

Train 4 Work

Inspection date

7 August 2009

Inspection number

333623

Contents

Background information	3
Inspection judgements	3
Scope of the inspection.....	3
Description of the provider	4
Summary of grades awarded	5
Overall judgement	6
Effectiveness of provision.....	6
Capacity to improve	6
Key strengths	7
Key areas for improvement	7
Main findings.....	8
Achievement and standards	8
Quality of provision	8
Leadership and management	9
Equality of opportunity	9
What learners like.....	12
What learners think could improve	12
Learners' achievements	13

Background information

Inspection judgements

Inspectors use a four-point scale to summarise their judgements about achievement and standards, the quality of provision, and leadership and management, which includes a grade for equality of opportunity.

Key for inspection grades

Grade 1	Outstanding
Grade 2	Good
Grade 3	Satisfactory
Grade 4	Inadequate

Further information can be found on how inspection judgements are made on www.ofsted.gov.uk.

Scope of the inspection

In deciding the scope of the inspection, inspectors take account of the provider's most recent self-assessment report and development plans, and comments from the local Learning and Skills Council (LSC) or other funding body. Where appropriate, inspectors also consider the previous inspection report (www.ofsted.gov.uk), reports from the inspectorates' monitoring visits, and data on learners and their achievements over the period since the previous inspection.

In addition to reporting on overall effectiveness of the organisation, its capacity to improve further, achievement and standards, quality of provision and leadership and management, this inspection focused on specialist provision in:

- Health, public services and care

Description of the provider

1. Train 4 Work Limited. (T4W) formerly part of Craft Services Group, was established in 2008 to help meet the labour and skills needs within the Hertfordshire care sector. The company has grown rapidly and is now a national training provider working predominantly in Bristol, Hertfordshire, Greater London and Manchester. It employs 15 staff across the country. The company is headed up by a managing director supported by a quality manager, training coordinators, and a team of internal verifiers and assessors. The main offices are in Hertford town centre. Spectator safety qualifications are subcontracted to two other training organisations.
2. T4W supplies training using government funding through both the East of England and South East regions of the LSC for Train to Gain provision. It also provides bespoke privately funded commercial training for the care sector representing approximately 10% of its work. All learners are employed and training is predominately provided at employees' work locations. Unemployment rates vary across the areas where T4W operates and in June 2009 they were 5% in Bristol, 4.2% in Hertfordshire, 7.3% in Greater Manchester, 10.3% in Newham and 6.9% across London as a whole, compared with 5.7% nationally.
3. Currently 226 learners are in training; 68 taking National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) in health and social care, 62 at level 2 and six at level 3, 86 security services at level 2, 72 spectator safety at level 2 and none in cleaning and support services. As there were no learners taking cleaning and support services qualifications, it was not included in this inspection.

Summary of grades awarded

Effectiveness of provision	Inadequate: Grade 4
Capacity to improve	Inadequate: Grade 4
Achievement and standards	Good: Grade 2
Quality of provision	Satisfactory: Grade 3
Leadership and management	Inadequate: Grade 4
Equality of opportunity	Contributory grade: Satisfactory: Grade 3

Sector subject area

Health, public services and care	Satisfactory: Grade 3
----------------------------------	-----------------------

Overall judgement

Effectiveness of provision

Inadequate: Grade 4

4. The overall effectiveness of the provision is inadequate. Achievement and standards are good and learners' develop good work-related skills. The quality of provision is satisfactory. Teaching and learning are satisfactory with good individual coaching from assessors. Provision to meet the needs and interests of learners and employers is good. Support and guidance is satisfactory, however, identification and provision of support for learners with additional learning needs is inadequate.
5. Leadership and management are inadequate. Strategic direction is insufficiently clear. Policies and guidance to steer key processes in the learner journey are inadequate. Quality assurance arrangements are also inadequate and quality improvement activities have only just begun to be developed. Equality of opportunity is satisfactory.

Capacity to improve

Inadequate: Grade 4

6. T4W has demonstrated that its capacity to improve is inadequate. Although success rates are good and inspectors judged the sector subject area to be satisfactory overall, leadership and management are inadequate and quality improvement is only recently being developed. Data is accurate but is only just beginning to be used to inform management decisions.
7. The self-assessment process is inadequate. T4W's first self-assessment was produced just before inspection by the quality manager. Staff were not involved in the process and were unaware of the proposed grades. The self-assessment report identifies strengths and areas for improvement. However, it is not accurate or sufficiently critical in its judgements about leadership and management. Quality improvement planning is recent and timescales and responsibilities are clearly identified. Quality assurance arrangements are weak, however, new policies and procedures have been drafted to provide guidance and consistency to key training processes.

