

Lifelong Learning

Community Learning and Development (CLD) Activity Survey 2007

*(Results of the CLD Activity Survey undertaken during the
reporting week 5 – 11 November 2007)*



Contents

Executive Summary	Page 3
Background and Method	Page 6
Survey aims	Page 6
Survey design	Page 6
Evaluation process and quality assurance	Page 7
Data collection results	Page 9
Analysis of Survey Data	Page 10
Comparison of 2007 figures with 2006 survey results	Page 10
Local authority returns 2007	Page 10
Non-local authority returns 2007	Page 11
Acceptable uses of the information	Page 12
Evaluation of the Survey Process	Page 13
Introduction	Page 13
Evaluation results: local authority responses	Page 13
Evaluation results: responses from non local authority providers	Page 16
Comparison between local authority and non-local authority responses to evaluation questions	Page 19
Summary of evaluation	Page 19
Future of the CLD Activity Survey – what will happen next?	Page 20
Appendix 1 - Activity Survey questions and definitions	Page 21
Appendix 2 – Evaluation Questionnaire	Page 27

Executive Summary

Process

1. This report sets out the results of the 2007 national activity survey for community learning and development (CLD). The survey builds on the CLD Activity Survey which ran in November 2006, and the pilot survey carried out in November 2005.
2. The CLD 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 from 5th to 11th November 2007. All 32 local authorities were invited to participate in the survey. They were asked to coordinate the return of information on CLD activity carried out directly by their own staff and volunteers.
5. For the second year running, the invitation to take part in the survey was extended to non-local authority CLD partners who delivered CLD opportunities within the CLD partnership.
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;
 - the number of learning opportunities that they directly provided for young people; and
 - The number of community groups that they directly supported during the reporting week.

Results from the data collection

Local authority delivery

7. Returns were made by all 32 local authorities. In total, across Scotland, they reported that during the reporting week of 5 – 11 November 2007:
 - 62,855 adult learning opportunities were accessed;
 - 90,317 youth work opportunities were accessed; and
 - 3699 community groups were supported.

Delivery by non-local authority partners

8. The total number of returns made was 95. Participants were asked to make separate returns in relation to each local authority area in which they worked and therefore some organisations made more than one return. In total, 70 separate, non-local authority partner organisations, from 28 local authority areas made at least one return. There was no response from 4 local authority areas, other than that from the local authority itself.
9. In total, across Scotland, the non-local authority partners who took part in the survey reported that during the reporting week the following CLD opportunities were accessed via their organisation:
 - 8383 adult learning opportunities were accessed;
 - 4332 youth work opportunities were accessed; and
 - 409 community groups were supported.

Notes on the figures

10. The following points are important considerations in respect of all these figures:
 - This is the third year of data collection from local authorities, using substantively the same questions in terms of their own direct delivery. It is apparent that local authorities have continued to refine their data collection processes over the past 3 years. The reported improvements in accessibility of data indicate improved performance information systems in many local authorities.
 - Though the repetition of the questions asked of local authorities in the pilot and previous surveys allows for some comparison, it is advisable to be cautious in drawing conclusions at this stage. Data collection over a longer period will be required to robustly identify trends over time.
 - Ninety five returns from non-local authority partners clearly substantially under-represents actual delivery; this number represents about 14% of the organisations who were invited to participate. These figures should therefore not be taken as indicative of the level of non-local authority delivery across Scotland.
 - The non-local authority partners which made returns in 2006 and 2007 are largely different in each year, with only a small number making returns in both years. Worthwhile conclusions can therefore not be drawn from year on year comparison of non-local authority figures at this stage as it is not based on figures from the same set of organisations.
 - Due to the wide range of local factors impacting on the level of CLD delivery, the data do not support comparison between local areas.
11. More detailed consideration is included in the main report.

