

# Private Document Pack

**Sheffield**  
**City Region**

COMBINED  
AUTHORITY

## SKILLS EXECUTIVE BOARD

Date: Tuesday 6 June 2017

Venue: SCR Executive Team, 11 Broad Street West, Sheffield

Time: 8.30 am

### AGENDA

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Page
	<b><u>Introduction</u></b>			
1	Welcome and Apologies	Verbal	Chair	
2	Declarations of Interest	Verbal	All	
3	Urgent Items/Announcements	Verbal	All	
4	Minutes and Actions of the Previous Meeting	Paper	Chair	1 - 6
5	Matters Arising	Paper	D Brennan	7 - 8
	<b><u>Discussion Items</u></b>			
6	Employment and Skills Strategy	Presentation	T Allen	
7	Devolution of AEB	Paper	K Wooffinden	9 - 12
8	Institutes of Technology	Paper	D Brennan	13 - 20
9	Early Intervention Employment Support Pilot	Paper	A Fitzgerald	21 - 26
10	Health Led Employment Trial	Paper	A Fitzgerald	27 - 30
	<b><u>Updates for Information</u></b>			
11	Skills Bank Update	Paper	R Bentley	31 - 36
	<b><u>Actions and Forward Planning</u></b>			

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Page
12	Agree Actions and Summary for Resolution Log	Verbal	Chair	
13	Forward Plan	Paper	D Brennan	37 - 38
14	Any Other Business			

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 18th MAY 2017**

**SCR SKILLS EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2017**

**BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD**

No.	Item	Action
1	<p><b><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u>            Nigel Brewster, LEP – Co-Chair            Cllr Chris Read, RMBC – Co-Chair</p> <p><u>In Attendance / Advisory Members</u>            Conor Moss, SHU            Sarah Stanley, SCR Exec Team            Andrea Fitzgerald, SCR Exec Team            Dave Brennan, SCR Exec Team            Kysia Wooffinden, SCR Exec Team            Paul Jagger, TRC            Jennefer Homes, DMBC            Melanie Ulyatt, OnetoOne Support Services            Simon Perryman , Barnsley College            Paul Corcoran, Sheffield College            Tom Smith, Barnsley MBC            Karen O’Donoghue, Martingale Consulting            Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>Apologies were received from Board Members: Jo Miller (DMBC), Julie Kenny (LEP), Cllr Ann Syrett, (BoDC) and Dorcas Bunton (DDDC) + Dan Fell (DCoC), Tony Tweedy (SCC), Andy Gates (SCR Exec Team) and Richard Howard (SCC / SCR Executive Team).</p>	
2	<p><b><u>Declarations of Interest</u></b></p> <p>The attendees noted a number of instances of association with projects and schemes directly and indirectly related to SCR activity and questioned whether these should be formally recorded.</p>	

	<p>It was noted that more explicit guidance on this matter will be included in the next substantive iteration of the SCR constitution in relation to member and officer engagements on the new Delivery Boards (the successors to the current Executive Boards). It was further noted that officer declarations are not ordinarily required as officers are covered their respective employing authorities officer code of conduct and any declarations of interest will already have been acknowledged.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></b></p> <p>None received.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<p><b><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> January were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<p><b><u>Matters Arising</u></b></p> <p>An update report on matters of significance was provided for Members information.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<p><b><u>Stakeholder Mobilisation</u></b></p> <p>A report was received seeking agreement in principle to commission specialist support to help develop and deliver a clear and coherent set of messages to employers, individuals and stakeholders that result in them taking the action needed to deliver SCR Skills and Employment Priorities.</p> <p>The Board questioned how this work fits with the SCR Vision study (launched last Thursday) noting that education and skills is one of the vision's 6 proposed themes. It was suggested the 2 undertakings have different timeframes and would be complementary, with the mobilisation work providing the wider awareness required for stakeholder-critical undertakings such as embedding the vision.</p> <p><b>Action: Dave to ascertain synergies between the stakeholder mobilisation and SCR Vision studies</b></p> <p>Questions were raised regarding why we need to seek external support for this work and an assurance was requested that we are utilising all available in-house resources in the Exec Team and districts. It was confirmed in-house resources and stakeholder networks will be engaged as part of the exercise and argued that external support will provide additional synergies and specialist expertise.</p>	<b>DB</b>

	<p>The Board asked that the outcomes of the mobilisation exercise be sufficiently sustainable to provide long term benefit for other stakeholder engagement undertakings.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board approves the recommendation to commission specialist support to help develop and deliver a clear and coherent set of messages to employers, individuals and stakeholders that result in them taking the action needed to deliver SCR Skills and Employment Priorities.</b></p>	
7	<p><b><u>CEIAG Strategy</u></b></p> <p>A report and presentation were provided to engender the Board's contribution to the development of a Careers Information, Advice and Guidance Strategy for the SCR.</p> <p>It was noted the SCR is the only LEP area which is proposing the creation of an all-age / all-stage CEIAG strategy and suggested the SCR should be congratulated on taking such a direction.</p> <p>The presentation covered the national CEIAG context, including the role of the Careers and Enterprise Company (CeC).</p> <p>Locally, it was suggested CEIAG provision has a relatively strong enterprise offer but with multiple service providers is somewhat fragmented.</p> <p>The Board was introduced to the concept of the SCR's CEIAG charter being built around 3 key priorities; leadership, infrastructure and entitlement, with each explained in detail.</p> <p>The Board was asked to note support for the SCR's bid of £571k to the CeC Mentoring initiative, for which the SCR has been shortlisted. The Board agreed to support the bid but requested more information to justify why the bid's demographic target had been chosen.</p> <p><b>Action: Karen to provide the additional information requested.</b></p> <p>The Board discussed the need to remain mindful of the SCR's SMEs' capacity to accord with and help deliver the aims and ambitions of the CEIAG strategy, and thus the need to minimise red tape and bureaucracy where possible.</p> <p>It was agreed the Strategy needs to align with the government's National post-16 Skills Plan</p>	<p>KO</p> <p>KO</p>

