

CAPITAL CITY PARTNERSHIP

MINUTE OF MEETING

Meeting of:	<u>JOINED UP FOR JOBS STRATEGY GROUP</u>	
Held at:	Capital City Partnership offices, 1 Canon Street, Canonmills, Edinburgh	
Date:	Wednesday 15 June 2006	
Present:	Jim Rafferty (chair) Matthew Crighton Ken Shaw Cora Macfarlane Lindsay Geddes Cllr. Ian Perry Paul Gierthy Roger Horam	Capital City Partnership Capital City Partnership City of Edinburgh Council Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh & Lothian Jobcentre Plus City of Edinburgh Council Careers Scotland Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce
Apologies:	Kenneth Wardrop Christine Docherty	City of Edinburgh Council NEAR

Action

1 Minutes of the meeting of 1 March 2006 and Matters Arising

Cora Macfarlane asked that the minutes under item 4, SEEL/CCP Mapping Exercise, be changed to say that "SEEL's budget for Training for Work in 2006/7 was expected to be £0.95 million". She reported that the actual budget was £779,000. With this amendment the minutes were agreed as a correct record.

The following matters arising were considered:

Health and Employability

This had been part of the discussion at the CCP Board meeting referred to in item 7b below

IB Reform Green Paper

Matthew Crighton reported that the CCP had made a submission on the basis of the experience of JU4J, which had been circulated and was available at the meeting.

Employer Contacts

There had been a meeting between Bill Wilson and Matthew Crighton about how the services for employers provided by JCP and the intermediaries in the city could be co-ordinated and how the employer contacts of JCP could be useful for the intermediaries. This had fed into the draft of the City Strategy bid discussed in item 6 below.

Working Together

Ken Shaw reported that the final report of this project had been submitted to the European Commission and a summary had been circulated. He agreed to circulate the conference report as well.

KS

2 Other Minutes and Matters Arising

The minutes of the meeting of the Infrastructure Development Programme Panel on 24 May 2006 and the funding decision therein were agreed.

The following minutes were noted and items arising from them were discussed as recorded below:

a) Evaluation Sub-group, 6 June 2006

The non-availability of data from three of the academies, ERA, HAC and Springboard, was noted. **Cora Macfarlane agreed to ask that they pass on data relating to outcomes from contracts with SEEL; and failing that, that SEEL could pass on information already supplied to SEEL.** There was discussion as to whether outcomes from publicly-funded programmes were anyway in the public domain. Jim Rafferty said that in relation to CCP contracts this would be the case. Cora said that in this respect SEEL was bound by SE national policy and it might be considered that this was commercially-sensitive information. It was noted that Springboard's contract was not for TFW but with the hospitality industry's section of SE.

CM

b) Partnership Forum, 6 April and 1 June 2006

c) Academies Collective, 30 May 2006

Issues relating to funding recorded in these minutes were discussed under item 7 below.

d) Money Advice Pilot Steering Group, 16 March and 18 May 2006

e) Communications Sub-group 12 May 2006

The direction in which it was proposed, in outline, to take the communications strategy for JU4J, was outlined – that the priority audience is those working in the territory of JU4J in the city; that news and live information would be channelled through the website and an associated e-mail bulletin; and that the remit of Working Capital should be revised in this light, with the possibility of less frequent publication. **This was endorsed in principle.**

Roger Horam said that there should be more attention to its production in electronic formats and there might be opportunity for sponsorship. Ken Shaw Paul Gierthy said that if frontline staff in JCP, Careers Scotland and intermediaries were the target audience then there was a danger of loading it too heavily with policy discussion and the current informative style should not be displaced.

f) Employability for Prison-leavers Steering Group 28 April 2006

3 Beneficiary Targeting

Ian Perry introduced this topic by noting that JU4J was regarded as an unqualified success and offered his congratulation for the effort and imagination which had gone into it. In this context he drew attention to the reduction of the difference in unemployment rates between target areas and the city average to below 5%; except in the cases of, where it remained just above 5%. Firstly he asked whether the target should be revised to, for example, twice the city average. Secondly he noted that it did not seem to be easy to move Craigmillar and Muirhouse below 5%; and he asked what this might mean in terms of targeting; and whether the shifting of resources to these areas (and implicitly away from other areas) might achieve greater levelling down.