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:

- The evaluation of the data collection exercise for 2007 was broadly positive. The majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the guidance and the data collection process.
- However, the continued low level 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.
- Against this broadly positive picture, there remain a number of issues that should be considered if undertaking the exercise again:
- Feedback in the evaluation forms indicates that some aspects of the guidance were clear for those with a CLD background, but less clear for those from other disciplines.
- The length of the guidance was an issue and several local authorities reported that they had produced abridged versions for use in the field.
- The online format was welcomed by many as a quick and efficient way of making the returns; however, for those who did have difficulties, it was perceived as a major problem. Comments received on the evaluation, indicate that smaller organisations in particular, do not always have easy access to the internet or the staff with the IT skills to complete the survey on-line.
- During the data collection process, it became evident that problems had arisen from providing a sample form. Feedback from the 2006 survey suggested that we send this out with the guidance to allow participants to see what information would be required prior to completing the on-line survey. A word version of the survey form was sent out with the documentation for the 2007 survey. However, several organisations attempted to return the sample form instead of completing the on-line survey, resulting in frustration which was reflected in several comments on the evaluation of this year's survey.

THE FUTURE OF THE CLD ACTIVITY SURVEY

13. Learning Connections currently plans to run a CLD Activity Survey in 2009. Over the coming months, we will work with partners to review the experience of running the survey in 2005, 2006 and 2007, the issues that have emerged from that and the options for collecting data on the outputs of CLD in future.

14. We would welcome your views on how data which can measure the scope and scale of all CLD provision (by local authorities and other sectors) on a national basis could be progressed.

Background and Method

15. This report sets out the key findings of the 2007 national activity survey for community learning and development (and associated evaluation). The survey was carried out by Learning Connections (part of the Lifelong Learning Directorate in the Scottish Government) with the objective of quantifying the scale of the activity delivered by community learning and development (CLD) providers across Scotland.
16. 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. The CLD Performance Information Project (PIP) was launched at a seminar in October 2004 and ran through to June 2006. It took forward strands of work focusing on improving information on the outcomes, outputs and inputs of CLD. The project recognised the importance of a robust but limited core of information at national level, and of supporting CLD partners to improve local information for their own management purposes.
17. Learning Connections is now working with partners to take forward a programme of work building on the Performance Information Project:
 - To maintain and develop the national evidence base on CLD activity and outcomes which can feed in to the National Performance Framework and inform policy;
 - To support development of local performance information systems and of work to evidence the outcomes of CLD at local level.
18. The robust collection of quantitative information on the CLD activity delivered 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.
19. 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.

Survey aims

20. 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.
21. Similarly at the national level there is a need for information which quantifies the scope and scale of CLD in Scotland to support the development and evaluation of national policies and priorities by the Scottish Government. This information is used along with other information being gathered by Learning Connections, from a range of sources, to provide an increasingly accurate picture of all aspects of the CLD sector.

Survey design

22. The survey was substantively based on the previous CLD Activity Survey which took place in November 2006.

23. 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.
24. For the first two priorities, providers were asked to report all the opportunities provided directly by them that were accessed in the reporting 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.
25. For the third national priority, community capacity building, we asked for the number of community groups that had received support during the reporting week.
26. 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.
27. The counts of opportunities accessed were carried out over the course of the reporting week, 5 – 11 November 2007. This was expected to give a snapshot of a typical week.
28. 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.
29. 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 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.
30. 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 positively evaluated in previous surveys and were used substantively unchanged in this year's survey. In addition, as a response to feedback in the 2006 evaluation, examples were included in the guidance. A word version of the survey form was also included to allow participants to prepare the appropriate data prior to completion of the on-line survey form.

Evaluation process and quality assurance

31. 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. Some figures were revised and updated as a result of this.
32. The continuity between the survey questions in the previous surveys gave the opportunity to compare figures for local authority delivery between the two years. The checking process involved identifying the biggest changes year on year. This was done in two stages:
 - Firstly, by stratifying the data for local authorities into quartiles (8 local authorities in each quartile) based on the 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.
 - Then, the upper quartile was checked for significant variation between the 2006 figures and the 2007 figures. Where significant changes were detected, lead officers were re-contacted and asked to either confirm or amend their figures. Two lead officers responded with changes to their local authority returns and the others confirmed, giving reasons for the differences.
33. An evaluation questionnaire was included in the on-line survey form. The person coordinating the data collection was asked to complete it with regards to the survey form and the guidance attached.
34. The evaluation questions can be found in Appendix 2.