	<b>Action: Karen to develop ‘phase 2’ of the CEIAG strategy in accordance with the Board’s comments</b>	
<b>8</b>	<p><b><u>Mitigating the Impact of Redundancies within the SCR</u></b></p> <p>A report was received presenting the findings and suggested solutions from the Economic Shocks research study.</p> <p>It was noted the analysis has identified 3 key areas for further consideration; the need to improve co-ordination &amp; communication of support, the need to increase the pace of the system and the need for greater emotional support for those experiencing redundancy. In addition, it was noted that there have been additional ‘higher level’ issues required that would need to be delivered in partnership with the government.</p> <p><b>Action: Sarah / Andrea to consider whether the SCR has any specific sectors for which specialist support would be required in the event of a redundancy event.</b></p> <p>It was agreed there will be a need to ‘embed’ the findings of the study to ensure these can be appropriately enacted when required. There will therefore a need to pre-identify appropriate funding sources for actions.</p> <p><b>Action: Sarah / Andrea to develop the proposed actions in partnership with the LA officers, via the Officers’ Group</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Note the outcomes of the research highlighted in this report.</b></li> <li><b>2. Support the notion of Local Integration Boards undertaking service mapping for redundancy support which is shared across agencies aimed at individuals affected.</b></li> <li><b>3. Recognise the importance of each LA having a single point of contact for redundancy support</b></li> <li><b>4. Note the identified gaps set out within the report and agree that further study take place in these areas.</b></li> <li><b>5. Agree to keep the situation under review and recognise that if a significant deterioration in the labour market is identified there will be a need to utilise (pre-identified) resources for redress.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>SS / AF</b></p> <p><b>SS / AF</b></p>
<b>9</b>	<b><u>Proposed Investment of European Social Fund</u></b>	

	<p>A report was received to provide the Board with an update on current spend in relation to the Sheffield City Regions allocation of European Social Fund (ESF), under the European Social Infrastructure Fund (ESIF), and advised of plans for future projects to ensure we maximise spend.</p> <p>The Board was reminded we have considerable funds within ESF that remain unallocated. Currently from an allocation of £64,906,608 we have £18,046,438 committed and £6,647,000 currently in the final stages of approval with DWP the Managing Authority leaving £40,213,170 unallocated. This is across the range of priorities that ESF is designed to support, i.e. people into work, delivery of qualifications, support for young people and employers.</p> <p>It was confirmed all activity will be aligned to the aims and objectives of the SCR Skills Strategy.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board endorses the recommendations in relation to Open Calls under ESF and will work with the Managing Authority (DWP) to prepare specifications</b></p>	
10	<p><b><u>Apprenticeship Grant for Employers (AGE)</u></b></p> <p>A report was received asking the Board to endorse the continuation of the devolution of the Apprenticeship Grant for Employers (AGE) into 2017/18 to the SCR.</p> <p>It was noted this will be the final allocation of funding and is part year only covering January – July 2017. This is due to the changes to how apprenticeship programmes are funded which will give employers more of a leading role in the recruitment of apprentices.</p> <p>The additional award was accepted in principle. The Board requested the provision of an advice note detailing why this is ‘money well spent’</p> <p><b>Action: Dave to provide the advice note</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED, that the Board endorses the acceptance of the grant offer letter subject to section 151 officer approval and the approval of the Combined Authority</b></p>	DB
11	<p><b><u>Devolution and Programmes Update</u></b></p>	

	<p>A report was provided to give the Board an update on key aspects of the Devolution Deal in relation to Skills and Employment and activity on current key programmes.</p> <p>It was noted announcements on the Employment Pilot and Work and Health trial are expected in the next few weeks.</p> <p>The Board was asked note the undertaking of Skills Bank funding reprofiling (with the SFA) to ensure the profile is realistic (i.e. not flat). It was reported that this reprofiling may establish some financial underperformance.</p> <p>It was requested that a separate session with the Skills Bank leads be convened to facilitate detailed discussion of current matters</p> <p><b>Action: Dave to convene</b></p>	<b>DB</b>
<b>12</b>	<p><b><u>Forward Plan</u></b></p> <p>The Forward Plan to June 17 was provided for information.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>No further matters noted.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<p><b><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></b></p> <p>Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> April 2017, 8.30am, Broad Street West, Sheffield</p>	



**SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**6 APRIL 2017**

**MATTERS ARISING**

**Purpose**

This paper provides an update on matters arising from the previous meeting – 23 February 2017.

**Item  
no.**

**7. CEIAG Strategy**

Board Members asked for additional information regarding SCR's bid of the £571k to the CeC Mentoring initiative (a quote on this has been sent to the chair) as well as the development of phase two of the CEIAG strategy in accordance with the Board's comments. Phase 2 will be brought to the 18 May meeting.

**10. Apprenticeship Grant for Employers (AGE)**

A report was presented on the continuation of the AGE into 2017/18 to the SCR. The Board requested the provision of an advice note detailing why this is 'money well spent'. This advice note will be circulated shortly.

**11. Devolution and Programmes Update**

Board Members asked that a separate session with the Skills Bank leads be convened to facilitate detailed discussion of current matters. A meeting with Skills Bank has been planned for late April 2017.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD

6<sup>th</sup> April 2017

### DEVOLUTION OF THE ADULT EDUCATION BUDGET

#### **Purpose of Report**

This paper gives an update on progress towards devolution of the Adult Education Budget (AEB) and seeks endorsement from the Board for approval of two key decisions in relation to this.

#### **Thematic Priority**

This paper relates directly to Thematic Theme 5 'Develop the SCR skills base, labour mobility and education performance'.

#### **Freedom of Information**

Executive Boards do not make decisions on behalf of the CA therefore are not made available under the Combined Authority Publication Scheme however this paper is not exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

#### **Recommendations**

This paper updates the Executive Board on progress towards devolution of the AEB.

