

Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan - Supplementary guidance

Introduction

1. This paper supplements guidance included in *Arrangements for assuring and improving the quality of provision and services in Scotland's colleges* and *How good is our college?* and provides additional information on the Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan (EREP) that colleges are required to submit. Annex A sets out the format colleges should adopt for their EREPs.
2. 2016-17 is a 'year of development' to acknowledge the fact that colleges, SFC and Education Scotland required time to implement the new arrangements and adapt to working with the new *How Good is our College?* framework. Colleges have welcomed and supported the new arrangements and much progress has already been made in familiarising staff and preparing for implementation. However, the complexity of implementation has become more evident as colleges have started to work with the detail of the arrangements, and further discussions have taken place through the Quality Arrangements Steering Group to clarify expectations and modify requirements for AY 2016-17, which are set out below.

Development expectations and timescale for new arrangements

- Colleges will use AY 2016-17 to embed ownership of the new arrangements and develop approaches to evaluation and reporting that are suitable for their regional context and operating circumstances, with support from Education Scotland HMIs and SFC Outcome Agreement Managers (OAMs).
- Colleges will apply the grading approach outlined in the arrangements as a learning and development exercise in AY 2016-17, but will not formally submit their grading outcomes with their Evaluation Reports. Colleges will be expected to discuss grading outcomes with their HMIs and SFC OAMs, and HMIs will also refer to these grading outcomes at Endorsement meetings with college Boards.
- Colleges' Evaluative Reports and Enhancements Plans submitted for 31 October 2017 will reflect the different contexts for each college and the progress achieved at that stage with implementing the new arrangements.
- The learning and developmental nature of AY 2016-17 will lead to further consolidation by colleges in AY 2017-18.
- Education Scotland and SFC will be learning from their engagement with the new arrangements in AY 2016-17, and will also be contributing to consolidation of the new arrangements in AY 2017-18.

Timeline for implementing Quality Arrangements

October 2017	Submission of development year EREP
November 2017	Independent scrutiny and endorsement
December 2017- January 2018	Publication of development year EREP
January 2018	Start of year two – consolidation year
January-February	Supplementary guidance for consolidation year issued
March-April	Initial tri-partite meetings take place
July/August	OA guidance issued
31 October 2018	Submission of consolidation year EREP and grades
November 2018	Independent scrutiny and endorsement
December 2018	Publication of consolidation year EREP and grades
January 2019	Start of year three

Reporting requirements in October 2017

3. Colleges/regions should evaluate the quality of their provision and services using the 12 quality indicators, and submit an Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan to SFC and Education Scotland for formal, independent endorsement. Outcome Agreement measures have been incorporated into the *How good is our college?* framework, and colleges are expected to evidence progress against the measures when carrying out their evaluations to produce their Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan.
4. The first Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan (EREP) is due to be submitted to SFC and ES on 31 October 2017. We expect these reports to be brief, approximately 15 pages. Both documents must be endorsed by the Principal, Chief Officer or Chair of College Board/Regional Strategic Body. (Annex A provides further advice on content and structure to assist colleges in preparing their reports).

Multi-college region reports

5. Of the 13 regions in Scotland, three are multi-college regions. Each of the multi-college regions differ, with varying numbers of colleges in each region and different governance arrangements.
6. Assigned colleges within a multi-college region are required to produce their own individual EREP (and grades) and multi-college regional bodies must continue to produce a regional summary of progress against outcome agreement measures and targets.
7. Over the course of AY2016-17, HMIs and Outcome Agreement Managers will work with the multi-college regions to develop a methodology for regional reporting that will encompass the output from the assigned college's EREPs, satisfying both outcome agreement and quality assurance reporting requirements. It is anticipated that the reporting processes developed will be unique to each region.

Required content for the Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan (see also Annex A)

8. ***Quality assurance*** - In *How good is our college?* SFC and ES have provided a structure for evaluation and enhancement which colleges, with their stakeholders, can use to identify what is working well and what needs to improve. This structure is based on the following four high level principles (which in turn are underpinned by challenge questions and quality indicators):
 - Leadership and quality culture.
 - Delivery of learning and services to support learning.
 - Outcomes and impact.
 - Capacity for improvement.
9. In responding to these principles, each college/region EREP should contain descriptions of the methodology and approaches taken to evaluation and the context in which evaluation was carried out. The college/region is required to retain all information used to support the evaluation processes, and where relevant, the allocation of grades.
10. ***Outcome Agreement progress*** - Outcome Agreement measures have been incorporated into the *How good is our college?* framework, and colleges should provide evidence of progress against the following measures in their evaluation reports:

- Qualitative and quantitative progress in the preceding year, including specific reference to published milestones (recognising that, for the year in question, audited statistical data will not be available and that we therefore rely on region's own data at this point in time).
- Early thoughts on progress in the current year (for example, towards recruitment targets, any internal evidence on retention).