Data collection results

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

Results of the national CLD data collection: November 2007

National Priorities	Number of responses	Scotland total
Q1: National priority one: achievement through learning for adults		
(a). Number of community-based learning opportunities for adults, provided directly by local authority ¹ staff or volunteers, accessed during the reporting period.	32	62855
(b). Number of community-based learning opportunities for adults, provided directly by staff or volunteers from other organisations, accessed during the reporting period.	95	8383
Q2: National priority two: achievement through learning for young people		
(a). Number of youth work opportunities, provided directly by local authority ¹ staff or volunteers, accessed during the reporting period.	32	90317
(b). Number of youth work opportunities, provided directly by staff or volunteers from other organisations, accessed during the reporting period.	95	4332
Q3: National priority three: achievement through building community capacity		
(a). Number of community groups or organisations which received community development, community work or community capacity building support directly from local authority ¹ staff or volunteers, during the reporting period.	32	3699
(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.	95	409

1. Culture and Sport Glasgow was, until April 2007 Glasgow City Council Cultural & Leisure Services, but is now a charitable company carrying out services on behalf of the local authority. The organisation is in effect the local authority provider of CLD and for continuity; their returns have been included under local authority provision.

Analysis of survey data

Comparison of 2007 figures with 2006 survey results.

36. Figures for provision by local authorities for 2006 and 2007 are directly comparable. It is not possible to compare non local authority returns because few of the same organizations responded in both years. A comparison of figures for local authority provision is given below. As highlighted elsewhere in this report, these should be treated with some caution.
- Q1: National priority one: achievement through learning for adults. The 2007 figures show an increase of nearly 6000 (10%) community based adult learning opportunities compared to 2006.
 - Q2: National priority two: achievement through learning for young people. The 2007 figures show a decrease of just over 5000 (6%) in community based youth work opportunities accessed compared to 2006.
 - Q3: National priority three: achievement through building community capacity. The 2007 figures show a decrease of just over 1000 (22%) in the 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.

Local Authority Returns 2007

37. Based on the survey data and the evaluations, we have come to the following conclusions regarding the data:
- Where there are significant differences between the figures for individual local authorities for 2006 and 2007, either amendments or plausible reasons for this were given by the responsible Lead Officer.
 - It is apparent from the increased number of departments involved that local authorities continue to develop the comprehensiveness of their returns.
 - It is not generally possible to read much from the changes in the figures in the early years of the survey. A number of sweeps of the survey would be needed to build up information on trends over time.
 - It appears likely that the figures for community capacity building are an exception to this. The total number of community groups reported to have received support from local authority staff in the 2007 survey week is approximately 20% less in comparison to both the 2006 and 2005 surveys. Comments on several returns and from lead officers during the quality assurance process indicated that there had been a reduction in such provision by their local authority. This evidence raises important questions in relation to the scale of community capacity building activity being delivered through CLD partnerships.
38. 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. A significant number of local authorities had made efforts to collect information from a wider range of departments (beyond 'core' CLD services)

indicating that there is commitment to improving the depth and quality of the data collected on local authority provision.

39. There was a significant degree of variation in how 'department' had been interpreted by different local authorities but the range of departments mentioned in returns gives a clear indication that 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 82 different departments (an average of 2.6 across the 32 LA returns). In 2006, this was 71, (an average of 2.2 across 32 LA returns).
 - Youth work opportunities were reported to be delivered by 65 different departments (an average of 2.0 across the 32 returns). In 2006, this was 61, (an average of 1.9 across 32 LA returns).
 - Community capacity building support was reported as being provided by 65 different departments (an average of 2.0 across the 32 returns). In 2006, this was 66, an average of 2.1 across 32 LA returns.

Non- Local Authority Partners' returns 2007

40. 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.
41. Year on year comparison between the participating non-local authority organisations shows that there was only a small proportion that made returns in both the 2006 and 2007 surveys. It is therefore impossible to compare the numbers in a meaningful way.
42. In advance of the data collection, CLD partnership lead officers were asked to provide a list of the partners to which they would pass the invitation to take part. In total, 30 lead officers provided this information and they indicated that they would be passing the invitation on to 659 partners (an average of 20.6 per partnership). The number of partners invited ranged from 4 to 124.
43. Ninety five returns were received from non-local authority partners throughout Scotland. Three returns came from partnerships that had not provided a list of partners prior to the survey. The response rate was therefore 14.4% of the 659 partners that we know were invited to take part. The number of responses ranged from no partners in two areas where we know invitations were issued, to a maximum of 18 partners in one area. This is an average of 3.4 responses per partnership.
44. The majority of non-local authority responses (77.9%) came from voluntary sector organisations; the next largest sector was colleges and universities with 14.7% of responses; the "other statutory" sector was the smallest, with 7.4% of responses.
45. There was an increase in the number of responses from voluntary organisations, up from 50 in 2006 to 74 in 2007. However, there was a significant reduction in the number of organisations in the "other statutory" category responding to the survey; 16 responses in 2006, compared to 7 responses in 2007.

