



EMPLOYER-LED  
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT  
DEVELOPMENT  
IN THE  
SOCIAL CARE SECTOR

A REPORT BY THE NATIONAL CARE FORUM

JANUARY 2009

# INDEX

Introduction	Page 3
Background	Page 4
Supporting organisations	
Methodology	
Scope and limitations	
Care sector data	
Literature review	
Survey Part 1: Existing Employer Programmes	Page 9
Core modules	
Delivery methods	
Staff groups involved in L&M development	
Date implemented	
Training providers	
Annual spend	
Public funding	
Accreditation	
Feedback systems	
Assessed programme effectiveness	
Survey Part 2: Wider Employers' Views	Page 15
Overall importance	
Key factors	
Staff groups	
Subjects	
Additional comments	
Findings and conclusions	Page 20
Recommendations	Page 24
Removing the barriers	
Delivering a solution	
Encouraging uptake	
Conducting further research and analysis	
Appendix – survey questionnaire	Page 26
References	Page 29

# EMPLOYER-LED LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOCIAL CARE SECTOR

## Introduction

The NCF Training & Development Committee identified Leadership and Management (L&M) development as an important issue in an NCF internal training survey in 2007. It was agreed to carry out a survey of members to develop greater understanding of this issue. The intention was to identify L&M best practice and to disseminate ways of working in partnership more effectively in delivering L&M development.

However, with work on the National Skills Academy for Social Care progressing, it was decided to extend this survey to include other employer groups involved in this project: Acevo and ECCA. Thanks to East Sussex County Council, with whom AgeCare work in delivering clinical and management workshops, we were also able to access small employers. The support of these organisations is gratefully acknowledged. The original objectives were extended to include enabling us all to inform the work of the National Skills Academy for Social Care by better representing the needs of the sector in a very positive way.

This survey was carried out by AgeCare without funding, so inevitably has been constrained to some extent by a lack of resources. Nonetheless, it is believed that the findings are robust and underpinned with appropriate data. Moreover, this work is a collective effort by many individuals, who are hands-on operators with very substantial experience both of the social care sector and L&M practical delivery within it. Their views have informed this work in a very positive way.

A total of 36 responses were received from 30 organisations employing 40,919 staff. The survey was circulated widely and staff in some organisations responded independently. As these views offered different perspectives, all were included.

Ian McLintock

Chair of the NCF Training & Development Committee

CEO, AgeCare, 47 Great Russell Street, London, WC1B 3PB





Tel: 020 7637 4577

E-Mail: [ian.mclintock@agecare.org.uk](mailto:ian.mclintock@agecare.org.uk)

## BACKGROUND

### Supporting Organisations

The organisations below provided support in accessing their members, without which this survey would not have been possible. They also critically reviewed the draft report, which has helped to ensure that it is properly objective and balanced.

	<p>The National Care Forum (NCF) promotes quality care through the not-for-profit health and social care sector in the U.K. The NCF embraces the diversity of provision and with 58 care organisations in membership, the NCF represents more than 50% of not-for-profit social care providers.</p>
	<p>AgeCare provides residential care services for older people and a wide range of specialist clinical and management training programmes throughout the UK. The Society chairs the NCF Training and Development Committee and, in this capacity, carried out the L&amp;M survey.</p>
	<p>The Association of Chief Executives of Voluntary Organisations (Acevo) connects, develops and represents the third sector's leaders. Acevo has over 2000 members.</p>
	<p>The English Community Care Association (ECCA) works on behalf of small, medium and large not-for-profit and private providers, providing a wide range of services, to promote high standards of health and social care in the independent sector and create an environment in which care homes can deliver the high quality care that communities require and deserve.</p>

## Survey responses

The following organisations returned survey responses:

AgeCare, Aaron Manor Bexhill, Abbey Care Group, Anchor Homes, Anchor Trust, Bourneville Village Trust, Care South, Careways Trust, Chanctonbury Healthcare Ltd, CLS Care Services, Cooksbridge Care Services, Cornwall Care, Coverage Care Services, Field Lane Foundation, Fremantle Trust, Glebe Housing Association, Greensleeves Homes Trust, Heart of England Housing and Care Ltd, HICA, Mental Health Providers Forum, MHA Care Group, Quantum Care Ltd, RAF Benevolent Fund, Rett Syndrome, RMBI, Sanctuary Care Limited, Sanctuary Supported Housing, Servite Houses, The Orders of St John Care Trust and Wealden Community Care.

## Methodology

The survey (Appendix 1) sought to map existing provision of L&M development work (Part 1) and to identify what employers felt was needed in respect of L&M development within their organisations (Part 2). It was targeted at Training Managers and Directors, as well as CEOs, as it was felt these positions would be best able to respond effectively.

The survey was issued to all NCF CEOs and also members of the NCF Learning Network, members of the Acevo Social Care Leaders Group, ECCA members and, with the permission of East Sussex County Council, by AgeCare to attendees at management workshops.

