

Lifelong Learning Directorate:  
Learning Connections



# **Community Learning and Development (CLD) Activity Survey 2006**

(Results of the CLD Activity Survey undertaken during the  
reporting week 6 – 12 November 2006)

## Executive Summary

1. This report sets out the results of the 2006 national activity survey for community learning and development (CLD). The survey built on a pilot data collection, and associated evaluation, run in 2005 (the report from which was published in July 2006<sup>1</sup>).
2. The activity survey is a key part of a range of work by Learning Connections to build robust performance information relating to the CLD sector at a national level. This work to develop information on the *outputs* of CLD complements work relating to *inputs and outcomes*.
3. This survey therefore focuses on collecting information on the tangible deliverables of CLD; specifically the number of individual learning opportunities accessed and the number of community groups supported by the sector.
4. The data collection was carried out over a snap-shot week in November 2006. As last year, all 32 local authorities were invited to participate in the survey. They were asked to coordinate the return of information on activity carried out directly by their own staff and volunteers.
5. However, building on the pilot survey, in this year the invitation to take part in the survey was extended to non-local authority partners in community learning and development, through the CLD partnerships.
6. The full text of the questions asked can be found in Appendix 1 but in general terms respondents were asked to report on:
  - the number of learning opportunities that they directly provided for adults and young people during the reporting week; and,
  - the number of community groups that they directly supported during the reporting week.

## Results

7. The following are the main results from the data collection:

### ***Local authority delivery***

8. Returns were made by all 32 local authorities. In total across Scotland they reported that, during the reporting week of 6 – 12 November 2006:
  - 56,943 adult learning opportunities provided directly by local authorities were accessed;
  - 95,673 youth work opportunities provided directly by local authorities were accessed; and,
  - 4,769 community groups were supported directly by local authorities.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Community Learning and Development activity survey: pilot data collection 2005:*  
[http://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/webpages/lccs\\_015220.pdf](http://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/webpages/lccs_015220.pdf)

### ***Delivery by non-local authority partners***

9. Figures were returned by 68 non-local authority partner organisations. The total number of returns made was 80, as organisations were asked to make separate returns in relation to their work in each local authority area<sup>2</sup>. Returns were made by partners active in 25 of the local authority areas (there were no returns from 7 areas, other than that from the local authority itself).
10. In total across Scotland, non-local authority partners reported that, during the reporting week:
  - 4,718 adult learning opportunities were accessed;
  - 3,498 youth work opportunities were accessed; and,
  - 537 community groups were supported.

### ***Notes on the figures***

11. The following are important considerations in respect of all these figures. More detailed consideration is included in the main report.
  - This is the second year of data collection from local authorities, using substantively the same questions in terms of their own direct delivery. It is apparent that – following the pilot last year – local authorities have continued to refine their data collection processes.
  - Though the repetition of the questions asked of local authorities in the pilot and in this survey allows for some comparison, several years of data will be required to robustly identify trends over time.
  - Notwithstanding this, comparison with last year's figures from local authorities serves to reinforce their validity.
  - 80 returns from non-local authority partners clearly substantially under-represents actual delivery. This should therefore not be taken as indicative of the level of non-local authority delivery across Scotland.
  - Due to the wide range of local factors impacting on the level of CLD delivery, the data does not support comparison between local areas and these figures continue to be valid only at a Scotland level.

### ***Evaluation returns***

12. In addition to the data return, respondents were asked to complete a detailed evaluation form. The following are the main results from the evaluation:
  - In summary, the evaluation of the data collection exercise for 2006 was broadly positive. The majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the guidance and the data collection process.
  - However, the low levels of returns by non-local authority partners makes it difficult to draw conclusions about how the process worked for them. It may be that those who were not satisfied with the guidance or the process simply did not make returns.
  - Encouragingly, however, of those that did take part the vast majority from both local authorities and non-local authority partners said that they could see the relevance of the exercise and would be willing to take part in it again.

---

<sup>2</sup> Only one organisation made returns in respect of more than one local area, providing information on activity in 13 local authority areas.

13. Against this broadly positive picture, there remain a number of issues that should be considered in undertaking the exercise again:
  - Indications that non-local authority partners were less satisfied with the definitions provided.
  - Comments from some respondents about how the online return could be adapted to be more useful.
  - Comments about the type of information respondents would like to see collected in future (but there were also suggestions that asking for too much information could deter respondents from participating in the survey).

