

Young People's Education and Skills Operational Sub-Group

Pan-London drop-out notification process

Item No: 4(a)

Date: 14 June 2013

Contact: Yolande Burgess

Telephone: 020 7934 9739

Email: yolande.burgess@londoncouncils.gov.uk

Summary	This report presents the findings of the pan-London drop-out notification and referral process feasibility study carried out in May-June 2013 and recommends next steps for action.
Recommendation	<p>OSG members are asked to consider and agree the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">– take forward work to design, establish and implement a pan-London drop-out notification process, taking into account the issues raised through the survey (see proposed project plan at Annex A);– the process will focus on drop-out notification but it should be developed to enable,<ul style="list-style-type: none">• the referral of young people at risk of NEET ('wobblers') for local authorities that wish to establish local agreements with their providers;• the transfer of learner information to post-16 providers at a later stage in the development of the process.

1 Background

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of the pan-London drop-out notification and referral process feasibility study carried out on behalf of London Councils Young People Education and Skills team in May-June 2013 and recommends next steps for action.
- 1.2 The feasibility survey was conducted to explore the appetite for a pan-London drop-out and risk of drop-out referral process, and new learner information exchange process. The study also asked a series of questions to inform any subsequent work to secure a set of approaches, agreements and practice that would make this a reality should a pan-London approach be deemed feasible.

2 The feasibility survey

- 2.1 A survey was conducted to establish:
 - What local and sub-regional practice is already in place or being developed in London in relation to capturing leavers and how well it is working so far.
 - What the barriers and enablers to a pan-London process are seen to be at a local level

- What the appetite is for a pan-London process from the perspective of:
 - all London local authorities;
 - London providers - schools, colleges, training providers;
 - the sub-regional data units.

2.2 The methods used to capture information was as follows.

- Gathering the views and examples of current practice from local authorities;
 - a survey was produced and distributed to local authority 14-19 leads and results collected and analysed;
 - four telephone discussions took place with colleagues who had not completed the survey and three face-to-face meetings held with local authorities that had expressed reservations in their survey responses;
 - examples of good practice were requested.
- Consultation and discussion with sub-regional units
- Discussion with Director of Association of Colleges London.
- Discussion with Chair of Work-based Learning Alliance.

3 Findings and conclusions

3.1 There is a clear appetite for developing and implementing a pan-London process. Outlined below is a summary of the main findings by stakeholder type.

Local authorities

- 3.2 There is an overwhelming support for the development of such a process and the majority of local authorities would like it to have the facility for notification of 'wobblers' as well as those who have left learning. The majority of boroughs were also interested in the idea of sharing learner information with post-16 providers when they enrol; this suggests that any process established to capture leavers should enable and facilitate information sharing at a later date.
- 3.3 There were very few examples of boroughs already having a system in place and even where there was a locally agreed process it was not necessarily focused on all providers.
- 3.4 A number of boroughs offered example data sharing agreements. A letter to local providers about the duty and a local notification form were also offered and collected.
- 3.5 The main issues to be considered and addressed are as follows:
- 3.5.1 Some boroughs commission Information, Advice and Guidance providers to carry out drop-out tracking and matching processes on their behalf and want this arrangement to stay in place for at least the medium term.
 - 3.5.2 Some local authorities have internal teams carrying out this work and want this to continue.
 - 3.5.3 Local authorities have varying levels of data security requirements. e.g. one borough does not allow the use of encrypted spreadsheets for data transfer.
 - 3.5.4 Some local authorities already have a process in place with local schools and want to ensure that the new process builds on and enhances this rather than discard/replace it.
 - 3.5.5 Anything that involves significant costs was seen by all as prohibitive.
 - 3.5.6 Any arrangements involving having to change the contract with a sub-regional unit was also seen as prohibitive.

- 3.6 Local authorities want to be actively consulted during the development and finalisation of the process.
- 3.7 The majority of responses indicated that either data sharing agreements were not in place with some providers or it was not known if agreements were in place or not.

Sub-regional units

- 3.8 The sub-regional units supported the concept of developing a single agreed process.
- 3.9 The main issues to be considered and addressed were identified as follows:
- 3.9.1 *Matching* - When a notification of drop-out is received a matching process needs to take place before the young person's information can be updated on the local case management database. Some sub-regional units may be able to incorporate this additional data processing work as a matter of course, however there may be cost implications for others depending on their existing resources and arrangements.
- 3.9.2 *Data security* - The use of encrypted spreadsheets to transfer information might not be secure enough going forward. Encrypted Winzip is more secure but not all areas have Winzip.
- 3.9.3 *Portal* - A common portal into which all providers uploaded information was seen as desirable but where the data then went and who did the matching would need to be resolved.
- 3.9.4 *Scope* - It is not yet known how many sets of drop-out information would be received a month and whether or not this would be an increase on current volumes.
- 3.9.5 *Monitoring* - A monitoring process would be needed, with some method for establishing what percentage of drop-out is being referred.
- 3.9.6 *Accountability* - There would need to be a clear accountability framework. Decisions would need to be reached as to who would challenge providers or local authorities that were not using the system as agreed.