Ken Shaw said that although these were pockets of disadvantage they were created by city-wide processes including housing allocations and migrations. Cora asked what was known about the unemployed and inactive populations, their age and experience, how long they had lived at that postcode. Lindsay Geddes thought that these areas

tend to have more long-term unemployed in their JSA count and high numbers of IB claimants.

Jim Rafferty said that CCP was looking at its contracts with the area intermediaries with a view to increasing outcomes in these areas and shifting attention to IB claimants. Matthew Crighton suggested that intermediaries be asked for their insights into the issues; and that a sensible pattern of joint working would be to expect JCP and the intermediaries to be able to help most JSA claimants into work with support from other local organisations; and to be able to refer those with substantial problems, often IB or IS claimants, to specialist agencies in the city if their local resources were insufficient.

It was agreed to investigate the questions and to return to the subject when more information would be available.

CEC,
CCP

4 City Strategy proposal

Matthew Crighton summarised the key elements of the draft Expression of Interest which had been circulated for the meeting. Jim Rafferty emphasised the additionality for the city which was expected from this in targeting of the hardest to help groups with the assistance of flexibilities in national rules ('enabling measures'). He considered that a reliable agreement about reward funding would be important. Ken Shaw noted that the New Deal contracts which had recently been awarded contained a clause saying that the contract may be varied in light of agreed City Strategies. Ian Perry said that the Expression of Interest should make clear that Edinburgh is already at a point which DWP want many other cities to get to and that we are in a position to go to the next stage of developing joined-up infrastructure.

It was agreed that the Expression of Interest would be developed by CCP on the lines in the draft and submitted on behalf of the Strategy Group.

MC

5 Strategy and Policy Development – Equal Opportunities Monitoring

The meeting considered the report produced by the Employment Research Institute on this subject as part of the Working Together project. The discussion centred on two issues, firstly the recommendation that "The principles of positively promoting equality should be actively pursued by all JU4J partners. In relation to gender and race equality, action includes conducting equality impact assessments for the JU4J strategy and in individual organisations and publishing equality schemes".

It was noted that equal opportunities monitoring has been incorporated into the JU4J Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and the outcomes report to the Strategy Group; and **agreed in principle that it should be extended to cover all the major programmes of partners; and that it should be standard practice of all provider organisations.**

ALL

In addition the meeting considered the conclusion that "overall, the service providers who participated in the research were more familiar with the issues surrounding gender inequality than for race" and that "there were reports of a reluctance among some ethnic minority clients to access white-dominated pre-employment services. A small number of organisations had no ethnic minorities in their client group and had not taken steps to address this imbalance". Ken Shaw said that Skillnet had done some work funded by CEC on this issues and it was agreed **that a further report be prepared on promoting participation in employability and employment services by minority ethnic groups.**

KS

6 Regeneration Outcomes Agreement

a) Vocational Options in Schools

Jim Rafferty reported that CCP had recruited an employee to work on this project. She was seconded to the Children and Families Department of the City of Edinburgh Council to join up efforts to extend vocational programmes to more schools in the city. He also referred to the recent announcement of the NEET Strategy by the Scottish Executive, 'More Choices, More Chances'. Paul Gierthy mentioned the need for (additional support for?) school-college collaboration.

b) CCP Board: reports on funding for Jobs Strategy

Jim Rafferty reported that the CCP Board meeting in March had received a report on the Jobs element of the Regeneration Outcomes Agreement (ROA). It had agreed to look at the working relationships which might be established with other Lothian Councils with a view to extending the geographical scope of JU4J or elements of it. It had also noted the anticipated reductions in funding for support for jobseekers, particularly ESF and agreed to look into how these reductions could be mitigated and planned for.