### **What will happen next?**

14. Based on the results of the evaluation we will continue to build on the data collection and further establish it as an annual process.
15. We believe that through the data collection we are beginning to establish important information from local authorities. It will be important that consistency is maintained and, in some cases, enhanced – both in terms of the questions asked and in terms of the interpretation of questions by different departments within local authorities.
16. The relatively low number of returns from non-local authority partners means that increasing the reach of the survey beyond the local authorities is a priority. A marked increase in return rate would be necessary to view the picture as a good indication of delivery.
17. Key next steps therefore include:
  - Further establishing the activity survey by collecting the same range of data in 2007.
  - Using the evaluation feedback obtained to further clarify and streamline the guidance provided, and facilitate the return of information.
  - Take steps to build communication with non-local authority partners (both through national intermediaries and through the CLD partnerships), in order to encourage their participation in the survey.

### ***CLD ACTIVITY SURVEY 2007***

18. Building on the steps outlined above we undertook the activity survey again in November 2007, using substantively the same questions as 2006. A report on that survey will be published in May 2008.

#### **Background**

19. This report sets out the key findings of the 2006 national activity survey for community learning and development (and associated evaluation) carried out by Learning Connections with the objective of quantifying the scale of the activity of community learning and development (CLD) providers across Scotland.

20. This quantitative data collection is part of a wider range of work that aims to improve the quality and availability of performance information related to CLD at both national and local level. Important aspects of this work have included:
  - The development of a framework of the outcomes of CLD
  - National research aimed at quantifying the delivery of CLD outcomes over time.
  - Work to better understand and guide the development of management information systems in use across CLD.
  - The piloting of a biennial survey of the CLD workforce.
21. The robust collection of quantitative information on the activity delivered by CLD in Scotland is central to achieving these objectives. Learning Connections is considering information on CLD in terms of: the inputs required to deliver the activity; the outputs actually delivered; and the outcomes that these achieve. This survey is our main source of information on the **outputs** of CLD.

## Survey aims

22. Until the pilot data collection undertaken in 2005, there had been no systematic national collection of information on community learning and development since 1997. Increasingly, the need for robust collection of data reflecting the activity of the sector has become a priority.
23. At a local level information is required to plan, monitor and evaluate the delivery of CLD activity within communities, as well as to inform local strategies and policy. Similarly at the national level there is a need for information to support the development and evaluation of national policies and priorities.
24. The activity survey therefore aimed to collect information at a national level that would allow us to quantify CLD activity being delivered across Scotland. This information would be used along with other information being gathered by Learning Connections, from a range of sources, to give us an accurate picture of the CLD sector.
25. The piloting of the data collection in 2005 found that the methodology used was broadly held to be effective (see the pilot data collection report for more details). It was decided to substantively re-run the data collection as in the pilot, in order that:
  - Providers of the data could become accustomed to the process and develop their systems further;
  - Over time it would be possible to compare results generated in local areas;
  - A wider range of providers, and CLD activity, could be brought within the scope of the survey.
26. The main change from the pilot data collection was that a wider range of CLD providers – namely, all those who were involved in CLD partnerships – was offered an invitation to be involved in the survey.