Returns were collated on a spreadsheet and analysed. To inform this work, a desktop survey of L&M research was carried out. The final draft was then circulated to various individuals who had relevant expertise and their observations incorporated where appropriate.

## Scope and limitations

This survey was carried out on a 'no cost' basis. The findings are believed to be robust, although these should be interpreted in the context of the constraints outlined.

The desktop research of existing literature yielded some interesting information and insights, but it is accepted that it is limited in its scope. It is primarily focused on voluntary sector research, and as such, it is probable that valuable commercial and HE sector research material has been omitted.

The sample size and composition were driven by the need to access organisations at low cost and not designed around the sector profile. Data collection was limited to completing a survey return without follow-up, although this was at least partly resolved through the critical review process.

A total of 36 responses were received from 30 organisations employing 40,919 staff, as follows:

- **Organisation role:** The majority of respondents were providing services to older people and adults with learning disabilities, including care home and extra care facilities. Five respondents provided housing. Individuals in receipt of direct payments or who held individual budgets were not represented, as we were unable to reach them with our limited resources for this exercise.
- **Organisation type:** A total of 23 not-for-profit and 7 for-profit organisations responded which reflects the survey distribution.
- **Organisation size:** The largest organisation responding employed 5300 staff and the smallest just 5. Nine were very small employers who employ less than 50 staff, 10 were larger employers with up to 1000 staff, 7 employed between 1000 and 2000 staff and there were 3 large employers with in excess of 3500 staff.
- **Geographical location:** The majority of respondents were based primarily in the SE of England, but there were a number of returns from organisations operating in the Midlands and North, with one also operating in Wales and Scotland. Overall, the survey reflected the sector fully in respect of organisational size and geographical distribution, but was weighted towards the not-for-profit sector.

## Care sector data

### The social care sector

The CSCI Annual Report January 2008<sup>1</sup> reported that, over 2 million people of all ages, including children, and from every community, used social care services arranged by local councils during 2006-07. Councils spent £14.2 billion on social care for all adults. It is estimated that private individuals spent £5.9 billion on personal social care for older people alone.

As at March 2007:

- Over 18,500 registered care homes, run by private and voluntary organisations and councils, provided almost 442,000 places to people of all ages.
- 4,735 registered home care agencies, the majority privately run, provided support to people to live at home.
- 54,000 people (including parents caring for disabled children and young carers) used Direct Payments.

As at September 2007 around 1,000 people had an Individual Budget.

A total of 1.39 million people were estimated to be working in adult social care services.

Care services provided by councils, private and voluntary bodies are meeting more of the national minimum standards but improvement appears to have stalled.

It may be that the substantial improvements delivered through the implementation of induction standards, NVQ training and Care Standards Act training targets have been achieved in many organisations.

## Sector training data

The NCF Personnel Statistics Report 2008<sup>2</sup> found that qualification rates remain broadly similar to previous years. NVQ 4 qualifications were in excess of 96% and the NVQ2 mean average was 61% (CSCI target 50%). These are broadly similar to the findings for 2007 but significantly higher than in previous years. For example, organisation NVQ2 rates were 34% in 2005. Admittedly, not-for-profit qualification rates tend to be higher than the sector as a whole. NMDS data<sup>3</sup> suggests that qualification rates tend to be much lower, but there are questions over the accuracy of this data due to poor take-up in some areas.

## Hypothesis

Although the stalling in improvement is likely to be due to a number of factors, the above data suggests that the opportunity to drive up care standards through NVQ staff development will increasingly become more limited.

## Literature review

The Department of Health, *Putting People First - working to make it happen: adult social care workforce strategy - interim statement*<sup>4</sup>, published in June 2008, lays out a vision of a highly skilled workforce. However it recognises this must occur within the known context of the demographics and skills of the existing workforce (paras 9 and 10). It acknowledges that this new vision of social care demands new skills and competencies for commissioners, managers and senior leaders across the sector (para 18).

Leadership, management and commissioning skills are identified as strategic workforce themes required for a range of 'Putting People First Enablers' (pages 8 to 11). There is recognition that the challenges for leadership and management are significant (para 43). In addition, it identifies leadership, management and commissioning skills as a key workforce strategic priority (para 56). To achieve this priority support and encouragement for leaders and managers to think creatively, use their entrepreneurial skills, and engage with a broad range of interests are considered essential. It was also felt that leaders will have to develop a culture in the workforce that is risk aware, not risk averse - to promote independence.

*Leadership and Management (A strategy for the social care workforce)*<sup>5</sup> is a Skills for Care reprint of a 2004 Topss England publication. This report describes a strategy to develop the L&M capacity required to implement the government's modernising agenda for social care. Nationally, the key issues affecting L&M development were identified as:

- The lack of a coherent and consistent approach
- The lack of integration of individual and organisational development
- Education and training, which is provider led rather than employer-led

This had resulted in a fragmented ad hoc approach to development with access to opportunities often dependent on the learning culture of the organisation and availability of appropriate programmes (p6). The final report promoted a common

approach to L&M development based on a whole systems model that integrated individual and organisational needs within any organisational setting (p iv).

