

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE**

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate  
Street, Rotherham. S60  
2TH**

**Date: Tuesday, 18th October, 2011**

**Time: 10.00 a.m.**

### **A G E N D A**

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 4th October, 2011 (herewith) (Pages 1 - 4)
4. Local Authority Governor Appointments (documents provided separately)
5. New Challenges, New Chances: Next Steps in Implementing the Further Education Reform Programme - Review of Informal Adult and Community Learning (report herewith) (Pages 5 - 16)

#### **Extra Item:-**

6. Technology Upgrade in New Central Library, Riverside House (report herewith) (Pages 17 - 19)

**CABINET MEMBER FOR LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE**  
**4th October, 2011**

Present:- Councillor Rushforth (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews and Dalton.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Sangster.

**F19. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 6TH SEPTEMBER, 2011**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture held on 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2011.

Reference was made Minute No. F16 (Strategic Commissioning Priorities for Children and Young People's Services) and the action plan, which once updated should be presented back to the Cabinet Member and Advisers for consideration.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member held on 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2011 be signed as a true record.

**F20. LOCAL AUTHORITY GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS**

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**F21. THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES SELF-ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PROGRAMME - OVERALL SCORE**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Lisa Broadest, Manager of the Heritage Services, which set out the details of the self-assessment of the Archives and Local Studies Service completed for Local Authorities last year and Rotherham's receipt of a 3\* (out of 4) rating.

This programme was designed to provide a measure of overall service quality in the absence of any formal performance indicators for Archive Services in the Audit Commission's performance indicator set for Local Government and was designed to supplement the formal, on-site, inspections that The National Archives undertook periodically. It would now, however, be superseded by an accreditation scheme, due to be developed during 2011/12 by The National Archives.

The self-assessment programme was based on a comprehensive questionnaire that examined five areas of work: Governance and Staffing; Documentation of Collections; Access Services; Preservation and Conservation; and Buildings, Security and Environment.

The report set out in detail the scores for Rotherham Archives and Local Studies with a comparison drawn against the returns from 2009 and 2007.

Each Authority received a percentage score on each of the five areas and an overall percentage score. The scores on the five areas of activity were then performance banded, with approximately the top 10% of services securing four stars - approximately the bottom 10% scoring one star and the remaining 80% being divided equally into two-star and three-star categories.

Analysis of the 2010 results showed that Rotherham was one of five 3\* or 4\* services in the region, the others being three major, long-established County Record Offices, Sheffield Archives (a larger Archive Service) and Hull City Archives. Three services scored lower than 3\* with one no return.

It would generally be possible to maintain the Service's current performance with some small improvements whilst taking into account the current financial situation and the Service's relocation from the Central Library and Arts Centre to Bailey House in 2012. These challenges may adversely impact upon impact upon Section 1 (governance), which focused upon budgets and staffing levels, Section 2 (documentation of collections) and Section 5 (buildings, security and environment).

There are, however, some small improvements that could still be made during 2011/13, some of which were dependant upon securing additional funding.

The Cabinet Member and Advisers welcomed this good news and congratulated the officers on the hard work that had taken place.

Resolved:- That the improvements, as set out in the report, be worked upon by the relevant officers.

**F22. YORKSHIRE LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION - MUSIC AND DRAMA COLLECTION SERVICES**

Bernard Murphy, Manager of Library and Information Service, gave a brief synopsis of the meeting that had taken place on Friday, 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2011.

The Music and Drama Collection Service Review Group were tasked with looking at various options which would be reported back to the next meeting of the Yorkshire Libraries and Information Service on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November, 2011.

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

**F23. PORTABLE BATTERY RECYCLING**

Further to Minute No. 23 of the meeting of the Recycling Group held on 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2011, consideration was given to the request that all schools be encouraged to participate in the portable battery compliance scheme with the opportunity for recycling collection containers to be provided to schools free of charge.

Discussion ensued on the merits of the scheme and it was suggested that the information be made available to schools and they be given the option as to whether they wished to participate or not.

Resolved:- That all schools be informed about the portable battery recycling scheme and they be given the option whether to participate or not.

