



# **The Eastern Leadership Centre**

Early Years Professional Status Audit  
by the Quality Assurance Agency  
for Higher Education

October 2012

## Contents

<b>Key findings about the Eastern Leadership Centre.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Good practice .....	1
Strengths .....	1
Recommendations.....	1
Addendum.....	2
<b>About this report.....</b>	<b>3</b>
The Prime Organisation's stated responsibilities.....	4
<b>Detailed findings about the Eastern Leadership Centre .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1 Management of EYPS candidate outcomes .....	5
2 Approach to quality improvement .....	6
3 Approach to the safeguarding and welfare of children .....	7
4 Approach to candidate support.....	8
5 Approach to data management .....	9
6 Approach to recruitment, selection and retention of candidates.....	10
7 Staff management and infrastructure.....	11
<b>Action plan .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 1: Candidate statistics .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Annex 2: About QAA.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Annex 3: Glossary .....</b>	<b>32</b>

## Key findings about the Eastern Leadership Centre

As a result of its Early Years Professional Status Audit carried out in October 2012, the audit team (the team) considers that the soundness of the Prime Organisation's present and likely future management of the accreditation standards of awards and links to the Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) standards **meets expectations**.

The team considers that the soundness of the Prime Organisation's present and likely future management of the quality of the learning opportunities and support available to EYPS candidates **meets expectations**.

The team considers that the soundness of the Prime Organisation's present and likely future management of the assessment and moderation systems and processes for EYPS **requires improvement to meet expectations**.

The team considers that the soundness of the Prime Organisation's present and likely future management of candidate data, financial data, internal staff and infrastructure **requires improvement to meet expectations**.

## Good practice

The team has identified the following **good practice**:

- the commitment demonstrated by Eastern Leadership Centre EYPS staff to supporting all candidates through all stages of the EYPS programme (paragraph 17)
- the organisation of the EYPS administration team, which facilitates the development of strong working relationships between a nominated Eastern Leadership Centre administrator working with a single delivery partner (paragraph 26).

## Strengths

The team has identified the following **strengths**:

- the demonstrable commitment of the Eastern Leadership Centre and the three delivery partners to the Early Years East Consortium as a whole (paragraphs 14 and 38)
- the commitment shown by the Eastern Leadership Centre and its delivery partners to candidates affected by the withdrawal of the University of East Anglia from the Consortium, and to ensuring future EYPS learning opportunities in Norfolk (paragraph 38).

## Recommendations

The team has also identified a number of **recommendations** for the enhancement of the provision.

The team considers that it is **essential** for the Prime Organisation to:

- establish, as a matter of urgency, formal written processes and procedures to monitor and quality assure each delivery partner within the terms of the contract, and ensure that these are fully understood by all delivery partners (paragraph 41)

- establish, as a matter of urgency, formalised systems and procedures for the effective operation of moderation (paragraphs 1 and 2).

The team considers that it is **advisable** for the Prime Organisation to:

- formally agree action plans for engagement with Local Authorities and employers by March 2013 (paragraph 7)
- fully brief and consult delivery partners in regard to the Eastern Leadership Centre's requirements for the production, by January 2013, of each delivery partner's Annual Quality Audit (paragraph 41)
- establish, by January 2013, appropriate formal arrangements to enable all stakeholders to feed back in a timely manner on all relevant elements of the EYPS programme (paragraphs 11 and 22)
- implement appropriate systems for the effective monitoring of mentoring across the Early Years East Consortium (paragraph 20)
- develop and implement a system that will effectively assure the Prime Organisation that placements remain fit for purpose over time (paragraph 22)
- put in place a process to ensure the effective tracking of candidate destinations (paragraph 5).

The team considers that it would be **desirable** for the Prime Organisation to:

- review the frequency, timeliness, comprehensiveness and pathway differentiation of candidates' evaluations of the EYPS provision (paragraph 9)
- regularly reassure itself that it continues to meet the Teaching Agency's requirements on data management (paragraph 26)
- initiate a more formal approach to the recording of liaison meetings (paragraph 37).

## Addendum

A follow-up visit to the Eastern Leadership Centre was conducted in March 2013. The purpose of the visit was to monitor the implementation of the action plan produced as a result of the audit (pages 13-28). The visit was undertaken by two auditors. The conclusion of the auditors is that the Eastern Leadership Centre was making satisfactory progress in addressing the recommendations arising from the audit undertaken in October 2012.

## About this report

This report presents the findings of the Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) Audit<sup>1</sup> conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at the Eastern Leadership Centre (the Prime Organisation). The purpose of the audit is to provide accessible information which indicates whether Prime Organisations have in place:

- effective means of ensuring that the award of EYPS is robust, rigorous and consistent in quality and standards across all pathways
- effective means of enhancing the quality of EYPS provision, particularly by building on information gained through monitoring, internal and external audits, and feedback from stakeholders.

The audit focuses on how the Prime Organisation discharges its stated responsibilities in seven key areas:

- the management of EYPS candidate outcomes
- approach to quality improvement
- approach to safeguarding and welfare of children
- approach to candidate support
- approach to data management
- approach to recruitment, selection and retention of candidates
- staff management and infrastructure.

The audit applies to those pathways leading to the award of Early Years Professional Status that the Teaching Agency has contracted with the Prime Organisations. The audit was carried out by Mrs Claire Alfrey (auditor) and Professor Peter Bush (auditor), and the QAA officer was Mr Alan Weale.

The audit team conducted the audit in agreement with the Prime Organisation and in accordance with the *Early Years Professional Status Audit: Handbook for Prime Organisations and delivery partners*.<sup>2</sup> Evidence in support of the audit included:

- self-evaluation document produced by the Prime Organisation
- meetings with Prime Organisation staff
- meetings with delivery partner representatives
- meetings and telephone calls with candidates
- meetings and telephone calls with assessors and mentors
- documentary evidence of policies and procedures provided by the Prime Organisation
- training materials for candidates and assessors
- minutes of liaison meetings
- access to web-based materials
- candidates' assessed work.

The audit team used as a key reference point the *Handbook for Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) Prime Organisations and their delivery partners (April 2012)* provided by the Teaching Agency.

Please note that if you are unfamiliar with any of the terms used in this report, you can find them in the [glossary](#).

<sup>1</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/pages/EYPS.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/pages/EYPS.aspx)

<sup>2</sup> [www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/EYPS-handbook-prime-organisations.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/EYPS-handbook-prime-organisations.aspx)

The Eastern Leadership Centre (ELC) is a 'not-for-profit' organisation which grew out of the University of Cambridge's Institute of Education. ELC became a registered charity in February 2003. Its main purpose is to 'improve children's and young people's lives: training and developing all those who lead, teach and support them'. ELC offers a wide range of programmes to government organisations and to Local Authorities and key stakeholders in the Eastern region.

ELC was awarded the EYPS contract by the Children's Workforce Development Council. The contract was subsequently transferred to the Teaching Agency in October 2011. The contract with the Teaching Agency is based on ELC, as the Prime Organisation, leading the Early Years East Consortium (the Consortium) of delivery partners - comprising ELC, University Campus Suffolk, the University of Hertfordshire, Pen Green Research Centre and the University of East Anglia. The University of East Anglia announced its withdrawal from the Consortium in March 2012.

A summary of candidate statistics is available in [Annex 1](#).

