

APPENDIX 1.

An analysis of the relative strengths and weaknesses associated with approaches to delivery of a Participation Service and a 16-19 Data Hub

Approaches for Commissioning a 14-19 Participation Service

Independently Commission a Participation Service externally via the Chest

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing service provider already has legacy agreements in place with education and training providers should they tender and be successful. An independent IAG service will work better across Schools, Academies, Free Schools, Colleges and providers in the 'new IAG market'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New data sharing agreements would be required between LAs and every provider and school across the Greater Merseyside SRG Issues with data access arrangements, particularly with sensitive information for vulnerable groups given LAs sharing personal data about young people not in their LA Limited opportunity for the LA to develop the CCIS system further using existing readily available datasets from within the LA (e.g. KS4 results matching in anticipation of DfE KS4/5 Progression Measure Performance Tables publication) Potential TUPE implications.

Local Authority Lead Jointly Commission a Participation Services

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint LA working and associated cost savings. Centralised LA service could facilitate greater flexibility and potential movement of staff between LAs during busy periods. An independent IAG service will work better across Schools, Academies, Free Schools, Colleges and providers in the 'new IAG market'. Potential for shared infrastructure with other LCR LAs to deliver and make CCIS returns to the DfE. Greater potential to develop the CCIS system and enrich the data collected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in tracking process may increase % Not Known and NEET temporarily. Possible loss of service during transition from current contract arrangements. Changes established staff links within current IAG provider by removing Tracking service. Potential TUPE implications linked to previous supplier.

Approaches for Commissioning a 16-19 Data Hub Service

Independently Commission a 16-19 Data Hub Service externally via the Chest (including software and staffing)

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing service provider already has legacy agreements in place with education and training providers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New data sharing agreements would be required between LAs and every provider and school across the Greater Merseyside SRG

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with data access arrangements, particularly with sensitive information for vulnerable groups given LAs sharing personal data about young people not in their LA • Limited opportunity for ad hoc reporting and data analysis. • Lack of opportunity for the LA to develop the CCIS system further using existing readily available datasets from within the LA (e.g. KS4 results matching in anticipation of DfE KS4/5 Progression Measure Performance Tables publication)
--	---

Local Authority Lead Jointly Commission a Participation Services (software only)

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instant access to and ownership of all data and management information. • Intelligence to strategically commission youth service provision based on hard data. • Centralised LA service can reduce duplication of datasets in LAs. • Using existing provider returns reduces duplication of provider data processing. • An independent data service will work better across Schools, Academies, Free Schools, Colleges and providers in the 'new IAG market'. • Officers can direct the service strategically in line with objectives according to business need and new government policy (e.g. Raising Participation Age). • MI and performance reports can be tailored for local need and datasets produced for LAs and partner agencies. • Potential for shared infrastructure with other LCR LAs to deliver and make CCIS returns to the DfE. • Opportunities for joint LA working and associated cost savings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in tracking process may increase % Not Known and NEET temporarily. • Possible loss of service during transition from current contract arrangements. • Changes established staff links within current IAG provider by removing Tracking service. • CCIS dataset may record only minimum requirements for DfE submissions though would retain the potential for full recording and reporting on young people if required. • Potential TUPE implications linked to previous supplier.

Independently Commission a Participation Services (software only)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instant access to and ownership of all data and management information. • Intelligence to strategically commission youth service provision based on hard data. • Officers can direct the service strategically in line with objectives according to business need and new government policy (e.g. Raising Participation Age). • MI and performance reports can be tailored for local need and datasets produced for LAs and partner agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in tracking process may increase % Not Known and NEET temporarily. • Cross boarder tracking issues to due tracking system compatibility issues. • Potential for increased manual data matching processes needed to monitor those young people moving outside of the borough – tracking the unknowns. • Possible loss of service during transition from current contract arrangements. • Changes established staff links within current IAG provider by removing
--	--

- Limited potential cost saving.

Tracking service.

- CCIS dataset may record only minimum requirements for DfE submissions though would retain the potential for full recording and reporting on young people if required.
- Potential TUPE implications linked to previous supplier.