

## CAPITAL CITY PARTNERSHIP MINUTE OF MEETING *DRAFT*

**Meeting of:** **Working Together  
for Employment and Inclusion in Edinburgh**

### **STEERING GROUP**

**Held at:** Capital City Partnership offices, 1 Canon Street, Canonmills,  
Edinburgh

**Date:** **Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> October 2005**

**Present:**

Bruce Penman	West Edinburgh Action/Stevenson College
Susi Corner	City of Edinburgh Council
Stephen McMurray	Capital City Partnership
Brian Martin	City of Edinburgh Council
Matthew Crighton (Chair)	Capital City Partnership

Peter Purves	Into Work
Roger Horam	Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce
Julie Skelton	Jobcentre Plus
Sam Hardie	Women Onto Work
Stephen McMurray	Capital City Partnership
Colin Lindsay	Employment Research Institute

**Apologies:**

Ken Shaw	City of Edinburgh Council
Kenneth Wardrop	City of Edinburgh Council
Sally McGreevy	Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh & Lothian
Dominique Petitquex	Communities Scotland
Mark Crawford	Edinburgh Retail Academy
Alister McInnes	Jobcentre Plus
Abi Reynolds	Edinburgh Lifelong Learning Partnership
Julie Bilotti	Scottish Executive
Christine Mulligan	ESF Objective 3 PME

Action

**1. Minutes of the meeting held on 13th July 2005**

Agreed as correct record.

**2. Matters Arising**

None that are not covered by agenda.

**3. Baseline Study**

Matthew tabled a copy of the slides from a previous presentation given by Colin Lindsay on the findings of the Baseline study. Matthew also tabled a paper summarising a selection of some specific recommendations from the study as an *aide memoir*, which highlight those which he feels we have the capacity to respond to. Matthew added that some recommendations affirm that we should continue to do what we are doing but there are others that require some discussion.

Matthew asked Colin, from the experience of researching and compiling the Baseline study, if he could identify a few of the key priorities that we should be focussing on. Colin offered what he felt were key issues that need to be addressed. He began by

identifying a need to better understand the key target groups and their needs. Colin emphasised the need to understand how we build on the mapping of target groups in terms of qualitative measures; a need to better understand their 'distance' from the labour market and what actually works by way of moving them closer to employment.

Colin referred to a number of issues that, to varying degrees, persistently came up as gaps in service and therefore barriers for clients moving towards employment. Issues include:

- Benefit issues – problems detected of clients still unwilling to go to JCP for this advice. This issue partly addressed via the Money Advice Pilot, demonstrating the value of outreach activity in this area. But a counter issue emerged of external agencies concerned about offering advice on benefits etc for fear of making errors leading to client being worse off.
- Childcare – a number of problems about availability and access to childcare services. Possibility that some of these issues can be addressed through future links to Working for Families programmes.
- Literacy – problems about assessment of literacy levels and general link with employability services. Colin mentioned some good work happening in Northern Ireland on this subject.

Colin continued by raising the question of how does the strategy respond. Where and how are intermediaries resourced to address any or all of these issues? Or how are services that already exist integrated into the strategy so that services are better co-ordinated.

Colin went on to report that the value of transitional placements via the Academies needs to be recognised. And the focus on Demand Led, although welcome, perhaps needs to be presented as Demand Responsive. One significant point to note however is that providers in the supported employment field feel outside of the loop.

Quality at Work was another area where the Baseline Study reports value in pushing this agenda, (perhaps via the Academies) as it can be demonstrated that it makes good progress getting people into work. Can we influence work place practices such as number of hours worked, start/finish times etc, that could be the difference between someone starting and keeping a job?

Key question however, is how do we engage employers on retention and progression routes? How do we develop that discussion and articulate a strong business case for employer engagement?

JU4J has been successful in promoting employability but need is now to push for employer buy in to address labour market problems.

Colin added that the Academies are established as a high quality brand in the JU4J strategy. Alongside this, the challenges in engaging and progressing the 'hard to help' key target groups is well acknowledged. Colin asked whether the Academies are meeting the needs of this client group?