At the time of the audit, the Prime Organisation provided the following pathways:

- Graduate Practitioner Pathway (GPP)
- Undergraduate Practitioner Pathway (UPP)
- Graduate Entry Pathway (GEP)
- Undergraduate Entry Pathway (UEP).

## **The Prime Organisation's stated responsibilities**

The Eastern Leadership Centre is contracted by the Teaching Agency to deliver the EYPS programme. It is one of eight organisations in England contracted by the Teaching Agency. ELC does not itself deliver the programme, but is responsible for ensuring that appropriate standards are met and suitable learning opportunities and candidate support are in place. Programme delivery is the responsibility of its three delivery partners; Appendix A of the contract between ELC and each of its delivery partners describes the roles of and relationships between the Prime Organisation and the delivery partners. ELC engages directly with the Teaching Agency on behalf of the Consortium and provides financial and other statistical returns as required by the Teaching Agency. ELC is accountable to the Teaching Agency for the performance management of the Consortium as a whole.

## Detailed findings about the Eastern Leadership Centre

### 1 Management of EYPS candidate outcomes

1 An effective process was followed by the Prime Organisation to appoint an external moderator. A person specification was developed and used to shortlist prior to interviews. The first external moderator's report was received just prior to the audit team's visit. Although not yet formally recorded, the Service Leader for the Eastern Leadership Centre outlined the process to be employed in the review of the external moderator's report to ensure its recommendations are used as part of the continuous quality improvement process. The team considers that it is **essential** for the Prime Organisation to establish, as a matter of urgency, formalised systems and procedures for the effective operation of moderation. These processes should be formalised as soon as possible to ensure that the internal moderator, assessors and delivery partners are able to learn from this initial and subsequent external moderation, and adapt practice to enhance the programme for candidates where relevant.

2 The team was assured that internal moderation has taken place. Evidence was seen of the lead internal moderator's completed moderation templates. Delivery partners had received some oral feedback from the internal moderation process. The team formed the view that the EYPS standards were secure. However, there was no formal evidence of internal moderation processes and systems. The team was also unable to find any evidence of how internal moderation will contribute to enhancement. It is **essential** that robust formal procedures are put in place before the next internal moderation, and that these address issues such as sample size, frequency, production and dissemination of the internal moderator report, together with the sharing of good practice. ELC will also wish to consider how assessors are trained as internal moderators, so as to make the assessment process sustainable as candidate numbers grow. Such staff development will also benefit assessors' practice and inform the continuous quality improvement process.

3 Completed candidate evaluations of the EYPS provision affirm that the assessment process was felt to be constructive. There was evidence from the evaluations and scrutiny of files to suggest that there was initial confusion about the formal recording of the candidates' developmental review, which led to some missing paperwork in the final portfolio; this has been rectified for the future. Of the nine completed candidate evaluations, eight felt that the programme had had a positive impact on their working practice, indicating programme effectiveness and constructive professional development.

4 Of the GPP cohort who completed EYPS recently, 89 per cent of the GPP candidates were successful. Given the relatively small numbers concerned, this figure can be said to effectively meet the 90 per cent performance indicator set by the Teaching Agency.

5 As each of the candidates who have completed to date was in employment, their destinations were known and they did not need support in seeking employment. While delivery partners indicated that they would in future use their own careers services to assist candidates in seeking employment, formal arrangements for this, together with monitoring by ELC, were not yet in place. Formal systems to track destinations and support Early Years Professionals into employment will need to be established swiftly; the team considers that it is **advisable** for the Prime Organisation to put in place a process to ensure the effective tracking of candidate destinations. There is evidence from specific questions on the evaluations that the impact of the programme on the candidates is being collected.

6 Overall, and since standards were secure, ELC's management of EYPS candidate outcomes meets the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to the management of candidate outcomes. However, the evidence to demonstrate this was largely oral. It is essential that systems and processes are recorded and formalised as soon as possible.

## 2 Approach to quality improvement

7 The Consortium has developed action plans for recruitment, and the 'Implementation of Revised EYPS Standards', which have been monitored at liaison and Consortium meetings and with which the partners have been fully engaged. The recruitment action plans were discussed at Consortium meetings, and delivery partners confirmed the widespread discussions concerning the revised EYPS standards. While all partners have recognised the importance of developing relationships with Local Authorities and other employers, and ELC intends to develop action plans for Local Authority and employer engagement, there appeared to be no evidence of a timescale for these, although delivery partners engaged regularly with their Local Authorities on an informal basis. The team recommends as **advisable** that the Prime Organisation formally agree action plans for engagement with Local Authorities and employers by March 2013. More generally, ELC will wish to reflect on the development of a more comprehensive approach to action planning.

8 The team noted that ELC and its partners were regularly represented at Teaching Agency Forum meetings, and the matters raised there were discussed further at Consortium meetings. Some ELC administrative staff attended Teaching Agency-led training days and regularly cascaded materials to ELC colleagues and their delivery partner administrative link, albeit in an informal way. The reporting and appraisal lines relate to ELC's operations more generally, rather than specifically to EYPS, and as such the team was unable to identify a structured staff development scheme dedicated to EYPS. Delivery partners confirmed that appropriate staff development opportunities for academic and professional support staff associated with the EYPS programme were available within their own institutions. ELC did not require information on staff development and training opportunities within the delivery partners.

9 Candidates completed a questionnaire at the end of the programme and were in regular contact with their mentors and other ELC and delivery partner staff. The questionnaires requested qualitative rankings on an excellent/good/average/poor scale against nine elements: tutor, course delivery, online support, activities, assessments, mentoring, course materials, venues and application process. The vast majority of the returned questionnaires rated all elements as 'excellent' or 'good', with only an occasional 'average' score being recorded against just one of the nine elements. The questionnaire required no specific evaluation of the candidates' development review. As all the activities evaluated relate to EYPS and the EYPS standards, the team formed the view that the provision was effective in clarifying candidates' understanding of the standards. ELC acknowledged the difficulties of securing full response rates and was planning a revised approach for the future. However, by restricting candidate feedback to the end of the programme, ELC has no opportunity to respond to current candidates and possibly accelerate improvements. The team recommends as **desirable** that ELC review the frequency, timeliness, comprehensiveness and pathway differentiation of candidates' evaluations of the EYPS provision. One of the delivery partners operated a course committee with candidate representation, but ELC has no arrangements in place for the formal establishment of course committees or the reporting of candidate views directly to ELC. While the delivery partners undertook course monitoring through candidate feedback as part of their institution-wide quality assurance arrangements, the outcomes of this did not appear to be reported to ELC.



10 Placement settings (see Section 4 below) communicate directly with delivery partners. The informative and comprehensive Placement Pack alerts placements that they should contact the Course Tutor at the delivery partner if there are any concerns. However, there appeared to be no mechanism whereby ELC received feedback from placements, although there were opportunities at Consortium and liaison meetings to discuss any placement issues that might have emerged. Similarly, the Prime Organisation does not appear to have in place arrangements for the monitoring and evaluation of mentors (see Section 4 below), nor an opportunity for mentors to feed back their views on candidates or EYPS in general.

11 There appeared to be no formal arrangements whereby the views of Local Authorities and other employers were sought. In developing its action plan for engagement with these organisations, ELC is advised to ensure that it incorporates opportunities for Local Authorities and other employers to offer feedback on the EYPS programme and, where appropriate, candidate progress. The team considers it **advisable** for the Prime Organisation to establish, by January 2013, appropriate formal arrangements to enable all stakeholders to feed back in a timely manner on all relevant elements of the EYPS programme.