Noting that whilst SCR and government are still working towards full devolution of budgets in 18/19, 2018/19 is to be managed as a transition year, with full implementation of the SCR Outcomes based approach happening in 19/20.

This will be subject to the Combined Authority agreeing to the Devolution arrangements, when the details of this have been finalised by Government.

## **1. Introduction**

**1.1** The Sheffield City Region Executive Team continue to prepare for implementation of the AEB devolution by 18/19. This has included;

- Data collection of delivery in relation to the eight Outcome Agreement priorities (in the absence of appropriate data from the SFA this included the development of data scripts to be run on providers management information systems)
- Production of a Provider Delivery Agreement template (this has now been completed by all Block Grant providers)

- Phase 2 meetings with all Block Grant providers (to unpick Responses from Provider Delivery Agreement)
- Ongoing dialogue with Statutory Officers through a Technical Working group and a paper for the Statutory Officers Working Group
- Development of a template to establish financial health of providers and the impact of any changes

**1.2** Following the change of Government last summer, some of the previously communicated milestones towards devolution have not yet been met, for example relevant orders have yet to be laid in parliament and the framework setting out the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders is awaited from the Department. It is also expected that the Government's approach to localities budgets will be communicated shortly.

**1.3** It is understood that the Government, like the Combined Authority, remains committed to devolution of AEB. The Government's commitment was underlined when devolution of the AEB to London was announced in the 2016 Autumn Statement last December.

## **2. Proposal and justification**

**2.1** The devolution deal secured in October 2015 set out a journey towards full devolution in 2018/19 which for 2016/17 detailed getting to know your providers to understand the mix and balance of provision, 2017/18 the ability to vary allocations to Block Grant providers (within an agreed framework) based on our knowledge and understanding of current delivery and 2018/19 full devolution.

**2.2** In recognition that some policy areas are yet to be finalised/communicated, we propose that the Skills, Employment and Education Executive Board approves for recommendation to the Combined Authority two key decisions in relation to our Devolution Journey.

**2.3** Firstly, we make the decision and communicate to Block Grant providers that we don't intend to vary allocations for 2017/18.

**2.4** Secondly, we explicitly confirm the current SCR Executive planning assumption that devolution of AEB in 2018/19 be treated as a transition year, with full implementation of an Outcomes based approach happening in subsequent years.

**2.5** For 2018/19 this would mean that the Combined Authority would operate a presumption that stability in provider allocations, performance management and payment arrangements is desirable, with changes only being made to these where there is a compelling business case to do so.

This would allow us to then implement a phased approach to the changes we intend to make to the AEB around funding policy, over a two to three-year period. Should the Combined Authority decide it wishes to proceed with AEB devolution, once the details of the final deal are known.

**2.6** This approach will give re-assurance that in the first instance we can successfully accept, administer and manage the budget, allow us sufficient time to develop and introduce a funding policy and associated processes that we have evidence for and allow providers to adjust to any changes from the introduction of the new Funding Formula by Government.

**2.7** This approach comes with its own set of challenges and risks. One option may be to maintain a Service Level Agreement with the recently announced Education and Skills Funding Agency. This would require detailed negotiations with DfE around the role/service the ESFA would provide and reassurances around their ability to provide this service moving forward.

- 2.8** Option two would involve the Combined Authority developing internal functions to manage and administer the budget. One grey area from Government is the additional allocation of Implementation funds for this activity as currently the budget is due to land with us in April 2018 for delivery to begin in August 2018 with no clear indication of implementation funding. The Greater Manchester Devolution Deal (secured after ours) had the following wording included

*“A funding formula for calculating the size of the grant to local / combined authorities will need to take into account a range of demographic, educational and labour market factors; it will also need to take account of the costs of meeting statutory entitlements, implementing devolution and continuing operational expenditure.*

The removal of Gain share for the current year also reduces capacity within the Combined Authority to undertake preparatory work in relation to this

- 2.9** A third option would be to work with another (or others) Combined Authority to share back office functions to implement and manage this fund.

### **3. Consideration of alternative approaches**

- 3.1** If we pursue our ability to vary contracts it may have implications politically across the SCR as we would need strong evidence to move funding from one college to another or from one Local Authority to another and at this point in time we don't have access to sufficient data to provide that evidence base.
- 3.2** Likewise, a wholesale change to Funding Policy, Payment Mechanics and Performance management would need to be predicated by a sound evidence base and communicated to providers as a minimum in August 2017, allowing them 12 months' preparation. At present, we don't have this evidence base.
- 3.3** An alternative option would be to turn down the devolution deal as we don't have the resources to support the level of capacity or expertise required to accept the fund.

### **4. Implications**

#### **4.1 Financial**

There is significant risk associated with taking on Adult Education Budgets and associated activity whilst there is still material uncertainty arising from a lack of management information.

This issue is compounded by the lack of available resource to support preparatory works before the activity commences.

The proposal attempts to mitigate some of this risk by maintaining provision and budgets at their existing levels in 2018/19. This is a prudent proposition and will allow the Authority and delivery partners time to adjust to new ways of working, if they are required.

#### **4.2 Legal**

The legal implications essentially revolve around the ability and capacity of SCR to perform and deliver its obligations as contained in any SLA or arrangement with central government in the process of divesting the current provider / recipients.

As SCR becomes the intermediary through which funding is channelled then a suite of contracts both up and down stream will be required to facilitate the distribution of educational grant funding. This will not be an insignificant logistical and contract management process.

The scope for SCR to fail or underperform in undertaking this function must be factored into any legal consideration which itself must assess and try to mitigate the risk to SCR. That evaluation must be intelligence lead following a robust assessment of the capacity and resource mentioned above. Only if SCR is 'match fit' can the legal implications vis a vis risk be dealt with satisfactorily.

As has been referred to in the body of this report, central government has not been forthcoming on detail and in the absence of this it is almost impossible to quantify let alone mitigate risk via contractual mechanisms.