Acceptable uses of the information

46. The data have been collected with the aim of establishing Scotland-level counts. Although the data have been collected at local authority level they do 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.
47. Comparison between the 2006 and 2007 figures (for local authority delivery only) appears to bear this out. Though individual figures have fluctuated, at Scotland level, they are broadly similar. Further sweeps of the survey will be needed to establish trends over time and allow for any random variation from year to year.
48. The data collected by individual authorities can be used 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 of the Survey Process

Introduction

49. 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 data collection.
50. Results from the local authority and non-local authority evaluations have been summarised below. Quantitative results from the respondent evaluation forms are supplemented by qualitative information from the free text fields in the evaluation form.
51. The guidance issued to all respondents was split into: evaluation form guidance; data collection process; online return; and overall.

Evaluation results: local authority responses

Local authority response rate

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

Evaluation of the guidance by local authority respondents

53. Guidance for the data collection exercise was issued along with the online survey. Over three quarters (78%) of local authority respondents found the guidance in general either 'very helpful' or 'quite helpful'. Two (6%) found the guidance quite unhelpful. The rest said that they found the guidance 'helpful'.
54. Respondents were then asked how useful they found particular sections of the guidance and there were a range of views on this:
 - Summary section - Eighty one percent of local authority respondents were either 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' with the summary in the guidance and a further 9% were 'quite satisfied'. Only two respondents said they were 'quite unsatisfied' with this section.
 - Clarity of the guidance – Eighty one percent of local authority respondents thought the summary was either 'very clear' or 'quite clear' and two respondents felt it was 'quite unclear'. The remainder said it was clear.
 - On the 'Background' section in the guidance only two local authority respondents (6%) said they were 'not very satisfied' with the information provided. Seventy eight percent were either 'very satisfied' or 'quite satisfied' with the information provided in the background section. The remaining 9 percent were 'satisfied' with the background section.
55. Specific comments offered by local authority respondents, in relation to the guidance issued included:
 - Guidance is still not clear for those for whom CLD is not a core part of their function or background.
 - Whilst clear to CLD officers, it was reported that the guidance was too lengthy and may deter some potential contributors from participating. Several Lead

Officers in local authorities had produced abridged versions of the guidance for their staff.

- Several positive comments were made regarding the inclusion of examples in the definitions this year and it is clear that this helped respondents to understand the definitions.
- There are still problems in communicating that returns should be made for the number of groups who were assisted during the reporting week rather than the number of people in those groups. It was suggested that this should be made clear on the form as well as in the guidance.

Evaluation of the data collection process by local authority respondents

56. Respondents were asked questions about the time and effort required to complete the survey. The average time taken by local authority respondents to complete survey in 2007 was 33 hours, slightly lower than in 2006, when the average was 36 hours. There was a huge variation in the amount of time taken by various organisations; the minimum being 3 hours and the maximum 200. Eight local authority areas did not respond to this question and some of those commented on the difficulty in recording the amount of time spent on the task.
57. 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 2 in one local authority to over 200 in another. This question may be open to different interpretation in different authorities, where some include everyone involved in the collection process and others count only those who collate the information.
58. When asked how easily accessible information was, the survey found in relation to local authority respondents that of those who answered the question:

Q1: National priority one: achievement through learning for adults

- For 25% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
- For 16% it had to be collected specifically for the exercise;
- For 50% the data existed already and was accessible with some effort.
- The remainder did not answer this question

Q2: National priority two: achievement through learning for young people

- For 19% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
- For 28% of respondents it had to be collected specifically for the exercise;
- For 44% data existed already and was accessible with some effort.
- The remainder did not answer this question.

Q3: National priority three: achievement through building community capacity.

- For 13% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
- For 34% of respondents it had to be collected specifically for this exercise;
- For 44% data existed already and was accessible with some effort.
- The remainder did not answer this question.