Key strengths

- High success rates
- Good development of workplace skills
- Good individual coaching and support by assessors
- Very effective response to local employment needs

Key areas for improvement

- Inadequate identification and provision of support for learners with additional learning needs
- Ineffective leadership and management
- Inadequate quality improvement arrangements

Main findings

Achievement and standards

Good: Grade 2

8. Achievement and standards overall are good. This was recognised in the self-assessment report but unsupported by relevant data. To date, overall success rates are high at 84% with outstanding success rates in spectator safety at 91% and care at 93%. Success rates are satisfactory in security at 68% and cleaning at 73%. The timely success rates are satisfactory at 66%. The achievements of different groups are not routinely collected or analysed, however, there are no significant differences in outcomes between groups.
9. Learners develop good workplace skills, which was not identified as a strength in the self-assessment report. Learners show particularly good skills in the workplace in security. Staff demonstrate very effective operational skills such as people and vehicle searches, site patrols, management of accidents and incidents and the use of CCTV equipment. Security staff report improved communication skills, teamwork and personal confidence when dealing with the public. At one high profile site in London some staff have gained promotion since completing the NVQ. Staff demonstrate high levels of health and safety and security knowledge.
10. Care managers report improved knowledge of what learners can and cannot do in their work role. They have more insight into abuse and infection control and a greater understanding of service users with dementia. Learners are more confident and knowledgeable, particularly about the legislation and policies that underpin their work practice. Learners' work-related skills are good but the range and standard of written work in their portfolios is satisfactory despite appropriate coaching and development to support learners' individual additional learning needs.

Quality of provision

Satisfactory: Grade 3

11. The quality of provision overall is satisfactory. Teaching and learning are satisfactory. The induction process is satisfactory, covering all required aspects of the programme. Assessors offer good individual coaching and support for learners. Security staff receive good supplementary training in the workplace from T4W assessors. Most training is delivered individually. Assessors coach learners well and give good demonstrations in procedures such as vehicle search, use of radios and completion of good-quality incident reports. Workplace health and safety training is good. Care learners and managers report that T4W offer good mandatory training which is used for NVQ evidence. This has helped learners develop a satisfactory level of knowledge. However, no additional learning resources are available to support learners further.

12. Assessment practice is mostly satisfactory although some observation reports were unsigned and undated and some assessor judgements were inaccurate. The recording of assessment planning and review is insufficiently detailed and no formal reviews of progress take place. However, T4W evaluate progress reviews and target-setting as good in its self-assessment report. Assessors visit the workplace regularly with flexible assessment arrangements in security at unsociable hours and to fit around complicated shift patterns. T4W assessors make themselves accessible between visits to clarify understanding of what is required for the next visit. Employers arrange a wide range of work activities to support the NVQ programme.
13. Provision to meet the needs and interests of learners is good. As recognised in the self-assessment report, T4W respond very effectively to local employment needs. Within spectator safety, very good links have been made with community outreach groups to encourage learners from diverse backgrounds to apply for the programme. The links are further used to solve practical issues relating to such a diverse learner group. Effective use is made of community premises. In security, good working relationships with employers have been developed that contribute to workforce development in areas of local regeneration, for example at the Olympic village site, which will offer continuing employment opportunities after the Olympic Games have finished. T4W supports care employers to develop their workforce to meet the regulatory requirements in care.
14. Guidance and support for learners overall are satisfactory. The identification and provision of support for learners with additional learning needs, such as literacy, numeracy and language needs is inadequate. However, this was self-assessed as a strength by T4W. All learners undergo an initial screening for literacy and numeracy but in some cases where additional needs have been identified no action is then taken. T4W staff have recently received Skills for Life training and are developing a strategy to address this area. Some learners have had additional individual sessions and assessment methods have been adapted to reduce the written work. However, in spectator safety 13 learners with additional learning support needs did not receive appropriate support so left the programme without a qualification.