**F24. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TEACHER DISCIPLINARY AND INDUCTION REGULATIONS FOLLOWING THE ABOLITION OF THE GENERAL TEACHING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND**

Consideration was given to the draft consultation response form presented by Liz Buxton, Lead Adviser, and Paul Fitzpatrick, Human Resources Manager, arising from the Education Bill which made provision to abolish the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE) and give responsibility to the Secretary of State to operate a streamlined regulation system.

The Department of Education were currently consulting on the new arrangements. A draft response to the consultation had been prepared and formed part of this report.

The closing date for this consultation was 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2011 and all comments made must be submitted for the above date.

The Cabinet Member was in agreement with the response form as submitted, which clearly set out Rotherham's concerns and feedback to the proposals set out by the Department of Education.

Resolved:- That the consultation response form, as now submitted, be approved.

**(THE CABINET MEMBER AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM IN ORDER TO MEET THE SUBMISSION DEADLINE)**

**F25. PRIORITY SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME - SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION**

Consideration was given to a report presented by Robert Holsley, Capital Projects Manager, which set out how the Department for Education (DfE) announced on the 19th July, 2011 a new school building programme called the Priority School Building Programme (PSBP), which was intended to address those schools whose buildings were in the worst condition.

It was anticipated the programme would cover the equivalent of building or rebuilding of approximately one hundred secondary schools. However, the programme was not limited to secondary schools, but would also include primary and special schools and sixth form colleges.

Local Authorities were responsible for co-ordinating and submitting applications from all maintained schools and voluntary aided and controlled schools. Academies could either be included in the Local Authority submission or apply on their own behalf.

The deadline for submissions was the 14th October, 2011 with a decision being expected on applications in December, 2011.

Further information was provided on the eligibility criteria and the determination and prioritisation of schools for consideration,

If Rotherham was successful in its submission for all the schools it would mean an investment of approximately £45 million. This was somewhat short of that expected through the Building Schools for the Future Programme and would leave the Local Authority with three options:-

- Fully bridge the funding gap through the Children and Young People's Service capital programme and prudential borrowing;
- Partially bridge the funding gap through the Children and Young People's Service capital programme and prudential borrowing;
- Provide no additional capital. Schools and the Local Authority to accept that the size of the school would be significantly smaller than it was now and would have been through the Building Schools for the Future Programme and the primary capital programme.

Children and Young People's Service and Finance would investigate the options mentioned above and present its findings once the application had been submitted.

It was also noted that in respect of Aston Academy discussions had taken place with the Head Teacher and Chair of Governors as to whether they wished to submit their own bid or for it to be included with that of the Local Authority.

The Cabinet Member welcomed any opportunity to improve the condition of Rotherham's schools.

Resolved:- That the inclusion of Swinton Community School, St. Pius X Catholic High, Oakwood Technology College, Wath Victoria Junior and Infant School in the submission to the Department for Education be approved.

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

1	<b>Meeting:</b>	Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture
2	<b>Date:</b>	September 27 <sup>th</sup> 2011
3	<b>Title:</b>	<b>New Challenges, New Chances: Next Steps in Implementing the Further Education Reform Programme</b>  <b>Review of Informal Adult and Community Learning</b>
4	<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Young People's Services

## 5 Summary

In November 2010 the government published two strategy documents, Skills for Sustainable Growth and Investing in Skills for Sustainable Growth setting out the future direction of the reform of further education for those aged 19 and over. The department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) is now consulting on proposals to deliver the governments' aims for Informal Adult Community Learning to:

- Promote consistently high quality teaching and learning
- Freeing college and other providers from as many bureaucratic restrictions as possible in order to allow a more effective response to the needs of communities

The consultation on Informal Adult Community Learning is part of a wider consultation on the post-19 further education provision. This includes consultation questions on:

- The structure of the sector
- The impact of greater freedoms and flexibilities on the sector
- The impact of simplifying the funding system
- The provision of adult literacy and numeracy
- The introduction of FE loans.

## 6 Recommendations

That the review of Further Education Reform Programme and Informal Adult Community Learning be noted.

That the Senior Director for Schools and Lifelong Learning respond to the consultation by 21st October 2011.

That a further report regarding the outcome of the consultation and the impact upon the council's delivery of Adult and Family Learning be submitted when the proposals for the future are published.