12 As the delivery partners would expect to make use of QAA's UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code) as a reference point in setting and maintaining the academic standards of their programmes and in establishing and maintaining the quality of their students' learning opportunities, ELC is encouraged to develop an understanding of the Quality Code and increasingly adopt it as a source of guidance and support in its oversight of that part of its portfolio associated with higher education.

13 The team consider that, while ELC is committed to enhancing quality, it requires improvement to meet the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to quality improvement.

### 3 Approach to the safeguarding and welfare of children

14 Information regarding the Consortium's approach to the safeguarding and welfare of children is clearly laid out in a comprehensive policy on child protection. The policy contains information for candidates, mentors and assessors. Candidates on the UEP and UPP pathways confirmed that they had received this document. Assessors had received safeguarding guidance from ELC that laid out effective procedures and processes. The delivery partners require evidence from candidates if they have attended Local Authority-run continuing professional development courses on safeguarding and welfare, which they use to meet standards. The Consortium has worked together to ensure that the safeguarding and welfare of children has been embedded into preparation days. The Service Leader from one of the delivery partners had undertaken additional continuing professional development to ensure the Consortium is up to date on all initiatives. This collegiate approach was viewed as positive by the audit team.

15 Following concerns about the timeliness of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks for the initial EYPS intake in January 2012, raised as a result of the initial QAA interim audit conducted in January 2012, a more effective process has been put into place. Applicants are informed that an enhanced CRB check will be carried out at the application stage. Candidates then complete their CRB paperwork at interview. A CRB disclaimer has been developed to enable candidates to start the programme if there is a delay in receiving their CRB check. Delivery partners, who are responsible for checking and monitoring CRBs, strictly adhered to the requirement that no candidate would commence a placement without an enhanced CRB check having been received. ELC monitors CRB check progress through the delivery partners.

16 The team considers that ELC meets the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to the safeguarding and welfare of children.

#### 4 Approach to candidate support

17 Candidate support is well regarded by candidates. The newer candidates identified more closely with ELC than with their delivery partner, and highlighted the commitment and flexibility of the ELC staff, particularly the administrative staff. The established candidates identified more closely with their delivery partner, and confirmed the support they had received relating to their individual needs. All candidates welcomed the local provision of the programme, which they felt was a key factor for recruitment. Candidates were all confident that they could contact a number of staff - personal tutors, mentors, programme tutors, the Service Leader or administrative staff (delivery partner or ELC) - at any point should they need to. The commitment demonstrated by ELC EYPS staff to supporting all candidates through all stages of the EYPS programme was identified by the team as **good practice**. The online support available was rated positively by all in candidate evaluations. Candidates receive a standard set of policies and an EYPS assessment handbook, which ensures a common understanding across all delivery partners.

18 ELC's website is used to provide online information throughout all phases of the programme. This information is updated regularly by administrators and marketing staff. As yet there is no ELC virtual learning environment to support candidates through their programme.

19 Candidates on all pathways are required to have a mentor. Candidates select their own mentors. Neither mentors nor delivery partners were aware of any criteria or processes to be used to quality assure the mentoring process. ELC is advised as a matter of urgency to review its quality assurance systems to ensure that the criteria for mentors (person profile) outlined in its 'Framework for EYPS Mentors' are adopted and monitored by delivery partners (see recommendation in paragraph 20).

20 Mentors were offered training sessions in February 2012, and a mentor handbook (currently under review) outlines a number of processes for mentors. These include a mentor record form for recording discussions in meetings. The records are not formally collected or monitored by the delivery partners; rather, they are included in candidate files. Administrators confirmed that the delivery partners communicate with mentors but that there were no measures in place to monitor the frequency of meetings, although the team noted evidence of an initial mentor review summary. Mentors confirmed their confidence in contacting delivery partners about any issues that arose. The team heard from a mentor that there is little oversight of mentors, who were generally fairly independent. Nevertheless, mentor availability and support appears to be well regarded by candidates, although one student reported that mentoring was not applicable to her. The team recommends as **advisable** that ELC implement appropriate systems for the effective monitoring of mentoring across the Consortium. The team considers that mentors should receive feedback through these formal systems.

21 Delivery partners reported that candidates identify their own placements. Where candidates are on an entry pathway, the delivery partners assist in identifying placements if required. Delivery partners advise the use of the Ofsted standard of 'good'/'outstanding' to select a setting's appropriateness. Where a selected setting does not hold the necessary Ofsted standard, the delivery partner carries out an assessment, although this process is not formalised and there are no common criteria employed across the Consortium for assessments of this kind. The issue of sustainability as candidate

numbers grow has been considered, although delivery partners are approaching this matter in their own way.

22 A Placement Pack, which is currently under review, outlines information for placement providers. Delivery partners confirmed the usefulness of the pack for placements. Candidates are responsible for ensuring placement settings receive the pack, and generally brief the settings about their requirements. The pack includes information on the causes for concern process and details of who to contact if necessary. Delivery partners outlined how, if candidates raise issues with their placement or if the placement raises issues, they would visit the setting to try to resolve the matter. The team was, however, unable to identify any formalised system for this process for use across the Consortium. The Placement Pack contains a placement confirmation form for the setting to complete and return to the course provider. As there are no formal procedures on how to monitor or audit placements, it was not clear to the team how these forms were used by the delivery partners or ELC, although candidates place them in their files and discuss them with their tutors. Placements are not given the opportunity to evaluate their experiences (see recommendation in paragraph 11). It is also unclear how candidate evaluations of their experiences on this aspect of the programme are obtained, as there is no specific place to evaluate this aspect in the current candidate evaluation template. The team **advises** ELC to develop and implement a system that will effectively assure the Prime Organisation that placements remain fit for purpose over time.

23 Evidence of the candidates' development review was seen in candidates' portfolios. However, there appeared to have been some confusion over what had to be included for summative assessment. No feedback on the development review was seen in portfolios by the team (see Section 2).

24 The team considers that ELC meets the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to candidate support, but requires greater formality of processes and the establishment of auditing systems.

## 5 Approach to data management

25 ELC reported that careful and detailed financial management systems are fully in place. Monthly financial reports are discussed within the ELC EYPS team, and bi-monthly with the ELC Business Development Group, including senior ELC executives. EYPS is one of eight ELC business channels and operates strictly to the ring-fenced Teaching Agency budget. Delivery partners confirmed that they received accurate financial allocations on time through arrangements agreed between their finance departments and the ELC finance team. ELC operates a devolved budget system with each delivery partner, whereby EYPS staff within each delivery partner have discretion on the use of its financial allocation.

26 The team learned that ELC has in place an electronic communications log to accommodate information underpinning the Teaching Agency data requirements and that the log appeared to be well understood by staff responsible for entering information into the system, who submit the weekly Teaching Agency data returns. ELC was confident that its arrangements could deliver timely, accessible and accurate data on candidate numbers and outcomes, although further work is required on the capture of data on candidate characteristics. It is **desirable** that ELC regularly reassure itself that it continues to meet the Teaching Agency's requirements on data management. ELC confirmed that the Consortium was actively considering how best to manage the 'impact' of the EYPS programme generally, rather than its impact on individual candidates. The delivery partners confirmed that they had appropriate read-only access to data on their candidates and that the entries appeared to be accurate. The team noted the well-developed relationship between the ELC

EYPS administration team and the delivery partners, and identified as a feature of **good practice** the organisation of this team, which facilitates the development of strong working relationships between a nominated ELC administrator working with a single delivery partner, while ensuring that the whole administration team was sufficiently briefed to respond generically to queries from any of the three delivery partners.