Brian suggested that there was perhaps too much emphasis on the Academy end of the strategy and that this brushes over and over simplifies the role of intermediaries in engaging and equipping hard to help individuals and groups prior to any Academy intervention.

Roger added that Academies are not all the same and have different approaches. The

role of area based intermediaries' needs to be highlighted. There are small numbers going through Academies and many of them are working with 'blue chip' companies. Roger added that there is no SME involvement.

Matthew raised the question of the capacity of Academies to work with more clients, (either employees or employers)??

Susi referred to the response tabled from Julie Bilotti and specifically the priorities listed. Susi felt that Julie's list both captured and ordered the priorities we should be looking at. The list below is extracted from Julie's paper.

- a new approach to meeting funding challenges;
- a more "joined up" approach to the development of the "menu" of interventions where clients are not near enough job ready for the Academies, and more effective data sharing;
- more proactive employer engagement especially SMEs;
- the challenge of an increasingly hard to help client base, and leading from that;
- the need to integrate more with healthcare and social work services; and
- the need to look beyond job entry to improve sustainability and job progression

The meeting agreed that Julie had summarised the priorities well.

Colin said that the focus on Academies followed the brief provided and he accepted that the Academies should not see clients who were not job ready or at least very close to being job ready. He drew the meeting to 2 key matters that he felt need some attention.

Firstly, there is a need to look at a **Quality at Work** agenda in order to encourage progression at work and retention. And secondly, accepting the challenges of getting many of the key target groups into employment, there is a need for some form of **Transitional Placements** to be available.

Bruce agreed with this and suggested that the JU4J Strategy needs to acknowledge the value of a Transitional Placement Model (TPM) and that the Strategy Group should explore ways to fund and support this.

Peter added that there was a particular need for Supported Employment placements, and that employer engagement is crucial to this. Peter also added that the SME market was virtually untapped and that more should be done to improve this.

There was further discussion on TPMs', including voluntary work, and what one might look like. It was agreed to that this should be accepted as a priority and that this should be communicated to the JU4J Strategy Group. There was also agreement to look at the Baseline recommendations and identify which of them are key priorities.

Bruce echoed funding as a priority for the Strategy. Issues around multiple funding streams for similar work. He asked if it were possible for funders to sit down and come up with a more strategic model of funding? Standardised funding applications would also help.

Matthew concluded the discussion by suggesting that the Steering Group agree that the 4 key priorities are:

- The need for a Training Placement Model that includes recognition of voluntary work.

- That the strategy responds to employers needs generally and not just through the Academies.
- Ways to develop joined up funding of activities should be pursued
- And the need to develop practical links with health and social work departments and agencies.

The meeting agreed to accept these issues as priorities.

## **4. Secretariat Report**

### **4.1 Conference – PR and other details**

Brian informed the meeting that the conference programme is now complete (tabled). Numbers for the event are about 340. Looking to get some PR jointly between, CCP, CEC and ERI on Baseline Study, Website/Directory and Conference.

### **4.2 Consultations**

Both the Prison Leavers Study and the Equal Ops/TNA Study are in or near Draft Final stages. Both are out for comment and will be available in the near future. The Evaluation Sub Group meets on the 30<sup>th</sup> November and will discuss the Equal Ops Study.

### **4.3 Policy/Strategy Update**

Policy mapping grid seeking to identify priorities still to be returned by some partners. There is still need to reach a consensus on future policy direction and process.

### **4.4 Website Update**

Website now live. Intention to use the Working Together Reception as a formal launch event.

### **4.5 Evaluation**

TERU wish to speak to key stakeholders on processes of Working Together. Work will begin in earnest after the conference. The Steering Group members have been identified as the key stakeholders and Alan McGregor will be in touch I due course.

## **5 AOB**

### **5.1 Issue 9 of Working Together is at the printers and includes an extra 4 page Conference spread.**

### **5.2 Budget/ Project Extension**

Brian informed meeting that the Commission has agreed to a project extension till February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

### **5.3 Online Survey**

Roger informed the meeting that he had been working on an online survey in

relation to employer engagement that Brian has circulated for comment, and following the discussion earlier in the meeting. Roger would welcome some further comments on the form prior to it being circulated.

**6**

Date of Next Meeting  
30<sup>th</sup> November 2005