#### **4.3 Risk Management**

Key Risks are highlighted above but in the main relate to SCR's ability to successfully receive and manage the fund in the first year whilst ensuring our statutory obligations are met and providers continued to be paid for the delivery which takes place.

#### **4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion**

AEB supports those who are either currently unemployed or not achieved benchmark qualification levels to achieve these thus promoting social inclusion, diversity and equality.

### **5. Communications**

- 5.1 Clear communication on our approach to AEB providers will need to be managed so providers have sufficient time to respond to any changes, understand the rationale for this approach and benefits.

### **6. Appendices/Annexes**

- 6.1 None.

<b>REPORT AUTHOR</b>	<b>Krysia Wooffinden</b>
<b>POST</b>	<b>Senior Programme Manager</b>
Officer responsible	<b>Ruth Adams</b>
Organisation	<b>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority</b>
Email	<b>Krysia.wooffinden@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk</b>
Telephone	<b>0114 220 3473</b>

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at: 11 Broad Street West, Sheffield S1 2BQ

Other sources and references: n/a

## SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD

6<sup>th</sup> April 2017

### INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

#### **Purpose of Report**

The Government has recently provided further information on its approach to Institutes of Technology that describes a national competitive process beginning in the spring with final decisions being taken in the autumn. This paper proposes how this should be progressed in SCR.

#### **Thematic Priority**

This paper relates directly to Thematic Theme 5 'Develop the SCR skills base, labour mobility and education performance'

#### **Freedom of Information**

Executive Boards do not make decisions on behalf of the CA therefore are not made available under the Combined Authority Publication Scheme however this paper is not exempt under FOI.

#### **Recommendation**

That the Board approve the recommendation that the SCR Executive work with the emerging hub and spoke proposal to develop a high quality IoT proposition for SCR, and that this is presented to a future meeting of the Board.

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1** Government has identified a chronic shortage of high-skilled technicians below graduate level (Levels 4/5) in England, with few people undertaking higher-level skills, while industry demand for these skills is growing, driven by the pace of technological change. Government analysis suggests that this shortage is partly due to the investment required to teach STEM subjects, providers' focus on delivering lower level qualifications and learners' choices being limited by lack of a quality offer with a clear route to employment.
- 1.2** As a response to this, Government will be launching a call for proposals to establish Institutes of Technology in Spring 2017. Applicants will be able to bid into a £170m fund to establish institutions which specialise in delivering the higher level technical skills that employers need, in areas with evidence of a higher level skills gap and clear learner demand. Potential

applicants have been asked by the Department to express an interest by registering their email address prior to the call for bids.

**1.3** It is the Government's intention that IoTs should meet local economic needs for higher technical STEM skills by strengthening and growing provision to fill gaps in the market. The detailed offer will vary from area to area but is expected to be based around the following:

- boosting provision at Levels 4 and 5 in STEM subjects;
- developing a strong pipeline of provision at Level 3 either as part of the IoT offer or with clear pathways of progression to the IoT's level 4/5 provision;
- up-skilling or re-skilling the existing workforce, to keep pace with rapid technological change; and,
- using innovative modes of delivery.

**1.4** The Government expects that IoTs will have a clear identity and must meet the following critical success factors:

1. Strong employer engagement in governance and leadership as well as the design and delivery of the curriculum;
2. Specialise in teaching technical Routes set out in the Post-16 Skills Plan, focused towards STEM subjects;
3. Offer high quality provision – in teaching, facilities and equipment – at levels 3, 4 and 5;
4. Local focus to deliver qualifications and apprenticeships of value that meet the skills needs of local employers;
5. Use the IoT status to distinguish themselves and raise the prestige of technical training in the local area;
6. Work collaboratively with other providers to avoid duplication by building on high-quality provision in an area; and
7. Be financially sustainable.

## **2. Proposal and justification**

### ***National Considerations***

**2.1** Government guidance suggests that a proposal would need to be supported by:

- in most cases an FE College, unless there is robust evidence that this is not appropriate for the local area;
- the lead authority for local economic policy to confirm fit with strategic economic priorities (either the Local Economic Partnership (LEP) and/or Combined Authority).
- local employers identified as potential "anchor partners".

**2.2** It is essential that proposals demonstrably meet local economic need, although the Government has not defined 'local focus' and will leave it for bidders to decide the right area boundary for their proposal which makes sense for their business case in terms of learner number forecasts, local labour market, provider landscape and partnerships in the proposal, as well as travel to learn distances.

**2.3** Where the underpinning evidence base justifies more than one IoT (eg travel to learn catchment areas), the Government expects areas to look at innovative delivery options (eg hub and spoke models) for a single coordinated bid rather than two independent bids.



- 2.4** It is expected that IoTs will make a significant contribution to social mobility so Government has indicated that it would welcome applications to deliver provision in the recently announced Opportunity Areas and other areas where social mobility is low.
- 2.5** The guidance on IoTs issued by Government identifies a range of possible delivery models, including:
- extending technical education provision from within an existing high-performing college while providing for liability to be limited contractually or through funding provisions, or through a legally separate subsidiary;
  - delivery through partnerships of FE and HE through a range of legal structures such as a Joint Venture or Special Purpose Vehicle using a company limited by guarantee;
  - a group of employers partnering with an education provider to create an IoT; and
  - establishing a wholly new institution where there is evidence that existing providers cannot meet higher level STEM skills needs.

