



Regional Improvement Collaboratives – Analytical Meeting

Date: Monday 22 January 2018 – 14:00-16:00

Location: St Andrews House, Edinburgh. Conference Room B.

Attendees:

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| [redacted], SG (Chair) | [redacted] (ES) | [redacted] (W) |
| [redacted] (SG) | [redacted] (ES) | [redacted] (T) |
| [redacted] (SG) | [redacted] (IS) | [redacted] (SE) |
| [redacted] (SG) | [redacted] (SW) | [redacted] (N) |
| [redacted] (SG) | [redacted] (FV&WL) | [redacted] (SG) |

This brief note sets out the main issues discussed and decisions taken at the meeting.

Arrangements for Analysis in Collaboratives

Representatives from Collaboratives set out their overall structures for incorporating analytical support into the initial work of the RICs and plans for taking this forward. The approaches are varied and at different stages, although all acknowledged the importance of data and analysis in supporting the improvement agenda.

Information Governance/Data sharing

[redacted] outlined the process SG undertook in December to provide a range of nationally held data to each collaborative, noting that this was publicly available data and therefore there were no issues with sharing it. However to go further and to provide or share more detailed disclosive or individual level data would require a legal basis. [redacted] went on to set out the thinking the SG has done on the issue to date, including noting the upcoming introduction of GDPR which will require a clearer understanding of legal basis than we may previously have looked for. He then discussed 4 potential models and the strengths and weaknesses of each. The key questions are who is accountable, what is the legal basis for data sharing and who will get access to the data. As RICs do not have a legal status the preferred model of the SG would be to have a network of data sharing agreements (DSAs) between LAs within a RIC, which would allow the SG to share data for one LA with another within the same RIC.

Collaborative representatives noted that not much thought had been given to these issues as yet and they were not at the stage of requesting or sharing disclosive or pupil level data. However there was general agreement that the approach proposed sounded sensible. SG colleagues noted that setting up DSAs can be a time consuming process so whilst we are at early stages, it may be that work needs to start on this in order for it to be in place at the appropriate time.

Insight

[redacted] explained the work the Insight team have been doing to adapt Insight for use by RICs. Firstly they have developed the functionality to have the national benchmarking measures available at RIC level. National measures have been prioritized and can be available



in February. Other aspects of Insight can be developed to include RICs in the future. Additionally, the access policy will be amended and Collaborative leads will be asked to identify users. An agreement will need to be in place so that LAs are content that their data is available to other LAs in the collaborative.

There were mixed views from the group about the relevance of some data being available at RIC level. Some felt this was useful in setting the context for a collaborative whilst others questioned whether it was helpful in the key task of driving improvement. The meeting agreed that the comparisons measures should be released as part of the February Insight update as a prototype and views would be sought on their usefulness.

No-one at the meeting was aware of SEEMIS taking forward any work to build functionality within the system for RICs.

Education Scotland

[redacted] asked for views on Area Lead Officer (ALO) packs and whether these were felt to be valuable.

There was a clear interest in accessing the ALO packs but we had a very positive discussion about how we could streamline the requirements for data sharing protocols and reduce duplication if this information was made available on Insight as a downloadable pdf. The group agreed that the first course of action is to use the ALO packs as a starting point and review what would be useful to provide to the collaboratives. [redacted] agreed to lead a session quite quickly with the RIC contacts to do this.

National Statistical Outputs

[redacted] explained that we were looking for views on whether our national/official statistical outputs should include data presented by RIC – this could be included in our statistical publications and/or in the supplementary tables published on our website. This could apply to some datasets, rather than all, as some areas of our statistics are perhaps more useful and relevant for RICs than others.

Similar to the discussion regarding Insight measures, there were mixed views. There was a general feeling that this may be expected so there may be benefit in proactively shaping how data is presented at a RIC level. However, we should be cautious with regard to how data may be interpreted and recall that RICs are vehicles for improvement and not, for example, legal bodies. The meeting agreed that this could be an area which would evolve over time and that the June publication of attainment would likely be the first to include RIC level data. This would most likely be in supplementary tables. [redacted] will discuss with colleagues and will bring proposals on this to the group prior to the June publication.

Future working arrangements and data requirements



In concluding the meeting, [redacted] asked that attendees keep in mind the discussion on the purpose and value of data for RICs and that regional representatives consider their position with regard to DSAs as discussed earlier in the meeting.

The attendees agreed that the meeting was useful and, now that we are clearer on the nature of the discussion, that further meetings of the group would be helpful. [redacted] suggested a meeting in late April/early May and that it would be held somewhere other than Edinburgh.

Education Analysis
January 2018