The *Voluntary Sector Skills Survey (England) 2007*<sup>6</sup> was commissioned by the Workforce Hub and Skills for Health. The survey explored skills gaps and skills shortages in paid employees within the voluntary sector in 2007. As social care charities account for over half of the voluntary sector (54%) and these were specifically identified in this research, the findings have been included in this report.

The survey reports that within medium sized organisations, gaps in leadership were an issue. Half of employers identified that the skills gaps within their organisations were caused by a lack of time and/or funding (p3). Larger organisations were more likely to provide training and development (p42). Lack of funding was a particular issue among organisations within Skills for Care (63%). The top ten skills gaps within Skills for Care organisations were strategic use of IT (27%), legal knowledge (25%), fundraising (27%), strategic planning and forward thinking (25%), health and safety (23%), marketing (22%), communication (20%), leadership (21%), monitoring and evaluation (20%) and team working (20%).

A further, more recent report, *Third Sector Skills Research 2008* - provides evidence and recommendations on skills gaps<sup>7</sup>.

The *Looking After Leaders*<sup>8</sup> research project in 2007 carried out by the Third Sector Leadership Centre and Henley Management College investigated leadership development for leaders working in health and social care in the third sector. The project identified that there had been several studies into leadership of third sector organisations, but that there were no clear outcomes to support the design and delivery of leadership development (p5).

The project also found that large organisations were more likely to have the resources needed and access to L&M programmes. There was an expressed need for leadership development by 95% of respondents covering issues relating to personal style and its robustness, influencing, managing change and future personal direction. Some reported the need for greater functional knowledge, e.g. financial management and fundraising.

The primary barrier to development was found to be cost. Existing leadership development was perceived to be too expensive as well as not meeting specific needs. Respondents reported having coaches and mentors, with a significant number using learning sets and groups. It was recommended that suitable e-learning and distance learning programmes be designed to meet the specific needs of leaders in this sector.

## SURVEY PART 1: Existing employer programmes

A total of 15 of the 30 responding organisations said that they had L&M development programmes. Two other organisations intended to do so and one wanted to.

A total of 1,768 staff of all grades had undertaken L&M development. In organisations delivering L&M development, the percentage of total staff within the organisation that had done so ranged from 1% to 34% with an average of 9%. However, the larger organisations were most likely to undertake L&M. This data reflects the research findings referred to above.

Total Staff	Number of organisations in Sample	Number undertaking L&M	% undertaking L&M
>3500	3	3	100%
1000 to 2000	7	4	57%
>50 to 999	10	7	70%
<50	9	1	11%

### Core modules

There was a clear focus on the development of soft leadership skills. The most common subject areas covered were team working, appraisal/ supervision, coaching/mentoring, managing conflict, communication and motivating people.

Element	Team Working	Appraisal/ Supervision	Coaching/ Mentoring	Managing Conflict	Communication	Motivating People
Number of responses	10	10	8	8	8	8

Leadership styles, employment law/HR, managing projects, finance and legal issues were also relatively popular. These tended to focus on more functional skills.

Element	Leadership Styles	Employment Law/HR	Managing Projects	Finance	Legal Issues
Number of responses	7	5	4	4	3

Interestingly, whilst important, these more functional/management skills were less well represented than leadership skills. However, previous research suggests that, due to the need to multitask, functional skills may be of more importance to smaller organisations. Nonetheless, this focus on generic skills and competencies may offer

an opportunity to implement a Skills Passport that would be valid across organisational boundaries.

Respondents were invited to include details of any other subjects that were included in their programmes. The range was impressive and included: MBTI, improving cultural change, managing people, management of a rota, policy direction, executive and team shadowing, competency based interviewing, management information, quality assurance/audit, managing absence, managing performance, managing change, stress management, learning styles, supervision, developing our people, and learning and development.

There was no evidence of coverage of external topics such as contracting, commissioning or policy. This may be because environmental scanning is not seen as a priority for the main staff groups undertaking L&M or that the relevant aspects have been embedded within the programmes themselves.

### Delivery methods

Organisations use a range of delivery methods. The most popular were classroom based training, seminars, projects, on-the-job training and coaching, as follows:

Classroom Based	Seminars	Projects	On-The-Job Training	Coaching
10	6	6	6	6

Less common were:

Mentoring	Distance Learning	E Learning	Workbooks	Toolkits	Tutorial support
4	4	2	2	1	1

This suggests a preference for a flexible approach to learning delivery, probably to fit around the operational demands of a busy working environment and the varying learning styles/abilities of individuals.

Learning appears to be weighted towards a practical focus.

There also seems to be a preference for supported learning, rather than individual study through distance learning and using the internet.

### Staff groups involved in L&M development

The key staff groups that L&M development focused on were Managers and Senior Managers. The following numbers of organisations deliver L&M development to the staff groups indicated below.

Junior Staff	Supervisors	Managers	Senior Managers	CEO
1	10	15	12	4

The focus on managers and senior managers may reflect the fact that many homes/units operate as distinct business units, which places significant demands on the individual in charge/front line manager.