### ***SCR Considerations***

- 2.6** Almost a year ago, the SCR Skills, Employment and Education Board considered our approach to IoTs (and the merit of two specific proposals) and agreed that:-
- Doncaster Council should liaise with the lead civil servants to explore the potential for an Institute of Infrastructure to be an IoT (as had previously been agreed in the Devolution Deal)
  - Three Board members should undertake further work to develop proposals for a Digital Institute (with a focus on Advanced Manufacturing, Healthcare Technology and Digital Industries)
- 2.7** An outcome of the SCR Area Review of FE was that SCR should lead a curriculum review of post-16 provision. This review has now been commissioned from the AoC with a focus on STEM. It is scheduled to report May/June. It is intended that this review will underpin future SCR investment in skills. If timings permit the findings of the Curriculum Review should be used to inform and underpin development of the SCR IoT. This will provide a clear line of sight from the SCR ABR to the SCR IoT proposal.
- 2.8** SCR Executive has recently commissioned the production of a Digital Action Plan. If timings permit, the findings of this work should be used to inform and underpin development of the SCR IoT proposal.
- 2.9** The guidance recently published by Government is now explicit that where there is a robust case for more than one IoT in an area, proposals should be brigaded into a single bid – possibly using a hub a spoke approach.
- 2.10** The SEP is currently being refreshed. The analysis of the SCR economy undertaken by MetroDynamics to underpin this refresh has identified that Manufacturing is a sector of competitive advantage for the city region, with SCR experiencing jobs growth in this sector in stark contrast with the experience of other areas and with our own past experience. It is therefore likely that Manufacturing will emerge as a key priority in the refreshed SEP. The IoT will need to reflect this.
- 2.11** Sponsors of the Infrastructure proposal and the Digital/Manufacturing proposals that were previously discussed at the Board have recently collaborated to develop a hub and spoke model IoT. This is consistent with Government guidance on how to treat multiple proposals from the same area. A summary of this emerging proposal can be found at Annex 1.

**2.12** This emerging IoT proposal focuses specifically on delivering a highly skilled workforce. Specialisms in development so far include:

- Infrastructure (e.g. roads, railways and transport hubs such as ports, stations and airports) including management.
- Engineering, based on the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre.
- Digital capabilities.
- Railways with NCHSR at its core but also including trams, light rail, underground and conventional rail.
- Freight and logistics (including technology to deliver integrated delivery systems).
- Automotive (including low carbon and Intelligent Transport Systems).

### **Recommendations**

**2.13** That the SCR Executive work with the emerging hub and spoke proposal to develop a high quality IoT proposition for SCR. In so doing, the final proposal will need to demonstrate:-

- Employer leadership, including the involvement of employers in the governance of the IoT
- Local economic impact
- Focus on key sectors, including manufacturing and digital
- Filling curriculum gaps, and building on excellence, linking to the findings of the Curriculum Review and Digital Action Plan
- A fit with the Government's guidance

**2.14** That the final proposal for an IoT should be brought to the May Board for endorsement (or a later meeting of the Board if the final guidance and bidding timescales from Government are further delayed).

## **3. Consideration of alternative approaches**

**3.1** The Board could choose not to articulate its priorities for an IoT and choose not to intervene in the process of IoT proposal formation at this stage, but take a view on any proposals that emerge prior to the closing date for applications. Were this approach to be adopted, the risk of proposals emerging that did not meet SCR needs would increase, as would the risk of SCR not securing an IoT investment.

**3.2** The Board could choose not to express support for any IoT proposals in SCR. However, support from the Board is obviously a significant factor in determining whether proposals will be supported by Government, and to withhold Board support from all proposals would increase the risk of no SCR proposals being successful with Government.

## **4. Implications**

### **4.1 Financial**

This paper notes the potential to bid into new funding for Institute of Technology centres.

At this stage ideas are still formative and no view can be drawn on the proposals.

Any new activity to be undertaken will add to capacity burdens on the Authority. The Authority's ability to resource these burdens will be central to any view to be taken on the Authority's ability to discharge the activity.

## 4.2 Legal

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report, however, as the initiative develops the basis upon which funding and support for the IoT takes shape in terms of any legal arrangements will be considered and legal advice sought as and when required.

## 4.3 Risk Management

At this stage in the process, the key risks are a) developing a proposal that fails to secure Government support; and, b) developing a proposal that will fail to deliver impact in SCR. The recommendation at 2.13 above requires the final proposal to demonstrate:

- Employer leadership, including the involvement of employers in the governance of the IoT
- Local economic impact
- Focus on key sectors, including manufacturing and digital
- Filling curriculum gaps, and building on excellence, linking to the findings of the Curriculum Review and the Digital Action Plan
- A fit with the Government's guidance

Meeting these requirements will mitigate these risks.

## 4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion

The Government has stated its expectation that there is a clear contribution by IoTs to social mobility and the above recommendation means that this will also be a consideration in securing Board support for the final proposal for SCR.

## 5. Communications

- 5.1 Discussions regarding communications with Government and internally will be on-going as the proposal develops.

## 6. Appendices/Annexes

- 6.1 A summary of the emerging hub and spoke IoT proposal can be found at Annex 1.

<b>REPORT AUTHOR</b>	<b>David Brennan</b>
<b>POST</b>	<b>Interim Assistant Director</b>
Officer responsible	<b>Ruth Adams</b>
Organisation	<b>Sheffield City Region</b>
Email	<a href="mailto:Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk">Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk</a>
Telephone	<b>0114 2203442</b>

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at: 11 Broad Street West, Sheffield S1 2BQ

Other sources and references: n/a

## DRAFT

### SCR LOGO

### Making the Future

### The Sheffield City Region Institute of Technology

The Sheffield City Region (SCR) Devolution deal with Central Government stated that:

*“SCR will work with HM Government to achieve their ambitions for a National Institute for Infrastructure within Doncaster. The SCR will take forward discussions with HM Government to explore the potential for alignment of the new National College for High Speed Rail (NCHSR) based in Doncaster with the new Institutes of Technology (IoT) to help meet a wider set of national infrastructure challenges”.*

This is the beginning of the realisation of that agreement. Our proposal is based on the recommendations of the Area Based Review which found that less than 1% of current FE provision in SCR was at Level 4 or above. The SCR IoT is fully backed by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the SCR Combined Authority.

The UK Commission for Employment and Skills reported in 2013 that, the incidence of hard-to-fill vacancies in England for Core STEM jobs was highest in Yorkshire and the Humber (30%)<sup>1</sup>.