Providers

- 3.10 The Director of the Association of Colleges London region and the joint Chair of the London Work-based Learning Alliance have both expressed their support for the idea and are keen to engage further.

4 Recommended next steps

- 4.1 OSG members are asked to consider and agree the following recommendations:
- 4.1.1 take forward work to design, establish and implement a pan-London drop-out notification process, taking into account the issues raised through the survey (see proposed project plan at Annex A);
- 4.1.2 the process will focus on drop-out notification but it should be developed to enable,
- the referral of young people at risk of NEET ('wobblers') for local authorities that wish to establish local agreements with their providers;
 - the transfer of learner information to post-16 providers at a later stage in the development of the process.

Proposed Project Plan

This draft plan sets out the key requirements, principles, activities and milestones for the London Councils Young People's Education and Skills project to design and implement a Pan London 16-19 year old "Drop-Out" notification process.

Requirements/design specification

This process, when in place, should enable all London providers to simply and securely inform their host local authority of any young people they have on roll, who leave before completing their course. It should also enable all London local authorities to receive timely notification of any resident who drops-out of their course before completion.

The process when in place must:

- Be easy to use.
- Be easy to understand.
- Meet data security requirements.
- Use existing systems as much as possible.
- Incur as small a cost as possible.
- Involve as little extra work as possible.
- Respect existing arrangements and processes and allow for variation in arrangements at local level.
- Enable providers and local authorities who wish to use the same process for notification of in-year joiners and 'wobblers'.
- Ideally be ready for implementation by the 1 September 2013.
- Define an overall agreed pan-London approach.

Project Principles

- Clear communication
- Consultation at each stage
- Value for money
- Respect for local variations in requirement
- Partnership working and dialogue

Project activity/milestones

1 Designing the process

a Notification Sheet

- i. Establish the fields (required and optional) to be included in the notification spreadsheet that providers will complete.
- ii. Produce the draft spreadsheet template including the agreed fields.
Example attached for comment: appendix 1.
Consult on and agree final field and format.

b Data Security

- i. Consult with local authorities on the following options:
 - a. Using Egress Secure Webform - *a cost of approximately £6,400 a year for the whole of London (£200 per borough).*
 - b. Using encrypted Winzip.
 - c. Using encrypted Excel sheet.
 - d. Using Careers Vision software – *prices and capability still to be determined.*
 - e. Any further options identified.
- ii. Agree option.
- iii. Put option in place (this may require purchase and set up, so may need sub-plan).
- iv. Produce information and instruction sheet as part of 'toolkit'.

c Matching

- i. Establish, for each borough, who they would wish to do the matching (sub-region, themselves, contracted IAG provider)

d Information Flow

- i. Agree inform flow for each borough
- ii. Produce matrix that shows the information flow for each borough
Example attached for comment: appendix 2

e Process Toolkit

- i. Once all elements are agreed produce draft "toolkit"
- ii. Consult with all stakeholders on "toolkit"
- iii. Finalise "toolkit"
- iv. Send out Toolkit
- v. Process toolkit on London Councils website
- vi. Process toolkit on LA websites, AOC website etc as appropriate

2 Communication and Publicising

- a Draft cover letter to providers informing them of the system, to be jointly endorsed by AOC London and London WBLA.
- b Provider organisations consulted, local authorities consulted.
- c Final letter and promotional Leaflet produced and sent out with toolkit
- d Process presented at as many provider events and other channels as possible

3 Accountability, Monitoring, Evaluation and Review

a Service Level Agreement

- i. Draft service level agreement developed
- ii. Consultation with boroughs
- iii. SLA finalised

- iv. SLA signed off by all boroughs- August

b Establishing Scope and Baseline

- i. Establish how many London learners drop out “in year” by looking at retention data
- ii. Establish how many drop out notifications are currently received LAs and or sub-regional units

c Monitoring

- i. Develop a draft monitoring process
- ii. Consult with boroughs
- iii. Finalise process
- iv. Implement process

d Accountability

- i. Develop a draft accountability process
- ii. Consult with boroughs and provider organisations
- iii. Finalise process
- iv. Implement process

e Evaluation and Review

- i. Develop a draft evaluation and review process
- ii. Consult with boroughs and provider organisations
- iii. Finalise process
- iv. Implement process