The broad range of staff groups undertaking L&M development suggests recognition of the pivotal importance in delivering high care standards and the value of succession planning. The focus on a range of staff groups suggests an opportunity to introduce a Skills Escalator integrating the programmes between different staff groups.

### **Date implemented**

Data on implementation from the 15 organisations with L&M development programmes was incomplete. However, whilst one organisation reported implementing L&M development in 1998 and another in 2002, almost all others had done so in 2006 or 2007.

This may be because in recent years organisations have focused staff development on responding to NVQs and induction to meet regulatory targets and the associated public funding availability. In organisations with finite, or in many cases nil training capacity and limited funding, they may simply have been unable to undertake L&M development. In many organisations these have now been achieved. Another factor could be that many organisations have now reaped the benefits of this type of staff development and are now seeking new ways in which to continue to drive up care standards.

### **Training providers**

The 3 organisations that used only external provision employed at least 1500 staff. Those that used internal provision only, employed between 305 and 1500 staff. External providers appeared to be largely consultants. Most organisations tended to use more than one provider (internal or external) for their programmes.

Number of Organisations	Internal Only	External Only	Internal and External
15	4	3	8

There may be a number of reasons that organisations are developing L&M programmes internally. For example, because either appropriate programmes are not available, for cost reasons or this gives them flexibility. The use of various consultancies may represent organisations 'buying-in' expertise only for those areas in which they do not have these themselves.

Only one organisation delivered L&M development to other organisations. However, 11 of the remaining 14 said that they might be prepared to do so and only 3 said they would not. This suggests considerable opportunity to utilise existing employers' programmes and delivery capacity to provide L&M development to other organisations, particularly those not able to deliver their own.

## Annual spend

Thirteen organisations reported annual spend on L&M totalling £911,688. However, of this £675,000 was spent by 3 large organisations. One organisation reported spending of £400,000.

Total Staff	Staff undertaking L&M	Total spend	Spend per head
>3500	319	£275,000	£862
1000 to 2000	162	£536,000	£3,309
>50 to 999	209	£75,000	£359
< 50		No Data	

Removing the single organisation that reported a spend of £400,000 reduces the spend per head of organisations of 1000 to 2000 staff from £3309 per head to £1038 per head of staff undertaking L&M development. Using this figure, the average spend was £753 per head across all organisations.

As no organisation reported setting up its programme within the last year, it is presumed these figures do not include the substantial development costs. It is not known to what extent organisations included direct and indirect overhead costs, so the full cost may not have been reported.

It is evident that those organisations undertaking L&M are willing to commit significant resources to their programmes.

## Public funding

Forty six percent of organisations who reported spending on L&M (6 out of 13) reported that they had been able to access some level of public funding for their programmes. Funding was sourced from Train to Gain, ESF, TSI and the Care Training Consortium Sussex. Further work would be helpful to develop a better understanding of the investment in L&M development and training.

This also suggests that there would be merit in reviewing public funding to encourage L&M development. The diversity of existing programmes and inability of smaller organisations to access L&M may suggest that large scale contracts and complex funding mechanisms may not be appropriate, particularly for smaller organisations.

## Accreditation

A total of 7 courses were accredited and 2 others followed, or provided, underpinning knowledge for recognised qualifications, such as the RMA, and NVQ3 and 4. The most common accreditation was with the Institute of Leadership and Management (ILM – 5 organisations), but the University of Derby, Edexcel and CIEH also provided accreditation for some programmes. All of which suggests that organisations value formal recognition of courses and highlights the extent to which

employers and educational bodies are working together to develop appropriate L&M programmes.

### **Feedback systems**

Ten of the 15 organisations provided details on their feedback systems. A range of methods were used, including:

- Currently redesigning an evaluation process for in-house progress. External delivery is assessed through assignment work, management reports and presentation.
- Projects and measures such as staff turnover.
- In house evaluation.
- Course evaluation and supervision.
- Pre and post (course) student evaluation. Course staff team meetings and evaluation and assessment appropriate to ILM requirements for chosen route.
- Immediate impact evaluation and 3 month follow-up.
- All training attracts feedback and the MDP has a lunchtime debriefing session.
- L&M approach based on RMA. Director of Care and Asst Director of Care key components in shaping programme delivery. External experts utilised as facilitators/speakers.
- Peer evaluation, manager survey and learner education.
- Reaction forms, post course projects and action planning.

There may be merit in developing standard feedback systems that all organisations could adopt easily if they wished to.

