



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA

# **An Evaluation of the PVI Workforce Development Programme 2010 – 2011**

**Consultant:**

Manraj Sehmi. RBKC HSC Learning and Development Commissioning Officer.

**Date:**

October, 2011.

## **Introduction**

The Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC) provided funding of £20,000 to support workforce development in Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector organisations. In order to access this funding, one of the criteria set was that local authorities contract with a local voluntary sector provider to deliver a programme, which meets the CWDC specific criteria.

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea commissioned and worked with the Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC) to deliver a training programme for trustees and practitioners working in voluntary organisations in the borough, concentrating particularly on underrepresented Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups. It was identified and decided that the key priority of this programme was safeguarding children. Although practitioners within the PVI sector have access to RBKC's Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) training, it is felt that training does not fully address the needs of the PVI sector staff and many lack confidence in taking a lead role in coordinating services for clients. The Chief Executive of KCSC developed a proposal in consultation with the Senior Learning and Development Consultant for Family and Children's Services (FCS) to address these needs and develop a group of best practice champions who can advise and support PVI practitioners to maintain best practice in their organisations and across the PVI sector.

## **The programme:**

A series of five half day workshops between January 2011 and April 2011 on the following topics:

- Common Assessment Framework (CAF)
- Safeguarding x 2
- Working in Partnership
- Measuring Outcomes for Child Care Services.

Workshops were delivered by the following facilitators:

- Joanna McCann, External Trainer (Common Assessment Framework)
- Ruth Lacey, RBKC Family Support and Child Protection Advisor (Safeguarding)
- John Kalogianis, RBKC Principal Policy and Commissioning Officer (Measuring Outcomes)
- Siobhan Sollis, KCSC Organisational Development Adviser (Working in Partnership).

Prior to delivering the programme, organisations were invited to attend an introduction event, facilitated by Aneesa Chaudhry, KCSC Personalisation Officer, where the outline of the programme was presented and discussed. This session was designed to establish any gaps in knowledge so that sessions could be designed to address these and delivered at the appropriate level. The exercise to establish the gaps involved requesting the groups to identify the following in relation to the different workshop topic areas of the programme:

- What are your strengths?
- Are there any worries or issues?
- Where do you think you need more support?
- Why did you want to attend the children and families development programme?

This report provides an evaluative summary of the training programme.

## **Attendance Report**

### **Attendance Figures.**

Course	Date	Number of spaces	Attended
CAF	10 February, 2011	20	15
Safeguarding	26 February, 2011	20	16
Partnership Working	10 March, 2011	20	14
Agreeing Outcomes	26 March, 2011	20	10
Safeguarding	17 May, 2011	20	23
<b>Total</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>

**The overall attendance rate for the programme was 78%**

### **Attendance and numbers by organisation**

The table below shows the organisations that were represented at the training and the instances of their attendance throughout the programme. The table also shows that 8 BME groups were able to attend the programme, which demonstrates that the programme was successful in meeting one of its original objectives of being accessed by underrepresented BME groups.

Organisation	Instances of attendance
African Women's Care	1
Algerian women project	1
Alcohol Resource Centre	2
Blenheim CDP	1
Brook	1
Cara Trust	1
Catholic Children's Society	1
Colville Nursery	2
Dadihiye Somali Organisation	7
Denbigh Under Fives Group	2
Ethiopian Community Alliance	2
Earls Court Nursery	3
Eaves Housing	3
Full of Life	2
Gheez Rite	4
Havengrove	2
Healthier Life 4 You, Family & Community	7
Hestia Women's Services Kensington	3
K&C Link	2
Meanwhile Gardens Community Association	9
Midaye Somali Development Network	4
Moroccan Community Welfare Group	5
Octavia Foundation	2
Octavia Housing	1
The Regeneration Trust, World's End Estate	3
The Virtual Engine Training Enterprise	1
West London Action for Children	6

The table below shows the professional roles of course attendees and the courses they attended.

Professional roles of attendees	Courses attended
Administrator	All
Chief Executive	Safeguarding
Children & Families worker	Agreeing Outcomes / Partnership Working / Safeguarding
Coordinator	Agreeing Outcomes / CAF / Safeguarding
Executive Director	Agreeing Outcomes / CAF /Partnership Working
Family and children worker	CAF / Partnership Working / Safeguarding
Head teacher	CAF / Partnership Working
Link Member	Partnership Working / Safeguarding
Link Worker / Trainer	All
Manager	Agreeing Outcomes / Partnership Working
Nursery Assistant	Safeguarding
Nursery Manager	Agreeing Outcomes
Play worker	Safeguarding
Project manager	All
Project Support Worker	Safeguarding
Service Manager	CAF
Supplementary Teacher	CAF
Teacher	Safeguarding
Therapist	CAF
Trustee	Agreeing Outcomes
Volunteer	CAF / Partnership Working
Youth worker	Partnership Working

## **Post course feedback.**

After each course participants were requested to complete course evaluation forms to ascertain whether the objectives of the course had been met and provide feedback on other aspects of the training. Below are a series of tables which capture participant responses to the questions asked on the evaluation form. The responses have been collated across the 5 courses and are not for single courses.

The aims of the session were well met

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure
	1	28	46	

The session met my expectations

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure
	1	34	38	2

I have the resources I need to share my knowledge with colleagues

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure
	2	46	26	1

I now have a better understanding of the subject\* than before I attended the session

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure
	1	29	42	

I now have a better understanding of how my organisation can play a role in \*course subject\* than I did before I attended the session.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	1	6	44	26

I feel more confident about how \*the topic\* can meet the needs of my users that I did before I attended the session (question asked on forms for 2 courses only).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure
	2	23	23	1

## **Evaluation Summary.**

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Sure
0.2%	2%	39%	52%	7%

The results of the evaluation suggest that overall the outcome of the programme has been positive.

