

CAPITAL CITY PARTNERSHIP

MINUTE OF MEETING

Meeting of: **JOINED UP FOR JOBS
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME PANEL**

Held at: Capital City Partnership, The Canon Mill, Edinburgh

Date: **25 May 2005**

Present:

Ken Shaw (Chair)	City of Edinburgh Council
Matthew Crighton	Capital City Partnership
Alister McInnes	Jobcentre Plus
Sally McGreevy	Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh & Lothian

Apologies Bill Wilson Jobcentre Plus

Action

1 Minutes of the meeting on 15 February 2005 and Matters Arising

The minutes of the meeting on 15 February 2005 were agreed as a correct record.

It was noted that two of the potential proposals mentioned in the minutes had not been received. Ken Shaw reported that it was now unlikely that there would be a proposal in respect of Get On.

As regards the relation between the JU4J website and directory and the Worktrain website, Matthew Crighton agreed to check again but he understood that the link would be to the Jobcentre plus website not Worktrain.

2 Outstanding Business

Draft IDP Outcomes and Funding Report

Matthew Crighton presented this draft report. **It was agreed as a draft for further circulation and development.** The following points were made on the report: MC

- The IDP had not started with a rigid plan so to some extent what it presents what arose from partners and providers
- It should examine whether targets set for specific projects have been achieved and specify the improved or additional elements of infrastructure which they have left
- The JU4J Strategy Group should consider how some of the successful developments should be embedded in the mainstream
- The processes devised for the IDP have worked, and while there have been some weaknesses it has been possible to learn from them

Matthew Crighton agreed to work on incorporating these points into the report MC

It was noted that almost all the funds in the IDP from the first two years had been allocated although not all had been spent to date. Some of the project appraisals were not on file. Matthew Crighton agreed to check which ones and circulate the Panel with this information.

Employer Outreach/Nisus Scotland

Ken informed the Panel that this project had finished early, by mutual consent, because the worker had got another job. Its outputs included two reports, which had been circulated to the Panel. He noted that the project had not been able to fully implement the task of devising ways of doing outreach to employers on behalf of the JU4J network, or a of smaller groups of providers, and that one of the reports explained some of the difficulties encountered. Matthew Crighton said that it was important to understand these since they were directly relevant to other ideas about

a common approach to placements.

It was also felt that probably there had not been sufficient understanding of the brief by the contractor. However, the second report produced, about issues for joint working based on a survey of a number of intermediaries, was of considerable interest and **it was agreed to circulate this.**

Edinburgh Retail Academy

Sally McGreevy referred to reports received from the Edinburgh Retail Academy. It was agreed that these did not appear to contain all the information needed and that the measures being used to record employer input were not as broad as anticipated. **The Panel agreed that Sally should seek further information before release of further money.**

SM

Employability Services for Prison Leavers

Matthew Crighton reported that the contractors for this would be selected on 27 May.

3 Forward Plan New Applications

Matthew Crighton reported that there remained only approximately £11,000 of IDP funds unallocated. It was agreed to seek a further round of funding of £60,000 each from the current partners. He also reported that if further funding for the IDP was to be awarded from the City Council's Social Justice Fund in this financial year, an application would have to be submitted which would outline the likely areas of expenditure and their impact on social inclusion. Similarly a report would have to be submitted to the CCP's Business Management Group for approval and release of a share of funds from the CCP.

Sally McGreevy confirmed the information given to the last meeting that if SEE&L is to make a contribution this will have to be related directly to achieving targets in terms of helping individuals into jobs; and specifically for the groups of people eligible for its National Programmes: Training for Work, Modern Apprenticeships and Skillseekers. She also informed the meeting that SEE&L itself had no budget for such a contribution but that there existed a discretionary fund within Scottish Enterprise National to which it could bid. Ken Shaw asked whether it would be a good idea to work together to maximise the sums drawn down from that fund to support activities within JU4J. Sally said that they intended to make such an application in respect of the Waterfront Recruitment Centre.