11. Reports for AY 2016-17 should also include progress on specific SFC and Scottish Government priorities:

- Delivery of the commitment to DYW, including growth in senior phase pathways.
- Delivery of widening access and progression targets.
- Improved progression in access-level provision.
- Industry-linked provision with a focus on employer needs, including involvement of employers in curriculum design.
- Improved support to increase completion of courses and progression to university.
- Progress with curriculum development to align to regional economic need.

12. We encourage colleges/regions to take account of intelligence from relevant activities in their evaluations such as:

- The Code of Good Governance and arrangements for Board evaluations and externally facilitated reviews of Board effectiveness.
- Developments in response to the Framework for the development of strong and effective college Students' Associations, the Student Engagement Framework for Scotland and engagement with learners.

Grading

13. The *Arrangements for assuring and improving the quality of provision and services in Scotland's colleges* document introduced a common grading system as part of the evaluation process. Colleges are asked to produce a grade for each of the following three high-level questions, based on evidence collated throughout the year:

- How good is our leadership and quality culture?
- How good is the quality of the provision and services we deliver?
- How good are we at ensuring the best possible outcomes for learners?

14. The grading exercise will be part of the learning and development process for colleges in AY 2016-17, providing a baseline across each of these three key principles and a tool for colleges to measure progress made and distance travelled.
15. We confirm that grades will not be published for AY 2016-17 and colleges are not required to formally submit their grading outcomes with their Evaluation Reports. However, colleges will be expected to discuss grading outcomes with their College HMIs and SFC OAMs during the endorsement process. College HMIs will also refer to these grading outcomes at Endorsement meetings with college Boards. (More information about grading is included at Annex A.)

Capacity to Improve supporting statement

16. Colleges are also required to produce a supporting statement to answer the following question:
 - What is our capacity for improvement?

The Enhancement Plan

17. The Enhancement Plan should be linked to the findings of the Evaluative Report and offers college/regions:
 - An opportunity to identify areas for improvement and action and to review milestones towards three-year targets (note: we would not normally expect three-year targets themselves to change, unless external circumstances had also changed significantly).
 - A rationale for any proposed changes to targets in the draft outcome agreement.

Scrutiny and endorsement

18. Annex B provides supplementary guidance on the arrangements for independent scrutiny and endorsement of the EREP. The guidance sets out the process for engagement between the SFC, ES and the college/region from submission to publication.

For further information:

19. SFC Outcome Agreement queries: Ken Rutherford, Assistant Director, Outcome Agreements, tel: 0131 313 6618; email: krutherford@sfc.ac.uk.

20. SFC College Quality queries: Alison Cook, Assistant Director, Learning & Quality, tel: 0131 313 6685; email: acook@sfc.ac.uk.

21. Education Scotland queries: Karen Corbett, tel: 07769 968 082; email: karen.corbett@educationscotland.gsi.gov.uk, and Andrew Brawley, tel: 07825 236484; email: Andrew.Brawley@educationscotland.gsi.gov.uk.

College Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan (EREP) 2016-17 - content and structure.

1. This annex provides further advice on content and structure to assist colleges in preparing reports. Colleges should follow it in preparing their forthcoming EREPs.

Evaluative Report

2. **Section 1 – Relevant background information about the college and its operating context** (suggested word limit approx. 500 words).
3. **Section 2 – Methodology used to evaluate the quality of provision and services** This section should describe arrangements for reflection and evaluation and how these are used to inform judgements regarding performance across the full range of college functions. Include evidence from key stakeholders and external partners (suggested word limit approx. 500 words).
4. **Section 3 – Outcomes of evaluation** This should contain a summary of areas of positive practice in bullet point format and a summary of areas for development in bullet point format (Suggested word limit approx. one page of A4 for each QI). Evaluations must cover:

Leadership and Quality Culture

- Areas of positive practice
- Areas for development

Delivery of learning and services to support learning

- Areas of positive practice
- Areas for development

Outcomes and Impact

- Areas of positive practice
- Areas for development

Enhancement Plan

5. The Enhancement Plan should contain an appropriate action plan to address identified areas for development and improvement; colleges should use the following headings:

Annex A

6. Section 1 – Actions for improvement

Leadership and Quality Culture:

- Areas for development
- Planned actions

Delivery of learning and services to support learning

- Areas for development
- Planned actions

Outcomes and Impact

- Areas for development
- Planned actions

7. Section 2 – Arrangements for monitoring progress on actions for improvement.

Grading outcomes

8. For AY 2016-17 colleges should grade their provision using the six point scale below as a learning and development exercise. Grades will not be published for AY 2016-17 and colleges are not required to formally submit their grading outcomes with their Evaluation Reports.