## Survey design

27. The survey was substantively based on the pilot data collection in 2005, which was developed through extensive consultation with the field.
28. The survey itself remained relatively straightforward. It focussed on the three national priorities for CLD:
  - achievement through learning for adults;
  - achievement through learning for young people; and
  - achievement through building community capacity.
29. For the first two priorities, providers were asked to report all the opportunities provided directly by them, which were accessed in the target week. It should be noted that the number of opportunities accessed may be greater than the number of individuals participating as any individual may undertake more than one activity within the week. This should not be considered as double counting as we are deliberately counting the uptake of opportunities not individuals.
30. There is an important distinction between opportunities accessed and individual uptake of those opportunities. It is not feasible in this type of multi-agency survey to collect the levels of participation of individuals with reasonable confidence that double counting has been avoided.
31. For community capacity building we asked for a report on the number of community groups who had received support during the reporting week.
32. The counts of opportunities accessed were carried out over the course of 6 -12 November 2006. This was expected to give a snapshot of a typical week.
33. It was not expected that it would be possible to multiply this figure by 52 to give a year's activity. It should also be noted that across the organisations involved we would expect to see variation in the numbers for the chosen week. Put simply, in some areas this will be a quiet week, in others a busy week. Across the country (assuming this variation is random in nature) we would expect the fluctuations to balance out to give a reasonable national figure. As part of the evaluation respondents were asked how typical the week selected was for them.
34. The questionnaire was set in context with a description of the background to the survey explaining why we were requesting this information. General guidance was provided explaining the concepts behind the data collection in terms of what and how the data should be reported. The guidance recognised the cross-cutting nature of much of the work of CLD and asked respondents to count activity where it best fitted within the three national priorities.
35. Detailed guidance and definitions relating to each question were provided along with the survey form. Due to the complex nature of the CLD sector the definitions are extremely important. Definitions were produced by Learning Connections for the pilot data collection, with guidance from the CLD field and drawing upon widely used definitions already in existence. These were found to be useful, and were positively evaluated in the pilot, and were therefore used substantively unchanged in this year's survey.

## Evaluation process and quality assurance

36. The evaluation process was completed in a number of stages. An evaluation questionnaire was attached to the survey form with a request that the person coordinating the data collection on behalf of the individual organisation complete the online evaluation.
37. The evaluation was a mixture of free text and tick box questions focussing on the sections of the main return. The evaluation questions can be found in Appendix 2.
38. In order to allow for local quality assurance of the data, following the close of the survey, each CLD partnership was given the opportunity to review and confirm the returns from their partnership area. Following this process one CLD partnership offered revised figures in respect of delivery by non-local authority members.
39. The continuity between the survey questions in the pilot and in 2006 gave the opportunity to compare figures for local authority delivery between the two years. All local authorities in the top quartile of returns (in relation to number of opportunities accessed per head of population for the first two questions; and in relation to number of community groups supported per head of population for the third), which showed significant variation between the 2005 figures and the 2006 figures were re-contacted. These were contacted individually and the details discussed, with particular attention to any explanations of the differences between the 2005 and 2006 figures.

## Data collection results

### Results of the national CLD pilot data collection: November 2006

40. The following table sets out the detailed national information collected.

	<i>No. of responses<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>Scotland total</i>
<b>Q1: National priority one: achievement through learning for adults</b>		
(a). Number of community-based learning opportunities for adult, provided directly by local authority staff or volunteers, accessed during the reporting period.	32	56,943
(b). Number of community-based learning opportunities for adults, provided directly by staff or volunteers from other organisations, accessed during the reporting period.	60	4,718
<b>Q2: National priority two: achievement through learning for young people</b>		
(a). Number of youth work opportunities, provided directly by local authority staff or volunteers, accessed during the reporting period.	32	95,673
(b). Number of youth work opportunities, provided directly by staff or volunteers from other organisations, accessed during the reporting period.	38	3,498
<b>Q3: National priority three: achievement through building community capacity</b>		
(a). Number of community groups or organisations which received community development, community work or community capacity building support directly from local authority staff or volunteers, during the reporting period.	32	4,769
(b). Number of community groups or organisations which received community development, community work or community capacity building support from other organisations, during the reporting period.	41	537

### Response rates and robustness of the data

41. Based on the evaluation and comparison with other relevant published information we have come to the following conclusions regarding the data:

<sup>3</sup> The total number of responses listed here is greater than the overall number of returns (80) as some organisations delivered services in relation to more than one of the national priority areas for CLD.