Alister McInnes confirmed that the District Office of Jobcentre Plus currently did not have funding available outside of the standard contracts for JCP programmes. It remained a possibility that the District Manager's Discretionary Fund might be a source of funding for projects of the type considered by the IDP. However the scale of and the criteria for this fund in the current financial year were not yet clear.

As regards the content of the application for further funds for the IDP, **it was agreed to emphasise that allocations would be decided through the agreed processes but to set out a number of likely projects drawn from the items covered in the report at the previous meeting and from the proposals in the pipeline.** It was noted also that if the second ESF Article 6 application is successful it may be important that some IDP expenditure can match-fund it, so the proposal in that should be referred to as well.

MC/KS

4 New Applications

Stepping Out

The Panel considered that this proposal, to fund a post which would give

employment-related support to people leaving prison, was in the same territory as the study already funded and soon to start. It was noted that it was not clear how the proposed activities would relate to those of Jobcentre Plus, and that the study would help clarify the options in this respect. **It was agreed that it would not consider the application until the report of this study is available.** KS

Waterfront Recruitment Centre

Sally McGreevy presented the proposals for the Waterfront Recruitment Centre, which was to be located in a cabin made available by one of the developers, Second Site. It had already been agreed that a JCP adviser would be based there, and that the Construction Academy would pay for the secondment of a Working Links worker, to focus on construction jobs. She said that it would provide links across Edinburgh to the jobs being created on the Waterfront sites (200 in year one, 400 in year two) and that it was supported by a feasibility study.

She said that there was an identified need for a Co-ordinator post, which was not yet funded. The application to the IDP was for the full amount set out in the spreadsheet provided, to be split between the IDP and SEE&L. The spreadsheet showed a 50/50 split of all costs except marketing, with the IDP bearing all marketing costs, giving a total request of £99,921 over two years; although Sally stressed that this was only a notional split and that the SEE&L application for funding for its share was yet to be finalised.

It was noted that the IDP has not got funding for the current year yet, and that there is no certainty of funding in the following financial year. If such an allocation were made from the funds being applied for, it would comprise over 80% of the funding available. In this context, a number of questions for clarification were asked:

- Matthew asked if the feasibility study could be made available
- Ken asked for more information about the case for a Co-ordinator, suggesting that this might perhaps be carried out by existing staff of one of the partners
- Matthew asked about the additionality of the project, since it could be assumed that most of the jobs would be filled without a Recruitment Centre; and specifically how many of the new jobs would be going to people from JU4J target groups.
- He also asked what agreements had been made with developers and contractors about their role in ensuring recruitment and training outcomes through contracts, since this was established as best practice in getting employer input on major developments.
- Ken asked what would happen to the Co-ordinator post after two years – what was the exit strategy.
- Matthew said that he hoped that the WRC would support and link into the JU4J ICT strategy

It was agreed that it was desirable that there should be a Waterfront Recruitment Centre, but that as regards this proposal there were two sets of issues. The first concerned eligibility and additionality, framed around the question of what additional outcomes for JU4J would arise from IDP funding. **It was agreed that Sally would consider these questions and report back on them.** The second concerned opportunity cost: if a large share of the available funds were to be dedicated to any one project, serious thought had to be given to the displacement of opportunities for funding other proposals. In particular it was noted that the Strategy Group would be holding a discussion of the future funding of the Employment Academies. For this reason **it was agreed to refer this issue to the Strategy Group for guidance.**

Staff Training and Development Programme

This proposal had been received from Potential Developments Ltd. It was noted that the Working Together project is planning to look at training needs of providers and

their staff and that it would fit into this framework. **It was agreed not to consider this proposal until the option of funding from this source had been explored.** Alister McInnes asked how the added benefits of the training proposed could be measured; and noted that if it was agreed to fund such training the Panel would then need to agree who would be best to provide it.

5 Dates of Future Meeting

It was agreed to set a provisional meeting for 10 June at lunchtime if necessary. MC

Scheduled meetings:

23 August

22 November

CAPITAL CITY PARTNERSHIP
JOINED UP FOR JOBS

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

REPORT MAY 2005

OBJECTIVES AND BACKGROUND

The objective of the IDP has been defined as *“to provide a resource to help address the various issues constraining the movement of individuals into employment, as highlighted in the “Joined up for Jobs” strategy (JUFJ) and subsequent evaluation work”*.