## 7 Proposals and Details

As set out in *New Challenges, New Chances* the consultation focuses on six key challenges:

1. The need to clarify Government objectives for the funding of Informal Adult Community Learning and its role in supporting wider Government policy objectives, including the Big Society, localism, health and wellbeing, social inclusion and digital inclusion.
2. The need to ensure that Government funding is sufficiently focused on the most disadvantaged. Middle income, educated learners are currently over-represented. However they do pay fees which could cross-subsidise those who cannot afford to pay.
3. The need to provide robust evidence for Informal Adult Community Learning. Social and economic impact measures for BIS-funded Informal Adult Community Learning are under-developed and Government does not collect data on non-government funded Informal Adult Community Learning.
4. The need to address funding anomalies and make funding fairer. Funding is currently based on an historical, and in many cases inequitable, distribution.
5. The need to create the conditions that will enable a much wider range of informal learning to thrive, whether this is supported by Government, self-organised in local communities, delivered in the private sector or enabled through harnessing the power of the internet.
6. The need to ensure that workforce training and quality assurance arrangements support the new vision for BIS-funded IACL.

## 8 Finance

For the academic year 2011/12 four components of the Adult Safeguarded Learning budget have been combined into a single budget line. The four previously separate components are:

- Neighbourhood Learning in Deprived Communities (NLDC)
- Personal and Community development Learning (PCDL)
- Wider Family Learning (WFL)
- Family Literacy, Language and Numeracy (FLLN).

Funding at national level will be maintained at the 2010/11 rate of £210 million for 2011/12 and 2012/13. The financial implications for delivery at local level will not be known until after the consultation.

9 **Risks and Uncertainties**

The government has recognised the value of Adult Learning and has made a commitment to continue funding. The future shape of provision in Rotherham will not be known until after the consultation and the implementation of the Further Education Reform programme.

10 **Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

Adult Safeguarded Learning targets are set by the Skills Funding Agency.

11 **Background Papers and Consultation**

New Challenges, New Chances: Next Steps in Implementing the Further Education Reform Programme - Review of Informal Adult and Community Learning

This document is part of the wider consultation on the reform of Further Education to be found at:

[www.bis.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.bis.gov.uk/consultations)

**Contact Name:** Sue Shelley  
Telephone: 822540  
E-mail: sue.shelley@rotherham.gov.uk



## **NEW CHALLENGES, NEW CHANCES**

### **Review of Informal Adult and Community Learning**

**AUGUST 2011**

#### **Response form**

Q1. Do you agree that BIS-funded IACL contributes to the development of the Big Society and complements the delivery of other Government policies, and if yes, which policies and how might IACL's contribution be measured?

Learning should be central to the development of the Big Society if individuals are to feel "free and powerful enough to help themselves and their own communities" (NIACE). Informal Adult Community Learning supports one of the key principles of the Big Society; putting more power into people's hands. Learning is essential to developing confidence and skills to influence decision makers and to help everyone understand and contribute effectively if they are to get the most of out of the changes.

The Big Society is about much more than a bigger role for volunteers and the voluntary and community sector. Local people having a greater say over the decisions and services that affect their quality of life is to be welcomed.

For learners, empowered consumers will be able to create the learning offer for their communities. To be part of these developments individuals need to be able read, write and be able to use digital technology. Without the skills to develop networks, and groups with social enterprise models, the new rights and responsibilities will be harder to discharge and only available to those in society who have the skills to take advantages of the new freedoms and responsibilities.

We would support the NIACE view that learning for active citizenship is central to the Big Society. The Big Society is based on the importance of

local communities taking a more active part in government. Informal adult learning has a part to play in helping to address those inequalities of social class, income, age, gender race, faith and disability. With cuts to funding and services from the statutory and voluntary sectors there is a danger that those suffering multiple disadvantage will be at a further disadvantage and unable to play an active part in the Big Society. Research shows that a more unequal distribution amongst adults of learning and skills has a correlation to higher rates of civic unrest and lower levels of social trust.

In Rotherham groups who have moved on from organised funded courses to become self-organised groups have struggled to keep going. It is easy to underestimate the resources in skills and capacity needed for self-organised learning groups to thrive. If volunteers are to be supported from initial expression of interest to being an effective part of self-organised learning again there needs to be support with structures and processes at local level. Commitment from individuals needs to be supported with training for the roles required. The danger is that without this there will be the dominance of a few 'professionals' within communities. To avoid this there is a need to make sure Informal Adult Community Learning supports as wide a range of learning as possible if citizens are to take on responsibility.