### **Assessed programme effectiveness**

All 15 organisations provided information on their assessed programme effectiveness, the majority of which was very positive:

- **Not ready to evaluate** yet (2 organisations).
- **Favourable** from external programmes - encouraged managers to change some current practice. Looking at ways to maintain learning and to implement CPD.
- **Extremely positive.** Project achievements at manager level will provide hard measures once completed plus overall impact on staff turnover.
- **Very effective** for first line supervisors, **effective** for managers.
- Ongoing - **too early to assess** full impact.
- **Feedback mixed**, at end of training, group completes project on selection of topics - this proved to be **extremely positive** with **some excellent ideas** formatted for organisation development
- **Hard work** to design the programme and ensure external trainers were pitching at the right level and priorities.
- Candidates producing **satisfactory** work for assessment. **Positive benefits**, increase in self-confidence and enhanced performance. Acquire or improvement of business and management skills within the context of social care.

- **Extraordinary!**
- **Positive feedback.** Need to roll-out to other tiers of management for full analysis. Praised by IIP assessor in recent sample evaluation
- **Appointed last 3 managers almost directly from the programme. Have not recruited externally for a registered manager or deputy for the last 4 years.**
- **Very successful.** Managers have moved from Care Managers to Business Managers. Benefitted the business, residents and staff. Approach extended to Deputy and Hotel Service Managers.
- All staff asked to evaluate the sessions. Senior managers also attend some sessions.
- **Improved attendance, greater team cohesion, improved staff retention, greater service user satisfaction.**
- **Need more variety locally** only provider more majority – IPF.
- **Not in place** - staff development approaches being reviewed.

There would be merit in developing a range of input, process, output, outcome metrics that organisations could use to assess the effectiveness of their programmes.

## SURVEY PART 2: Wider Employers' Views

### Overall importance

Contributors were invited to assess how important they felt L&M development is/would be to their organisation.

	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All
Number of organisations	23	5		
Percentage	82%	18%		

These responses clearly indicate the employers attach considerable importance to the development of L&M.

### Key factors

Contributors were asked to score a range of criteria to identify what they felt to be the key factors in successfully delivering L&M development.

The factors scored most highly were cost, workplace delivery, recognition of L&M development by CSCI in inspection reports, having a range of courses (skills escalator) and qualifications being transferrable (skills passport).

Most important factors	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All
Cost	21	10	2	
Workplace delivery	15	11	2	
Recognition of L&M by CSCI	17	15	1	1
Accreditation	11	19		
Skills escalator	12	19	1	
Skills passport	11	16	3	

The factors that scored less highly were as follows:

Less important factors	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All
Web based resources	6	14	3	3
Local delivery (e.g. FE college)	4	17	5	2
Distance learning	3	17	4	3
Web based learning	4	10	4	3
Degree level qualification	5	10	6	3
Delivery by existing provider	2	13	4	3

Contributors also suggested the following:

- How learning can be practised and implemented in the workplace with further coaching to encourage continuous development
- Tools to be able to measure effectiveness of leadership and management skills developed
- You need to have sign up from your own Manager and the Trustees to (promote the) importance of leadership
- Accreditation of provider e.g. Edexcel, City & Guilds, ILM
- I believe that leadership and management development is a major factor in developing brand and differentiation and therefore commercial advantage. As such I do not believe in an off the peg product
- No mention of practical application ... theory to practice... I would give this a 'very important' rating. Also application to the area where the individual works... whilst L&M has a broader context it is also essential that it relates to the person's existing work place....again 'very important'
- The level of qualification will be dependent on the individual. Having a Masters in Business Management. I undertake courses at all levels for personal development
- We are an umbrella body - my current concern is the view we are hearing from commissioners that they do not think the voluntary sector management and leadership are good enough. I don't know whether this is my perception or reality and whether it applies equally to small and large organisations.
- To be able to offer a range of delivery methods to take into account learning preferences, work commitments etc.
- Flexibility (2 organisations)
- Accessible to people for whom English is a second language/or who have dyslexia
- Opportunities for shared learning alongside other students/organisations.
- Accessibility
- Support
- Opportunities to maintain accreditation for management and other vocational qualifications already held
- Distance learning can work if there is a supportive learning set to keep individuals motivated
- E-Learning can be beneficial for overseas staff, as pace can be at individual's capability
- That materials and delivery are tailored to our sector.

## Staff groups

Respondents felt that the key staff groups who should be targeted were Managers and Senior Managers.

Staff groups	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All
Managers	28	3		
Senior Managers	23	9		
Supervisors	16	16		
CEO	17	15	2	
Junior staff		13	16	

## Subjects

The subjects rated most important were all soft skills, with functional skills such as finance and marketing tending to be less highly rated.

The following subjects were assessed to be the most important.

