|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| OTLA standardisation Meeting | |
|  | |  |
| Date | **19th April 2023** | |
| Time | **1pm – 3 pm** | |
| Location | **EII Denning** | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Present** | Wendy Scott (Chair)  Claire Allen  Susie Higgs  Liv Fallon  Helen Overton-Hore  Julie Fleming | Tiffany Matthews  Rekha Gupta  Sandra Russell  Sue Jupp |
| **Apologies** | Sue Muldowney, Kevin May, Gill Keightley, Rachael James | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Welcome and Apologies** |
| **2** | **OTLA Progress to date**  78% of tutors have been observed.  **Key strengths:** sequence of learning, clarity of purpose, activity learning.  **Key areas for development:** curriculum planning, clarity of purpose and questioning skills. |
| **3** | **Standardisation activity (SLW)**  **SLW1**   * Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence? In place * Is the report written in a supportive manner? In places, could be better. * Do the reports help the tutor to identify areas they can improve upon? Yes, but not always in the correct place. * Have all areas for development been addressed? Missed some areas, (clear sharing of learning objectives and expectations are clear both ‘not in place’) * Comments: the objectives were not clear. Area of good practice: Active learning, comment relates to tutor activity rather than learner activity.   **SLW2**   * Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence? Yes. * Is the report written in a supportive manner? Yes * Do the reports help the tutor to identify areas they can improve upon? Yes, but not all in the right place. * Have all areas for development been addressed? Yes, but could be clearer. * Comments: Observer had used subheading with a judgement attached. We agreed that use of sub-headings is suitable, but without the one-word judgements. Area of good practice: lots of ‘excellent’ in the report but only one area identified in the report.   The developing good practice section is too brief, for a new tutor there should be more hints and tips offered. |
| **4** | **Development of SLW**  Suggested changing to wording: Change the middle column heading **‘No/not in place’** to read **‘Area for development’**. Change **‘Not seen’** to have **‘Not Applicable’**.  For development actions these should be bullet points, with further advice and guidance included within the developing good practice section. |
| **5** | **Standardisation activity (formal)**  **Standardisation1**   1. Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence? There is a lack of evidence. 2. Is the report written in a supportive manner? Yes, in places with examples of what to do better. 3. Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas? Lacks detail 4. What outcome would you give based on the information in the report? Meets or exceeds. 5. Comment: a discussion was had in relation to risk assessment not being signed, this was identified as an action. As it was only missing the tutor signature it did not require a reobservation. Rather than reference document numbers it is better to give the title of the document e.g curriculum plan rather than HL05. For learner comments a summary would be better. The report is missing developing good practice section.   **Standardisation 2**   1. Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence? Some, but report is somewhat narrative. 2. Is the report written in a supportive manner? Yes 3. Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas? Yes 4. What outcome would you give based on the information in the report? Meets or exceeds. 5. Comment: Not all paragraphs had value, with missing judgemental language or narrative comments. Area of strength ‘Active learning’ had very little link to the style of activities being completed.   **Standardisation 3 (completed remotely)**   1. Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence? Yes 2. Is the report written in a supportive manner? Yes 3. Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas? Mostly 4. What outcome would you give based on the information in the report? Meets or exceeds. 5. Comment: a well written report that was positive and supportive, clear to read. There were no areas for development identified, this is acceptable within reports (not setting actions for actions sake), but wherever possible in this situation there should be suggestions for developing good practice.   **Standardisation 4 (completed remotely)**   1. Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence? In places, but not consistently throughout. 2. Is the report written in a supportive manner? Yes 3. Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas? Mixed response, split between yes and in places. 4. What outcome would you give based on the information in the report? Meets or exceeds. 5. Comment: the narrative containing suggestions for improvement, and it would be clearer for the tutor if this was written in the developing good practice section. The tutor’s practice has not fully improved since previous observation and could include suggestions as to CPD courses to attend, or elements to research in this last section (e.g. questioning and clarity of purpose) |
| **6** | **Example of questions to ask learners**  A list of questions that have previously been asked by Ofsted Inspectors was given out to everyone.  Observers were requested to make sure they ask probing questions when conducting observations. A list of questions was circulated at the meeting to provide examples. |
| **7** | **Conclusion**   * Use of sub-headings is acceptable in reports but should not contain a specific judgement. * When referencing learner comments please provide a summary of comments. * When referencing documents please use their name not number. * Developing good practice: this should be in depth for new tutors, and present for all, even when no actions were identified. * When making suggestions for improvement/developing good practice this is best within the specific section for this rather than embedded within the Quality of Education section. |
|  | **Next meeting date: Monday 17th July 2023 10 am – 12 PM, EII Drop-in room** |