The strategy for improving mental health talks about new five ways to wellbeing model that is going to be promoted nationally. Learning is seen as one of the five ways to wellbeing. The need to ensure continued access to learning for the sake of learning and to ensure recognition is still given for learning even where it may not necessarily lead to job outcomes will have a positive impact on wellbeing and contribute to wider targets relating to health and wellbeing. Learning in itself has a direct positive impact on wellbeing but it indirectly impacts on wellbeing through improved job prospects and reduced health inequalities where the most disadvantaged are targeted.

Community involvement is key to the new strategy for Public Health (Healthy Lives Healthy People) e.g. formation of health and wellbeing boards. Access to Informal Adult Community Learning could link to this by empowering people in disadvantaged communities to get involved. A life course approach to tackling health inequalities is recommended by the strategy and access to learning with a view to gaining employment is key to this. We welcome the intention to promote the expansion of volunteering opportunities as an effective route to gaining skills and employment, for example by supporting the training of volunteer Community Learning Champions to engage local people in learning activities, acquiring new skills and embarking on new career routes.

“Strong families are where families learn to become responsible people” – David Cameron May 23<sup>rd</sup> 2011. Family learning is important in the growth and support of learning families. Family learning is a powerful tool in increasing confidence for families and an important way of engaging adults in further learning to improve their own skills. Many parents progress on to other learning and increased involvement in school is another way in which the

capacity required to deliver the Big Society is built through Informal Adult Community Learning.

Informal Adult Community Learning can support the digital agenda, particularly for those who are not formally engaged with learning. Learners do need to be supported with physical access and the skills and confidence to use technology. There is a concern that the focus on e-learning is seen as a replacement for community learning provision. Good quality e-learning resources are important but as a tool to support access and not a replacement. A reliance on e-learning will not help with the social and soft skills employers are looking for.

**Q2. Should BIS funded IACL be aimed solely at supporting specific outcomes such as progression to training and employment, or enable progression in a broader sense?**

We would agree with the consultation that IACL can make a real difference to people's job prospects, especially for those who have had few chances in life or who come from the most deprived and excluded sections of society. Narrow job focussed outcomes could be self-defeating as only with a wider offer including a range of engagement opportunities will there be the learning that allows personal growth and the development of softer skills so valued by employers.

In Rotherham IACL is important in engaging with new arrivals supporting community cohesion with learning opportunities open to all new arrivals. Families can engage with organisations within the wider community including schools, health and libraries building an understanding of and relationships with the settled communities.

**Q3. If the latter, what other types of progression are relevant and how could they be measured?**

In the concentration on progression that can be measured it is important not to forget the contribution to personal growth that IACL can make. Longitudinal studies on individual learners will give valuable information on the range of progression made by learners. This could include: increased confidence, motivation, steps to learning, improved health, volunteering activity and self employment. Learner journeys will demonstrate what works for individuals and provide evidence for funding decisions.

The Office for National Statistics is due to undertake a survey that will run each year, part of which is around the impact of learning on mental health. In the adoption of impact measures for IACL it will be important to make sure that these wider indicators are included in measuring impact.

#### **Q4. What should be the respective national and local roles in relation to IACL?**

We welcome the greater freedoms and flexibilities. These will help in maximising resources at local level and will help with responding to local needs. However the complexity of the system is not complementary to getting the best outcomes for the learner. Strengthening accountability to local communities is a natural adjunct to the focus on customer satisfaction; the impact on the individual learner.

The promotion of greater provider diversification needs to sit alongside a focus on the quality of the learner experience. In this way greater diversification will provide more quality opportunities for learners.

With less money in the system and more fees what will be the best way to inform learners of the most appropriate route for them? There is no mention in the consultation of how Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) will be provided or funded in the future. IAG, including engagement and outreach, is a critical element of IACL delivery, particularly in trying to support and encourage the progression of reluctant learners.

The importance of this will be even greater when learners have to make decisions they will find difficult to change because of the financial commitment they will have had to make. Information, Advice and Guidance needs to be part of any nationally set framework and could perhaps be made a mandatory element of all courses, with a specific funding allocation provided.