A majority of 52% of participants strongly agreed that:

- The course/s met participant's aims
- The course/s met participant's expectations
- knowledge from the course/s could be shared with colleagues
- They had a better understanding of the subject area and how their organisation can play a role in implementing practices and procedures around the subject area
- Overall confidence increased.

This was followed by 32% of the participants agreeing, 7% unsure and 2 and 0.2% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing respectively.

Comments received on the evaluation sheets were very positive overall and link to the need identified in the Key Decision Report, dated 29<sup>th</sup> November, 2010, to develop the skill and practice of Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) staff in several areas, with safeguarding practice being the key priority.

Participants commented that by attending the courses, there were things that they would be doing differently within their organisations and that they have been able to think about the subject areas in more depth, understand their responsibilities and think about how they could implement what they have learned into their practice. Participants commented that they felt more confident in implementing what they had learnt (i.e. *'when and how to make referrals'* / *'ways to listen to a child and the importance of asking open questions'* / *'how to carry out a CAF'* / *'Approach KCSC and contacts at the Council in regards to suitability of potential new partners'*, to name a few).

Participants also commented that attending the training and gaining a better understanding of the subject areas would increase the dialogue between them and their managers around the key issues and processes and also work in partnership/collaboration with other professionals. It was also commented that the knowledge gained from the training would be taken back to participants' respective organisations and imparted to colleagues that were not able to attend the training, and this links to the second need identified in the Key Decision Report (November, 2010), to develop a group of best practice champions who can advise and support PVI practitioners to maintain best practice in their organisations and across the PVI sector.

In addition to this, it was also commented that organisations would update and change their child protection policies and ensure that staff receive regular refresher training.

Overall, participants felt that the quality of the training and trainers was of a very high standard and the handouts received would be useful for reference and refreshing their knowledge. However some participants reported that they would have liked longer for the training and more group exercises during the sessions. As a result, a request for more training and training updates was made on the evaluation forms.

## **Learning points**

Informal feedback received from participants following the workshops helped to establish the following learning points from the programme which could be taken into consideration for the future:

- Small BME groups who are unlikely to attend training would rather attend if they know the organisation that is providing the training. They also prefer training that is not so time intensive. The current training from RBKC's Local safeguarding Board needs to take all this into account when organising training.
- Single parents were able to come to the evening training and appreciated that their childcare costs would be paid for as they would otherwise not have been able to attend. However the crèche was underutilised on the Saturday sessions.
- Outcomes training can be very daunting for groups as the attendance figures show. There needs to be a way to make it less daunting as many groups lack the skills to show the difference they make and capture it for future funding.
- When asked why they did not attend the courses, several groups said that they wanted to attend the course but were put off by the time of the training. It may be a good idea to spread out the training to include day time as well as evenings.
- Some larger groups asked if they could have the workshop facilitators go into their organisations and train all of the staff. This may be something that KCSC could look at providing in the future.
- Small groups were not aware of the training that RBKC puts on as it's not marketed to them. Those that are feel it's too time intensive and some are confused by the forms and don't know if it's free. Some felt it's too complicated for them. There needs to be a way to get the training marketed to the smaller groups so that they are aware of what is out there. It also needs to be at a convenient time for small groups to attend as many have daytime jobs.

## Expenditure

The estimated budget for delivering this programme of training was originally £17,168 and this was broken down as follows:

<b>Draft budget for PVI workforce development project</b>	
<b>Item</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (£'s)</b>
Salary costs for Junior Development Officer: 1.5 days per week for 4 months @ £85/day plus 1.5 days pre-project training and meetings	2168
Mentoring for Junior Development Officer: 4 hours per months for 4 months @ 20 per hour	400
Trainer's fees for x 5 half-day workshops @ £350 per session	1750
Training handouts, materials and expenses	750
Venues and catering for x 5 half-day workshops @ £360 per session	1800
Transport and refreshments for centre visits	300
Vouchers for centres hosting visits	1000
Backfill costs for participants attending workshops	5000
Publicity and outreach	1000
Creche facility for workshop participants @ £200 per half-day session x 5	1000
Contingency	2000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£17,168</b>

The actual expenditure for delivering this programme is broken down below.

<b>Actual Costs for PVI workforce development project</b>	
<b>Item</b>	<b>Cost (£'s)</b>
Salary costs for Junior Development Officer: 2 days per week for 5 months @ £85 per day plus 1.5 days pre training and meetings	3400
Travel Expenses	148
Mentoring for Junior Development Officer: 4 hours per months for 4 months @ 20 per hour	400
Trainer's fees for x 6 half-day workshops @ £350 per session	2100
Catering for 5 sessions@ 200 per session	1500
Venues@ 250 per session x 2 (Earls Court Nursery)	600
<b>Transport and refreshments for centre visits</b>	
<b>Vouchers for centres hosting visits</b>	
Backfill costs for participants attending workshops	5000
Baby sitting costs @ £6 per hour x 3 sessions (15 hours) x 10 participants	690
Crèche facility for workshop participants @ £425 per half-day session x 2	500
Publicity outreach	1000
contribution to overheads	1899
Contingency	
CEO Time 5 days	900
Office Manager and Finance 3 days	346
Evaluation and follow up work	1517
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,000</b>