- Data drawn from question (1a), (2a) and (3a) – that is delivery directly by local authorities – is broadly comparable to figures produced in the pilot survey, and which withstood comparison with existing figures (where these were available through other surveys).
  - Where there are significant differences between the individual local authority figures for 2005 and 2006, plausible reasons for this have been identified in all cases (through follow-up discussions with respondents).
  - However it is clear that local authorities continue to develop the comprehensiveness of their returns and a number of sweeps of the survey will be needed to build up information on trends over time.
  - Data drawn from questions (1b), (2b) and (3b) is considered to be robust in respect of the organisations which made a return. However there are insufficient returns to draw any conclusions about the true level of delivery by non-local authority partners.
42. Feedback from the evaluation and quality assurance process indicated that in general the individual local authorities were confident in the robustness of the data provided for delivery directly by them. However a significant number of local authorities had made efforts to collect information from a wider range of departments than in the previous year (beyond 'core' CLD services).
43. Local authorities were asked to include with their returns an indication of which local authority department had provided the opportunity or support. It was clear that there was a significant degree of variation in how 'department' had been interpreted by different local authorities but the information provided gives a clear indication of how CLD opportunities and support are now delivered in a range of ways by local authorities:
- Community based learning opportunities for adults were reported to be delivered by 71 different departments (an average of 2.2 across the 32 returns).
  - Youth work opportunities were reported to be delivered by 61 different departments (an average of 1.9 across the 32 returns).
  - Community capacity building support was reported as being provided by 66 different departments (an average of 2.1 across the 32 returns).
44. The limited number of returns in respect of delivery by non-local authority CLD partners severely limits the usefulness of this data as the basis for forming a robust national picture.
45. In advance of the data collection, CLD partnerships lead officers were asked to provide a list of the partners to which they would pass the invitation to take part. In total 23 partnerships provided this information and they indicated that they would be passing the invitation on to 426 partners (an average of 18.5 per partnership). The number of partners invited ranged from four to 45.
46. Eighty returns were received but 16 of these were from organisations in areas that had not provided a list of partners. Therefore 15% of the 426 partners that we know were invited provided a return. This ranged from no partners responding in several areas where we know invitations were issued, to a maximum of 47% of partners in one area responding.

47. No significant sectoral pattern was evident in responses, with 64.8% of responses from voluntary sector organisations; 12.5% of responses from colleges and universities; and 22.5% from other statutory sector organisations (with one response from a private sector training provider).

### **Acceptable uses of the information**

48. The data has been collected with the aim of establishing Scotland-level counts. Although the information has been collected at local authority level it does not support comparisons between local authorities. The activity week was selected as being a random typical week. We would therefore expect random variations between areas in the numbers of activities delivered. Across the country we would expect these random variations to broadly even out, allowing us to use the national figure.
49. Comparison between the 2005 and 2006 figures (for local authority delivery only) appears to bear this out. Though individual figures have fluctuated, the Scotland level figures are broadly similar. However further sweeps of the survey will be needed to establish trends over time and allow for any random variation from year to year.
50. The data can be used by individual authorities to inform their own work as they are in a position to understand the local factors impacting on their activity. It is anticipated that year on year data within a council area can be used locally given the caveat that any changes are interpreted within the context of the local environment.

# Evaluation results

## Introduction

51. All respondents to the activity survey were asked to complete an evaluation form on the activity survey process. This feedback will be used by Learning Connections to develop and improve future activity surveys.
52. Results from the Local Authority and non-Local Authority evaluations have been summarised below. This was the first year that non Local Authority partners were asked to take part in the activity survey. Quantitative results from the respondent evaluation forms are supplemented by qualitative information from the free text fields in the evaluation form.
53. The guidance issued to all respondents was split into evaluation form guidance, data collection process, online return and overall.

## Local authority responses

### *Response rate*

54. All 32 local authorities responded to some or all of the evaluation questions.

### *Evaluation of the guidance*

55. Guidance was issued, along with the online survey, for the data collection exercise. Over three quarters (77%) of respondents found the guidance issued for the data collection either 'very helpful' or 'helpful'. The rest said that they found the guidance 'quite helpful'. No respondents found the guidance unhelpful in any way.
56. Respondents were then asked how useful they found particular sections of the guidance and there were a range of views on this:
  - Three quarters were either 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' with the summary in the guidance and a further 17% were 'quite satisfied'. Only two respondents said they were 'not very satisfied' with the summary in the guidance.
  - In terms of clarity, over three quarters thought the summary was either 'very clear' or 'clear' and no one felt it was very unclear.
  - On the 'Background' section in the guidance only one respondent said they were 'not very satisfied' with the information provided. Sixty-two percent (62%) were either 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' with the information provided in the background section.
57. Specific comments offered in relation to the guidance issued included:
  - Whilst clear, the guidance was too lengthy and may deter some potential contributors from participating.
  - Illustrative examples were particularly useful and should be further developed.
  - Guidance needed to be adapted for those for whom CLD is not a core part of their function or background.
  - Sharper definition needed of capacity building work.