27 Candidates observed that ELC was both helpful and very efficient at the handling of enquiries, and cited in particular the very positive responses within the candidate recruitment system. The team learned that while the ELC administration team did not work to formalised timescales, they sought to respond to email applications and enquiries within 24 hours and would initiate at least a first stage response to a complaint within three working days. ELC is encouraged to develop these informal and apparently highly effective response times into a more formalised arrangement, especially as the numbers of candidates is projected to increase.

28 The team was advised that ELC had deliberately sought International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 27000 accreditation (Information Security Management Systems), in addition to ISO 9001 (Quality Management Systems), as further security to its data systems.

29 The team considers that ELC meets the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to data management.

## **6 Approach to recruitment, selection and retention of candidates**

30 A marketing strategy established early in 2012 had been successively reviewed and developed for the September 2012 intake and for more general marketing for 2012-13. Marketing is led by ELC in close collaboration with the delivery partners, with the intention of promoting the EYPS brand and web presence via the Consortium, a view endorsed by the delivery partners and noted by the team on viewing a range of promotional literature. Delivery partners confirmed they could individually supplement promotional activities and materials, provided they conformed to the agreed Consortium brand and sought sign-off from ELC. Posters, advertisements, webinars and social media were exploited through targeting relevant employers, possible candidates, job centres and career fairs.

31 The focus has been on recruiting to meet Teaching Agency-funded candidate numbers. Data supplied to the team indicated that ELC had received, for the September 2012 intake, acceptances from 109 applicants - or 88 per cent of its funded places. ELC records enquiries, applications received, offers and accepted offers by pathway, delivery partner, candidates working in the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) of most deprived areas, and those from black and ethnic minority groups. ELC acknowledged it would need now to focus more on efforts to recruit to the Teaching Agency's priority candidate groupings, and it is encouraged to develop the ongoing discussions with delivery partners on appropriate niche marketing into a targeted action plan. Of the 109 confirmed acceptances, 17 per cent reflected the Teaching Agency's prioritised groupings; only two applications had been received from men.

32 The materials available to candidate applicants were comprehensive, accurate and clear, as was the information sent to candidates inviting them to interview; interviews included a short candidate presentation, of which they were made aware beforehand. The acceptance letter also included a letter to employers, if appropriate, setting out the nature of EYPS, and requirements and expected commitments of the candidates. Candidates confirmed their full understanding of the recruitment process, which was handled

by ELC, and commented positively on the assistance and support they had received from ELC during the process. Delivery partners confirmed that ELC led the candidate recruitment process, indicated that they were fully involved in the assessment of candidates, and attested to the rigour adopted to ensure that entry criteria were met. Candidates confirmed that ELC adopted an individual and personalised approach to their application to ensure that they were on the appropriate pathway. ELC invested effort into supporting candidates in presenting equivalency information, taking up resit opportunities and signposting them to top-up opportunities.

33 Candidates were content with their early briefing materials, which they found comprehensive and helpful, and which built on the information received through the application process. These are standardised across the delivery partners.

34 Individual candidate performance is monitored through a variety of mechanisms. The six-weekly liaison meeting enables delivery partners to report to the Service Leader on candidate progress and causes for concern. Delivery partner Programme Leaders are themselves advised by the individual candidate's personal tutor, (see Section 4) with whom the mentor interacts as appropriate. ELC believed it has appropriate arrangements in place to monitor candidate progress and to intervene as necessary, pointing to the 89 per cent successful completion rate of the GPP cohort completing in summer 2012.

35 The team considers that ELC meets the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to recruitment, selection and retention of candidates.

## 7 Staff management and infrastructure

36 EYPS provision is overseen by the Service Leader, whose 0.8 full-time equivalent contract is exclusively dedicated to the EYPS programme. Approximately 1.6 full-time equivalent administrative staff directly support the Service Leader (who is also able to access financial, marketing, administrative and secretarial/clerical support) and work with the executive team of ELC as a whole. The Service Leader's own reporting line is to the Deputy Chief Executive and Delivery Director. ELC will wish to support the Service Leader in the development of its EYPS provision, particularly in relation to the implementation of the action plan consequent upon this audit.

37 The Service Leader relates directly to the Programme Leaders at each of the delivery partners and meets them at liaison meetings, on a one-to-one basis at the delivery partner sites, at approximately six-weekly intervals. The meetings provide opportunities to discuss any possible causes of concern, with appropriate action, and to share new information. These meetings additionally provide the opportunity for ELC to monitor contract delivery by the delivery partner. Both parties agree the content of the meetings and agreed actions at the end of the meeting, each compiling their own notes. It is **desirable** that the Prime Organisation initiate a more formal approach to the recording of liaison meetings. ELC should consider recording these liaison meetings through formal circulated minutes as the scale of the EYPS programme increases.

38 The Service Leader is also responsible for convening Consortium meetings at approximately four-monthly intervals and for circulating minutes of these meetings. Delivery partner representatives described these meetings as 'collegial', with the interests of the Consortium overriding institutional issues - citing in particular the efforts of the Consortium as a whole to provide for candidates studying through the University of East Anglia at the time of their withdrawal from the Consortium, and the subsequent Consortium decision to retain provision in Norfolk in partnership with the University of Hertfordshire. Consortium priorities for recruitment and marketing were regular items on Consortium



meeting agendas. A strong feature of the ELC-led provision is the demonstrable commitment of ELC and the three delivery partners to the Consortium as a whole, and in particular the strong commitment of all Consortium members to those candidates affected by the withdrawal of the University of East Anglia and to ensuring future learning opportunities in Norfolk.

39 ELC communicates with mentors, assessors and settings primarily by email, and additionally provides a number of workshop sessions for mentors and assessors, supplemented by PowerPoint presentations and guidance notes/handbooks; these have been generally well received. Contacts with Local Authorities and employers are informal and are focussed on the relationship between the delivery partners and local area stakeholders. Communications with candidates from ELC is by email or telephone; although candidates have access to virtual learning environments at two of the delivery partners, there are currently no plans to develop an ELC virtual learning environment for the programme as a whole (see Section 4).

40 ELC approved the training facilities, buildings, learning materials and resources of the delivery partners during the bidding process to ELC, and selected only partners whom it felt to be of appropriate quality. Apart from the informal liaison meetings and end-of-programme candidate questionnaires (see Section 2), ELC has no formal systems in place to assure itself of the continuing fitness for purpose of the delivery partners' learning infrastructures. Two of the providers had in place institution-wide quality monitoring arrangements, although the extent to which resulting outcomes were made available to the Prime Organisation was not clear.