59. More local authorities reported that the data existed already and was accessible with some effort, and less reliance on collecting the data specifically for the exercise, than in 2006. This may indicate that Local Authorities are improving their own management information systems and staff are able to access data collected as a matter of routine to complete the CLD Activity Survey. Indeed, one Local Authority commented in the

2007 survey, that recording data is now a practice that all staff are required to do in the normal course of their work.

60. It is expected that the next national survey of CLD Activity will be carried out, depending on the results of the review, in 2009. Over the years, as staff become increasingly familiar with national data collection, management information systems will be able to adapt to easily obtain the information needed. This has come a long way since the pilot study in 2005, when for example, for building community capacity, 60% of respondents had to collect data specifically for this exercise (now 38%).
61. When asked how typical the levels of activity were in the data collection week, 72% of local authorities responded that they were either 'very' or 'quite' typical. However, a substantial number (19%) reported that it was either quite or very untypical. Many of these respondents did not give specific reasons for the week being untypical, however, those that did, mentioned either bad weather leading to many cancellations or that the reporting week coincided with special weeks in their programme which either increased or decreased the numbers of participants in comparison to a "typical" week. It was open to organisations to move the reporting week under special circumstances and this could have been applied, particularly where the weather played a significant part in the week being untypical.
62. Specific comments around the data collection process included:
 - Difficulties in calculating the number of hours spent on the survey.
 - Understanding of "what is CLD" is patchy.

Evaluation of the online return process by local authority respondents

63. 69% of local authority respondents said they were either 'very satisfied' or 'quite satisfied' with the online form as a way of reporting the information. 17% said they were 'satisfied' and four respondents (13.8%) said they were 'not very satisfied'. No respondents said that they were not at all satisfied with the online form.
64. 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. Unfortunately, this was a restriction due to the survey software used for the on-line return. A copy of the survey form in Word format was sent out with the documentation for 2007. However, some respondents mistook this for the actual survey form and tried to return it on-line. The problems arising from this may have been the cause of increased dissatisfaction with on-line reporting, though it should be remembered that the vast majority of respondents in local authorities were satisfied with this type of submission.
65. The computer software used for the 2006 and 2007 Activity Survey has now been replaced by a system which will allow people to go in and out of the survey before submitting it. It may not, therefore be necessary to send out the word version of the survey for future collections.

Relevance of data collected to local authority respondents

66. Encouragingly, most of the respondents (83%) said they saw the relevance of the data being collected to their own work. Two said they did not think it was relevant and three were not sure. A large majority (26 respondents) said they would be willing to participate in the activity survey again; four said they did not know and two did not answer the question. No one said they would not participate next year.

67. When asked what other information should be collected in future activity surveys, local authority respondents gave a number of suggestions, including:
- More targeted questions on learners' experience,
 - The numbers of people in the groups provided with community capacity building support.
 - Analysis of male/ female split
 - As with last year, there were requests for more detailed information regarding the depth of the learning experience eg staff time or a breakdown of the types of opportunities available.
 - Educational guidance sessions should be recorded separately.
 - Recording partnership work which takes place at the venue.
 - It may be useful to stipulate whether activity is taking place in priority or non priority data zones.
 - Data related to outcomes, as well as participation.

Local information systems

68. It is clear that many local authorities have shown commitment to developing and improving their information systems and as a result of this, collection of the basic information we ask for on the CLD Activity Survey is a much easier for many local authority staff.

Evaluation results: responses from non-local authority providers

Response Rate by non-local authority respondents

69. Of the 95 returns submitted by non-local authority partners, 70 (74%) included responses to the evaluation questions. The difference between the number of returns and the number of responses to the evaluation is largely explained by the fact that some organisations submitted more than one response because they operated across several local authority areas but only completed one evaluation. There were a small number of organisations which did not respond to the evaluation at all and organisations did not always respond to all questions.
70. The number of responses varies from question to question in the evaluation and it should be noted that percentages in the following section, for non-local authority organisations, will be calculated using the number of actual responses to each question. Therefore any percentages should be read as 'the percentage of those who responded to this question'.