### ***Evaluation of the data collection process***

58. Respondents were asked questions about the time and effort required to complete the survey. The average time taken to complete survey was 36 hours and there was a huge variation in the responses given about how many people in the organisation were involved in collecting, collating and entering the data. These ranged from two in one local authority to over 300 in another.
59. When asked how easily accessible information was, the survey found that in respect of adult learning opportunities:
  - For 27% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
  - For 23% it had to be collected specifically for the exercise
60. When asked about getting the information on youth work opportunities:
  - For 13% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
  - For 40% of respondents it had to be collected specifically for the exercise.
61. And finally in relation to community capacity building:
  - For 10% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
  - For 47% of respondents it had to be collected specifically.
62. For the remainder of the respondents in each case the information existed and was accessible with some effort.
63. When asked how typical the levels of activity were in the data collection week, 84% responded that it was 'very' (24%) or 'quite' (59%) typical.
64. Specific comments around the data collection process included:
  - The difficulty of gaining returns from different departments of the local authority, and of encouraging other partners to participate.
  - The need for local co-ordination to ensure that definitions are not stretched and to explain definitions to colleagues and partners.
  - A perception of the limited value of snapshot surveys, though other respondents did indicate that the information gained was useful..

### ***Online return***

65. 72% of respondents said they were either 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' with the online form as a way of reporting the information. 21% said they were 'quite satisfied' and two respondents (7%) said they were 'not very satisfied'. No respondents said that they were not all satisfied with the online form.
66. The most common specific issue raised was that the electronic form had to be completed in one session and could not be saved or returned to later. In addition the provision of Word versions of the forms was suggested as a useful development.

### ***Next steps***

67. Encouragingly almost all of the respondents (96%) said they saw the relevance of the data being collected to their own work. No one said they did not think it was relevant and only one respondent was not sure. 97% said they would be willing to participate in the activity survey again, no one said they would not and one person did not know.

68. When asked what other information respondents felt should be collected in future activity surveys respondents gave a number of suggestions, including:
- Collection of more detailed information about participants, such as equalities monitoring information.
  - The collection of information in relation to specific fields of work, such as core skills; lifestyle; and employability.
  - The numbers of people in the groups provided with community capacity building support.
  - Data related to outcomes, as well as participation

## **Non-local authority responses**

### ***Response Rate***

69. Of the 80 returns from non-local authority partners, 60 (75%) included responses to the evaluation questions.

### ***Evaluation of the guidance***

70. Almost two thirds (60%) of respondents found the guidance issued for the data collection was either 'very helpful' or 'helpful'. Only one respondent found the guidance 'very unhelpful'. Similarly, 58% of respondents found the guidance either 'clear' or 'very clear'. Only one respondent found it 'very unclear'.
71. Almost half (48%) of all respondents were satisfied with the background information in the guidance and over half (52%) of all respondents were satisfied with the general guidance. 45% of respondents were satisfied with the summary and the questions in the guidance. However only 37% were satisfied with the definitions provided and a third of all respondents were 'quite' satisfied, suggesting that there may have been a degree of uncertainty around the definitions of activities and what should be counted.

### ***Evaluation of the data collection process***

72. The average total time taken to respond to the survey was found to be 3.5 hours (unsurprisingly this was significantly less than the time invested by local authorities). In part this may be due to the fact that non-local authority partner organisations reported that information was considerably more accessible to them.
73. When asked how easily accessible information was, the survey found that in respect of adult learning opportunities:
- For 45% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
  - For 15% it had to be collected specifically for the exercise
74. When asked about getting the information on youth work opportunities:
- For 40% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
  - For 14% of respondents it had to be collected specifically for the exercise.
75. And finally in relation to community capacity building:
- For 45% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
  - For 10% of respondents it had to be collected specifically.

76. Almost three-quarters of respondents felt the week selected (6 to 12 November) was either 'typical' or 'very typical' in terms of levels of activity (compared to 20% who reported it was 'quite' or 'very untypical' (the remainder did not know).