The Infrastructure Development Programme was established in 2003 by agreement of the key partners in Joined Up For Jobs. It was agreed that it would be funded by equal contributions from the City of Edinburgh Council, Capital City Partnership and Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh and Lothian (SEE&L). Contributions of £60,000 from the first two (CEC and CCP) in the two financial years (2003–4 and 2004–5) have been pooled in a fund administered by CCP.

The contribution from SEE&L could not be pooled in the same way and was to be made through funding of IDP-agreed projects considered on a case-by-case basis. It was accepted that Jobcentre Plus did not have the same capacity to contribute funding to the kind of activities envisaged under the IDP but it said it would contribute to IDP-funded projects where possible.

ACTIVITIES

The partners established an IDP Panel, comprising the four organizations mentioned above, which reports to the JU4J Strategy Group. It first met on 20 May 2003 and its first tasks were to agree procedures and criteria for funding. The partners were clear that the IDP would only be used to fund strategically important projects which would have an overall benefit in terms of improved joined-up service provision; therefore it would not normally fund direct delivery to clients; and could not be looked to by provider agencies to fill funding gaps for their delivery programmes.

It was further agreed that it was important that the IDP should support the most important strategic priorities, and not be only reactive. Therefore, while it offered the opportunity for organizations to make proposals of projects for funding by the IDP, the partners also prepared a work plan derived from the JU4J action plan and it

was agreed that the IDP Panel would arrange for the commissioning of projects to fulfill this.

In this framework, the following administrative steps were taken:

- Agreeing a transparent decision-making process with a set of criteria, a proposal form and an assessment template
- Creating necessary administrative and financial systems
- Dissemination of the opportunity to make proposals.

The consistency of the Work Plan with the JU4J Action Plan made it possible for some of the allocations of the IDP to be used as match-funding for the Working Together project, part-funded by Article 6 of the European Social Fund. This supports the review and development of policy, within the framework of the European Employment Strategy. Some projects have likewise been used as match-funding for the CCP's EQUAL programme, which has significantly enhanced the CCP's resources for co-ordination of the strategy.

The projects which the IDP Panel has agreed to fund are listed below.

PROJECT	DATE AGREED	LEAD PARTNER	STATUS
Academies Development Resource – Pool	29 Jul 03	SEE&L	Completed
Construction Academy Secondment	29-Jul-03	CEC	Completed
JU4J ICT Development Ph 2 Pilot	29-Jul-03	CCP	Completed
JU4J Research & Evaluation	2-Sep-03	CCP	Ongoing
Employer outreach – NISUS	5-Dec-03	CEC	Completed
Academy Development Pilot – ERA	5-Dec-03	SEE&L	Ongoing
Academy Brand Marketing	5-Dec-03	SEE&L	Completed
Academy Development Feasibility Study	6-Aug-04	SEE&L	Completed
Website and Directory	6-Aug-04	CCP	Ongoing
Baseline Study	6-Aug-04	CCP	Ongoing
Primary Intermediary Model – Intowork	6-Aug-04	CEC	Ongoing
Employability services for prison leavers	21-Dec-04	CCP	Starting
ICT Policy Roll-out	15-Feb-05	CCP	Agreed in principle

Further information on each of these is attached, and separately there is a spreadsheet showing the financial allocations and expenditure. A number of proposals have been rejected, on grounds that they did not meet strategic objectives; or that they could be funded in other ways.

OUTCOMES

The outcomes from each project are reported separately so this section gives an overview of the outcomes of the IDP to date. These can be grouped around three central themes of JU4J: working better to support excluded groups; working with employers to improve flows into work; and developing a co-ordinated pattern of delivery. Although these are presented as strategic objectives, it will be seen that they have a direct impact on improving results in terms of helping people into work.

Working better to support excluded groups

The JU4J Research and Evaluation project is playing an important role in investigating the scale and difficulties facing each of the JU4J eleven target groups: Physical Disabled, Learning Difficulties, Mental ill health, Ex-prisoners, Homeless, Ex-addicts, Care leavers, Lone Parents, Ethnic minorities, Refugees, NEET school leavers. This will set a benchmark for measuring progress. The work on each target group is being used to start or develop further discussion with key organisations about priorities.