Most important subjects	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All
Motivating People	26	6		
Communication	24	9		
Coaching/Mentoring	20	11		
Appraisal/Supervision	20	11	1	
Team Working	19	11	1	
Managing Conflict	18	13		

The following subjects were not included in the survey format, but were suggested by 2 or more organisations:

Suggested subject	Number of Organisations
Managing change	5
Marketing	4
Managing performance	3
Recruitment and retention	3
Self awareness	3
Stress and time management	3
Problem solving	2

The following subjects in the survey template were assessed to be less important:

<b>Less important subjects</b>	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	Not At All
Leadership Styles	17	13	1	
Managing Projects	10	19	1	
Finance	10	20	1	
Employment Law/HR	9	21	2	
Legal Issues	7	21	3	

The following subject areas were also suggested by respondents:

- Strategic thinking/reports/planning
- Equalities/trans-cultural management practice
- Negotiations skills
- Market management and fundraising
- Leading through and managing change
- Customer service
- Finance training should be aimed at project budgeting and monitoring and integrated into a management accounting framework
- Shift Management
- There is no mention of social or people skills. Communication doesn't necessarily cover these important aspects
- Management behaviours which would include role modelling
- Observation skills
- Language skills
- Quality Management
- Systems - understanding of
- Commercial aspects of running a business: understanding management accounts, putting a budget together, reviewing the budget and taking appropriate decisions, the commercial environment
- Writing and submitting tenders
- Stakeholder management
- Delegation
- Training skills, induction to a common standard to bring consistency in approach
- Decision making
- Reporting systems and skills
- Stress management
- Audit

## General Comments

Respondents were invited to make any additional comments they wished to. The following comments were received:

- When looking at leaders/managers and their development an important process is to understand their strengths, behaviours, knowledge and skills so that a measured approach can be made to identifying next steps and ensuring the appropriate support is put in place to equip those being promoted or brought in externally.
- Leadership and management development can be expensive. I would like to see NCF liaising with a big accredited provider e.g. ILM to ensure that the particular aspects of managing within a care environment are harnessed. Many of the bespoke programmes available don't understand the regulatory environment.
- The senior managers and executive have bespoke (separate) training that is formed through the IPR process.
- Many L& M programmes communicate the theory but miss out the important and essential component of the 'HOW' to put what has been learnt into practice. Effective leaders and Managers need tools available which they can use in order to be effective on a day to day basis.
- Any L&M development should have a strong link back to practical application in the workplace.
- This is enormously important. The frustration for smaller organisation is that we have to duck and dive a bit to find good training at affordable prices.
- Whilst I am happy to take part in this survey I think it is clear from the form and content of this survey that I have a radically different view of the constituents of leadership and management training.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A total of 36 responses were received from 30 organisations employing 40,919 staff. This was a good response, which covered most organisational roles, sizes and geographical distribution, but was weighted towards the not-for-profit sector. Micro employers and the public sector were not represented.

The latest CSCI annual report (2008) has found that improvement within the sector appears to have stalled. There is obviously a need to maintain NVQ standards and for CSCI to focus on those organisations still not delivering these. However, it may well be that these skills gaps have largely been closed in many organisations. In order to deliver continuing care standard improvements through staff development across the sector, suggests that there may be a need to identify what other sector wide skills gaps exist and to focus on closing these.

A limited literature review of other research suggested fairly general agreement that existing leadership development was inadequate, with the major barrier to development being cost. Larger organisations were found to be better able than small ones at accessing L&M development. This supports our survey findings.

### **Part 1 – Existing employer programmes**

Existing employer programmes appear to have been largely developed independently of each other. The diversity within these programmes is understandable given this, but impressive nonetheless. There also appears to be a commonality that runs through these programmes, which suggest significant consensus amongst employers about what is needed to deliver effective L&M development.

### **Organisations undertaking**

Half of the 30 organisations surveyed had implemented L&M development. The percentage of total staff within the organisations which had undertaken L&M development ranged from 1% to 34% with an average of 9%. However, the larger organisations were most likely to undertake L&M. 100% of the largest organisations had done so, falling to only 11% of small organisations. Given that a very large percentage of L&M development and delivery was found to be internal, this may well be linked to a lack of internal training capacity in small organisations.

### **Subjects**

These organisations are delivering an impressive range of L&M related subjects, with the most common being soft leadership skills and, to a lesser extent, functional skills. The most common subjects were team working, appraisal/supervision, coaching/mentoring, managing conflict, communication and motivating people. This commonality of generic skills may afford an opportunity to develop a Skills Passport that would be valid across organisational boundaries.

## **Delivery**

Most organisations use a mixture of internal and external training delivery. The use of internal programmes may be because of a lack of appropriate programmes and/or cost or flexibility. They tended to use multiple delivery methods, with the most common ones being classroom based, seminars, projects, on-the-job training and coaching/mentoring. There is a preference for flexible learning approaches that are practically focussed, tending to use supported learning rather than individual study. This is probably to fit around the demands of a busy working environment and the varying learning styles/abilities of individuals.

## **Staff groups**

Staff at every level from junior staff to CEOs had undertaken L&M development, but the most common grades were managers and senior managers. This may reflect the fact that many homes/units operate as distinct business units, which places significant demands on the individual in charge. The broad range of staff groups may afford an opportunity to implement a Skills Escalator integrating the programmes between different staff groups.

## **Implementation dates**

Most organisations that had implemented L&M had done so within the last 3 years. This may be due to the focus on NVQ and induction standards driven by targets and funding taking up organisations' capacity to undertake training.