#### **Q5. What (if any) steps could facilitate the changing role of central Government in IACL?**

For any changing role in IACL central government does need to look at the clash between the priorities of different areas of government. There is currently a clash between DWP and SFA priorities, for example, the mandatory requirement for a learner to attend a Work Programme. This could have a negative impact and disengage individuals from further learning. In addition there are the financial pressures of needing to take out loans for Level 3 qualifications, with the subsequent impact on well being.

#### **Q6. What are the implications of seeking a wider local provider base?**

Increasing the range of organisations and groups involved in delivering learning is to be welcomed if such growth is accompanied by a focus on maintaining the quality. Without a national and local commitment to maintaining the quality of provision there is a danger that more disadvantaged learners in less affluent communities may only be able to access lower quality provision. Funding for IACL does still need to be tied to quality improvement.

**Q7. What would a localised IACL offer mean for providers, such as the Workers' Educational Association, delivering learning across localities?**

**Q8. Should BIS-funded IACL be targeted or universal, and why?**

The increased focus on learners is welcomed. If provision is to be more targeted then it does need to be explicit as to who the target group are. If provision is to be targeted at the most disadvantaged then who decides this and at what level is important. Local circumstances should be taken into account in deciding target groups.

If the government is serious about focussing on the most disadvantaged then there needs to be a fresh look at fees. We would suggest there needs to be a reciprocal initiative on fees.

There should be consideration of the impact on those learners who may have a qualification at level 2 or above but may need another qualification to secure a job. How do they move on?

In terms of attracting potentially "reluctant" learners, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, a possible approach could be to provide free engagement and taster courses for all, but then apply fees with appropriate remission for longer courses.

Where possible, local fee policies should be developed with the involvement of learners and local residents. This would encourage service users and communities to develop solutions for income generation and is consistent with the Big Society agenda.

**Q9. What are the key challenges to generating fee income and what associated solutions would encourage more sophisticated approaches to income generation?**

If fees are not to stop learners accessing provision there needs to be a clear understanding of the loans system and how this will operate. Learners need to have clear information on how and when they will have to pay loans back. Many learners who need to access provision will be put off unless they have a clear understanding that they do not need to provide the funding up front to take part in their course. The consultation does not mention scholarships or bursaries for the most disadvantaged students. Without this information as

part of the approach to income generation there is a danger that IACL will not be accessed by those who most need the provision.

**Q10. In a localised model, what are the key challenges and associated solutions that would secure accountability for tax payers' investment?**

The advantage of a localised model would be the freedom to focus on local need and priorities.

Within a commissioning-based approach, the lead body would be responsible for ensuring transparency and accountability.

Initial plans should be developed with the full involvement of all stakeholders and clear, deliverable outcomes identified.

Ongoing monitoring and evaluation systems should allow for regular challenge by learners and the wider community, with comprehensive reports at the end of each funded period demonstrating progress towards achieving the desired outcomes. This monitoring and evaluation cycle should then inform future commissioning plans.

**Q11. Which, if any, of options a) b) and c) on page 13 present a proportionate approach to measuring impact? Are there any alternatives?**

In any decisions on measuring impact we should not lose sight of the intended outcome of Informal Adult Community Learning to contribute to personal growth and improve life chances for individuals and families. It is important not to make the mistake of shaping the offer by what can be measured. It is difficult to measure personal growth and the contribution to community cohesion, social inclusion, health and wellbeing but however measured this should be the primary outcome and not a side issue.

Evidencing of spend and targets needs to be reduced if we are to avoid the situation where a disproportionate level of funding is committed to the completion of statistical returns.

**Q12. What core information should recipients of BIS investment have to provide in relation to learner characteristics and learning activity?**

We would be keen to reduce the amount of information currently collected. The ILR has become too unwieldy and presents a challenge to learners and providers alike. The suggestion is that collecting information such as gender, age, nationality/ethnicity, employment status, geographical location

(postcode), health / disability and starting point would be sufficient to provide the basis of a learner profile, which could be developed as the learner progresses through the system through the unique learner number.

Details of the learning and activity supported could be restricted to learning aim, length of course and guided learning hours.