Jim asked about progress on the mapping of the provision funded by JU4J Strategy Group members. Cora said that this was getting close to completion but may well have to be revised in light of current rounds of contracting. It was noted that the CEC International Unit was monitoring developments as regards ESF. Roger Horam said that ECCE was looking at the jobs and beneficiary places which would be lost from Edinburgh. It was noted that if the East of Scotland European Partnership was to be wound up and the only administrative split was to be Highland/Lowland, then Edinburgh's applications would be competing with Strathclyde's.

SEEL

Jim drew the meeting's attention to the approaches to the Strategy Group from both the Partnership Forum and the Academies Collective on funding matters. **It was agreed that:**

- **A funders group would be convened**
- **JCP and SEEL would be asked respond to the issues raised in the correspondence**
- **Jim Rafferty would meet with the funding sub-group of the Partnership Forum.**

JR
CM
LG
JR

7 Implementation and Funding Issues

New Futures Fund Successor Programme

Jim Rafferty reported that a brief for commissioning a new co-ordinating programme for vulnerable target groups had been agreed and would be sent out for tenders within June 2006.

Working for Families

Ken Shaw gave an update on this programme.

Employability Case Management for Prison-Leavers

Matthew Crighton reported that a brief for the creation of an employability case management system for prison-leavers has been agreed by the Steering Group which includes CCP, City of Edinburgh Council, JCP, Careers Scotland, ECCE, Scottish Prison Service: Edinburgh Prison, Polmont YOI, and Cornton Vale, SACRO, Drugs Action Team, Lauder College, and APEX. A presentation was to be made to interested organisations on 23 June at which they would be invited to submit short Expressions of Interest by 6 July. Following this a selection of organisations invited to prepare a full tender will be made.

8 Monitoring and Evaluation Reports

Lothian Labour Market Unit (LLMU)

A report on the JSA claimant count prepared by CEC City Development was considered. It was noted that it did not cover the same breadth as the LLMU reports. It was reported that John Carmichael of SEEL had said that they had no plans to continue producing this kind of labour market intelligence but that he had heard the York Consulting might be producing a labour market bulletin for Lothian. Ken Shaw pointed out that even if this was done it would not replace the LLMU because a core part of that had been the capacity for primary research; and asked if there would be another LLMU Steering Group held as had been planned. Cora Macfarlane referred him to Research Online on the Futureskills Scotland website for links to any research which was being done; and said she did not know whether there would be a further meeting but no resources were available from SEEL.

On the information in the report, it was noted that there appeared to be a convergence between the indicators for Scotland and Edinburgh, which had previously been doing better than the Scottish average. The meeting also considered the report drafted for the CCP Board on employment issues and it was noted with surprise that data was only available on vacancies and ILO unemployment up to 2004. **It was agreed to ask JCP if their Districts could access any more up-to-date data.**

LG

Academies, Area Intermediaries and other outcome data

A report on outcomes of the four area intermediaries, the academies and other programmes had been submitted by CCP. Jim Rafferty noted that although there were still gaps in data collection and there were presentational issues to be addressed, this contained abundant useful data. Points noted included:

- The area intermediaries had exceeded their target outcomes.
- Only a small proportion of their beneficiaries were recorded as claiming IB; and a significant proportion were claiming no benefits.
- There were very varying degrees of penetration of the JU4J target groups
- The data on academy outcomes were patchy and unreliable

The NEET Group of School-leavers (not in employment education or training)

The meeting considered a report prepared for the Evaluation Sub-Group on this subject. It was agreed to:

- Refer it to the Vocational Options Sub-group
- Investigate why fewer school-leavers were entering Further Education
- Refer the recent rise in NEET school-leavers in North Edinburgh for consideration by NEAR.

JR

CS

CD

Paul Gierthy reported that the Scottish Executive had asked for more information and there would be two 100% surveys of school-leavers annually, in October and March.

9 Dates of Future Meetings

The dates for meetings in 2006 will be:

2.00 pm 6 September

2.00 pm 6 December