Evaluation of the guidance by non-local authority respondents

71. Respondents were then asked how useful they found particular sections of the guidance and there were a range of views on this. Scoring was based on a 5 point graded scale where 1 was very helpful/ clear / satisfied and 5 was very unhelpful/ unclear/ dissatisfied. Data on responses by section are set out below.
- General guidance on data collection - Based on 69 responses, almost two thirds (61%) of respondents found the guidance issued for the data collection was either 'very helpful' or 'helpful'. Three respondents found the guidance 'unhelpful'.

- Clarity of guidance - Based on 68 responses, 57% of respondents found the guidance either 'clear' or 'very clear'. Over a third (34%), however, found the guidance neither clear nor unclear and six respondents found it 'quite unclear'.
- Summary – 62% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the summary section of the guidance. A further 36% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with this section and only one respondent was quite dissatisfied.
- Background – Just over two thirds of respondents (67%) were either very satisfied or satisfied with the background information given in the guidance. A further 30% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and only 2 respondents (3%) said they were quite dissatisfied.
- Questions – 60% percent of respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the questions asked in the survey, the remainder were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. They are the same questions which have been asked every year of the survey since it began.
- Definitions – 64% of respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the definitions. A further 34% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and only one respondent was not at all satisfied. Learning Connections responded to suggestions in 2006 feedback and included more practical examples in the guidance. This received positive feedback in the 2007 evaluation, saying that it was helpful in identifying appropriate activities to be included in the survey.

Evaluation of the data collection process by non-local authority respondents

72. The average total time taken to respond to the survey by non-local authority respondents was found to be 2 hours (this was significantly less than the time invested by local authorities). Factors affecting this may be differences in scale of the organisations concerned, and the fact that non-local authority partner organisations reported that information was considerably more accessible to them.
73. Non-local authority organisations only answered the questions on the survey that were relevant to their activity. The percentages below only relate to the organisations which answered the specific question.
74. When asked how easily accessible information was, the survey found that in respect of adult learning opportunities:
 - For 52% of respondents, information was easily and readily accessible;
 - For 37% of respondents, the information existed already and was available with some effort.
 - For 11% it had to be collected specifically for the exercise.
 - (Based on 65 responses)
75. When asked about getting the information on youth work opportunities:
 - For 60% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
 - For 34% of respondents, the information existed already and was available with some effort.
 - For 6% of respondents it had to be collected specifically for the exercise.
 - (Based on 35 responses)

76. And finally, in relation to community capacity building:
- For 60% of respondents information was easily and readily accessible;
 - For 30% of respondents, the information existed already and was available with some effort.
 - For 9% of respondents it had to be collected specifically.
 - (Based on 43 responses)
77. As with the local authority organisations, these figures appear to indicate an improvement in the availability of existing data which can be accessed for the purposes of this survey. However, that is only true of the organisations who actually participated. The low response rate is a concern; it means that there is still little reliable information on the overall scale of provision by these sectors.
78. Care should be taken when comparing year on year for the non-local authority sector as the majority of organisations who responded are not the same for both years.
79. More than three-quarters (77%) of respondents felt the week selected (5 to 11 November 2007) was either 'typical' or 'very typical' in terms of levels of activity (compared to 21% who reported it was 'quite' or 'very untypical' (the remainder did not know). Reasons given for the week being untypical included other events such as in-service week and youth work week. Some areas were affected by bad weather and others simply reported the week was particularly quiet eg because of availability of volunteers or other workers.

Evaluation of the online return by non-local authority respondents

80. Almost half (49%) of respondents were 'very satisfied' with the online return form as a way of reporting the information, and 28% said they were 'satisfied'. Four were dissatisfied and another 5 were not at all satisfied; that is 8% percent who gave negative feedback on this aspect of the survey.
81. The vast majority of respondents were satisfied with completing the survey on-line and there were several positive comments from non-local authority respondents regarding the efficiency of responding on-line. 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.
82. There were some suggestions for improving the existing on-line survey, relating to the software:
- The survey had to be completed in one sitting and this proved problematic. (New software is now available to be used in future surveys, which will enable people to go in and out of the returns before final submission).
 - There were several comments suggesting that creating an option to print out responses for their records should be explored. Learning Connections are currently looking into how this can be done.

