

**Provider Data      Forest Learning Alliance**  
**Report 1:**

**Metric 1: Participant recruitment**

NPQ Level	Year 1 Participants	Year 2 Participants	Unknown Start Date	Total Enrolments	% Enrolments
NPQH	16	0	0	16	22.54%
NPQML	22	0	0	22	30.99%
NPQSL	15	18	0	33	46.48%
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>71</b>	

**Metric 2: % FSM at participants schools**

NPQ Level	Providers over 30% FSM	% over 30% FSM
NPQH	1	6.25%
NPQML	0	0.00%
NPQSL	1	3.03%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	

**Metric 3: Participants from non-white British groups**

NPQ Level	Non White-British	% Non White-British
NPQH	1	6.25%
NPQML	0	0.00%
NPQSL	1	3.03%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.82%</b>

**Metric 4: At least 90% of participants present for final assessment within 18 months**

NPQ Level	Present within 18 Months	% Present within 18m
NPQH	0	0.00%
NPQML	0	0.00%
NPQSL	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	

**Metric 5: Assessment Secure**

NPQ Level	Assessments moderated	% Assessments
NPQH	0	0.00%
NPQML	0	0.00%
NPQSL	0	0.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

**Metric 6: Participant Feedback Rating**

NPQ Provider	No of Reponses	Overall Avg Rating	Course Delivery Avg Rating	Rating of costs	Rating of assessment requirements
Forest Learning	22	7.99	7.96	8.07	7.11

NPQ Provider	Rating of course duration	Rating of pre course comms	Rating of application - ease	Rating of application -
Forest Learning	7.81	8.33	8.33	8.00

NPQ Provider	Rating of delivery models	Rating of delivery method suited to style of learning	Rating of how well delivery style matched the topic	Rating of how well the delivery style aided

Forest Learning	8.07	7.41	7.89	7.78
-----------------	------	------	------	------

NPQ Provider	Rating of the relevance of resources	Rating of expertise of the trainers	Rating of quality of delivery of the trainers	Rating of peers professional development
Forest Learning	8.37	8.59	8.41	8.11

NPQ Provider	Rating of opportunities to deal with challenges	Rating of opportunity to ask questions	Rating of opportunities to identify improvements	Rating of opportunity for personal reflection
Forest Learning	7.74	7.96	7.63	7.59

NPQ Provider	Rating of course content	Rating of filling knowledge gaps	Rating of development of understanding of leadership	Rating of pre and post reading material	Rating of how well the provider matched to participant's
Forest Learning	8.11	8.11	8.33	8.04	7.96

#### Metric 7: Achievement and Retention

NPQ Level	Achieved Count	Deferred Count	Withdrawn Count	Deferred and Withdrawn	Retention Rate
NPQH	0	0	2	2	87.50%
NPQML	0	1	1	2	90.91%
NPQSL	0	0	2	2	93.94%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>91.55%</b>

#### Strengths:

- Provider self-assessment data shows good overall performance against metrics 1-3. For example:
  - overall recruitment is exceeded for metric 1
  - metric 2 exceeded the target for recruitment before the requirement became mandatory in Year 2
  - metric 3 target exceeded for recruitment to NPQSL and NPQH.
- The participant survey reflects satisfaction with the NPQ programme with all ratings meeting expectations. The most highly ranked feature, 'the expertise of trainers' was near the exceptional rating.
- Completion of QAA participant survey (participants enrolled for 6 months or more).

#### Areas for Development:

- Ensure metric data reported to the QA Agent matches internal metric data.
- Improve the quality of assessment information presented to the participants prior to application (this was the lowest rating score from the participant survey at 7.11).

**Overall Evaluation:**

**(NB: the data set provided for this report is not fully in line with the data included in the provider self-assessment and reporting of metrics 1-3 which are referenced in the summary strengths).**

The self-assessment document is well constructed. Internal evaluation of the quality requirements for leadership and management of the NPQ programme is clear and the summary report against all metric requirements effective. The self-assessment describes how the quality requirements for provision are met but not all are analysed to the same level.

The analysis of internal participant feedback is a good example of more detailed evaluation to justify the self-assessed score for this requirement. The overall self-assessment rating is 8.53. This is higher than the overall rating of 7.99 from the participant survey which is just slightly above the national figure of 7.88 for all providers. The participant survey indicates that participants are satisfied with the quality of the NPQ provision. 93% of participants would recommend their NPQ programme to a colleague and 89% of participants would recommend their provider to a colleague.