Only 28% of SCR residents are qualified to NVQ Level 4 and above, compared to 37% in Great Britain. This ranks the city region in 35<sup>th</sup> place out of 39 LEP areas<sup>2</sup>. The SCR IoT, focusing on high level technical skills and competencies, will be well placed to help bridge this gap.

We shall be confirming with SCR partners over the coming weeks the exact shape and form of the SCR Institute of Technology.

We have already identified the urgent need, articulated by industry, **to tackle the infrastructure skills challenge**. Therefore, the Sheffield City Region IoT will meet an urgent skills need in transport related infrastructure investment, estimated to be £88.4bn nationally, between 2016-2017 and 2020-2021.

The 2016 Integrated Infrastructure Plan for SCR identified opportunities worth £28bn. The National Infrastructure Delivery Plan has a pipeline of programmes and projects worth over £425bn. But, there are skills shortages across the key sectors that present a risk to economic ambitions. The national pipeline creates a demand for over 250,000 construction and over 150,000 engineering construction workers by 2020. There is a need to recruit and train nearly 100,000 additional workers and to up skill some 250,000 of the national existing workforce over the next decade<sup>3</sup>. Our ambition is to work with partners nationally to address this challenge. Centrally located and easily accessible, over 500,000 young people live within an hour’s journey of Doncaster centre, the SCR IoT will have a local and national impact with learners equipped to meet local skills needs and help deliver national infrastructure plans and programmes.

Our work in the coming weeks will include additional research on and engagement with the Sheffield City Region’s digital and technology led businesses on how we can meet the equally pressing need in

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/302973/evidence-report-77-high-level-stem-skills\\_1\\_.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/302973/evidence-report-77-high-level-stem-skills_1_.pdf)

<sup>2</sup>

[https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/imp/lep/1925185559/subreports/quals\\_compared/report.aspx?allInGB=&pivot=290&sort=2&ascending=](https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/imp/lep/1925185559/subreports/quals_compared/report.aspx?allInGB=&pivot=290&sort=2&ascending=)

<sup>3</sup> National Infrastructure Plan for Skills, 2015

**digital skills** which is holding back our contribution to the 4<sup>th</sup> Industrial Revolution (Industry 4.0)<sup>4</sup>. Digital and technology-led applications will underpin all provision in the SCR IoT and will be aligned with the Digital Action Plan which is currently in development.

The Sheffield City Region has secured high profile **engineering and advanced manufacturing** investment notably Boeing, Rolls Royce and recently McLaren. The city region is well placed to attract more investment as long as it has a ready supply of talented technicians. The development of the Institute of Technology will build on the successes of the Training Centre at the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC), as part of the Advanced manufacturing Innovation District.

We are ready to deliver a powerful, tangible quick-win for Government in delivering the Industrial Strategy and are committed to establishing SCR as a beacon of innovation in technical education and infrastructure management, providing social mobility for all. We shall deliver private sector and public sector leadership hand-in-hand to drive productivity growth for the UK economy.

### **The Focus**

The SCR IoT will deliver skills and competencies from Level 3 and above, particularly at Levels 4 and 5. All our progression routes will have pathways into employment, full time under graduate or post graduate study and or degree apprenticeships through the development of a city-regional skills eco system. So far national employers like Henry Boot, Willmott Dixon, Arup, Mott MacDonald and Atkins have expressed support.

Our IoT will focus on developing clear and sustainable technical pathways to meet the needs of employers. It will focus specifically on delivering a highly skilled workforce. Specialisms in development so far include:

- Infrastructure (e.g. roads, railways and transport hubs such as ports, stations and airports).
- Programme and project management and leadership.
- Railways with NCHSR at its core but also including trams, light rail, underground and conventional rail.
- Freight and logistics (including technology to deliver integrated delivery systems).
- Automotive (including low carbon and Intelligent Transport Systems).
- Engineering and manufacturing technical pathways based on those developed by the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre's training centre.
- Digital capabilities across all the above developed in consultation with business.

Given the existing infrastructure and expertise, our IoT can begin operations prior to construction. Capital will be invested to deliver an innovative, co-designed curriculum building on existing capacity and upscaling where necessary to suit key specialisms.

### **The Solution**

The **Hub and Spoke model** we are developing has been widely welcomed as it ensures that we build on existing capacity, facilitates delivery across the city region and focuses any investment on high value added solutions. The Hub will be based in Doncaster to optimise the value of investment in the NCHSR and its role will be aggregating demand from employers, marketing, careers advice and guidance, administration of the IoT and the development of provision. Delivery will take place in Doncaster and in 'spokes' across the city region, taking advantage of the strengths of existing

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly\\_fs/1.659109!/file/SIA-Summary-Report-FINAL-v3.pdf](http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.659109!/file/SIA-Summary-Report-FINAL-v3.pdf)

training providers and businesses. We will align our provision and delivery to the emerging 'T' Levels and 15 technical routes as set out in the National Post-16 Skills Plan.

This is an employer-led IoT that co-designs and delivers the training, skills, qualifications, standards, and competencies demanded by businesses and infrastructure commissioners. We will also work closely with Innovate UK and the national Catapults to ensure that the latest research informs all learning. This will equip our labour pool with the required technical expertise and will make our infrastructure companies more competitive in the global marketplace. It will provide a co designed curriculum where **technology is embedded in all learning** and the UK workforce is working at the cutting edge of the technologies of the fourth industrial revolution.

### **Engagement**

We have built partnerships with both Sheffield universities who have strong reputations in technical education, to learn from best practice, provide pathways above Level 5, and expose learners to the widest possible range of opportunities. We have committed to working with other IoTs across the UK that may be set up under this initiative to secure comprehensive coverage and avoid duplication.

So far we have also engaged with more than 60 employers, Principals of all colleges in SCR, The National College for High Speed Rail, University Technical Colleges, Universities, Professional bodies and relevant public sector bodies.