41 According to the Prime Organisation, ELC's prime mechanism for the monitoring of delivery partner performance is through the regular liaison meeting, and ELC pointed to its own 'Quality Framework' as informing the scope of such monitoring. The Quality Framework appeared to the team to reflect the broad areas of monitoring, but it seemed insufficiently prescriptive to provide ELC with an appropriate level of assurance. The delivery partners were unaware of this Quality Framework, although they acknowledged the requirement in Section 3 of Appendix A to their contract with the Prime Organisation to undertake an Annual Quality Audit. Although the Prime Organisation confirmed that the audit would be required by January 2013 (that is, 12 months after the contract signing), it appeared to the team that little consideration had been applied to the content, format and style of such a report. As monitoring of the EYPS operation within the Consortium is largely informal, the team was of the opinion that the annual audits provided by the delivery partners offered an opportunity for the Prime Organisation to assess fully the operation of each of the contracts, including the continuing fitness of their learning infrastructures. Accordingly, it is **essential** that, in the context of the annual audit, the Prime Organisation establish, as a matter of urgency, formal written processes and procedures to monitor and quality assure each delivery partner within the terms of the contract, and ensure that these are fully understood by all delivery partners. It is also **advisable** that delivery partners be fully briefed and consulted in regard to ELC's requirements for the production, by January 2013, of each delivery partner's Annual Quality Audit.

42 The team considers that ELC requires improvement to meet the Teaching Agency quality criteria for its approach to staff management and infrastructure.

## Action plan<sup>3</sup>

Eastern Leadership Centre action plan relating to the Early Years Professional Status Audit October 2012						
Good practice	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
The audit team identified the following areas of <b>good practice</b> that are worthy of wider dissemination within the provider:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the commitment demonstrated by Eastern Leadership Centre EYPS staff to supporting all candidates through all stages of the EYPS programme (paragraph 17).</li> </ul>	<p>The Prime Organisation will lead and facilitate two specific 'Consortium Development Days' per year for EYPS/Consortium performance related CPD aimed at Delivery Partners and their key EYPS staff involved in delivery of the programme.</p> <p>To include a focus on candidate 'case study' work.</p> <p>The PO will, from the above, identify any particular areas for further development by each PO, and</p>	31-7-13	Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation	<p>Evaluations of the two development days show that Delivery Partners are better equipped to support candidates' individual learning needs within the EYPS programme</p> <p>Liaison Meeting minutes show increase in DPs performance against given criteria</p>	CEO of ELC	<p>Evaluation will be via Service Leader's review of Delivery Partner performance (formally at Liaison Meetings but also via informal means - email, tel contact, etc.) as well as self- evaluation by each Delivery Provider (via annual appraisal process)</p> <p>Evaluation will be via evaluation feedback sheets</p>

<sup>3</sup> The Prime Organisation has been required to develop this action plan to follow up on good practice and address any recommendations arising from the audit. QAA monitors progress against the action plan, in conjunction with the Teaching Agency.

	implement individual development/support plans where appropriate.			<p>Reduction in 'Cause for Concerns' received by PO</p> <p>Observed attendee engagement is positive</p> <p>Candidate evaluations will show increase in % who consider themselves 'satisfied or very satisfied' with the support provided to them, and with the programme as a whole.</p>		<p>completed by attendees</p> <p>Evaluation will be via statistical data showing a decline in the % of candidates escalating to 'Cause for Concern'</p> <p>Informal evaluation will be via SL's observation and analysis of delegates' engagement during the session.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the organisation of the EYPS administration team, which facilitates the development of strong working relationships between a nominated Eastern Leadership Centre administrator working with a single delivery partner (paragraph 26).</li> </ul>	<p>Each PO EYPS Administrator will visit their allocated DP at least annually, plus attend one 'Core Preparation Day' at their allocated DP</p> <p>PO Administration Manager will support the CPD of EYPS admin team, to ensure they are</p>	<p>1-4-13</p> <p>1-10-13 and ongoing thereafter</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p> <p>PO Administration Manager</p>	<p>Delivery Providers' reporting of 'strengths and weaknesses' of PO and own administration arrangements within Consortium meetings (specific agenda item)</p>	<p>EYE Consortium &amp; Service Leader for Prime Organisation</p>	<p>Evaluation of candidate's experience will be via candidate evaluation forms</p> <p>Evaluation of administration team's feedback will be via monthly supervision arrangements</p>



Early Years Professional Status Audit: The Eastern Leadership Centre

	<p>equipped to fulfil their role effectively</p> <p>PO SL will meet quarterly with the Administration Manager within the PO to review administration arrangements, consider any feedback received relating to administrative processes, etc. and adjust processes as appropriate. Feedback will be reviewed by the SL quarterly, with actions followed up and brought to Consortium meeting as appropriate.</p>	Quarterly	Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation	% of candidates who report that they are 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with the recruitment and induction processes in particular will increase.	EYE Consortium & CEO of ELC	<p>and PDR process conducted by Admin manager</p> <p>DP evaluation will be via Consortium meeting feedback.</p>
The audit team identified the following areas of <b>strength</b> within the Prime Organisation:						
the demonstrable commitment of the Eastern Leadership	For the PO to formalise performance	30-12-12	Service Leader for EYPS with Prime	DPs will be fully briefed around key performance	CEO of ELC	Achievement against performance

<p>Centre and the three delivery partners to the Early Years East Consortium as a whole (paragraphs 14 and 38).</p>	<p>management arrangements of delivery partners via formal structuring and recording of PO/DP Liaison Meetings and standardising agenda items at Consortium meetings; SL will draw up standardised structure to Consortium meetings. Structure will be directly linked to denoted performance measures. SL will take to Dec '12 Consortium meeting for agreement. SL will lead implementation</p> <p>For the PO to develop a more robust approach to quality assurance of DPs and implement an appropriate system and review as appropriate.</p> <p>To facilitate learning opportunity for DPs and key EYPS team</p>	<p>13-12-12</p> <p>31-1-13 And on going</p> <p>Review 6 monthly</p> <p>28-2-13 (Feb Consortium</p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p>indicators and performance criteria that they are required to meet under the contractual arrangements</p> <p>Delivery partners will understand, and be able to accurately self-evaluate their own performance against the set criteria, and understand the origin of the criteria</p> <p>DPs will meet necessary quality criteria</p> <p>Following liaison meetings, DPs will be clear on what action is required of them, and rationale for.</p> <p>Delivery Partner organisations will be better</p>		<p>indicators will be a key method for evaluating success. Liaison meeting records will show changes in performance against set criteria</p> <p>Reports are commented on by DP Leads, and actioned as appropriate.</p>
---	--	--	---------------------	---	--	--

	<p>outlining such new arrangements and processes and rationale for</p> <p>The PO will implement a procedure to alerting 'Departmental Heads' within the relevant DP where a decline or insufficient performance is evident.</p>	<p>meeting)</p> <p>28-2-13</p>		<p>informed of their performance as well as areas for development.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the commitment shown by the Eastern Leadership Centre and its delivery partners to candidates affected by the withdrawal of the University of East Anglia from the Consortium, and to ensuring future EYPS learning opportunities in Norfolk (paragraph 38)</li> </ul>	<p>The PO to review existing interim provision via analysis of cohort data and candidate evaluations &amp; outcomes to assess viability for future continuation. For PO to explore and consider alternative viable options and take steps to implement as appropriate; Review existing provision against candidate outcomes, experiences and feedback.</p>	<p>Evaluations 30-1-13</p> <p>Outcomes 28-2-13</p> <p>31-1-13</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p>	<p>A continued commitment to the consortium will be evident in dialogue with DPs, and CM records/minutes. Provision for candidates in Norfolk will be of at least equal quality to that delivered across the rest of the consortium. Candidate satisfaction will increase year on year</p>	<p>CEO of ELC with additional reporting to EYE Consortium</p>	<p>Evident at annual audit/formal discussion</p> <p>The use of individual case studies to demonstrate continued commitment by whole consortium to addressing challenge</p> <p>Analysis of candidate evaluation feedback</p>