Project Timeline

		Key Milestones			
Activity	Sub-Activity	June	July	August	September-Dec
1 Designing and implementing the process	a Notification Sheet	i. Fields established ii. Notification template designed iii. Sent out in consultation pack to local authorities 27 June	iv. Final notification template agreed 4 July v. Template included in 'toolkit'	vi. Local authorities have communicated requirements and agreements to providers at a local level	Processes in place and being used
	b Data Security	i. Options paper written ii. Options consulted on - <i>how? by when?</i>	iii. Final option agreed 4 July iv. Agree option included in toolkit v. Option implementation plan in place if needed	vi. Local authorities have identified those providers based locally without data sharing agreements and have a plan in place to address this	
	c Matching	i. Matching process agreed for each borough - <i>how? letter/phone call?</i>	ii. Training on matching process provided by sub-regional units as required	iii. Local authorities have in place any necessary matching arrangements needed that were not already in place	
	d Information flow	i. Information flow agreed ii. Draft Matrix produced which shows information flow for each borough iii. Matrix sent out for consultation/checking (27 June)	iv. Final matrix agreed 4 July		
	e Process Toolkit	i. Draft Toolkit produced ii. Toolkit sent out for comment to local authorities (27 June) iii. Draft Toolkit presented to provider groups	iv. Toolkit discussed at Leads conference 4 July v. Toolkit discussed with AOC London and London WBLA vi. With agreed 'pilot' local authorities and providers vii. Toolkit placed on key websites viii. Toolkit finalised and sent out		

		Key Milestones			
Activity	Sub-Activity	June	July	August	September-Dec
2 Communication and Publicising		i. Provider orgs consulted, LAs consulted on all aspects of process ii. process for communication with providers established (e.g. –through LAs or through provider orgs or both) iii. Distribution list established	iv. AoC London and LWBLA agree to signal their endorsement of process by jointly signing of cover letter for toolkit v. Cover letter produced vi. Promotional leaflet produced vii. Final letter and promotional Leaflet produced and sent out with toolkit viii. Process presented at as many provider events and other channels as possible	ix. Local authorities have communicated requirements and agreements to providers at a local level	
	a Service Level Agreement	i. Draft service level agreement developed	ii. Consultation with boroughs iii. SLA finalised	iv. SLA signed off by all boroughs	
	b Establishing Scope and Baseline		i. Number of London learners dropping out ‘in year’ established by looking at retention data ii. Number of drop out notifications currently received local authorities and or sub-regional units established		
	c Monitoring	i. Consult with boroughs – how?	ii. Draft Monitoring process developed iii. Process finalised		Process Implemented
	d Accountability		i. Draft accountability process concept established (4 July) ii. Draft drawn up iii. Boroughs and providers/ organisations consulted	iv. Process finalised	Process Implemented
	a Evaluation and Review			i. Develop a draft evaluation and review process	ii. Consult with boroughs and provider organisations iii. Finalise process iv. Implement process

Key Dates

19 June - meeting with London Work-based Learning Alliance

27 June - Consultation Pack sent out to all local authorities

4 July - 14-19 London Leads Conference - consultation and finalisation session /workshops

1 September - duty commences

Appendix 1: Example Provider Return

London Education and Training Providers Notification to Local Authority of 16-19 year old Joiners and Leavers return								LDOR			
Provider Name				This return is to be completed monthly and uploaded in accordance with							
Provider Number											
Contact Name				For help or assistance contact							
Tel											
e-mail											
								Reason for notification			
ULN	Family Name	First Name	DOB	Address	Post Code	Contact e-mail	phone number	Joiner	Leaver	at risk of dropping out	Destination if known

Appendix 2: Example Information Flow Matrix for Provider Drop-Out Notifications LDORs

Depending on which local authority a provider is based in they will either be submitted their LDOR to an LA officer or sub-contractor or a sub-regional contact .the grid below shows who the data should be submitted to by Local Authority. Please use the secure data transfer method described on page .. to submit your LDOR to the person indicated for your Local Authority.

Local Authority	LA Contact	e-mail	Sub-region	Sub-regional contact	e-mail
Ealing			West	Dave Pether	dpether@ealing.gov.uk
Hillingdon	CFBT named person	e-mail	West		
Wandsworth	Borough named person	e-mail	Central London		