### **Online return**

77. Almost half (47%) of respondents were 'very satisfied' with the online return form as a way of reporting the information, and 35% said they were 'satisfied'. Only two respondents (4%) were 'not at all satisfied'.
78. A number of positive comments were made but less positive comments generally related to difficulties in being able to access the online form, either because it was unclear how to do so or because of technical difficulties.

### **Next steps**

79. A clear majority of respondents (63%) found overall that this data collection exercise was either 'very useful' or 'useful'. A further 30% of respondents felt overall that this data collection exercise was 'quite useful', with the remainder stating that the exercise was 'not very useful' or 'useless'.
80. Almost three quarters of respondents (73%) said that they did see the relevance of the data being collected to their own work, whilst 15% said they did not and the other 13% did not know.
81. Overwhelmingly, 96% of respondents said that they would be prepared to participate in the annual data collection activity again. Only one respondent said they would not and another one respondent said they did not know.
82. A range of responses were given when asked what information might be collected in future in a national data collection. These included:
- Collection of more detailed information about participants, such as equalities monitoring information.
  - Asking about the type of support that is given to potential learners, such as through Individual Learning Accounts.
  - Data related to outcomes, as well as participation.
  - Information on the 'weight' of the learning opportunities (for example through learning hours).
83. However one respondent commented that asking for too much (or too complex) information would make people less willing to participate in the data collection exercise.

### **Comparison between local authority and non-local authority responses**

84. Overall both sets of respondents were satisfied with the guidance and data collection process. However it is clear from the range of evaluation responses that there were two significant differences. These were:
- 85.
- **Satisfaction with definitions:** non-local authority partners were significantly less likely to express satisfaction with the definitions used (though over two-thirds were still 'satisfied' or 'quite satisfied'). This perhaps reflects the fact that this was the first year they were involved in this survey but perhaps also

less familiarity with CLD terminology compared to those working in local authorities.

- **Accessibility of data:** non-local authorities reported more frequently that they already held the data needed, and that it was accessible to them. This may be in part due to the differences in scale, given that most of the non-local authority respondents were from voluntary organisations. Unsurprisingly, an analogous pattern was reported in the time and number of staff involved in data collection.

## Summary

86. In summary, the evaluation of the data collection exercise for 2006 was broadly positive. The majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the guidance and the data collection process.
87. However, the low levels of returns by non-local authority partners makes it difficult to draw conclusions about how the process worked for them. It may be that those who were not satisfied with the guidance or the process simply did not make returns.
88. Encouragingly, however, of those that did take part the vast majority from both local authorities and non-local authority partners said that they could see the relevance of the exercise and would be willing to take part in it again.
89. Against this broadly positive picture, there remain a number of issues that should be considered in undertaking the exercise again:
  - Indications that non-local authority partners were less satisfied with the definitions provided.
  - Comments from some respondents about how the online return could be adapted to be more useful.
  - Comments about the type of information respondents would like to see collected in future (but there were also suggestions that asking for too much information could deter respondents from participating in the survey).

## What will happen now?

90. Building on the pilot process in 2005, the activity survey in 2006 appears to have been successful in further embedding the data collection process in local authorities. More local authorities than in the pilot appear to have taken the opportunity to gather data from other parts of their organisation and further opportunities still exist to promote this approach more widely.
91. Extending the data collection this year to non-local authority CLD partners has been a qualified success. A return rate of around 15% does not provide a national picture of CLD delivery by these partners but does provide a solid basis on which to try to expand participation.
92. The priority for the data collection is therefore to:
  - Continue to build appropriate data collection from local authorities, across the range of the departments and services which deliver CLD opportunities or support.
  - To build the participation of non-local authority partners, in particular from areas which did not make any non-local authority returns in this year.
93. We believe that these priorities can best be met in a situation in which we again run the data collection with as much continuity as possible. This gives participants the opportunity to get used to the definitions used and familiarise themselves with the process.
94. However, notwithstanding this, we will learn from the evaluation responses and make further efforts to improve the data collection exercise. We will do this by:

### ***Revising the guidance and supporting documentation***

95. Given the need to include ever wider ranges of partners in the exercise, it is particularly important that the guidance and definitions provided are as straight-forward and simple as possible. We will therefore:
  - Review the guidance and make it as 'plain english' as possible.
  - Present a better summary of the guidance, so that respondents can quickly and easily see what they are being asked to do.

