adult education service.
- 3.2 Tables 2 – 6 provide an overview of the curriculum that is proposed for this mainstream provision from September 2016 onwards. Additional short courses will be added later in the year, but these are dictated by both demand and the progress made towards the funding target. However, it is anticipated that any further mainstream courses planned for 2016/17 will fall within the categories listed on tables 2-5 below.
- 3.3 Table 2 lists the types of daytime provision planned for the Kentwood Centre, table 3 lists that proposed for evening delivery.

Table 2 Kentwood Centre – day time courses

Course title	Number planned	Short = one term or less Long = over one term	Status
Art Appreciation	1	Long	Non-Accredited
Bookkeeping	1	Short	Accredited
Bridge	1	Long	Non-Accredited
Clothes making	4	Long	Non-Accredited
Clothes making	2	Short	Non-Accredited
Computing/Digital Skills	1	Long	Accredited
Computing/Digital Skills	3	Short	Accredited
Cookery	2	Long	Non-Accredited
Cookery	12	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	4	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	9	Long	Non-Accredited
English	2	Long	Accredited
English for speakers of other languages (ESOL)	10	Long	Accredited
Etching and printing	4	Long	Non-Accredited
Floristry	6	Short	Non-Accredited
GCSE English	2	Long	Accredited
GCSE Maths	2	Long	Accredited
Languages (French/Italian/Spanish)	8	Long	Non-Accredited
Learning for adults with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LLDD)	2	Long	Accredited
Level 1 Award in Caring for Children	1	Short	Accredited
Level 2 Award in Counselling	2	Long	Accredited
Level 2 Certificate in Counselling	1	Long	Accredited
Level 2 Interior Design	1	Long	Accredited
Level 2 Photography	1	Long	Accredited
Level 3 Interior Design	1	Long	Accredited
Maths	3	Long	Accredited
Meditation	3	Short	Non-Accredited
Patchwork	3	Long	Non-Accredited
Pilates/Yoga	8	Short	Non-Accredited
Sign Language	1	Long	Accredited
Stained Glass	2	Long	Non-Accredited
Stained glass	2	Short	Non-Accredited
Upholstery	2	Long	Non-Accredited
Total	107		

Table 3 Kentwood Centre – evening courses

Course title	Number planned	Short = one term or less Long = over one term	Status
Bookkeeping	1	Short	Accredited
Computing/Digital Skills	2	Long	Accredited
Cookery	9	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	2	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	3	Long	Non-Accredited
English	3	Long	Accredited
English for speakers of other languages (ESOL)	2	Long	Accredited
ESOL Support for Dyslexic Parents	3	Short	Non-accredited
Etching and printing	1	Long	Non-Accredited
GCSE English	1	Long	Accredited
GCSE Maths	1	Long	Accredited
Guitar	6	Short	Non-Accredited
Languages (French/Italian/Spanish)	9	Long	Non-Accredited
Level 2 Award in Counselling	2	Long	Accredited
Level 2 Certificate in Counselling	1	Long	Accredited
Maths	3	Long	Accredited
Photography	2	Short	Non-accredited
Pilates/Yoga	2	Long	Non-Accredited
Pilates/Yoga	4	Short	Non-Accredited
Sign Language	1	Long	Accredited
Stained Glass	1	Short	Non-Accredited
Stained Glass	1	Long	Non-Accredited
Total	60		

3.4 Table 4 lists the types of daytime provision planned for the Poverest Centre, table 5 lists that proposed for the evening delivery.

Table 4 - Poverest Centre daytime courses

Course title	Number planned	Short = one term or less Long = over one term	Status
Art Appreciation	1	Long	Non-Accredited
Bookkeeping	1	Short	Accredited
Computing	3	Short	Non-Accredited
Computing/Digital Skills	2	Short	Accredited
Childminding	2	Short	Accredited
Drawing and Painting	3	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	6	Long	Non-Accredited
English	3	Long	Accredited
English for speakers of other languages (ESOL)	7	Long	Accredited

ESOL support for Dyslexic parents	3	Short	Non-accredited
Languages (French/Italian/Spanish)	3	Long	Non-Accredited
Level 3 Counselling	1	Long	Accredited
Learning for adults with Learning Difficulties and Disabilities (LLDD)	31	Long	Accredited
Maths	2	Long	Accredited
Pilates/Yoga	4	Short	Non-Accredited
Upholstery	2	Long	Non-Accredited
Total	74		

Table 5 - Poverest Centre evening courses

Course title	Number planned	Short = one term or less Long = over one term	Status
Computing	3	Short	Non-Accredited
Childminding	2	Short	Accredited
Dance	3	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	1	Short	Non-Accredited
Drawing and Painting	2	Long	Non-Accredited
English	2	Long	Accredited
English for speakers of other languages (ESOL)	2	Long	Accredited
Languages (French/Italian/Spanish)	3	Long	Non-Accredited
Maths	2	Long	Accredited
Pilates/Yoga	8	Short	Non-Accredited
Total	28		

- 3.5 In addition to the courses that take place within the main centres a small number of offsite daytime courses are proposed. These courses encourage residents to be more active and to learn about the London environment.

