

Note of Cycle Training Standards Board Executive Meeting At RoSPA 2 March 2007

Those Present :- Claire Spink (DfT), Bob Richards (DfT), Philip Darnton (Cycling England), Steve Garidis (Cycling England), Kevin Mayne (CTC), Rob Fuller (CTC), John Mills (British Cycling), Steve Whitehouse (LARSOA) and Kevin Clinton (RoSPA). In attendance presenting item 3 Ken Spence and Pete Zanzottera (Consultants).

Apologies were noted from the Scottish Executive.

1. Welcome and Selection of chair

After a short discussion Claire Spink (CS) agreed to take the chair for an initial period but thought that DfT should not hold the chair for long. CTSB was an independent body. CS added that DfT would provide a basic secretariat until the new CTSB officer was in post.

2. Housekeeping Issues

There was a consensus that the CTSB would need a 'corporate' identity and web presence where the National Standards could be formally published. Steve Garidis (SG) distributed sample logos and CTSB website pages for the meeting to consider as Cycling England had been asked to take forward this aspect of setting up the CTSB. The meeting accepted the logo and website samples although the point was made that a number of accrediting bodies in other fields had similar 'tick' style logos. SG agreed to ensure that the logo was not too similar to others.

A job description and estimate of officer time would be needed for the Officer Post advert which should support both the Executive Board and the CTSB Working Groups. Philip Darnton (PD) added that it might be possible for Cycling England to allocate someone from their Advice Team to help out until the Officer Post was filled. **It was agreed that Executive Board papers would be circulated to the sub groups and made public via the new website.**

CS added that CTSB would need to advise the working groups on how they engage with the Executive Board to ensure the recent breakdown of communications between the end of CTRG and the beginning of CTSB did not reoccur.

3. Pilot of full Scheme Accreditation

Rob Fuller (RF) introduced this item. He reminded the Executive Group that scheme accreditation was not new and it was always known it would be needed to build on the experience of a quality framework which was already long

established. He also reminded the meeting that a provisional accreditation process had already been agreed. This was being called 'Provisional Bikeability accreditation' and was a separate process to the pilot and future full accreditation (although it was likely that once a full accreditation system was functioning, those with provisional Bikeability accreditation should be able to become fully accredited very easily.)

RF explained that the starting point for the pilot was whether 'self assessment' by training providers was a reliable method of accrediting schemes. The trial by Ken Spence (KS) and Pete Zanzottera (PZ) showed that an outside assessment procedure of some description was needed to supplement a self-assessment procedure.

KS and PZ gave a presentation on the pilot:

Summary of Presentation on the Pilot

- The organisations who took part in the pilot were CTUK, Bike Right, Hertfordshire CC, Wiltshire CC, Life Cycle and Derby City Council. All completed a self-assessment.
- The main findings of the pilot were :-
- Using a third party to assess a scheme's documentation showed that self assessment is useful as a documentary exercise but does not necessarily reveal exactly how the scheme is delivered in practice;
- Follow-up visits used to check whether third party assessment was accurate usually required a full day to ensure enough time to check that delivery reflected documentation submitted
- However it was considered that a third party checking a scheme's documentation significantly reduced the risk a scheme failing to reach the National Standard This was also felt to be the most robust method of ensuring quality.
- Visits were seen as being extremely useful, not only in enabling assessors see and satisfy themselves exactly how a scheme was delivered. Those running the pilot saw the visit as an opportunity to offer ongoing 'mentoring'.
- A discussion followed. The Board were impressed with both the pilot and the results and assessments presented. PD expressed concern that the pilot had not only assessed how schemes should be accredited but also the performance of instructors in delivering it. He stressed that the process

required was one to *evaluate and accredit the cycle training scheme*, not delivery. CTSB already had a robust accreditation method for ensuring the quality of instructors.

There followed a general discussion on the assessment of the pilot and the way forward. All agreed that the trial process of 100% follow up visits was clearly the ideal method of ensuring the quality of delivery, however there were questions about how affordable this was. There was also a need for a continued provisional accreditation process that ensured quality without watering down either Bikeability or the National Standards but provided for smaller schemes who could aspire to a higher level of accreditation.

CS and Steve Whitehouse (SW) favoured pre-selected checks and visits to a % of schemes. All agreed that further tests of smaller schemes were needed before a decision could be made.

KM and JM agreed to take this forward and make a recommendation to the CTSB as to what further piloting / testing was required in order to make a final decision.

There remained the question of how to handle the 6 schemes assessed as part of the pilot. CTSB decided that all 6 should be given provisional Bikeability accreditation as a further outcome of the pilot and final decisions on full accreditation would be made once a final decision on the full accreditation process had been taken.

4. Bikeability Launch

CS explained that DfT and Cycling England were working on a regional launch on 26 March followed by a rolling launch in other selected towns and cities after the Local Government Elections in May. CTSB could also be officially launched as part of the Bikeability announcement. CE / DfT will be producing a briefing pack which will be made available to CTSB members. SG would provide details of the dates and regional launches. CS added that no specific role was required of CTSB in the Bikeability launch.

5. Discussion of Future Work Programme

CS suggested CTSB should put together a work plan for 2007/8 which would then be passed to Cycling England / DfT for funding decisions. Items of work needed to be fully specified and broadly costed with timescales and deliverables. She asked the meeting what exactly was needed to be started and what work was already underway from CTRG. RF outlined the work that fell into a number of categories which were :-

(i) instructor work (Instructor Trainer Programme, Assistant Trainer Programme and Advanced Prior Learning (APL))

(ii) scheme work (accreditation) and

(iii) client work (special needs modules)

(i) Instructor Work

The assistant instructor course work was already underway with Herts and Bikeright working with the ITP Working Group. The manual was being finalised and would then be tested possibly with Darlington BC.

RF agreed to provide costings and timescales for work already underway.

It was agreed that providing for APL within the National Standard was a large task which should be included on the CTSB workplan but which was of less priority than the other tasks.

(ii) Accreditation

Developing full scheme accreditation was an ongoing task and already included in the CTC's capacity building contract. Rolling out scheme accreditation was not and it was for CTSB to decide how this should be managed once the piloting and development phase had produced a clear way forward. DfT / CE would decide how this should be funded.

(iii) Special Needs

It was agreed that the special needs modules were a priority for 2007/08. Cycling England/DfT would consider how best to take this forward and report back to the Board. RF added that much of this work was also still part of a National Lottery Funding Bid.

(iv) Monitoring

RF said there was a need to ensure that standards were maintained and suggested checks after one year. PZ recommended annual returns be collected on both incidents and accidents and added that TfL were also looking into how to best monitor the standards. KM felt that the Cycling England Youth Steering group should get involved and reminded people that DfES will in future be collecting travel to school returns every quarter. Basic monitoring on the number of children trained every year through the grant processes being put into place were agreed to be the bare minimum required.

The final scheme accreditation process would be for CTSB to approve. The working groups would be asked to comment on the Board's recommendations and to feed into the Board tasks that needed doing. The Board was asked to think about how to control the size of the working groups if more Independent Training Providers came on board.

6. AOB

Bob Richards read out an extract from Cycling Scotland's website that advised about free national standard training courses which also implied the ability to cascade what was learnt on the course to others to deliver national standard training. This did not exactly equate with procedures in England.

7. Future Meetings

There was general agreement that the CTSB Executive should meet 3-4 times a year and otherwise correspond by email. It was suggested that the next meeting be on either 26 or 27 June with the following meeting being in October.

BOB RICHARDS
DfT
Cycling Team
14 MARCH 2007 - Circulated 9 May 2007
Amended for the website August 2007