Comparison between local authority and non-local authority responses to evaluation questions

83. 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:
- 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 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 readily 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 of evaluation

84. In summary, the evaluation of the data collection exercise for 2007 was broadly positive. The majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the guidance and the data collection process.
85. 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.
86. 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.
87. Against this broadly positive picture, there remain a number of issues that should be considered in future collection of data on CLD activity:
- 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).

Future of the CLD Activity Survey - What Will Happen Next?

88. The survey has now been running for 3 years, including the pilot year. During that time, we have established that the local authority data is robust and stable and this data has been used to inform the Scottish Government of the scope and scale of CLD provision in Scotland. There is also evidence of improvements in the local information systems that can underpin the efficient collection of national level data
89. However, it has not yet been possible to establish a system that can deliver robust national data on provision of CLD by non-local authority partners. In consequence, the CLD Activity Survey in its current form only provides a partial picture of the overall scale of CLD activity across Scotland.
90. In the past year, the relationship between the Scottish Government local authorities has changed substantially with the introduction of the Concordat and the National Performance Framework.
91. There will still be a need for the Scottish Government, together with CoSLA and SCVO, to understand the scope and scale of CLD in Scotland as a whole and there is a need to review how information to inform that understanding can best be collected on a national scale.
92. The initial research commissioned by Learning Connections on measuring outcomes is now complete and we are exploring with partners the way forward in collecting information on the outcomes of CLD. There is a need to consider the relevance of the output data collected by the CLD Activity Survey in that context.
93. In the light of all these factors, Learning Connections will carry out a review of the CLD Activity Survey and the options for future collection of national data on CLD activity. This will include consideration of: the continued relevance of the data; how information needed at national level can be collected in future; and the wider context of data requirements flowing from the National Performance Framework.
94. We look forward to working with our stakeholders in carrying out this review, and to ensure that future data collection is relevant, easy to complete and places the minimum possible burden on participants. Subject to the outcome of the review, we currently expect the next national Survey of CLD Activity to run in November 2009.

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 organisations' staff or volunteers, were accessed during the reporting period?
2. Please state how many youth work opportunities, provided directly by your organisations' 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 organisations' staff or volunteers, during the reporting period?

Definitions:

National priority one: achievement through learning for adults

Please state how many **community-based learning opportunities for adults**, provided directly by each local authority department's / service's staff or volunteers, were **accessed** during the reporting period.

DEFINITION A: community-based learning opportunities for adults¹

Courses, programmes or other learning opportunities, which are generated in the community in consultation with local people, and which address issues of importance to improving the life chances of learners and their community. It is likely that some

¹This 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.

or all of the organisation, domestic arrangements and course content will be developed in dialogue with communities and participants.

This INCLUDES people 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 people 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 people engaged in adult literacy and numeracy learning, where provision meets the above definition. We recognise that opportunities for literacy and numeracy learning in particular, will usually be generated, initially at least, on an individual basis.

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?”

DEFINITION B: provided directly by each local authority department’s staff or volunteers

This means people working for a department/ service of your local authority, either paid or unpaid, to deliver community-based learning opportunities for adults.

This INCLUDES situations where they are **delivering** learning opportunities in partnership with other organisations but NOT where their input involves supporting other organisations to deliver learning (where such support is given to small voluntary or community groups, consideration should be given to whether such support should be included in the community capacity building section).

DEFINITION B: provided directly by your organisation’s staff or volunteers

This means those working for the reporting organisation, either paid or unpaid, to deliver community-based learning opportunities for adults.

This INCLUDES situations where they are **delivering** learning opportunities in partnership with other organisations but NOT where their input involves supporting other organisations to deliver learning. Where such support is given to small voluntary or community groups, consideration should be given to whether such support should be included in the community capacity building section.

DEFINITION C: accessed

This means that a specific learning opportunity was taken up by an individual. As previously stated each accessing of a learning opportunity should be counted, even where the same individual is accessing a number of learning opportunities during the reporting period.

National priority two: achievement through learning for young people

Please state how many **youth work opportunities, provided directly by each local authority department's/service's staff or volunteers or by your organisation's staff or volunteers** were **accessed** during the reporting period.

DEFINITION D: youth work opportunities²

Educational work with young people (not as part of formal educational provision) 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 enable young people to work together positively in groups;*
- *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

² 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.

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?”