### ***Improvements to the data gathering process***

96. Though the majority found it to be satisfactory, some respondents made comments about the ease of the data gathering process. In order to improve the process we will:
  - Provide paper-based templates of materials for use in local data collection.
  - Make it easier for respondents to make returns off-line, where the online system is not accessible to them or does not work for them.

### ***Appropriate communications***

97. We need to continue to build the information that is provided to colleagues and stakeholders at all levels about this data collection. We will:
  - Distribute this report to all those who took part in or facilitated the data collection.

- Continue to build dialogue with intermediary and national bodies around the data collection and encourage them to feed information on to their networks.
- Encourage CLD partnerships locally to highlight the usefulness of the information gained through the data collection and to encourage participation in the coming year.

### ***CLD ACTIVITY SURVEY 2007***

98. Building on the steps outlined above we intend to undertake the activity survey again in November this year, using substantively the same questions as this year. We would invite CLD providers and partnerships to begin planning on this basis.

# Appendix 1

## **Activity survey questions and definitions**

### **Questions for local authorities:**

1. Please state how many community-based learning opportunities for adults, provided directly by each local authority department's staff or volunteers, were accessed during the reporting period.
2. Please state how many youth work opportunities, provided directly by each local authority department's staff or volunteers were accessed during the reporting period.
3. Please state how many community organisations or groups received community development, community work, or community capacity building support, directly from each local authority department's staff or volunteers, during the reporting period.

### **Questions for non-local authority partners:**

1. Please state how many community-based learning opportunities for adults, provided directly by your organisation's staff or volunteers, were accessed during the reporting period.
2. Please state how many youth work opportunities, provided directly by your organisation's staff or volunteers were accessed during the reporting period.
3. Please state how many community organisations or groups received community development, community work, or community capacity building support, directly from your organisation's staff or volunteers, during the reporting period.

### **Definitions for local authorities and non-local authority partners:**

#### **1. Community-based learning opportunities for adults<sup>4</sup>**

*Courses, programmes or other learning opportunities, which are generated in the community in consultation with local learners, and which address issues of importance to improving the life chances of learners and their community. It is likely that some or all of the organisation, domestic arrangements and course content will be developed in dialogue with communities and participants.*

This **INCLUDES** learners, or potential learners, who are involved in the process of **negotiation** or **planning** for the delivery of learning opportunities. It does **NOT INCLUDE** people contacted more generally through surveys or questionnaires.

This **INCLUDES** engagement of learners, or potential learners, in work that enables or supports their involvement in learning opportunities (e.g. taster courses, or the provision of advice and guidance). It does **NOT INCLUDE** more general contact with individuals through promotional activities such as advertising.

This **INCLUDES** adult literacy and numeracy learners, where provision meets the above definition. We recognise that particularly for literacy and numeracy learners the generation of learning opportunities will, initially at least, usually be done on an individual basis.

---

<sup>4</sup> This definition is based on that used by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) in their inspection reports, supplemented by information from the quality indicators in *How Good is Our Community Learning and Development?*, and the personal development dimensions of LEAP.

**A KEY QUESTION IN DECIDING WHETHER SOMETHING IS A LEARNING OPPORTUNITY IS – “IS THERE A DELIBERATE ACTION THAT HELPS PARTICIPANTS TO GROW IN CONFIDENCE, KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING OR SKILLS?”**

## **2. Youth work opportunities<sup>5</sup>**

*Educational work with young people (outside formal education) that facilitates their personal, social and educational development and enables them to gain a voice, influence and place in society in a period of their transition from dependence to independence.*

*Youth work includes work with the following purposes:*

- *To build self-esteem and self-confidence;*
- *To develop the ability to manage personal and social relationships;*
- *To create learning and develop new skills;*
- *To encourage positive group atmospheres;*
- *To build the capacity of young people to consider risk, make reasoned decisions and take control;*
- *To encourage young people to develop a ‘world view’ which widens horizons and invites social commitment.*

*Youth work must be voluntary (i.e. young people choose to participate) and must build from where young people are (i.e. the educational process must be based on the issues and aspirations of participants).*

This **INCLUDES** work in a range of settings, such as community venues, youth cafes and on the street.

It **CAN INCLUDE** work in schools which meets the above definition of youth work.