Two projects are seeking to deal in detail with the practical challenges of particular groups, and developing city-wide responses: the Primary Intermediary Model, for working with a wide range of organisations dealing with specific disabilities; and the Employability Services for Prison-leavers project.

Working with employers to improve flows into work

The sectoral employment academies are Edinburgh's unique way of engaging employers with access-to-work policies and programmes. They are widely acknowledged as successful and innovative. Five projects have been related to the academies, comprising 24% of the total funds allocated. Through these relatively small projects the IDP has played a crucial role in supporting and developing this approach. The Academy Brand Marketing, the Academies Development Feasibility Study and the Academies Development Resource have been the only funding, apart from staff time, to support the collective development activities of the academies. The two other projects have piloted ways of engaging practical employer contributions to the management of the academies.

Developing a co-ordinated pattern of delivery

The largest proportion of the IDP allocated to date (60%) has been to projects which help to create a joined-up and co-ordinated pattern of delivery; and enhance the capacity of the city's providers to achieve outcomes for jobseekers, in particular

through better use of ICT. The Joined-up database pilot has demonstrated both the potential benefits of using a shared database and the collective willingness to do this. From this has been established an outline policy to support better joint working; the ICT Roll-out will be an essential resource for making this happen. The Baseline Study is a core element of the Working Together project. It will include an evaluation of JU4J and of the academy approach; and provide the baseline for the partners to review and move forward the strategy. The Website and Directory will be both a practical aid to all agencies in the field, as well as to job-seekers; and also a clear symbol of JU4J.

Benefits for the Strategy

There are also more general outcomes for JU4J which need to be reported. The existence of the fund has made a vital contribution to the development of Joined Up For Jobs by giving a practical demonstration of the key partners' commitments to changing the ways in which services are delivered for the benefit of jobseekers and employers. A particular benefit in having a fund dedicated to strategy-level actions is that it stimulates engagement at that level. Initially proposals made by providers were mostly for filling funding gaps and these were turned down as inappropriate or modified through dialogue. Now however intermediaries have started to bring forward which respond to strategic needs.

It might be added that, as far as is known, Edinburgh is the only city to have such a fund. It therefore is important is demonstrating, at national level, ways of achieving a joined-up approach to funding, which is a crucial underpinning of any effective delivery of local strategies. Lastly the role of the IDP projects as a source of the capacity to match-fund ESF in Working Together and EQUAL has been of great importance to the implementation and development of JU4J. The ESF drawn in from this match funding has been

CONCLUSIONS AND LOOKING AHEAD

The Infrastructure Development Programme has been central to Joined Up For Jobs. Each of the project completed has given tangible benefits. Although one has not achieved all of what was intended, the experience has all the same proved valuable. The funds available to date have almost been fully allocated so there is a strong case for continuing the Programme for another year. This will require an application to the CEC Social Justice Fund and to the CCP. In light of changed priorities at Scottish Enterprise and the continuing development of Jobcentre Plus it will be important in this process to identify the support that those partners will be able to offer.

Linkages and Overlaps Report

Employment Links and Guidance Service

February 2005

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Methodology
4. Results & Discussion
 - i. Quantitative Data
 - ii. Qualitative Data
5. Conclusions & Recommendations
 - i. Conclusions
 - ii. Recommendations

1. Executive Summary

The Employment Links and Guidance service was set up in North Edinburgh to make and evaluate links with partners and employers whilst assisting Nisus trainees and partner organisations access work placements and employment opportunities.

As part of this remit, the project was commissioned to investigate the links and overlaps within the employability sector in Edinburgh and produce a report outlining the findings and future recommendations.

60 questionnaires were distributed to Joined up for Jobs forum members, of the 20 completed questionnaires, 87% of participants did not believe there is enough joined up working within the employability sector in Edinburgh, despite 75% of participants being confident they had a good awareness of similar organisations and agencies. 80% of participants felt that there **were** overlaps in employability services in Edinburgh.