	<p>Consider DP feedback/position. Analyse alternative options. Decide most appropriate option for candidates and consortium. Convey outcome wider than ELC</p> <p>For the PO to consult with Norfolk LA to ascertain views and requirements from EYPS programme, and also facilitate joined up approach to addressing any disequilibrium following withdrawal of EYs programme at the UEA.</p> <p>PO to set up LA forum (see below)</p>	<p>31-1-13</p> <p>30-6-13</p>		<p>Consortium will have improved links with LAs across the region, and particular joined up approach to maintaining provision in Norfolk as well as improved data and local contacts.</p>		<p>Improved links with Norfolk LA. EYPS programme that is influenced by local needs.</p>
<b>Essential</b>	<b>Action to be taken</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Success indicators</b>	<b>Reported to</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
The team considers that it is <b>essential</b> for the Prime Organisation to:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish, as a matter of urgency, formal</li> </ul>	For the PO to formalise	20-2-13	Service Leader for EYPS with	Reports are commented upon	CEO of ELC and relevant	Via the achievement of at

<p>written processes and procedures to monitor and quality assure each delivery partner within the terms of the contract, and ensure that these are fully understood by all delivery partners (paragraph 41).</p>	<p>performance management arrangements of delivery partners via formal structuring, monitoring and recording of PO/DP liaison meetings - specifically focussing on DPs performance against contractually set KPIs. Brief summaries agreed with DP then circulated to DP/ELC relevant leaders within 10 working days of meeting taking place</p> <p>For the PO to brief all DPs as to revised arrangements, and rationale / purpose.</p>	<p>10-1-13</p>	<p>Prime Organisation</p> <p>All Delivery Partners and relevant DP Leads.</p>	<p>Performance of DPs will be in line with contractual performance indicators, and 'meets expectation'.</p>	<p>leaders of DPs within two weeks of meeting.</p>	<p>least 'meets expectation' outcome at 2013 QAA audit.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish, as a matter of urgency, formalised systems and procedures for the effective operation of moderation (paragraphs 1 and 2)</li> </ul>	<p>For the PO to formalise the existing Internal Moderation arrangements via 'Internal Moderation Purpose and Process' document. Draft document to be considered at</p>	<p>31-12-12</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p> <p>All Moderators involved with EYPS moderation</p>	<p>Consortium will have formal Internal Moderation written process which meets with contractual requirements. IM process will be</p>	<p>CEO of ELC</p> <p>EYPS Service Leader to review and feedback IM findings to Consortium meetings.</p>	<p>Via the achievement of at least 'meets expectation' outcome at 2013 QAA audit</p> <p>Low % of assessments</p>

	<p>December 2012 Consortium meeting, with view to final version being formally adopted by 10 January 2013</p> <p>PO to ensure IM and EM feedback (formal and informal) are used to influence EYPS Assessor training. Assessor training presentation slides/content will provide evidence of this taking place</p> <p>PO to ensure IM and EM feedback is circulated to DPs within 10 working days of receipt, as well as follow up discussion at following Consortium meeting.</p> <p>DPs to use IM and EM feedback to shape delivery.</p>	<p>28-2-13</p> <p>1-3-13</p> <p>30-3-13</p>	<p>All Delivery Providers</p>	<p>adopted and adhered to by all concerned. The PO will produce a Moderation handbook, and a tracking sheet detailing which standards, assessors and delivery partner have been moderated at each moderation event. Will be maintained by the Service Leader, and shared at Consortium meetings. Delivery partners will be able to fully explain the IM procedure. IM process will be conveyed to and understood by all Assessors and Moderators. Prior to engaging with moderation activity, moderators will be provided with</p>		<p>overturned at IM or EM stage</p> <p>Higher % of candidates achieving a 'met' outcome due to improved delivery.</p> <p>Consortium meeting minutes will show that IM &amp; EM feedback has been considered when developing</p>
--	---	---	-------------------------------	--	--	---

				a copy of the EYPS Moderation Handbook ,and asked to confirm in writing that they fully understand its contents, and will adhere to the guidelines at all times. External Moderator will consider IM process 'fit for purpose'.		training content.
<b>Advisable</b>	<b>Action to be taken</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Action by</b>	<b>Success indicators</b>	<b>Reported to</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
The team considers that it is <b>advisable</b> for the Prime Organisation to:					CEO of ELC	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>formally agree action plans for engagement with Local Authorities and employers by March 2013 (paragraph 7)</li> </ul>	<p>In partnership with DPs, the PO to develop an appropriate and effective strategy to engage with Employers and Local Authorities</p> <p>DPs to identify 'link officer' within each LA within their vicinity and report at each</p>	<p>30-3-13</p> <p>Quarterly</p>	<p>Jointly between Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation &amp; Marketing &amp; Communications Leader with Prime Organisation</p>	<p>Recruitment will increase. EYE will be in a position to understand and respond to feedback from LAs and employers as appropriate</p> <p>Candidates will have improved</p>	EYE Consortium	<p>Evaluation of effectiveness of strategy will be via review of LA and employer engagement and feedback content received, which will be reviewed by the Consortium twice per year and used to shape</p>

	<p>Consortium on contact and progress made</p> <p>Consortium will begin to gather feedback from LAs and Employers, and conduct analysis of such data – responding appropriately.</p>			<p>employability prospects, and greater awareness of career paths open to them</p> <p>The EYE Consortium will deliver EYPS programmes which are influenced by employers' needs.</p>		<p>programme delivery. Candidate destination data will show rise in % of entry pathway candidates who achieve employment 3 month post-EYPS completion</p> <p>Candidate questionnaires will evidence that candidates feel they have improved employability, and a better understanding of their possible career paths upon completion of their EYPS award.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>fully brief and consult delivery partners with regard to the Eastern Leadership Centre's requirements for the production, by January 2013, of</li> </ul>	<p>PO to facilitate briefing session at December Consortium meeting on requirements, and provide pro forma for DPs to self-evaluate</p>	31-12-12	Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation	<p>DPs will show that they fully understand the performance criteria which they must achieve via individual DP</p>	CEO of ELC	<p>Evaluation will be through analysis of DP performances against set criteria. An EYPS Delivery Partner</p>



<p>each delivery partner's Annual Quality Audit, (paragraph 41)</p>	<p>their own performance against contractual performance indicators prior to formal meeting in January 2013.</p>			<p>meeting records and informal communication e.g. email. Furthermore, they will be able to accurately self-evaluate their own performance against such criteria. DPs will know both their strengths and areas for improvement as well as exactly what the expected level of improved performance is and how this will be measured.</p>		<p>SEF will be requested by the PO and completed by each DP. An annual Performance Meeting will be held between each DP and the PO to agree areas of action for the coming 12-month period</p> <p>The PO will be able to evaluate the accuracy of DP self-evaluation through their own performance management of DPs; where judgements are aligned this will indicate that the DP has a good understanding of current performance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish, by January 2013, appropriate formal arrangements</li> </ul>	<p>PO to revise current evaluation schedule to specifically include</p>	<p>30-1-13</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime</p>	<p>Comprehensive Evaluation Schedule will be</p>	<p>CEO of ELC</p>	<p>Evaluation will be via the 'quality' of data gathered as</p>

