**Moving Guidelines to Standards Working Group (WG) Brief**

The Approval Committee has been working to move Professional Approval from Guidelines to Standards. The Approval Committee have worked as a group to tighten up the language in the proforma that the educational providers use as a template to create their submission. The document [Standards Annex v1.00 2020](Standards%20Annex%20v1.00%202020.docx) can be used for reference to that work so far.

We will also require to work on the main process document, currently referred to as [The\_Professional\_Guidelines\_2019.pdf](https://cldstandardscouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/The_Professional_Guidelines_2019.pdf). Once we have the Standards Annex v1.00 2020 format agreed SB will work on amendments to the current Guidelines document and add to a future agenda to be considered. (1st draft work in progress 1 Professional Approval Process 2020 v1.0 has now been added to i-develop)

The working group are tasked with:

* Reviewing the Standards Annex and making amendments as appropriate
* Ensuring Standards Annex is fit for purpose
* Confirming the titles of documents etc.
* Ensuring that the associated documents reflect the changes agreed
* Ensuring that approval process is still fit for purpose.
* Keeping the other 2 connected WG up-to-date
* Proof reading of all materials created
* Prepare a paper for sign off by Executive Committee.

Areas of focus suggested by Approval Committee:

1) The document [Standards Annex v1.00 2020.docx](Standards%20Annex%20v1.00%202020.docx) should be the first focus for the working group.

2) Once wording agreed for document above WG to review the Process document that the document relates to. SB will provide a 1st draft of this for comment.

3) Consider if the changes above impact on any other areas of work or documents? Create an action plan as required.

4) WG to consider the approval process and if it is still fit for purpose (including visit, virtual, use of i-develop etc)

5) Suggest changes that may be required to Approval Panel Member Training from the discussions in 3)

6) create a brief for Executive Committee to sign off on the changes

**Areas to be considered in 1) above**

In order to finalise the Standards Annex work the areas outstanding for action are:

**Front page**

As we are moving from Guidelines to Standards SB will be embarking on updating the existing Guidelines in this [link.](http://cldstandardscouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/The_Professional_Guidelines_2019.pdf) The proposal is to change the title of the document to reflect our move from Guidelines to Standards and the options are:

a) Professional Approval Standards

b) Professional Approval Process

Please make your choice or provide an alternative.

**Standard 1 : Background information:**

Maggie has made a start at providing overarching standards for each section. The proposal for this one is:

The organisations demonstrates: commitment to partnership working with local CLD providers and FE/HE institutions; an inclusive approach to the effective marketing of the programme; the values and principles of CLD are embedded in the programme.

Please comment on this standard and provide suggested changes as appropriate. Is there anything missing from this section?

SM: Might want to add something that demonstrates that these values are known, understood, acknowledged and accepted by university/institution management. For example, UoE has strategic goals such as social justice, widening participation, engaging with communities and building critical citizenship. These might be implicitly expressed in some cases, but nevertheless they are there. These reflect CLD values and so If there was a standard which encouraged the recognition and acceptance of these values, then it might help it would help to raise awareness of our values amongst senior manager and so help HE staff to promote the wider project of these small programmes.

SB - Not sure if we should add this as a standard or include information in the process document?

Do we include the commitment to annual review as a Standard?

**Standard 2: Equality and Diversity Standard:**

AS Equality and Diversity are legal obligations it is not the role of CLDSC to police this but it is in our remit to check that it is clear to Student CLD Practitioners. What does our focus need to be to reflect this. What is important from a CLD perspective?

Maggie has made a start at providing overarching standards for each section. The proposal for this one is:

The organisation models and promotes equality and diversity in their own and the students’ future practice.

Please comment on this standard and provide suggested changes as appropriate. Is there anything missing from this section?

SM - I’m not an expert on this area and again may have missed the discussion associated with this. And I would agree with the comments of other shown here. The one comment I would have though is about the wording of the standard and that is about how an institution could demonstrate some of it, specifically the last part of the sentence about ‘the student’s future practice’. I might be reading this wrong, but how can we demonstrate something that can only be measured in the future?