Table 6 – meet out courses, daytime

Course title	Number planned	Short = one term or less Long = over one term	Status
London walks	6	Short	Non-Accredited

4 Proposed Curriculum – Community Outreach Provision

- 4.1 The community outreach provision encompasses those courses that are aimed at disadvantaged and low-waged adults within local communities. This provision is usually set up in partnership with other organisations, local schools or Council departments that have direct access to the targeted communities.
- 4.2 Table 7 below compares the distribution of the community learning funding in previous years (column A) to that being proposed for the 2016/17 year (column C). Column B shows the illustrative example provided at the time of planning the

initial proposal in July 2015 and subsequently used to inform the consultation phase. Officers now propose a few minor adjustments to the distribution and these are explained in 4.3 and 4.4 below.

Table 7 – Distribution of funding across provision type.

Type of provision	Examples of partners	A	B	C
		Funding distribution prior to restructure	Distribution example at consultation	Actual proposed funding for 2016/17
Family English, maths and language	Primary schools, Children and Family Centres	£150,000	£200,000	£200,000
Wider Family Learning	Bromley Children Project, CFC's, primary schools, community groups	£100,000	£100,00	£ 80,000
Adults with Disabilities and Learning Difficulties	Community organisations such as Mencap, Deaf Access.	Not included	Not included	£20,000
Older learners	Adult social care, Age UK, residential care homes	£20,000	£75,000	£75,000
Learning organisation partnerships	Mottingham and Cotmandene Centres	£20,000	£50,000	£50,000 including 2 x work clubs
Other partnerships	Local agencies, housing associations and community groups	£10,000	£75,000	£100,000
Sub-Contracting	Local agencies and specialist providers	£60,000	£120,000	£95,000
Funding used to subsidise mainstream provision		£446,555	£176,555	£176,555
TOTAL		£796,555	£796,555	£796,555

4.3 In 2014/2015 overall learner numbers participating in wider family learning fell by 9% and it is understood that funding for the Bromley Children Project and CFCs is under review. For these reasons it is now proposed that, whilst the service will continue to offer parenting classes through the wider family learning projects, the amount should be adjusted downwards from £100k to £80k to reflect the smaller participant numbers. Through freeing up £20k of funding the service will develop targeted non-accredited learning for learners with disabilities and learning difficulties. Some of this provision could be delivered within BAEC centres to give learners access to the facilities on offer; in particular widening access to the cookery facilities at the Kentwood centre.

4.4 Since the original proposal was developed in July 2015 the Skills Funding Agency have introduced changes to the funding rules around subcontracting. Under current

rules, if the total amount of funding allocation subcontracted out by any provider exceeds £100k, an external auditing process is required. As this would reduce the amount of funding available to deliver provision adult education managers recommend that the subcontracted amount is reduced to £95k. This would free up £25k to be used to support small community associations, who do not meet the necessary criteria for sub-contracting, and allow them to deliver learning opportunities to specific marginalised groups of adults.

- 4.5 The proposed increase (as indicated in columns B and C) in the level of funding for the learning partnership work will help to support the local work clubs that operate out of the Motttingham and Cotmandene centres. Currently these services are provided by volunteers. The proposal is for BAEC tutors to provide training based on individual needs which will enable participants to make best use of the software and learning opportunities. The work club offer will complement the BAEC programme of IT courses that is also delivered at both centres.
- 4.6 Courses within the community outreach work are demand lead and negotiated with partners as part of the planning process to ensure the identified needs of targeted groups are met. As reflected by the levels of funding there will be a growth in the volume of courses available to such groups and table 8 below lists the types of courses that adult education managers plan to discuss with partners when negotiating the learning activities.

Table 8 – Examples of Community Outreach provision

Subject Area
Family English, maths and language
English for Speakers of other languages, including
• Employability for ESOL
• Enrichment learning with ESOL
Employability Skills, including:
• CV writing
• Digital literacy
• Interview skills
• Work club
Family Learning, to include
• Parenting skills
• Understanding Anger
• Enrichment & intergenerational learning
Healthy Lifestyles to include:
• Cookery
• Exercise
• Gardening
• Meditation
Learners with mental ill health, to include
• Arts and crafts
• Exercise
• Healthy lifestyle courses
• Meditation
Older Learners, to include:
• Arts and Crafts
• Digital literacy

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gentle Exercise
ICT in the Community, to include:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using Microsoft Office
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excel File Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using laptops and tablets
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get Online

This page is left intentionally blank