Further discussion and consultation took place with JUFJ members and the main issues acting as barriers to increased linkages and partnership working were:

- Time restraints – unable to devote time to developing partnerships due to demands placed on time by service delivery.
- Establishing a balance between effort and reward – can be difficult to recognise tangible benefits for investment of time and energy.
- Dealing with competition for funding, clients and employment outcomes – no established method of sharing outcomes.
- Reconciling priorities across agencies to fit with individual funding arrangement and recording mechanisms.
- Trust – can be difficult to establish trust across multi agencies with many individuals involved.

There were a number of recommendations identified through partner discussion, including:

- Streamlining of employability services
- Large scale evaluation and review of existing services
- Establishing shared protocols and standards
- Increased use of ICT to promote sharing of information
- Increased opportunity for regular networking and sharing of good practice.

It is acknowledged that due to the low volume of returned questionnaires and informal nature of discussions held that this report does not provide a comprehensive evaluation of all members of Joined Up for Jobs. However, this report does provide valuable insights into potential difficulties posed by partnership working; there is a commitment to working together and providing client centred services to increase employability and employment opportunities in Edinburgh. Creative solutions however, will need to be applied to the obstacles outlined above.

This project ran from 19th April 2004 – 18th February 2005. The project terminated earlier than the anticipated end date of April 2005 due to the Employment Links/Guidance worker leaving the project to commence alternative employment.

2. Introduction

The Employment Links and Guidance project was a one year pilot project funded by the Joined Up For Jobs Infrastructure Development Fund. The project was managed by Nisus Scotland to investigate methodologies to enhance Employer links with access and training services in Leith/North Edinburgh. The project also helped Nisus Scotland trainees access work placement and employment opportunities.

In response to the issue of 'Fragmented pattern of Provision', the Joined up for Jobs strategy seeks:

“...to create an integrated, well informed and well understood pattern of service delivery which achieves maximum effectiveness and best use of available resources”

(Edinburgh's Employability Agreement, 2003)

This project seeks to examine and report on two key research questions which can contribute to creating the pattern of service delivery detailed in Edinburgh's Employability Agreement, 2003:

- **How can employers best engage with voluntary/public sector employability and training services to ensure effectiveness of action; what methods can be used to respond to their needs?**
- **What are the real and perceived barriers for provider organisations, clients and employers in developing an effective approach to addressing exclusion through increased employment opportunities?**

In order to identify the real and perceived barriers for provider organisations, clients and employers in developing an effective approach to addressing exclusion through increased employment opportunities, an action research project was undertaken to examine linkages and overlaps in the employability sector – this report details the results of this research.

3. Methodology

Various methods of gathering information were utilised as detailed below:

- Field research – meeting and discussing linkages and overlaps at various networking forums
- Gathering information from JUFJ sub committee and forum meetings
- Individual discussions with various member organisations of the Joined up for Jobs forum
- Questionnaires were distributed via Joined up for Jobs Forum to over 60 linked agencies, 20 questionnaires were returned; questionnaires were distributed electronically or in paper format. Questionnaires were completed and returned anonymously within agreed time limit (see appendix 1).

Participants in the research included:

- **Employment intermediaries with area specific remit:**
 - West Edinburgh Action
 - Working Links (North Edinburgh)
 - Worktrack (Craigmillar)
 - Midlothian Employment Action Network

- **Employment intermediaries with disability & health remit:**
 - Intowork
 - Remploy
 - Scottish Employment Opportunities
 - Real Jobs
 - National Schizophrenia Fellowship
 - Moving Intowork

- **Employment intermediaries with Ex-offenders & substance dependency remit:**
 - Momentum
 - Apex Scotland
 - Kent Face
 - Sorted

- **Employment intermediaries with disadvantaged groups remit:**
 - Project 20:20 (young people through & after care)
 - SkillNet (black & minority ethnic Individuals)
 - Women onto Work (women returners)

- **Public sector agencies:**
 - Job Centre Plus
 - Careers Scotland.