### Q13. How can administrative data be used effectively to map fee income and learner disadvantage?

Current systems would allow for the mapping of learner data in relation to geographical communities but to map this against indicators of disadvantage would be more time consuming and involved. Although the data generated would be of interest this could run the danger of a disproportionate amount of funding being absorbed by the administration of the funding as opposed to delivering learning.

### Q14. What factors should be taken into account in the distribution of BIS funding for IACL?

Freedoms and flexibility allows funding to be maximised. We welcome the move if this is to be translated into local decisions. If local decisions are to be effective there needs to be sufficient funding to allow support for the most disadvantaged alongside the scope to try out innovative work. Without this there is danger that any new model will only deliver the same outcomes as the current model which engages with a disproportionate number of learners who can afford to pay.

Allocating an amount of BIS funding across each local area, based on local demographics and other specific criteria such as deprivation would seem to be the best option.

It would then be for local stakeholders to agree a local plan, which would determine priorities based on identified learner needs.

It may also be useful to provide the opportunity for sub-regional groupings of local authorities and other partners to develop a limited number of collaborative arrangements, which best reflect travel to learn patterns and local geography, and are consistent with emerging city region structures.

Some areas of specialist provision (e.g. for LDD young adults) may also transcend regional boundaries and benefit from wider collaboration.

### Q15. Which, if any, of options a), b) and c) on page 15 would best secure more localised delivery and are there alternatives that could be considered

Funding allocated directly to individual providers may address some local needs but may not provide a cohesive offer across an area.

Involvement in the design and delivery of local programmes by the full range of voluntary and community sector organisations and other non-statutory providers, is crucial. However, this can be achieved via effective local partnership structures, together with – where necessary – specific funding for capacity building. This could be complemented by national initiatives such as the support offered by LSIS and NIACE.

Any commissioning or provider model does need to be able to adopt the role of 'honest broker' representing the interests of the learner rather than providers. If a single local commissioning body is adopted there will need to be a careful balance between the economies of scale and the responsiveness to local circumstances. A South Yorkshire model would involve areas with very different needs and target groups. To find common ground target groups could be quite generic and the model would fail to be responsive to local needs.

The overriding factor in any funding model should be to maximise the amount of funding spent on the delivery of learning as opposed to monitoring and commissioning systems.

#### **Q16. Should BIS IACL funding be used to fund capacity building and innovation?**

The amount of funding available for the delivery of learning at a local level does not fully meet the needs and wishes of learners. It is appropriate to use the funding to improve the quality of the learning experience but if the funding was further dissipated to wider capacity building for organisations the amount of funding available would be diluted. With the current funding pressures on the community and voluntary sectors there is a danger that funding could be used to maintain organisations without increasing or improving the range of learning opportunities.

#### **Q17. If yes, how should funding be balanced and what type of activity should be funded?**

The NLDC model of supporting some capacity building has been helpful in growing the number of organisations able to deliver learning opportunities. IACL does need to have funding to allow for innovative activities and for trialling work with groups that may need different approaches to engage. IACL can support digital inclusion and self-organised learning. The majority of learners, particularly the most disadvantaged do need tutor support to access learning. These provide additional tools rather than a replacement for tutors.



**Q18. Is there a need for quality assurance arrangements to be changed in light of the potential changes to BIS funded IACL? If yes, in what way?**

Quality assurance systems need to ensure a consistent offer of quality learning opportunities.

Whilst it is important to not insist on unreasonably stringent standards that smaller organisations would struggle to meet, particularly for delivery of shorter courses, any revision of quality needs to focus on ensuring the same quality of opportunity is available to learners across IACL. Without this consistency, learners will not be well served.

**Q19. What adjustments to current workforce development arrangements in England would best support the new vision for IACL?**

IACL needs a well qualified workforce to deliver quality learning opportunities. However the strength of IACL is the ability to grow capacity within the system. We still need to value the skills needed to support community groups to write development plans and moving on to DTTLs / PTTLs developing tutors. The impact of fees and loans on reducing the diversity of the tutors, their backgrounds and experience needs to be considered in any review of the system. It is this richness that gives IACL its strength in delivering and progressing learners.