DEFINITION E: provided directly by each local authority department’s staff or volunteers

This means people working for a department/ service of your local authority, either paid or unpaid, to deliver youth work opportunities.

This INCLUDES situations where they are **delivering** youth work opportunities in partnership with other organisations but NOT where their input involves supporting other organisations to deliver learning (where such support is given to small voluntary or community groups, consideration should be given to whether such support should be included in the community capacity building section).

DEFINITION E: provided directly by your organisation’s staff or volunteers

This means those working for your organisation, either paid or unpaid, to deliver youth work opportunities.

This INCLUDES situations where they are **delivering** youth work opportunities in partnership with other organisations but NOT where their input involves supporting other organisations to deliver learning (where such support is given to small voluntary or community groups, consideration should be given to whether such support should be included in the community capacity building section).

DEFINITION F: accessed

This means that a specific youth work opportunity was taken up by an individual. As previously stated each accessing of a youth work opportunity should be counted, even where the same individual is accessing a number of youth work opportunities during the reporting period.

National priority three: achievement through building community capacity

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, or directly from your organisation's staff or volunteers**, during the reporting period.

DEFINITION G: community organisations or groups

These are groups or organisations formed and controlled by members of a community (defined by place, interest or identity) who have come together to bring about some agreed change.

It is recognised that often community development can involve supporting the early formation of such groups. In these circumstances organisations should INCLUDE support to informal networks, which aims to enable the development of community organisations or groups.

DEFINITION H: community development, community work, or community capacity building support³

The purpose of this activity is to improve the quality of community life, and contribute to social justice, by building community capacity. This involves 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.*

It includes:

- *Working on assessments of needs and aspirations with communities;*
- *Supporting them to develop plans to meet those needs;*
- *Supporting people to be confident, skilled and active members of the community;*
- *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;*
- *Assisting community organisations to include a wide range of people in their work;*

³ 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.

- *Supporting community organisations to get access to resources and to deliver services effectively;*
- *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;*
- *Assisting community organisations to plan, manage and assess their work effectively.*

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.

It CAN INCLUDE work with people of all ages.

A KEY QUESTION IN DECIDING WHETHER SOMETHING IS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY WORK, OR COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING SUPPORT IS – “IS THERE A DELIBERATE ACTION THAT AIMS TO ENABLE THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS OR GROUPS?”.

DEFINITION 1: directly from each local authority department’s staff or volunteers

This means people working for a department/ service of your local authority, either paid or unpaid, to deliver community development, community work, or community capacity building support.

This INCLUDES situations where they are **providing** such support in partnership with other organisations.

DEFINITION 1: directly from your organisation’s staff or volunteers

This means people working for your organisation, either paid or unpaid, to deliver community development, community work, or community capacity building support.

This INCLUDES situations where they are **providing** such support in partnership with other organisations.

Appendix 2

Evaluation questions

The following questions were included in both the Local Authority and Non-Local Authority questionnaires:

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?

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?

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

Please add any further comments on the guidance for the data collection (free text).

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). (Free text).

Including yourself, how many people within your organisation were involved in the collection, collation and entering of the information? (Free text).

Please identify which of these statements best describes the accessibility or otherwise of the information requested for each of the questions:

1. Information existed already and was readily accessible
2. Information existed already and was accessible with some effort
3. Information had to be collected specifically for this exercise
4. Did not answer this question

(Respondents were asked to answer this question separately for each National Priority).

Do you think that the week for which you reported data was a typical one for your organisation, in terms of levels of activity? (Drop down menu)

- Very typical
- Quite typical
- Quite untypical
- Very untypical
- Don't know

Please add any other comments about the process you were asked to undertake. (Free text)

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.

Please add any further comments about the online return. (Free text)

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?

Please add any further views about the overall usefulness or otherwise of this data collection. (Free text).

Do you see the relevance of the data being collected to your own work? (drop down menu)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

We plan to run this data collection annually. Would you be prepared to participate in it again? (Drop down menu)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please state any information that you feel should be collected in future in a national data collection. (Free text)



© Crown copyright 2008

ISBN: 978-0-7559-1784-6

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

Produced for the Scottish Government by RR Donnelley B57172 07-08

Published by the Scottish Government, August 2008

ISBN 978-0-7559-1784-6



9 780755 917846

w w w . s c o t l a n d . g o v . u k