<p>to enable all stakeholders to feed back in a timely manner on all relevant elements of the EYPS programme (paragraphs 11 and 22).</p>	<p>processes to garner feedback from wider stakeholders in a timely manner (Local Authorities, Lead Agencies for Children's centres within the region, and Primary Nursery chains active within the region)</p> <p>DPs/PO to develop key areas of questioning for all stakeholders (inc. LAs and Employers as above)</p> <p>PO to distribute feedback request to relevant parties and analyse responses. Consortium to consider analysis of responses within March Consortium meeting and develop action plan in response.</p>	<p>31-1-13</p> <p>30-3-13</p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p>in place, and will include appropriate reviewing mechanisms</p> <p>Consortium Meeting minutes will show evidence of how the EYPS programme is shaped by stakeholder evaluation and candidate feedback. EYE consortium will be more effective in targeting marketing activity; i.e. in areas where links are weakest.</p>		<p>well as 'quantity' of responses</p> <p>Evaluation will be through feedback provided at Consortium meetings to show stakeholder links strengthening.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implement appropriate systems for the effective monitoring of</li> </ul>	<p>PO to revise existing evaluation schedule to ensure more robust evaluation of Mentors.</p>	<p>28-2-13</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p>	<p>Comprehensive Mentor Evaluation schedule will be</p>	<p>CEO of ELC</p>	<p>Evaluation will be via the 'quality' of data gathered as well as 'quantity'</p>

<p>mentoring across the Early Years East Consortium (paragraph 20)</p>	<p>DPs to develop and implement system for providing feedback to Mentors of evaluations received.</p>			<p>included within wider EYPS Evaluation Schedule. The candidate's experience of mentoring will be evaluated, analysed and the findings fed back via Consortium meetings. DPs will understand their role with regards to Mentor evaluations, and will be implementing the evaluation process.</p>		<p>of responses  Evaluation will be via rise in % of Mentors who consider their experience has been 'Good' or 'Very Good'  Evaluation data received from Mentors will be fed back to DPs, following analysis, via Consortium meetings, or individually by the SL to the DP as appropriate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>develop and implement a system that will effectively assure the Prime Organisation that placements remain fit for purpose over time (paragraph 22)</li> </ul>	<p>DP/PO to develop a more formal process for the monitoring of and evaluation of placements both by placement hosts and candidates. DPs to implement a formal process of placement monitoring, to include formal arrangements for feedback gathering</p>	<p>28-2-13</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation  &amp;  All Delivery Partners, specifically; EYPS Programme Lead for EYPS at</p>	<p>The consortium will be better informed as to opinions of placement hosts, and will be in a position to review practice taking into account placement host views, and past candidates' experience</p>	<p>CEO of ELC &amp; EYE Consortium</p>	<p>Evaluation will largely be via analysis of responses received. Longitudinal analysis will show an increase in positive impact evidenced through responses received. This will</p>

	from candidates and placement providers.		University of Hertfordshire EYPS Programme Lead for EYPS at University Campus Suffolk EYPS Programme Lead for EYPS at Pen Green Research Centre.	feedback  Candidates and placements will be able to identify impact of any such placement  The placement arrangements will remain fit for purpose over time.		be reviewed 6 and 12 monthly by the PO, and fed back to the EYE consortium.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>put in place a process to ensure the effective tracking of candidate destinations (paragraph 5).</li> </ul>	<p>Candidate destinations are tracked in line with Teaching Agency requirements. PO to develop additional tracking of Entry pathways in particular to measure at programme completion and at 6 months following completion. PO to implement formal system for ensuring candidates not in employment are recognised and provided appropriate support/signposting.</p>	28-2-13	Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation	The consortium will have a clear understanding of the destination trends of candidates following EYPS.	CEO of ELC	Evaluation of initial rounds of candidate tracking data will provide an opportunity to develop interventions early to enable a higher proportion of candidates to achieve positive destinations following EYPS.

Desirable	Action to be taken	Target date	Action by	Success indicators	Reported to	Evaluation
<p>The team considers that it is <b>desirable</b> for the Prime Organisation to:</p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review the frequency, timeliness, comprehensiveness and pathway differentiation of candidates' evaluations of the EYPS provision (paragraph 9)</li> </ul>	<p>PO to implement 'mid point' evaluation to be completed by candidates within one month of undertaking development review; to include specific evaluation of DR experience. DP to implement midpoint evaluation, and analyse findings – sharing with PO during revised formal monitoring at Liaison Meetings.</p>	<p>28-2-13</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p>	<p>Candidate satisfaction programme-wide will increase, and the % of candidate reporting positive outcomes will increase.</p>	<p>CEO of ELC</p>	<p>Candidate evaluations will show an increase in satisfaction overall.</p> <p>Consortium minutes, and discussion with delivery partners will highlight changes made to the delivery content as a result of the previous candidate evaluations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>regularly reassure itself that it continues to meet the Teaching Agency's requirements on data management (paragraph 26)</li> </ul>	<p>PO Service Leader to meet 1/4ly with EYPS Administration team and Manager to review practices in line with TA requirements, and agree amendments as appropriate.</p>	<p>1-10-13, With meetings held at least during the months of January, April, June &amp; September</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p>	<p>PO meets all recruitment submission deadlines. PO consistently responds to data requests in timeframe provided by TA.</p>	<p>CEO of ELC</p>	<p>Feedback from TA will evidence that PO is meeting expectations.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>initiate a more formal approach to the recording of liaison meetings (paragraph 37).</li> </ul>	<p>PO to implement a more formal recording of Liaison Meetings against contractually set performance indicators</p> <p>PO will brief DPs on revised process.</p>	<p>31-12-12</p> <p>10-1-13</p>	<p>Service Leader for EYPS with Prime Organisation</p>	<p>DPs will fully understand what performance measures are used to assess their effectiveness</p> <p>DPs will be clearer about what corrective action is required, if appropriate</p> <p>DPs will be able to self-evaluate their own performance against the set criteria</p> <p>DPs will be able to measure their future performance compared to past performance, and identify 'distance travelled'.</p>	<p>CEO of ELC</p>	<p>Evaluation will be via DP achievements against performance criteria.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------	--	--	-------------------	---

## Annex 1: Candidate statistics

### January 2012 intake

	University of East Anglia	University Campus Suffolk	University of Hertfordshire	Pen Green Research Centre	Teaching Agency allocation	Total	% of allocation achieved
<b>GPP</b>	6	2	10 (self-funded)	0	10	18	100
<b>UPP</b>	8	9	10	5	40	32	80
<b>GEP</b>	6	0	2	0	20	8	40
<b>UEP</b>	6	5	0	0	20	11	55
<b>Total</b>	26	16	22	5	90	69	76

### Recruitment to meet strategic priorities - January 2012 intake

	Candidates from deprived areas	% of cohort	Black and Minority Ethnic candidates	% of cohort	Men into childcare	% of cohort
<b>GPP</b>	2	11	1	5.5	1	5.5
<b>UPP</b>	7	22	2	6	0	0
<b>GEP</b>	3	37.5	0	0	0	0
<b>UEP</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Retention and success - January 2012 intake