SM - Another point might be about recruitment and so how do applicant institutions demonstrate what is being done in terms of the support for recruitment of marginalised groups.

There are already a few suggestions on this section that need to be considered and it should be decided what the remit of CLDSC is on this standard:

- obtain an appropriate statement from BEMIS seek guidance on information we should be looking for.

- this section must be clear that it is wider than BAME but covers LGBTI and disabilities. We need to be clear on the evidence we are looking for

- does the statement/standard need to mention protected characteristics and possibly list them as a reminder.

- Most will have an equalities policy, however how is this promoted within? what evidence highlights training, development and how this is implemented in practice.

**Standard 3 - Participants Standard**

Maggie has made a start at providing overarching standards for each section. The proposal for this one is:

The selection process ensures participants understand and are committed to the field of community learning and development and are made aware of the pathways available to them to progress

Please comment on this standard and provide suggested changes as appropriate.

SM - Seems an appropriate wording for this standard. Don’t think I could add to or change it

VW - agree with whats being said

There are a few outstanding areas under this section:

1) the statement to consider is: What support do participants receive for supervised practice based learning: before, during and after the process?

IS this ok or does it need to be firmer? Is this in the right place in the document? The intention is that this would move to our practice placement standards in the future but is a step too soon at the moment.

SM - This is an important standard for an institution to demonstrate, however I don’t think it should be in this section alongside what seems to be questions about students on entry to the programme. As to where it should go I’m not clear, but it does relate directly to the support of practice learning.

2) the statement to consider is: What is the process for obtaining PVG (Or equivalent) before practice starts?

IS this ok or does it need to be firmer? Is this in the right place in the document? The intention is that this would be part of our practice placement standards in the future but it is felt there needs to be checks in place before those standards go live.

SM - I think this is a suitable question, the key is to demonstrate that the institutions processes do not allow students to go on placement before PVG is awarded. I think this question will allow institutions to do that. Something to consider here might be who bears the burden of the cost of the PVG. Is it the student (as with UoE), the institution or the placement agency. For example is there some institutions that rely on the placement agency to process and pay for a PVG? UoE students would know before accepting a place that they will have to pay for the PVG.

SB – do student teachers pay for this?

**Standard 4 - Content/structure/mode Standard**

Please suggest a standard for this area.

VW - - suggested standard..... The content and structure of the learning programme reflects current policy and practice of CLD and practice placements comply with CLDSC requirements

This section needs a lot of work to combine statements and consider their order in the document. See document [SB notes Standard 4 section D work.docx](SB%20notes%20Standard%204%20section%20D%20work.docx) for an exercise for working group to consider.

In the meantime, we really must address our 40% min approach. CLDSC are really keen to move to hours as the evidence standard. This would mean we remove options for evidencing in credits, % etc which seems to cause confusion. Would need to discuss the appropriate hours and how to differentiate between programmes/length of study etc – see table at end of document to help discussions.

Graeme McMeekin provided a very simple solution:

“I would suggest that we simply name that at Undergraduate they must do a minimum of 1,440 hours of placement (which is 40% of a 3 year programme) or 480 hours at Postgraduate (40% of PGDip) - that means that if a student does Honours or a Masters then they have covered the minimum for approval and they are not penalised for doing the extra academic study (which could put them at less than 40% overall).”

Thoughts?

VW - I like Graeme's suggestion

SM - Yes this is a challenging section of the process. I have to say that as someone who has recently went through the completing of the documentation, I found the 40% issue a real challenge. However, simplifying things be offering one calculation, in this case the percentage of time would seem a clearer way of doing it. Therefore, the solution Graeme offers seems sound and appropriate and I would agree with it at this stage (Although my perspective would benefit from a debate about this).

There are a lot of awareness of CLD items in this section Competence, Ethics, values, principles, i-develop and registration. Should we be insisting that the educational provider work with Kirsty Gemmell to provide an online or visit input to new students to cover these areas under 1 statement? KG is happy to do this!

