13.15

Mary welcomed the five new members to YLEUK

Sarah talked about 'getting our name out there' by means of various industry events, articles, seminars and events we promoted ourselves.

Sarah mentioned the EUK AGM to be held in May - was surprised that few organisations knew we existed. We gained a couple of new members there. The YL sig group meeting is organised by EUK and consists of a beneficial, round-table discussion.

Neil - collaborative national wide regions.  50 agents, Neil answered their Qs, it was a positive experience which raised the profile of the group by looking at existing members

Tim mentioned- ICEF in Berlin in November at which 26 members attended (about half our membership). We gave out leaflets, the safeguarding cards and spoke about what we are doing with young learners to raise our profile and make agents understand what it means to be a member.   The added benefit of YLsig membership shows the value of young learner courses accredited by British Council.

Mary mentioned the 11 training sessions held over the year and that the main mode of communication is via the forum - please make sure you get your email to us. All minutes and news on the website.

Sarah Cooper   - introduced herself and gave an overview of what EUK does, what Sarah herself does and outlined some new initiatives.

There was a meeting with all chairs to see what could be done better. How can we share the best practice of all the regions' interests?  We are working on new digital presence for EnglishUK - all could possibly use it as means of communication.

That EUK's mission is to lead the industry to success through innovation and intelligence.

The strategy consists of the main board of trustees, the finance panel, the enterprises board, the advisory group and SLT.

The board aims to stick to its budget, the enterprise board will promote ELT, new advisory groups, senior leadership team.

There are 5 pillars: membership, intelligence and market insight, promotion of UKELT, quality and professional development, representation of members of industry.

Membership includes 15 team members split into departments: Dedicated, Wider, CRM, Enhancement (of group infrastructure) and Roadshow (managing geographical programmes)

Intel report:

 Annual statistics are reported at AGMs, developing QUIC (quarterly intel cohort  which is £250 for the pack - 142 members signed up to date, 230 data submissions received).

The pilot data project was conducted in the north of England - deciding how to form it and manage payment/sponsor options.

New market reports  show 14% student number growth, 5% student weeks growth - YL = 53% of EUK numbers.

Sarah also explained reasons for various drop etc - there is info about this on the website,

She then showed regional market share and source market rankings.

Quality and Professional Development - Sarah mentioned that the key strategy is to ensure accreditation is fit for purpose (the strategy refresh with British Council). There is a new advisory group which is aimed at being user friendly. The scheme will be digitised (with member consultation). It is hoped it is supportive in driving quality and people want to be part of it. There is f2f training, webinars, agent webinar in China, 1700 agents have done/are doing the safeguarding training.

The DELTM in China was mentioned.

Promotion of UK ELT takes place at Studyworld, DIT, the China Roadshow, Osaka and Bangkok, Madrid as well as agent-facing safeguarding webinars.

In terms of representing member schools, Sarah spoke about local campaigning initiatives, that UK ELT is a key part of the economy and culture and that there is both an economic and social value of ELT students. It is worth £1.4 billion to UK industry. We must stress the importance of taking students from net migration figures - this needs to be campaigned for. We need a secure and sympathetic visa system. No visas should be required for EU students, ID cards (especially in Italy) they need to be accepted and protected.  MAC findings were disappointing. APPG very supportive.

Thank you very much, Sarah

13.55

Tim gave an account summary: There are currently 55 members. He showed current balances. The £300 membership fee remains the same. There was income from additional training sessions. There is currently no sponsorship income. Tim presented an overview of annual expenditure. Some meeting places are free of charge so this helps our figures.

Tim then spoke about the new renewal forms: There will be a section for updating contact names. The ultimate deadline is the end of March, however we understand organisational pay cycles can hinder the adherence to the deadline.

The new logo will be on promotional material, therefore if payment has not been received you will not be able to use the new logo. Please help us make sure we have your correct organisation logo.

Could members please tell us the number of schools you have that are BC accredited.

Some organisations have some schools accredited, but not others. Tim opened the floor to questions. There were none.

14.05

Mary spoke about our plans for next year in terms of industry-specific safeguarding, some new speakers for the AGM/conferences in 2019, the new publicity materials (banners), and agent's part in YLEUK.