4. Results and Discussion

i. Quantitative Data – Main findings

Questions	Yes	No	N/A
Are there enough links within the employability sector?	62%	38%	
Is there enough joined up working within our sector?	13%	87%	
Has joined up for Jobs helped establish links & networking?	50%	25%	25%
Good awareness of similar organisations in your field	75%	25%	
Good knowledge of services in your geographical area?	75%	25%	
Do you gather information about other organisations?	100%		
Do you find it difficult to establish good referral routes	25%	62%	13%
Do you have clients who receive a similar service from other organisations?	62%	25%	13%
Are there overlaps in service provision for unemployed people?	80%	10%	10%

87% of participants do not believe there is enough joined up working within the employability sector in Edinburgh. The main reasons given for this were:

- Time constraints
- Unwillingness to share
- Perceived threat to funding (target driven competition)
- Previous negative partnership arrangements
- Unequal commitment to working together.

50% of participants felt that the Joined up for Jobs initiative had helped their organisation to build links and work together, specifically noting that their awareness of issues faced by other disadvantaged groups had increased.

75% of participants were confident that they had a good awareness of similar organisations and agencies; this was attributed to membership of organisations such as the Scottish Union of Supported Employment and the Lothian Employability Forum and undertaking service mapping exercises.

80% of participants felt that there were overlaps in services, this raised concern that clients would be unsure of which agencies to approach for an appropriate service.

25% of participants felt that it was difficult to establish good referral routes, it was felt that this was due to duplication of service provision. Those who reported good knowledge of referral routes based it on experience of the sector and positive past experiences.

62% of participants know of clients who receive the same or similar service from more than one organisation. This was generally felt to be beneficial to the client as it showed a high level of support for the client to progress into employment.

ii. Qualitative Data – discussion based

Joined up for Jobs – whilst 50% of participants felt that the JUFJ strategy has helped them establish links and improved networking, there were a number of issues which were raised in discussion with partner organisations.

- Some members feel that the JUFJ strategy concentrates too much on the job ready end of continuum; whilst the demand led sectoral academies have an important role in matching job ready clients with vacancies, the agencies working with clients furthest from the labour market feel that they also have a very important role within the service delivery model.
- There were requests for increased representation of employment intermediaries at strategy group level; it was hoped that this would improve communication within the Joined up for Jobs strategy. Although there is strategy group representation at the intermediaries forum, it can sometime be an intimidating forum which can prohibit individuals from raising their point.

- It was suggested that a mapping exercise could be carried out by the JUFJ forum which could be used to create an online directory; the frequent staff changes which occur at service level can make it difficult to maintain good referral links and an updated online resource would aid this process.
- The mapping exercise could also be used to give a clearer indication of where agencies/services fitted into the JUFJ service delivery model.
- As the JUFJ model is based on creating and sustaining effective partnership working, it was suggested that having private sector membership of the JUFJ forum would be helpful in gaining a clearer understanding of roles and responsibilities.

Funding impacted on many of the issues raised throughout the research:

- Participants felt that funding was often given to “new” projects which appeared to offer a “quick fix”; it is more difficult to secure funding for sustaining projects, especially those working with the most disadvantaged groups for whom hard targets are difficult to achieve.
- Participants felt that it was difficult to keep up to date with project activities/client groups as these often changed to “fit” new funding requirements.
- Thus creating an element of clients having to “fit available funding” rather than funding designed to fit clients needs.
- Funding constraints also have an impact on time available for networking with other agencies. With pressure to reach targets and achieve outcomes, it can be difficult to devote time to attending meetings, networking or sharing information.
- Competition for available funding can also impact on willingness to share client, placement or employer information. Due to time restraints (as above) any time spent ‘fostering’ a relationship with an employer to achieve a successful outcome is not likely to be readily ‘shared’ with other agencies.

Service Provision – the questionnaire results show that 75% of providers have a good awareness of services available for clients within the JUFJ locale; only 25% found it difficult to establish effective referral routes, the suggested reasons for this are:

- Services are often compartmentalised into specific client groups, if the client has multiple issues (dual disability etc), it is sometimes difficult to access the most appropriate help for the client.
- Not having clear referral routes can lead to the client either being 'lost' in the system, or referred through many agencies before receiving appropriate assistance. Anecdotal evidence from clients suggests that this type of 'revolving door' experience can lower self confidence and can affect motivation to ask for help.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

i. Conclusion

This report seeks to examine the **linkages** and **overlaps** in employability services in Edinburgh. The data collected from 20 completed questionnaires and through individual and group discussions suggest that there **are** overlaps in services in Edinburgh.