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL</b>
----------------------------------

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Lifelong Learning and Culture</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>18<sup>th</sup> October 2011</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Technology upgrade in new Central Library, Riverside House</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Directorate:</b>	<b>Environment and Development Services</b>

### **5. Summary**

This paper provides a progress update on the proposed implementation of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology required to deliver and improve library services in Riverside House.

### **6. Recommendations**

- a) **That the Cabinet Member notes the progress to date**
- b) **That the Cabinet Member gives approval to enable an exemption from Standing Order 48.2.1 (requirement to obtain at least 3 written quotations for contracts with an estimated value of between £50K and £500K).**
- c) **That the supplier - 3M are approved to carry out the RFID implementation at the new Library at Riverside House**

## **7. Proposals and Details**

The relocation of the Central Library to Riverside House in 2012 presents us with the ideal opportunity to implement RFID technology, which will help to improve library processes, customer services and also push forward the Library & Information Service's 'new ways of working' agenda.

The proposal for implementation (including all financial arrangements) was approved at the Corporate ICT and Information Governance Board meeting on 26 September 2011 ('Technology upgrade in the new Central Library, Riverside House' - Option 2: Implement RFID technology to replace existing barcode system).

### **Reasons for Request**

We are requesting an exemption from Standing Order 48.2.1 so that we can award the RFID contract to one of our existing library suppliers, 3M, instead of going through a formal tendering process with 3 suppliers (although it should be noted that we have discussed our requirements with another supplier). On the evidence we have seen, 3M remain our preferred supplier as they offer certain technologies not currently available from other providers (e.g. the mobile workstations and printers for more effective on-the-spot enquiry work).

The financials in the Corporate ICT and Information Governance Board meeting paper were based on a quote for implementation from our current supplier, 3M, after extensive consultation on our business requirements. This was compared with the costings submitted by other suppliers in the ESPO Contract 350 – RFID for Libraries (Equipment & Tags).

3M also provide our current barcode self service units, and therefore would provide us with the most cost effective option for upgrading these units to RFID in the future. Changing to another RFID supplier would incur extra charges relating to equipment and configurations of existing systems.

As with all new technology implementations, time is of the essence, with RFID documentation recommending a 6 month implementation process (including staff training and familiarisation). Current timescales state that the new Library will open in April 2012, so it is crucial the project begins as soon as possible; a tendering process would delay the start of the project even further.

Other elements of the implementation are currently being held up: we need to order RFID tags from the library book suppliers, begin the process of re-tagging all current stock in the Central Library and instruct suppliers to RFID-tag new stock. None of this is possible until a RFID supplier is appointed.

Other partners also require adequate notice of our intention to implement RFID so that they can make changes to our system configurations (e.g. Capita, the providers of the library management system.)

## 8. Financials

The financials in the Corporate ICT and Information Governance Board meeting paper were based on a quote for implementation from our current supplier, 3M, after extensive consultation on our business requirements. On the evidence we have seen they are our preferred supplier as they offer certain technologies not currently available from other providers (e.g. the mobile workstations and printers for more effective on-the-spot enquiry work).

We compared this quote with costings from 3 other approved RFID suppliers as outlined in ESPO Contract 350 – RFID for Libraries (Equipment & Tags). In this respect, the information provided in the ESPO contract has already acted in some ways as a tendering document.

(Note: Other suppliers have referred us to ESPO for their current pricing details.)

In summary, 3M offer best value for money in terms of the technology they offer (which will enable more efficient mobile working in Riverside House) and future proofing the library service's existing software/hardware.

## 9. Risks and Uncertainties

If the project start date is delayed whilst we wait for quotes from other providers, we risk missing the deadline for the proposed opening date for the new library.

## 10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The implementation of new technology in the Riverside House library is key to the Library Strategy and links with several of RMBC's key strategies including the Corporate Plan, Customer Access, Work Smart and Sustainability strategies.

## 11. Background Papers and Consultation

Technology upgrade in new Central Library, Riverside House Paper to Corporate and Information Governance Board, 26 September 2011

ESPO Contract 350 – RFID for Libraries (Equipment & Tags) Issue No.4  
Contract Period: 18 May 2010 to 31 March 2012 (available on request)  
Financial Services

**Contact Name:** Angella Parker - Library Group Manager: Information and Knowledge Management , ext 74 3672