	Enrolled	Withdrawn	Deferred	Completed or due to complete	% retained	Assessed	Successful completion	% success
<b>UEA</b>	26	3	2	22	84	6	6	100
<b>UCS</b>	16	1	0	16	94	2	2	100
<b>UoH</b>	22	0	2	20	90	16	16	88.8
<b>PG</b>	5	0	0	5	100	0	n/a	n/a

**September 2012 intake**

	University of Hertfordshire (Norfolk provision)	University Campus Suffolk	University of Hertfordshire	Pen Green Research Centre	Teaching Agency allocation	Total	% of allocation achieved
<b>GPP</b>	5	5	9	4	18	23	127
<b>UPP</b>	14	17	21	10	42	62	147
<b>GEP</b>	5	12	6	0	40	23	57.5
<b>UEP</b>	0	6	3	0	36	9	25.5
<b>Total</b>	24	40	39	14	136	117	86

**Recruitment to meet strategic priorities - September 2012 intake**

	Candidates from deprived areas	% of cohort	Black and Minority Ethnic candidates	% of cohort	Men into childcare	% of cohort
<b>GPP</b>	2	2	1	1	0	n/a
<b>UPP</b>	6	5	3	3	0	n/a
<b>GEP</b>	4	3	4	3	1	1
<b>UEP</b>	5	4	1	1	0	n/a
<b>Total</b>	17	14	9	8	1	1



## Annex 2: About QAA

QAA is the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. QAA's mission is to safeguard standards and improve the quality of UK higher education.

QAA's aims are to:

- meet students' needs and be valued by them
- safeguard standards in an increasingly diverse UK and international context
- drive improvements in UK higher education
- improve public understanding of higher education standards and quality.

QAA conducts reviews of higher education institutions and publishes reports on the findings. QAA also publishes a range of guidance documents to help safeguard standards and improve quality.

More information about the work of QAA is available at: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk).

More detail about Early Years Professional Status Audit can be found at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/pages/EYPS.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/institutionreports/types-of-review/pages/EYPS.aspx).

## Annex 3: Glossary

This glossary explains terms used in this report. You can find a fuller glossary at: [www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary). Formal definitions of key terms can be found in the *Early Years Professional Status Audit: Handbook for Prime Organisations and delivery partners*: [www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/EYPS-handbook-prime-organisations.aspx](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/EYPS-handbook-prime-organisations.aspx).

**academic quality:** A comprehensive term referring to how, and how well, institutions manage teaching and learning opportunities to help students progress and succeed.

**academic standards:** The standards set and maintained by institutions for their courses and expected for their awards. See also **threshold academic standard**.

**assessor:** Person employed by the Prime Organisation or its partners to assess a candidate's competency against the EYPS standards.

**Code of practice:** The *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education*, published by QAA - a set of interrelated documents giving guidance for higher education institutions.

**delivery partners:** Any parties (as notified to and agreed by the Teaching Agency) that are required by the contractor to deliver any part of an EYPS contract.

**Early Years Professional:** A person who has achieved Early Years Professional Status. Early Years Professionals work across the diverse range of settings that make up the early years sector. They demonstrate excellent practice and leadership.

**Early Years Professional Status (EYPS):** A graduate-level professional accreditation for the early years workforce.

**EYPS pathway:** One of four packages of training, assessment and accreditation available for candidates to gain EYPS (as defined within the EYPS contract).

**EYPS standards:** The skills, knowledge and experience required to receive EYPS, as defined by the Secretary of State.

**external moderator:** The purpose of external moderation is to provide independent assurance that the quality and reliability of internal moderation and assessment is appropriate. The role of external moderator for EYPS is similar in nature, though not directly comparable, to that of external examiners used widely across higher education institutions.

**feature of good practice:** A positive aspect of the way a higher education institution manages quality and standards, which may be seen as exemplary to others.

**framework:** A published formal structure. See also **framework for higher education qualifications**.

**framework for higher education qualifications:** A published formal structure that identifies a hierarchy of national qualification levels and describes the general achievement expected of holders of the main qualification types at each level, thus assisting higher education providers in maintaining academic standards. QAA publishes the following frameworks: *The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ) and *The framework for qualifications of higher education institutions in Scotland*.

**Graduate Entry Pathway (GEP):** For people with a degree and limited experience of working with children from birth to five years of age, but who are looking to pursue a career working in early years. Normal duration 12 months; maximum duration two years.

**Graduate Practitioner Pathway (GPP):** For graduates currently working in the sector who require a small amount of learning or experience before they can demonstrate the EYPS standards. Normal duration six months; maximum duration nine months.

**internal moderator:** The Prime Organisation is responsible for carrying out internal moderation of all assessment outcomes. An internal moderator will:

- check that all judgements made during assessment are sound
- monitor the quality of assessment to ensure consistency and standards
- provide assurance that the standard and reliability of assessment is appropriate.

**learning opportunities:** The provision made for students' learning, including planned **programmes of study**, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories or studios) and staff development.

**learning outcome:** What a learner is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after completing a process of learning.

**mentor:** A person employed by the contactor to provide a development expert/novice relationship which supports a candidate to become autonomous through dialogue and skilled questioning.

**moderation:** The process by which the contractor will review assessment outcomes and ensure the consistent application of processes defined by the Teaching Agency.

**operational definition:** A formal definition of a term, which establishes exactly what QAA means when using it in reports.

**Prime Organisation:** The training provider with a direct contract with the Teaching Agency to deliver EYPS from January 2012.

**programme (of study):** An approved course of study which provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification.

**quality:** See **academic quality**.

**reference points:** Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured. Internal reference points may be used by higher education providers for purposes of self-regulation; external ones are used and accepted throughout the higher education community for the checking of standards and quality.

**Setting:** A childcare setting can be a nursery, crèche, pre-school, daycare centre, children's centre or the location of a childminder or nanny.

**threshold academic standard:** The minimum standard that a student should reach in order to gain a particular qualification or award, as set out in the **subject benchmark statements** and national qualifications **frameworks**. Threshold standards are distinct from the standards of performance that students need to achieve in order to gain any particular class of award, for example a first-class bachelor's degree. See also **academic standard**.

**UK Quality Code for Higher Education (the Quality Code):** Guidance developed and agreed by the higher education community and published by QAA, which is used by institutions to ensure that their courses meet national expectations for **academic standards** and that students have access to a suitable environment for learning (**academic quality**).

**Undergraduate Entry Pathway (UEP):** For undergraduates completing a degree, for example in Early Childhood Studies. Normal duration 12 months; maximum duration two years.

**Undergraduate Practitioner Pathway (UPP):** For undergraduates currently working in the sector who require a small amount of learning or experience before they can demonstrate the EYPS standards. Normal duration six months; maximum duration nine months.

**work placement:** A sustained period of learning for candidates on EYPS pathways which takes place in a setting registered to deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) and enable opportunity to develop the skills, knowledge and experience defined by the EYPS standards. A childcare setting can be a nursery, crèche, pre-school, daycare centre, children's centre or the location of a childminder or nanny.

**RG 1050 01/13**

**The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education**

Southgate House  
Southgate Street  
Gloucester  
GL1 1UB

Tel 01452 557000  
Fax 01452 557070  
Email [enquiries@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:enquiries@qaa.ac.uk)  
Web [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2013

ISBN 978 1 84979 725 2

All QAA's publications are available on our website: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)

Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786