Leadership and management

Inadequate: Grade 4

Equality of opportunity

Contributory grade: Satisfactory: Grade 3

15. Leadership and management are inadequate. This was not identified in the self-assessment report. Staff development and training are satisfactory. Most staff take up opportunities to gain qualifications. Many are completing assessor and internal verifier awards as well as planned literacy and numeracy qualifications. Staff are registered with the Institute for Learning.

16. Leadership and management are ineffective. This was not identified in the self-assessment report. The company's strategic direction is insufficiently clear. The company has grown rapidly without clear guidance, or a full understanding of government funding requirements. T4W had not completed a self-assessment report until just before inspection. Policies guiding key processes in the learners' journey are incomplete. The management information system is reliable and accurate and the company is able to present a range of data on success, progress and retention rates by different groups of learners. However, this has only just begun to happen. Information is made available to board members to manage performance against targets but this had led to some inappropriate target-setting, for example, setting excessive workloads for assessors. This has now been rectified. Communication is satisfactory. Board meetings are regular and frequent; however, the board do not work to a standardised agenda and therefore members are unable to follow a continuity of actions.
17. Quality assurance and improvement activities are inadequate. This was a proposed strength in the self-assessment report. The internal verification arrangements are incomplete. Standardisation meetings do not routinely focus on assessment practice or the sharing of good practice; however, care staff have recently started more focused standardisation meetings following an external verifier visit in April 2009. Many assessors have not yet been observed by the internal verifier. Some internal verification takes place at the end of the qualification offering little opportunity to improve assessment practice. The monitoring of the subcontracted provision is informal and no records of meetings are kept to ensure requirements are met. Action points are not clearly identified and no obvious review of any actions is completed. There is insufficient use of feedback from learners and employers. This was identified as an area for improvement in the self-assessment report. Information is collected, but no collation or analysis is completed. As identified in the self-assessment report assessors and trainers have good informal contact with employers through frequent assessment visits to learners at work, but this contact is not formally recorded or the positive relationship maximised. The self-assessment process is inadequate. T4W's first self-assessment was produced just before inspection by the quality manager. Staff did not contribute to the judgements and were unaware of the proposed grades. Until recently, quality improvement was not central to the company's working practices.
18. The procedures for safeguarding learners meet current government requirements. Criminal Record Bureau checks are completed for assessors visiting residential and domiciliary care settings and a central record is kept by T4W. Health and social care learners are made aware of procedures to protect vulnerable people they work with and their employers complete appropriate checks to safeguard their clients.
19. Equality of opportunity is satisfactory. Equality and diversity did not feature as a separate area in the self-assessment report and was not graded. T4W's equality and diversity policies and procedures are clear and detailed. They appropriately include a dignity at work policy and cover harassment and complaints procedures.

These are shared with learners at induction. A useful charter clearly sets out learner and employer expectations, and promotes the learners rights and responsibilities. Learners understand equal opportunities, although no procedures are in place to check continued understanding at key points in their programme. T4W recruits learners from ethnically diverse communities, which is reflected in the learner profile. The gender balance is good but no learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are on the programme. Good, harmonious working relationships are fostered between learners who are respectful of each other. A proprietary data collection system is able to produce the success rates of different learners and identify where learners are withdrawing and to make links between assessors, employers and learner success. However, this information has only recently been introduced and has not been analysed to identify trends or any inequalities in outcomes. Learners' individual needs and concerns are informally checked but no records are kept through for example, learner progress reviews.

What learners like:

- Staff are very friendly, approachable and very understanding
- Assessors answer all questions and explain things well
- Individual rather than group support
- 'If they are late they always let you know'
- 'The assessors are good and know their subject'
- 'I've improved my operating standards and gained more security knowledge'
- 'It's very interesting, learning new things'
- 'I can do a job I couldn't do before'

What learners think could improve:

- Wording of the worksheets
- 'I had to wait for certificates with no explanation'
- 'The assessor sometimes chats too much'
- 'Nothing'

Annex

Learners' achievements

Success rates on work-based learning Train to Gain NVQ programmes managed by the provider 2007 to 2009

Programme	End Year	Success rate	No. of learners*	provider NVQ rate**
Train to Gain NVQ	2007/08 April - August	overall	101	74%
		timely	54	39%
	2008/09 August to July	overall	372	84%
		timely	290	66%

* Learners who leave later than originally planned are counted in the year they actually leave. This group of learners are then added to the learners who planned to complete in a given year and did so or left earlier than planned

** NVQ qualification success rates are calculated using data supplied to Ofsted by the provider prior to inspection