SM - I think that would seem reasonable, UoE have certainly benefited from Kirsty coming in to do a session with students and staff. It might not be that Kirsty does this, but the institution has some form of recognised and discrete session introducing CLDSCS, registration and the range of other functions. But bear in mind that practice placement assessment is based around the CLD competencies and so students are introduced to and engage fully with key ethical principles and values throughout their programme of study.

Do we build use of the Practice Placement Standards into this area?

**Standard 5 – Staffing Standard**

Please suggest a standard for this area.

VW – suggested wording   - the selection process for teaching staff and practice supervisors ensures that they have the required CLD qualification and experience as specified by the CLDSC requirements

SM - The text in the existing document says this ‘Staff who are employed by learning providers for the prime purpose of delivering Community Learning and Development learning programmes must be professionally qualified in Community Learning and Development and have recent and relevant experience.’ The standard could be derived from this statement and read something like ‘Core teaching staff have recognised professional experience of and demonstrate a commitment to the field of practice, its ethics, values and principles.

One issue which causes me concern is the notion of ‘recent experience’ of practice. For example, I joined the UoE in 2012, as a practitioner straight from the field of practice. I’ve not ‘practiced’ in the field since then and so do I have ‘recent relevant practice’? I have engaged with the field of practice regularly through supporting and visiting placements, am in regular discussions with practitioners and write and research the wider field of practice, but I have not ‘practiced as such. Is there a need to describe what is meant by recent practice?

GM - GM Commented under annual monitoring doc - it not be better to ensure that they are CLD full / associate members rather than qualified

Note - This area may need some updating if we get the Supervisor Learning in place!

**Standard 6 - Assessment Standard to ensure Student CLD Practitioners can be recognised as Competent CLD Practitioner**

In title above should we amend competent to professional?

SM - I would add ‘a professionally’ before competent so it reads’ ‘a professionally competent CLD practitioner’

What standard should we use for this area?

VW - the Assessment process of CLD learning and practice is of high quality and ensures students are leaving as professional competent CLD practitioners.

Links to QAA Benchmark Statements and reference to Section 6 have been added - is this ok?

SM - Yes good addition and there is a need to link this to the QAA benchmark

**Standard 7 - Support Standard**

What should the standard be for this area?

VW - Student support is offered by qualified CLD practitioners to ensure positive, quality experiences for its students  (But it is the wider support we also need to include)

**Standard 8 Monitoring and Evaluation standard**

What should the standard be for this area?

VW - Effective evaluative mechanisms are in place to fain feedback from students and placement provider for ongoing practice improvement ( is it just practice improvement?)

**Timescales –** Original timescales were end of September but this should be amended to end of October to allow the working group to be established and meetings scheduled. WG interest to be sent to Willie Bhari by 11 August 2020

**Suggested Meeting dates - (needs to be reviewed and updated)**

Week 1 WB 17/08/20 – initial Virtual meeting of WG to agree plan of action and assign tasks? Also confirm action by dates. See suggested activities for this.

Week 4 WB 07/09/20 – WG check in on progress and agree next steps.

Week 7 WB 28/09/20 Virtual Group to meet up to discuss position and review/amend plan as appropriate to complete outstanding tasks.

**Details and contact info for WG: ??????**

**Suggested Activities to support the work?**

Depending on number of volunteers could we split into groups of 2 or 3 to focus on specific areas?

Break down task 1 into 2 parts 1 group take Standard 1-4 and review Group 2 take Standards 5 – 8 and review. Groups swap over for comment and present back to SB/RH to collate suggested new document. Suggested timescales:

Week 1 Group 1 and 2 review allocated areas. Virtually or on own and swap – leave to groups to decide.

Week 2 Groups swap information and review each other’s thoughts

Week 3 submit to SB/RH to collate into new document. This will be sent out for review and proof checking by the 2 groups.

Week 4 – Vritual WG meet up to discuss next steps. The Process document? Tasks 2), 3) and possibly start of 4)

Week 5 – Comments on process document to SB/RH. Plus any initial thoughts on task 3 and 4

Week 6 – SB and RH work on amended docs and consider any further action for tasks 3 and 4

Week 7 – Review position and revise plan as required.