Sarah spoke about changes to the AGM which has always been on the first Friday in December for the last 15 years, and always an afternoon session. She has been talking to Tom Weatherley and the committee to discuss  having a one-day conference with breakouts of young learner topics; the AGM will be a part of that same day. It will be open to all schools, but only member schools can attend the AGM. It is only an idea as of now, it needs a lot of organisation and discussion.

 In terms of looking for speakers, the forum mentioned management and HR. Perhaps we could invite DoSes, Centre Managers, Activity Managers etc. to bring in all aspects of YL to the conference.

Mary reminded filling in the form on website. The next member meeting will be in March. In terms of promotional materials, we now have pens, folders, leaflets, safeguarding cards. We are also talking about banners for member schools.

Neil mentioned agent participation of YLEUK

Articles have been published and we have been represented at various events - the most interesting was Studyworld. Neil was approached by agents asking questions about EUK schools. Anna will talk about agent feedback. How can we promote our group to agents?  We had an ICEF presence. There were 68 people attending the webinar. 52 agents were present, 5 had heard of YLEUK. Agents are directed to quality YLEUK schools whose benefits include safeguarding, group leader training before arrival, managing expectations.

14.15

Anna spoke about the agent affiliation programme.

Agents are interested in YLEUK forums and want advice from neutral parties. The benefits are certified online training and a dedicated agent forum. The benefits to members include better trained Group Leaders and agents. We facilitate questions which are posted on the forum so all round the world can benefit. It is confidential, meaning no names of schools or agents are posted.  There will be a membership fee. It is intended to be self - sufficient eventually. If everyone agrees we would like to launch it at Studyworld UK.

10 min breakout for ideas about content and pitfalls for training.

Feedback from breakout:

-Agents train Group Leaders or online safeguarding for GLs (a shorter course).

-Safer recruiting of Group Leaders.

-A list of criteria based on accreditation, meaning if YLEUK is asked for info, it is always the same info

-A  BC training scheme/familiarisation, standardisation

-Photo ID of those GLs taking the course - useful for next year )regarding quick turnover issues).

-Cultural awareness for group leaders, e.g. discipline, cultural expectations of UK, get to know the UK, awareness of students from other countries that they will meet (similar to prevent)

-Case studies to train with

-To say why safeguarding is so stringent (agents think it is merely a hoop - e.g. NY is easier to get to  because less strict safeguarding)

-Generic GL behavioural code?     Anna: there is such a doc in GL handbook online, agents do not always have a choice about the GLs they can get. How do they trained? - must make sure of this.

-The level of English of GLs needs to be better. Anna: How do we choose our GLs?  There are many market-based reasons why different GLs come - will be element on safeguarding section

-In response to a question about safeguarding Anna replied that safeguarding needs to be promoted - UK has all this in place. Mary added that some wanted to know if we can we get policies translated - we could start with the policy on the website - invest in that.

-We could have a breakdown of who we are.

Anna asked for any pitfalls to the proposal:

A mention that the term 'safeguarding' is not understood abroad - have to re-name to child protection officer, should we rename safeguarding ourselves for a few years? Anna mentioned that there are legal issues as safeguarding specifies a certain level of care that similar monikers do not.     Sarah mentioned that Liz McLaren will talk about this.

14.40   Anna asked for a show of hands in order to go ahead with the proposal. Attendees voted in favour. The next meeting will be in March, we will keep you informed.

BREAK

15.15

Anna spoke about next year's training dates (list handed out). Anna will also email all contacts on forms - please check forum for training dates.

Sarah mentioned there will be two meetings at St Katherine's

Anna added re. training dates -  in 2018 thanks to Wimbledon and Stafford House for hosting meetings,  St Giles especially, thanks for support from our members.

Mary mentioned possible sanctions for those who join but do not attend any meetings - others are waiting to join for example.

Anna mentioned that any assistance is always grateful.

15.20

Liz McLaren started with a breakdown of inspection success. There are a number of things affecting results - increased transparency - beginnings of action planning having an effect, there are always changes in the ELT sector that are beyond our control, but do affect results. There are also changes in provision and to scheme criteria.