It should **INCLUDE** work with young people of any age, where the local authority is offering the provision to those who are in the period of transition from childhood to adulthood. In each case the local authority will have their own definition of the ages targeted through youth work provision and that should be applied in this case.

This **INCLUDES** young people who are involved in the process of **negotiation** or **planning** for the delivery of youth work opportunities. It does **NOT INCLUDE** people contacted more generally through surveys or questionnaires.

It **INCLUDES** engagement of young people in work that enables or supports their involvement in youth work (e.g. taster courses, or the provision of advice and guidance). It does **NOT INCLUDE** more general contact with individuals through promotional activities such as advertising.

**A KEY QUESTION IN DECIDING WHETHER SOMETHING IS A YOUTH WORK OPPORTUNITY IS – “IS THERE A DELIBERATE ACTION THAT HELPS PARTICIPANTS TO GROW IN CONFIDENCE, KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING OR SKILLS?”**

## **3. Community development, community work, or community capacity building support<sup>6</sup>**

---

<sup>5</sup> This definition of youth work is based on that in the National Occupation Standards for Youth Work, subsequently developed for *Step it Up* and YouthLink Scotland's *Statement on the Nature and Purpose of Youth Work*. This has been supplemented by information from the quality indicators in *How Good is Our Community Learning and Development?*, and LEAP.

*The purpose of this activity will be to work with communities to bring about social change and justice. This can involve work with communities to:*

- *Identify their needs, opportunities, rights and responsibilities;*
- *Plan, organise and take action; and,*
- *Evaluate the effectiveness and impact of the action.*

*Included in this will be activities such as:*

- *Working on assessments of needs and aspirations with communities;*
- *Supporting them to develop plans to meet those needs;*
- *Promotion of broad-based participation in community affairs;*
- *Developing the skills and confidence of active community members and community leaders;*
- *Assisting communities to exercise power and influence;*
- *Supporting community engagement and representation;*
- *Supporting the development of community networks and organisations;*
- *Supporting community organisations to improve the quality of community life and contribute to social justice.*

Such support can include face-to-face meetings and support by email or telephone, during the reporting period. The support may be provided to one or more individual members of the groups, as well as to the whole group or organisation.

---

<sup>6</sup> This definition draws on those included in the National Occupational Standards for Community Work, combined with aspects of *How Good is our Community Learning and Development?* and LEAP.

## Appendix 2

### *Evaluation questions*

1. On a scale from 1 - 5 (where 1 is very helpful and 5 is very unhelpful), please indicate how helpful you found the guidance for the data collection?
2. On a scale from 1 - 5 (where 1 is very clear and 5 is very unclear) how would you rate the clarity of the guidance?
3. On a scale from 1 – 5 (where 1 is very satisfied and 5 is not at all satisfied), please rate your satisfaction with the following sections of the guidance:
  - Summary
  - Background
  - General guidance
  - Questions
  - Definitions
4. Please add any further comments on the guidance for the data collection.
5. Please estimate how long in hours it took to collect, collate and enter the information requested in this data collection (including time taken by others on your behalf).
6. Including yourself, how many people within your organisation were involved in the collection, collation and entering of the information?
7. Please identify which of these statements best describes the accessibility or otherwise of the information requested for each of the questions.
  - Information existed already and was readily accessible
  - Information existed already and was accessible with some effort
  - Information had to be collected specifically for this exercise
  - Did not answer this question
8. Do you think that the week for which you reported data was a typical one for your organisation, in terms of levels of activity?
  - Very typical
  - Quite typical
  - Quite untypical
  - Very untypical
  - Don't know
9. Please add any other comments about the process you were asked to undertake.
10. On a scale from 1 – 5 (where 1 is very satisfied and 5 is not at all satisfied), please rate your satisfaction with this online return form as a way of reporting the information.
11. Please add any further comments about the online return
12. On a scale from 1 - 5 (where 1 is very useful and 5 is useless), please state your overall view of the usefulness of this data collection?
13. Please add any further views about the overall usefulness or otherwise of this data collection.
14. Do you see the relevance of the data being collected to your own work?
  - Yes
  - No
  - Don't know
15. We plan to run this data collection annually. Would you be prepared to participate in it again?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

16. Please state any information that you feel should be collected in future in a national data collection.