## **Funding**

Thirteen organisations reported annual spend on L&M totalling £911, 688. However, of this £675,000 was spent by 3 large organisations. One organisation reported spending of £400,000. Excluding this very large figure, the average undertaking L&M development was £753. Less than half of the organisations had managed to access public funding. This demonstrates a substantial commitment to L&M development, particularly as cost is the major barrier to undertaking training.

## **Accreditation**

Half of the organisations delivering L&M had their programmes formally accredited, mostly by the ILM. This suggests that organisations value formal recognition of their courses.

## **Feedback and effectiveness**

Almost all organisations had undertaken feedback exercises, using a variety of techniques. Overall, assessment of programmes was very positive, some extremely positive. One organisation described programme effectiveness as 'extraordinary!' and another had not recruited externally for a registered manager or deputy for the last 4 years.

## **Part 2 – Employers' views**

### **Importance**

Contributors attached considerable importance to L&M development with 82% assessing it to be Very Important and the remaining 18% as Important.

### **Key Factors**

The most important factors were cost, workplace delivery, recognition of L&M by CSCI in inspection reports, accreditation, having a skills escalator and skills passports.

### **Staff groups**

The staff groups that would benefit most from L&M development were felt to be managers and senior managers.

### **Subjects**

The most important subjects were felt to be motivating people, communication, coaching mentoring, appraisal supervision, team working and managing conflict. Other suggestions made by respondents included managing change and marketing.

## **Conclusions**

Key themes have emerged from this survey that are consistent across previous research, organisations that have L&M programmes and the wider views of employers. L&M development is clearly seen as crucial to delivering quality care and support services.

There is a very real need for sector L&M development, particularly in smaller organisations. Cost is the main barrier, but lack of access to appropriate programmes also seems to be significant.

CSCI has reported that the substantial improvement gains in care achieved over previous years have stalled. Although conjecture, this could be due, at least in part, to NVQ targets being met in many organisations. The implementation of their own L&M development programmes by medium/large employers over the last 3 years could be a grass roots recognition and response to the above by organisations with the capability and capacity to do so.

Nearly half of the organisations surveyed had implemented L&M development. A substantial element of this had been internally developed and delivered, and these organisations had committed substantial sums of their own funding to doing so. Moreover, overall assessment of these programmes was very positive and half of the programmes had been formally accredited. There were clear themes in terms of subject, delivery methods and target staff groups, and the range of issues covered was impressive.

The views of the full range of employers surveyed on these issues matched very closely the employer L&M programmes already in existence. For example, the 6 top subjects in existing programmes matched exactly those assessed to be most important in the wider survey. Equally, the staff groups targeted in existing employer programmes matched exactly what employers said they needed. Also, the general approach of existing programmes to issues such as accreditation and workplace delivery, and their potential for implementation of a Skills Passport

and/or Skills Escalator match closely what employers assess to be most important to them.

That existing employer programmes meet the needs expressed by employers overall may seem fairly predictable, but the analysis of previous research suggests that existing L&M programmes are not seen as meeting the needs of employers. This may be because this survey focused on employer led L&M only and not on wider L&M provision by other agencies and organisations, which previous research has done.

This suggests strongly that there is no need to re-invent the wheel. An obvious, low cost approach that would meet employers L&M development needs would be to support employers in developing their existing programmes and then rolling these out across the sector. The majority of those already delivering L&M have indicated that they might be prepared to support such an initiative. It is evident that there are important messages in this survey to take forward in discussion with the newly established National Skills Academy for Social Care.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. Removing the barriers

#### **Being cost effective**

Employers are clearly willing to pay, but cost is the primary barrier to the implementation of L&M development programmes. Any programme must be highly cost effective, particularly in the current economic climate. Equally, the National Skills Academy for Social Care must be a lean, cost effective organisation to be attractive to employers.

#### **Making best use of public funding**

To help overcome the primary barrier of cost and ensure that the limited public sector funding available delivers best value, funding mechanisms should be identified and focused to specifically support L&M development. These must be readily accessible to all organisations, but particularly smaller ones.

#### **Supporting smaller organisations**

Access to effective L&M programmes appears to be a particular issue for smaller organisations, probably because of a lack of capacity. Attention should be given to developing specific support to accessing appropriate L&M programmes.

### 2. Delivering a solution

#### **Meeting employers' needs**

To be effective and encourage uptake, L&M programmes must meet employers needs, as outlined above. To begin closing the L&M skill gap, resources and support should be provided to existing employer L&M programmes to refine these and develop cost effective, practical programmes that can be easily replicated to meet the needs of the wider sector.

#### **Disseminating best practice**

Further work should be carried out to identify and disseminate the L&M best practice that already exists within the sector.

#### **Informing the National Skills Academy in Social Care development**

The employers' views in this report should be used to inform positively the developing work of the emerging Skills Academy to ensure it is able to meet fully the needs of L&M within the social care sector.

### 3. Encouraging uptake

#### **Recognition by the regulator**

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) should encourage organisations to work on closing the L&M skill gap to drive up care standards. Specifically, by recognising in inspection reports the importance of leadership, the commitment made by those organisations implementing L&M development and the contribution this makes to driving up standards of care.

