**OTLA Standardisation meeting**

**17th July 2023**

**Present:** Wendy Scott, Kevin May, Mikaela Collins, Susie Higgs, Tiffany Matthews, Rekha Gupta, Sue Jupp, Gill Keightley, Kait Roberts

**Apologies:** Sandra Russell, Liv Fallon, Sue Muldowney, Helen Myatt, Claire Allen

**Please see slides for key points**

**Progress to date –** 88% of tutors observed by end of July (less than last year 90.4%)

**Outcomes** from observations, as well as emerging themes (see slides 6 & 7)

**themes from mini-inspections:**

* Tutors have good relationships with learners and create supportive learning environments.
* Tutors tailored the programme and learning well to meet the needs of their learning groups. Examples include British Culture and supporting learners in understanding the newspapers content around the Queens passing and the Kings coronation.
* Differentiation and personalisation for learners was good.
* Learners show positive and professional behaviour and attitudes to their learning.
* Tutors set high expectations for learners.

Inspectors started to see themes where improvements could be identified, such as:

* Evidence of developing learners compared to their starting points was not in place for all learners.
* IAG was not always in place prior to the start of the programme to ensure learners were on the right learning and level appropriate for their development.
* Learner attendance was not always 100%, when learners were late these were not always marked as such. Tutors and observers to consider implication where the register is a legal document.
* Re-capping of learning was not in place in all observed sessions.
* Learners were not clear on the Prevent risks or any local prevent threats.

**Quality documentation updates**

* HL05 – curriculum plan – minor changes
* HL22a – tutor course evaluation – being withdrawn
* HL16b – learning goals no longer need to be written on form
* Individual learning Goals only need to be on HL16c

**Standardisation activity**

**Report 1**

Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence?

The group feel that this report contains some judgemental language but there is not full supporting evidence in all areas.

Is the report written in a supportive manner?

Yes, this report is written in a supportive manner.

Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas?

Yes, the narrative supports.

What outcome would you give based on the information in the report?

Meets

**Report 2**

Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence?

Yes

Is the report written in a supportive manner?

Yes, well written and supportive to the tutor and their practice.

Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas?

Yes – the tutor’s identified strengths are clearly evidenced within the report.

What outcome would you give based on the information in the report?

Meets – the group felt that the volunteer could have been used better to work alongside the higher achieving learners in order to allow the tutor to focus on the lower achievers.

**Report 3**

Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence?

Yes

Is the report written in a supportive manner?

Yes

Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas?

Yes – however it lacked evidence of teaching, and this was not marked as an action.

What outcome would you give based on the information in the report?

Meets – however the group feel this felt more like an art group from the way in which the session took place. It lacked actual teaching.

**Report 4**

Does the report contain judgemental language with supporting evidence?

Yes

Is the report written in a supportive manner?

Yes

Does the narrative support the identified strengths and action areas?

Yes – good feedback regarding revision of course structure.

What outcome would you give based on the information in the report?

Meets – overall well written and supporting report for the tutor.

**Annual observer meeting Thursday 7th September 1-4 pm**