

**KCC CLS: Future of Adult Education in Kent
Future options opportunity and risks**

Option	For	Against
1 – Contractual delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option would support and enable a change of mind set and culture for KCC CLS staff, and a focus on driving the skills agenda to upskill and reskill Kent’s residents for employment. • Reduced financial risk for KCC compared to other options. • Opportunities to attract additional funding would continue, for example wider funding attached to refugee groups and Hong Kong BN(O) passport holders. Also, opportunities to deliver fee income generating courses to employers and where needs were identified could still be implemented, within the focus on the skills agenda. • Learners who are no longer fundable would be signposted to organisations such as U3A (https://www.u3a.org.uk/) who have a broad leisure/pleasure offer. • Community groups, tutors for private classes and other partners could rent rooms when not being used. • More buildings will become available for disposal/repurpose. • Opportunity to prepare for devolution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of inability to identify sufficient external venue availability/capacity to accommodate/support the level of community-based provision and at a reasonable price. Discussions have commenced with Colleges and Housing Associations. • Financial cost of sustaining buildings which are no longer required. • Higher levels of redundancy than option 2, with increased redundancy and pension costs. • Destabilisation of the organisation and personnel. • Time required to develop and implement changes to MI system, web site etc are challenging, but ongoing. • CLS is ‘behind the curve’ in adjusting business model. • Requires a peripatetic workforce. Increase in environmental impact.
2 – Contractual delivery plus Learner Funded Business Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of leisure/pleasure courses would still be available. • Mitigation of complaints regarding closure of courses. • Learners, ineligible for funding, who couldn’t afford new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non funded, leisure/pleasure courses would see approx. increase in fees, for specialist courses requiring specialist equipment at circa 100% higher than the equivalent subsidised course rate, thus making them unaffordable

fees could be signposted to organisations such as U3A (<https://www.u3a.org.uk/>, Local council supported schemes, colleges etc)

- Some buildings will become available for disposal/repurpose.
- Community groups and other partners could rent rooms when not being utilised.

for some.

- Complaints regarding increase in course costs.
- Likely decrease in courses offered due to decreased demand, so staff redundancies would be likely but quantity unknown.
- Risk of non-viability of Full Cost unit with demand not meeting return on investment. Maintaining existing cost with reduced income would worsen the financial position of KCC CLS.
- Lack of 'start up' business development time may also limit KCC CLS ability to realise customer demand.
- Delivery of a full cost unit would be a distraction from contractual business, and in a time when a change of mindset/culture is required to undertake the work required to shape the core areas to best fit Kent's skills' needs. Engagement with staff regarding changes has been ongoing, with resistance being experienced.
- Risk of inability to identify sufficient external venue availability/capacity to accommodate/support the level of community-based provision and at a reasonable price. Discussions have commenced with Colleges and Housing Associations.
- Destabilisation of the organisation and personnel. Time required to develop and implement changes to MI system, web site etc are challenging, but ongoing.
- CLS is 'behind the curve' in adjusting business model.
- Financial cost of sustaining buildings which are no longer required.
- Requires a peripatetic workforce. Increase in environmental impact.

3 – Close CLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to prepare for devolution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact and delay to delivery of KCC strategic plans and detrimental impact on residents of Kent. • Negative impact to partner organisations who work closely with CLS (e.g. DWP) to progress their aims and in supporting Kent residents. • KCC would need to source alternative providers to bridge the gap • KCC Property costs accumulating despite no inhabitants or income. • Significant redundancy costs. However, some of the cost could be mitigated should TUPE apply to the transfer of contract to a third party.
4 – Do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to delivery or existing staff base in 2024 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option has been discounted as too high risk as it would not be compliant with funding rules or OFSTED expectations • Unable to claim funding to recoup spend to cover staffing costs / outlays (inc building costs) • Financially unsustainable with significant redundancy costs likely within a year or so. • Huge reputational damage to KCC which would impact on other aspects of KCC provision.