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Weak
- Unsatisfactory

Principle	Grade
Leadership and Quality Culture	
Delivery of Learning Provision	
Outcomes and Impact	

Capacity to Improve supporting statement

9. Colleges should also produce a Capacity to Improve supporting statement (suggested word limit approx. 250 words).

Scrutiny and Endorsement Arrangements for colleges report in AY2016-17

1 **Pre Endorsement Visit (PEV) to review content within the Evaluative Report (ER), Enhancement Plan (EP) and proposed grading outcomes**

At the end of the cycle of on-going engagement and activity (September 2017), the college HMI (CHMI), the reviewing HMI (RHMI) and the Outcome Agreement Manager (OAM) will discuss with college managers the content of the EREP, and the proposed grading outcomes. The CHMI will work with individual colleges to agree the format of the visit. Following this visit, colleges will formally submit the EREP and grading outcomes to Education Scotland (ES) and Scottish Funding Council (SFC).

2 **Formal Submission of the EREP**

Each college will submit their Evaluative Report and Enhancement Plan (EREP) to ES and SFC by 31 October 2017 after they have been approved by individual college Boards.

3 **Arrangements for independent scrutiny and endorsement of the EREP**

3.1 **Stage 1**

An independent scrutiny and endorsement meeting will be convened in November 2017 to formally endorse, or not endorse that:

- a) the ER provides an accurate and appropriate account of the quality of provision, services and outcomes being delivered by the college;
- b) the EP is well-informed by and linked appropriately to the findings of the ER, and communicates clearly plans to address areas of provision, services and outcomes which require improvement; and

The meeting will be convened by an ES HMI Lead Officer (LO) who has not been involved in working with the college. The meeting will include CHMI, OAM and up to three college representatives including, for example, college nominee, principal, senior managers and learner representative. Additional HMI colleagues will attend as appropriate. Following the meeting a letter will be sent to the college advising of the meeting outcomes and provisional endorsement statements. Communication to the college may provide suggested amendments to the documents, areas for development and main points for action. Colleges will be advised to amend and resubmit their EREP in light of comments received from ES and SFC.

3.2 Stage 2

ES will provide formal notification to the college of the endorsement outcome for the submitted documents. In relation to the ER, a statement of endorsement will identify whether ES and SFC:

- a) **endorse** the college's ER with an accompanying statement, for example:
*ES and SFC **endorse** the ER of (name of college). It provides an accurate and appropriate account of the quality of provision and services being delivered;*

or

- b) **do not endorse** the college's ER with an accompanying statement, for example:
*ES and SFC **do not endorse** the ER of (name of college). It does not provide an accurate and appropriate account of the quality of provision and services being delivered by the college.*

In relation to the EP, a statement of endorsement will identify whether ES and SFC:

- a) **endorse** the college's EP with an accompanying statement, for example:
*ES and SFC **endorse** the EP of (name of college). It is well-informed by and linked appropriately to the findings of the ER, and communicates clearly plans to address areas of provision and services which require improvement.*

or

- b) **do not endorse** the college's ER with an accompanying statement for example:
*ES and SFC **do not endorse** the EP of (name of college). It does not identify appropriate improvement actions comprehensively and/or timeously to address areas of provision and services which require improvement.*

In the event of ES **not endorsing** a college's ER, EP, SFC and ES will work together to take appropriate action. This action may include a schedule of intensive engagement activity to address identified needs.

3.3 Stage 3

ES will present the final endorsement statements to the college Board. The presentation will be delivered by the CHMI with the OAM in attendance. An ES LO will attend where appropriate.

4 **Publication of each college's ER and EP with accompanying ES endorsement statements.**

In December 2017, ES and SFC will publish college ERs and EPs with accompanying endorsement statements on their websites. Grading outcomes for AY 2016-17 will not be published.

5 **Future activities**

In January 2018 the cycle of activity recommences.

Activities and processes will be reviewed in January 2018 taking into account findings from the first cycle of the new arrangements. This will include a review of the deployment of resources.

The CHMI will work with the college to identify *Lines of Focused Enquiry (LFE)*. LFEs will be actioned when a college has:

- a) failed to identify a significant weakness within its ER;
- b) identified an area of weakness but is not sufficiently clear of the cause/s resulting in the weakness; or
- c) has made insufficient progress (over a reasonable timescale) to address a significant weakness.

Appendix 1 – Endorsement Criteria

The Independent Scrutiny and Endorsement meeting will consider the following criteria when reaching a decision regarding endorsement of the ER:

1. Does the ER provide an accurate and appropriate account of the quality of provision and services being delivered by the college?
2. Does the ER identify clearly what is working well for each theme?
3. Does the ER identify clearly what needs to improve for each theme?
4. Do judgements contained in the ER take appropriate account of the views of stakeholders?
5. Are judgements contained in the ER supported by appropriately robust sources of evidence?

The Independent Scrutiny and Endorsement meeting will consider the following criteria when reaching a decision regarding endorsement of the EP:

1. Is the EP well-informed by and linked appropriately to the findings of the ER?
2. Does the EP communicate clearly the plans to address areas of provision and services which require improvement?
3. Does the EP identify clearly what the college aims to achieve and by when?