We are determined to transform technical education in SCR to provide viable employment opportunities and boost the performance of the North. Our focus is on delivering inclusive growth through better jobs and wages for residents.

This is an opportunity to use innovative technical pathways to boost social mobility in "coldspots" across northern England<sup>5</sup>. Doncaster is one of 12 Opportunity Areas<sup>6</sup> in England which are being supported to build young people's knowledge and skills and provide them with the best advice and opportunities.

### **Partnership**

The bid will be led by Sheffield Hallam University (SHU), Barnsley College and Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (DMBC). SHU has a strong tradition of providing high quality technical pathways for learners and is a leader in the delivery of applied education in engineering, construction and related technical and vocational skills. SHU has embraced the opportunities of higher and degree apprenticeships and, through a regional partnership, has developed degree apprenticeships in construction, engineering and digital skills to meet employer need.

Barnsley College is rated as outstanding by OFSTED and has a particularly strong focus on the delivery of construction and infrastructure skills and qualifications. DMBC is committed to developing the Borough as a "Learning City" with clear and sustainable training pathways for all and has played a pivotal role in delivering the NCHSR. Together, these three organisations will lead the planning, consultation, design and delivery of the SCR IoT.

---

<sup>5</sup> Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission (2016): The Social Mobility Index

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/education-secretary-announces-6-new-opportunity-areas>

## SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD

6<sup>th</sup> April 2017

### SCR Devolution Deal – Early Intervention Employment Support Pilot

#### **Purpose of Report**

The board is being asked to note the likely commencement of the Early Intervention Employment Support Pilot. Subject to a favourable DWP announcement and CA acceptance of the offer the programme will commence in May 2017 and continue for a period of 5 years. Indications are for a favourable announcement from the Minister for Employment because it will give the Department insight into how stronger integration of local services coupled with early intervention can deliver outcomes for DWP customers.

This paper is to ask the board to endorse implementation of the pilot with a view to the CA formally accepting the devolved budget.

#### **Thematic Priority**

Develop the SCR skills base, labour mobility and education performance.

#### **Freedom of Information**

This paper is not exempt from FOI requests.

#### **Recommendations**

- Endorse work to date on the Early Intervention Employment Support Pilot, noting that the Managing Director of the Combined Authority Executive be asked to mobilise implementation of the Early Intervention Support Pilot.
- In order to quickly progress the due diligence and implementation phase consider and endorse that the SCR test a two contract delivery model with the market.

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The Devolution Deal October 2015 paved the way for SCR to propose an employment support pilot programme.

*“Sheffield City Region will develop a business case for an innovative pilot to support those who are hardest to help. The business case should set out the evidence to support the proposed pilot, cost and benefits and robust evaluation plans, to enable the proposal to be taken forward as part of the delivery of this agreement, subject to Ministerial approval”.*

- 1.2 The SCR pilot proposal was developed over the first half of the 2016 calendar year co-designed with the active participation of local stakeholders via the Employment Working Group which met every 2 weeks across that period.
- 1.3 Focused on supporting people early in their benefit claim process who are identified as potentially exhibiting issues which mean they will find it harder to find and keep work. The business case entitled “Early Intervention Employment Support Pilot” was submitted to DWP and CLG for appraisal early August 2016.

## 2. Proposal and justification

- 2.1 The pilot business case has now completed the appraisal process and we are awaiting Ministerial approval to progress, which we expect to be favourable. During the next month, DWP will be working with the SCR Executive to finalise figures and targets with a view to drafting the final agreement between DWP and the SCR. Noting the CA will formally need to accept the grant offer following due diligence on the terms of the deal.
- 2.2 The SCR intends to match the majority of this grant with ESF and a call has been prepared and will be progressed should the CA agree to progress mobilisation.
- 2.3 The business case has taken learning from earlier employment support programmes in its construction but further developed principles, key innovations within our approach include:

- **40% of the pilot’s expected total payments to the provider are secure up-front attachment payments**, with 60% based on sustained employment outcomes. This helps to ease cash flow, is especially helpful to enable smaller organisations to engage, and reduces perverse incentives to ‘park’ individuals, whilst retaining a strong incentive to deliver desired employment outcomes.
- **Local Integration Boards will be formed providing locally designed, formal, governance arrangements to enable integrated, holistic support** (e.g. health, skills, debt advice, housing, etc.).
- **SCR performance management will require the provider/s to be dynamic and flexible to change as the programme and performance evolves**, forming a collaborative and integrated local offer.
- **Better targeted**: the SCR devo pilot uses international best practice and JCP work coach insights to identify early those residents at high risk of long-term unemployment without this additional intensive support, it will provide a clearly targeted local approach.
- **Local authority referrals**: local authorities are able to refer into the devo pilot and are encouraged to start to identify their priority individuals.

- 2.4 Reflecting its strong localised approach, each of the 9 participating Local Authority areas have been asked to locally define their “ask” from the Employment Support Service. All of the 9 areas continue to make progress towards the development of a Local Integration Board structure and its operational requirements. Those responses identified a clear need identified across the whole of the SCR to target:

- 19-21 year old care leavers
- People with multiple needs (including mental health, physical health, homelessness/unstable accommodation, substance abuse, domestic violence, ASB, ex-offenders)

- 2.5 In order to ensure value for money and operational efficiencies the SCR recommends the commissioning of the Early Intervention Employment Service. In order to reflect our collaborative production principle each of the participating authorities will include a



specification of their localities delivery requirements within the procurement process and take an active part in the procurement of the contractor/s.

- 2.6 Whilst there is further development on commissioning options as part of the SCR CA due diligence phase, one approach is to test the potential for a two contract model with the market, in order to manage volume and mitigate risk of a single provider.

