

Approaches to PRD – Which Are You?

(✓ - As appropriate)

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Key Characteristics | | | | | | |
| Agreed protocols, roles & responsibilities (R&R), action plans etc | Detailed & focused | Detailed & focused | Focused. Less detailed. Appropriate to group | Action Plans designed to validate SAR. R&R, protocols less detailed | Focused. Less detailed. Appropriate to group | Less detailed, generally mission statement or outcome focused |
| Review planning | Detailed & focused. Objectives & outcomes set | Detailed & focused. Objectives & outcomes set | Focused. Less detailed. Appropriate to group | Processes for review agreed, SAR evidence agreed | Focused. Less detailed. Appropriate to group | Agreement made on collaborative areas for development |
| Review timescales | Very thorough – often 2/3 days across whole organisation | Less time bound more determined by area reviewing | Intensive – usually 0.5 – 1 days | Intensive – usually 0.5 – 1 days | Intensive – usually 0.5 – 1 days | Reviews take form of meetings to discuss developments/ share best practice |
| PRD process | All providers participate in review | All providers participate in review | Not all providers participate in review | Not all providers participate in review | Not all providers participate in review | All providers participate in development |
| Review team | Cross section of staff inc SMs, Lecturers, students | Cross section of staff inc SMs, Lecturers, students | Smaller teams usually Quality managers or SMs | Smaller teams usually Quality managers or SMs | Smaller teams usually Quality managers or SMs | Senior Managers dialogue |
| Feedback and reporting | Detailed reports produced. Follow up visits planned | Detailed reports produced | Feedback given. Format agreed locally | Feedback given. Format agreed locally | Feedback given. Format agreed locally | Needs of providers addressed through professional dialogue |
| Development aspect of PRD | Development needs of providers addressed collaboratively | Development needs addressed collaboratively/ independently based on need | Development addressed through best practice/ dialogue | Development aspects monitored by group delivered by provider | Development aspects monitored by group delivered by provider | Development initiated by group dialogue & collaboration. Delivered by provider |
| Ongoing evaluation of PRD process | Detailed evaluation processes in place | Detailed evaluation processes in place | Evaluation based on changing needs of providers | Evaluation based on changing needs of providers | Evaluation based on changing needs of providers | Evaluation based on changing needs of providers |
| Lead / Sector reviewer | Lead appointed to organise reviews – non reliant on lead | Lead appointed to organise reviews – non reliant on lead | Lead often appointed to coordinate group. Sometimes reliant on lead | Lead often appointed to coordinate group. Often reliant on lead | Lead often appointed to coordinate group. Often reliant on lead | Less reliant on a lead more organisation led focus |
| Areas of review | Wide ranging (SAR, QIP, national priorities) | Wide ranging (SAR, QIP, national priorities) | More themed focus – areas often reviewed in isolation | Generally SAR validation to prepare for/Improve Ofsted grades | More themed focus – areas often reviewed in isolation | Strategic development needs of the providers |
| Importance of funding & support | Self-sufficient and sustainable | Self-sufficient and sustainable | Would probably continue without but in more flexible way | More reliant on funding & support. Sustainability uncertain | More reliant on funding & support. Sustainability uncertain | Self-sufficient and sustainable |