(Liz showed the 2017 review slide). Both versions of the CRG are accepted, kept up to date and workable with changes highlighted in yellow. Inspection criteria will not change immediately. This enables us to benchmark and analyse, comparing results. But guidance will develop. The report format has also changed.

The analysis is used to monitor changes, evaluate impact, plan interventions, help us compare our results against the rest of the sector,

2017 areas of strength are split up into sector (by percentage). Care of students, leisure, quality assurance, student management and premises. Of 500 providers, more than 1/2 had strengths by the end of 2017 . The lowest were publicity, under 18s provision, learner management and accommodation. Under need for improvement were publicity, accommodation, care of under 18s, staff management and quality assurance. The top categories for seasonal providers were leisure, care of students, premises and facilities, quality assurance.

2018 (results include all full inspections that have gone to the committee, this will bring down results). More than 70 providers get strengths in strategic and quality management (this according to the new criteria).

Suggestion that marketing departments are getting carried away - there is a lack of information we give than isn't in evidence. There needs to be the same core information across all centres.

Perhaps website designers don't understand that info needs to be in agreement with BC criteria.

Suggestion that businesses in general do not say everything in their direct marketing. There is a difference between marketing material and all aspects of service.

Liz replied that the determined criteria needed to be clearer. This section should be one of the easiest to meet as it is factual, not judgement calls.

Suggestion that marketing is agent-based, so publicity doesn't matter in that case.

Liz replied we will be looking at that. We are trying to ensure quality and reputation and feel the criteria are important. There is the possibility that centres feel that can only expect a met.

Suggestion that people look at our company website very rarely.  Agents promote as they will / create marketing / say what they will in their office.

Liz replied she asked the management group to look at another criteria for agents. It is an agent-driven market, you need to control who is entering your classroom. If it is agents, then we need to look at it more. We are trying to assure organisations are selling the right product. Too high expectations is not a good situation. It is generally the agents' fault overselling, too high expectations.

Suggestion to correlate publicity with student feedback.

Liz: we want to build that into the inspection process, but it has money implications... Academic staff profile is not good but getting better. Accommodation too.

Suggestion that people often failing publicity for under 18s.

Liz: We now have S3 parental consent. Strategic management, premises and facilities, care of students is always good. Less than 45% strength in publicity, academic staff profile, under 18 and accomm. Under 18s is always lower as it is not applicable to some providers (they have 16,17 y.o.students on adult courses).

(Liz showed a slide comparing both years 17 and 18). 40 or more providers had strength in 37 areas, now in 49 this year. Measuring if this is because of greater transparency or standards is difficult. Quality Assurance is now statistically and qualitatively managed. Care of students is down, due to W2 (emergency planning) not mets. Leisure opportunities also down. Providers getting Strength for not very good leisure programmes - previously only 2 out of 4  needed, now it is 3 out of 5.

Suggestion that there is a dramatic change in the teaching criteria between the 2 years.

Liz: Possibly due to sample size this year - the changes don't appear to have broken anything, others have had an impact. Publicity needs improvement (slide shown) the criteria is often not met.

Liz then spoke about the need to submit your action plan with points to be addressed. Develop an ethos of quality, which some schools do really well. Organisations with 10 or more strengths is very high. If you are due an inspection in 2019 - start with action plan against the points to be addressed.  Do a self evaluation, refer to criteria and guidance docs, watch out for problem areas. It is easy to get Not Mets for safeguarding (part S4), welfare NMs have been for locked doors, fire drill etc. basics. Again publicity needs general improvement.

2019 will see the piloting of a split inspection. This is to potentially benefit a multi-centre where the head office and centres are both inspected during a busy summer. We will now try to visit the HO earlier(off peak) and teaching centres when students are there.

Re. training, January will see the launch of a BC/EngUK branded level 1 online safeguarding course.  Versions to be released. In simple language for GLs who must pass a test, demonstrate they have gone through the material. Scenarios will be specific to particular audiences and could focus on:  management, academic staff, GLs, other school employed staff. To note: BC Teaching English website has free training for safeguarding.

Additional: Foster care differs from local authority to local authority. Please feedback any comments re changes to CRG - particularly reports of any good practice in order  to build ethos of excellence.

Thank you Liz.

Fergal's talk