### **Celebrating existing excellence**

Ways should be found to recognise the excellence in L&M that already exists within the sector, perhaps through sponsorship of a sector award and/or media reporting.

## **4. Conducting further research**

### **The link to standards**

Further research should be carried out to test the conjecture that sector wide L&M development could play a key role in driving up care standards.

### **Transferable L&M models**

Further research work should be carried out to map existing L&M provision in more depth and begin developing transferable models that could be accessed by all organisations, particularly smaller ones, and which would support skills escalators and passports. This would support the developing work of the National Skills Academy for Social Care.

### **Stakeholders**

The needs of stakeholders not included in this survey should be included in further research work.

### **Funding**

AgeCare carried out this research without funding but, given the importance of this issue, funding should be identified to take this forward.

## Appendix – survey questionnaire



Training and Development  
Committee

### LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

<b>Name:</b>		<b>Tel:</b>	
<b>Appointment:</b>		<b>E-Mail:</b>	
<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>Type:</b> Older people Learning disability Housing Other.....	<b>Area of Operation</b> North, Midlands, South East South West	<b>No Staff:</b>

Please add/do not add my e-mail address to the NCF Learning Network\*

#### PART 1 – YOUR VIEWS

1. How important do you feel Leadership and Management (L&M) development is/would be to your organisation?

Very Important / Not Very Important / Not At All Important

2. Please assess the importance of the following factors.

	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Very Important</b>	<b>Not At All</b>
Workplace delivery				
Local delivery (eg FE college)				
Distance learning				
Delivery by existing provider				
Web based learning				
Web based resources				
Accreditation				
Degree level qualification				
Cost				
Transferrable (eg skills passport)				
Range of courses offering progression (eg skills escalator)				
Recognition of L&M by CSCI in inspection reports				

Are there any other factors that you feel are important?

--

3. Please assess the extent to which the following staff groups would benefit from L&M development.

	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Very Important</b>	<b>Not At All</b>
Junior staff				
Supervisors				
Managers				
Senior Managers				
CEO				

4. Please assess the importance of the following subjects.

	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Very Important</b>	<b>Not At All</b>
Leadership Styles				
Coaching/Mentoring				
Team Working				
Managing Conflict				
Communication				
Motivating People				
Managing Projects				
Finance				
Employment Law/HR				
Appraisal/Supervision				
Legal Issues				

Are there any other subjects that you feel would be important?

--

5. Are there any other comments that you would like to add?

--

**PART 2 - YOUR ORGANISATION**

**We have/ intend to implement/ would like to implement L&M Development\***

<b>Date Programme introduced (if applicable):</b>					
<b>Training Provider</b>			Internal/External Provider*		
If internally developed, do you provide to other organisations?					
If not, would you be prepared to do so if you had the opportunity? Yes/No/Maybe*					
If provided by external organisation, name of organisation?					
<b>Core Modules</b>					
Leadership Styles   Coaching/Mentoring   Team Working   Managing Conflict					
Communication   Motivating People   Managing Projects   Finance					
Employment Law/HR   Appraisal/Supervision   Legal Issues					
Other:.....					
<b>Method of Delivery</b>					
E-learning   Distance learning   Classroom Based   Workbooks   Seminars					
Projects   On-the-job training   Mentoring   Coaching .....					
<b>Staff Group(s) Undertaking</b>					
Group	Junior Staff	Supervisors	Managers	Senior Managers	CEO
Estimated numbers In last 12 months					
<b>Finance</b>					
Estimated annual spend on L&M training:					
Details of any public funding accessed.					
<b>Accreditation</b>					
If accredited, by whom?					
<b>Feedback/Assessment Systems</b>					
Details of any systems in place:					
Your overview of effectiveness/value of your L&M Programme					

Delete as applicable\*

## References:

---

- <sup>1</sup> State of social care in England 2006-07, 29 January 2008 (CSCI 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual report to Parliament)
- <sup>2</sup> NCF Personnel Statistics Report August 2008
- <sup>3</sup> NMDS-SC Briefing Issue 4 (November 2007) – Qualifications
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Health, Putting People First - working to make it happen: adult social care workforce strategy - interim statement, 23 June 2008
- <sup>5</sup> Leadership Management (A strategy for the social care workforce) main report 2006 reprint of 2004 Topps England publication
- <sup>6</sup> The Voluntary Sector Skills Survey 2007 (England) published by the UK Workforce Hub at NCVO
- <sup>7</sup> Third Sector Skills Research 2008: further evidence and recommendations on skills gaps published by the UK Workforce Hub, 2008
- <sup>8</sup> Third Sector Skills Research 2008: further evidence and recommendations on skills gaps published by the UK Workforce Hub, 2008
- <sup>9</sup> The UK Voluntary Sector Workforce Almanac 2007 published by the Workforce Hub at NCVO
- <sup>10</sup> Anatomy of the Third Sector 2008, Third Sector Magazine article by Andy Ricketts