The Joined up for Jobs strategy has assisted organisations in making useful and effective links, however, a distinction has to be made between effective links and effective partnership working.

If links between service providers could be strengthened into working partnership agreements, the overlaps identified could be reduced.

- **The benefits of partnership working were identified as:**
 - Increased knowledge of specific employability and client group issues
 - Mapping of referral routes
 - Shared resources
 - Developing models of good practice.
- **The factors which may inhibit partnership working were identified as:**

- Time restrictions – unable to devote time to developing partnerships due to demands placed on time by service delivery
- Trust – can be difficult to establish trust across many agencies with many individuals involved
- Establishing a balance between effort and reward – can be difficult to recognise tangible benefits for investment of time and energy
- Reconciling priorities across agencies to fit with individual funding arrangements and recording mechanisms
- Dealing with competition for funding, clients and employment outcomes – no established method of sharing outcomes.

There are a number of issues which have been raised in this report; there are a number of recommendations outlined below which seek to fulfil the principles of the Joined up for Jobs strategy to better align funding for intermediaries and to co-ordinate a pattern of delivery.

Due to the low numbers of returned questionnaires and the informal nature of the discussions held, the data presented within this report may not be wholly representative of the membership of JUFJ. In order to accurately measure this, the study would require to be undertaken on a larger scale.

ii. Recommendations

• Streamlining of Services & Funding

There are several agencies including the sectoral academies, currently providing support to clients at the 'job ready' end of the JUFJ service delivery model; there is a need for the agencies at the other end of the spectrum to examine ways of streamlining their services to provide clearer routes and choices for clients and to apply for funding in a cohesive manner. It has been acknowledged that the clients at this end of the spectrum require long term support and encouragement and this needs to be made clear to funding bodies and policy makers.

There is no quick fix for clients who have been distanced from the labour market for a substantial number of years and these clients may require a

multi-agency approach to enable them to return to work. Agencies need to look at how services can complement each other rather than replicate services to compete for the same funding source.

- **Evaluation, Review and Cost Analysis**

An increased transparency of service delivery would enable agencies and funding bodies to identify gaps in employment provision whilst also highlighting areas of good practice and positive outcomes.

A cost benefit calculation undertaken with agencies would allow consistent evaluation and monitoring of project costs and also detail the effectiveness of time spent on certain activities such as networking and marketing.

- **Protocols and Standards**

It would be useful to review the protocols and standards currently used by employability services; this would provide information which could be used for creating joint protocols and benchmarking services.

A 'trade association' approach could be adopted by services, adhering to common standards and using shared paperwork and protocols. This would promote a stronger, more coherent structure for employers and clients and would provide a collective voice for influencing policy makers.

Membership of Joined up for Jobs could be dependent on an agency/service meeting agreed minimum standards. This would aim to reduce issues of 'trust' mentioned previously, where services are reluctant to share employer information due to the perceived 'differences' in quality of service provision.

Joint paperwork and referral information would make it easier for organisations to work together; it would also provide easier access for clients. Clients would only have to complete one referral form which could be transferred to appropriate services as required.

It would be useful to develop a model of continuing professional development for staff working within the employability sector. Sharing of knowledge and expertise and also joint commissioning of training would ensure new staff had access to information and existing staff were updating and adding new skills.

Due to high levels of staff turnover within the employability sector (often directly related to project funding/short term contracts), a continuing development programme would ensure expertise and knowledge would remain within the sector.

- **Database and Systems which Promote Sharing of Information**

A shared database of employer contacts would be beneficial to professionals working within the employability sector. Intowork developed the 'Service Link' database a number of years ago, but uptake for this service has been low. Lack of time, staff resources to update details and lack of motivation have been suggested as reasons for low uptake.

In addition to Service Link (which records employer information), the Employment Pathway software (which records client information), there are systems in use by Careers Scotland and Job Centre Plus, can these systems be streamlined to create one system or are they compatible to be used together?

- **Regular Networking Opportunities for Sharing Good Practice**

It is important for there to be continued opportunities for networking and sharing information within the JUFJ network. These meetings can provide a forum for useful discussion and an opportunity to share examples of good practice and positive marketing.

Feedback and discussion within the meetings should be encouraged and action plans produced as a result.

The Working Capital newsletter was seen as a useful vehicle for promoting the positive aspects of partnership working and also provided a platform for information sharing and dissemination of best practice.

There was a suggestion to hold more networking events, where the emphasis is to talk to other providers and increase knowledge of new developments; it is not always possible to do this at a coffee break or within the confines of a business meeting.

Appendix 1 **questionnaire**

Appendix 2

FACTORS WHICH INHIBIT YOUR ABILITY TO WORK TOGETHER

Questionnaire Results	Discussion Results
Time Constraints	Fear of losing funding
Funding Issues	Fear of good ideas been stolen
Gaps in knowledge of resources	Lack of time
Unwillingness to work jointly	Lack of resources
None	Fear of unequal work balance
Time	Negative past experiences
National/local level issues	Fear of loss of reputation
Time	Competition for bums on seats
Effort	Unable to share outcomes
Unsure of perceived and actual benefits	Shared targets mean less targets for each party
Lack of incentive	Stepping on each others toes
Unable to measure effectiveness	Unwillingness to share
Funding	Lack of commitment
Competition for numbers	Issues with staff shortages
Competition for targets	individual personalities
Perceived threat	Differing priorities
Non commitment of partners	Lack of understanding of each others clients groups
Balance between effort and reward	Time
Time	Constant staff chant over
Time	New staff not aware
Knowledge gaps	Relationships
Lack of real commitment	Conflicting objectives
Unable to see benefits for clients	Different time tables
Timescale	Meeting delays
Contact times/arranging meetings	Difficulty in sharing information
Movement of staff	Time scales
Short term agreements	Funding issues
Loss of partnership funding	Fear of missing targets
Movement of teams	Individual lack of interest
Shift in Priorities	Constant staff change/ means repeating work
difficult to get hold of people	Work load and resource issues
Poaching of clients	Lack of venues/ vehicles to share info
	Drain on energy if one partner is

	weaker
Real and Perceived competition for clients and outcomes	Ignorance
Lack of Interest	Ineffective recording monitoring and evaluation

Appendix 3

BENEFITS OF LINKING WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Questionnaire results	Discussion Results
Advice available	Coherent structure
Sharing specialised info	Able to assess effectiveness for funders
Client referral and movements	Shared expertise
Ensure through care and support	Marketing tool
Allows agencies to provide specialist support	Referral routes
Sharing resources	common voice
Training	large group to bounce ideas off
Developing practice	Develop good practice
Potential referral source	more professional service for employers
Maximises effectiveness of service	information gathering
Sharing best practise	Knowledge raising
Effective support for organisation	Way to map movement
Effective support for individual workers	Brings city wide standards up
Effective support for clients	Sets standards
Heightened awareness of services	Ensures good service for clients
Heightened awareness of opportunities	Provides support
Good marketing tool	allows info to be shared
Shared protocols	Funders like it
common standards	meets funding requirements
Awareness of others work	advice available
less duplication	expertise to tap into
More professional Common voice/approach is more influential	Wider Opportunities for clients to progress
Improved standards	Attracts training
Feeling of unity	Larger group attracts vip's
Better use of each others services	Shared knowledge
Better service for clients	Increased Knowledge
Learning from others experiences	Shared resources
Better use of resources	Financial
Taps into relevant expertise	shared knowledge
Fosters Good Relationships	shared staff

improves co-operation	can save time
Is attractive to funders	shared funds/ costs
Sharing good practice	Able to tap into others resources
Developing ideas	Access to expertise
Cross referrals	
able to map progression	can save resources
Increases experience of other areas	
Can help achieve targets and numbers	
Can increase opportunities	
Helps to develop strategy	