### 3. Consideration of alternative approaches

- 3.1 Alternative delivery approaches and cohort focus were considered as part of the development of the business case and throughout the robust DWP appraisal process. The business case has been subject to active challenge from DWP.
- 3.2 Integrating the locality “asks” into a SCR commissioning approach is enabling diversity in cohort targeting and is reflective of existing local services. This was identified as best practice in the Manchester Working Well model.
- 3.4 Whilst there is additional work on commissioning options to be considered as part of the CA due diligence. The commissioning approach demonstrates best value for money and is legal compliance and has been part of the vfm challenge of DWP. Options have been considered to identify the best procurement route and these are attached at appendix 1.

Out of the options considered, commissioning provides the most appropriate route to deliver requirements within the timescales available. Within this 3 options are explored. Each option presents strengths and weaknesses:

#### 1. Commission through one contract

- ✓ Presents greater value for money and more coherence across SCR
- ✗ One provider brings a risk of contract failure and perception of a “prime model”.

#### 2. Commission through two contracts

- ✓ Again, a value for money option and provides coherence, this balances out risk of contract failure and retains clarity of referrals.
- ✓ Could target the specific groups identified within the prioritisation process above.
- ✗ Adds a slight additional cost to the procurement process.

#### 3. Commissioning against 9 LA level contracts

- ✓ Provides a strong alignment to specific area requirements as contracts are small enables smaller organisations to develop in the market.
- ✗ Adds confusion to stakeholders in terms of referrals and increased procurement and contract costs but loose economies of scale in the service provision.

### 4. Implications

#### 4.1 Financial

The paper notes that the Authority may shortly be in receipt of grant support from DWP to deliver an innovative pilot programme. At this stage the value and terms of that grant are not known, and a delivery model to operationalise the pilot is still being developed.

That delivery model, and the resourcing of it, will be central to any decision on whether to accept the grant.

## 4.2 Legal

There are no legal implications arising directly from acceptance of the grant other than it must be accepted on behalf of the CA by the s73 officer. Unless there are other conditions imposed upon the CA by the granting body, the future administration and operationalisation of the grant must be in accordance with the CA's constitutional processes – all of which are established.

Whatever contractual arrangement is used, it will have to reflect any of the obligations imposed upon SCRCA and include some degree of accountability for the expenditure in relation to the quantifiable outputs. Any capacity or resource issues at the SCR Executive to operationalise and deliver this initiative must be addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Board in order that the CA's ability to deliver – and thereby not breach any contractual obligations – is sustainable over the delivery period envisaged.

Legal advice will be sought about the funding obligations and risks both upstream and downstream as this project progresses.

## 4.3 Risk Management

A detailed risk log will form part of the contract review process.

**There is a risk we are unable to secure ESF investment which is critical to bolstering volumes in the Employment Support Pilot.** As we are not currently a co-financing authority, it is challenging for us to access the ESF funds. As matters stand, to access this we will have to bid against a call. The risk here is that the ESF investment is made in a way which results in a less effective procurement as a result of this lack of control by the SCR CA.

## 4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion

There are no equality implications of this report, however as part of the implementation of the Pilot an equalities impact assessment will be considered.

## 5. Communications

- 5.1 A communication and participation plan will be developed under a single area brand to enable active participation by the SCR communications team aligned to the broader SCR branding.

Key stakeholders including service users, employers and providers have been involved in the design and development of the models and this will continue across the life of the programmes.

## 6. Appendices/Annexes

- 6.1 Delivery Options – Strengths and Weaknesses

<b>REPORT AUTHOR</b>	<b>Andrea Fitzgerald</b>
<b>POST</b>	<b>Programme Manager Employment</b>
Officer responsible	<b>Ruth Adams</b>
Organisation	<b>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority</b>
Email	<a href="mailto:Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk">Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk</a>
Telephone	<b>0114 220 3442</b>

## APPENDIX 1: Early Intervention Pilot Delivery Option Review

Delivery Option	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>1. CA Commission against one contract</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Meets procurement law as competitive process</li> <li>✓ Enables quality of provision to be secured through a quality and V4M assessment</li> <li>✓ Clarity of provider</li> <li>✓ Strong provider market</li> <li>✓ One contract, simpler to manage/lower cost (in both contract admin / mgmt. and procurement terms)</li> <li>✓ Efficiencies in management fees</li> <li>✓ Enables contract alignment with clarity of a single provider Provides strong message across all 9 authorities – very joined up</li> <li>✓ No TUPE implications</li> <li>✓ Simpler to evaluate relative to other options</li> <li>✓ Easier to align to JCP</li> <li>✓ Clear accountability for performance</li> <li>✓ Independent delivery organisation unlikely to feel that information will be shared</li> <li>✓ Easier to manage data security/information sharing</li> <li>✓ EU funding compliant</li> <li>✓ Clear referral process</li> <li>✓ Aggregation of spend therefore better prices (economies of scale)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Greater risk of contract failure</li> <li>✗ Flexibility of delivery across areas</li> <li>✗ Loose ability to compare performance</li> <li>✗ Not very accessible to 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</li> </ul>
<b>2. CA Commission against two contracts</b>  <b>[PREFERRED OPTION]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Meets procurement law as competitive process</li> <li>✓ Enables us to target two clear priority groups within the cohort</li> <li>✓ Enables quality of provision to be secured through a quality and V4M assessment</li> <li>✓ Facilitates a wider breadth of provision across different sectors</li> <li>✓ Strong provider market</li> <li>✓ Clarity of providers</li> <li>✓ Balances risk of contract failure against two contracted delivery agents</li> <li>✓ Will be able to compare performance</li> <li>✓ Increases local ownership</li> <li>✓ Opens up greater opportunity for market</li> <li>✓ No TUPE implications</li> <li>✓ Able to align to JCP</li> <li>✓ Clear accountability for performance</li> <li>✓ Independent delivery organisation unlikely to feel that information will be shared</li> <li>✓ Easier to manage data security/information sharing</li> <li>✓ EU funding compliant</li> <li>✓ Clear referral process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Increases management and administration</li> <li>✗ Increases contract management requirements</li> <li>✗ Flexibility of delivery across areas</li> <li>✗ Postcode lottery potential</li> <li>✗ Increased risk of delivery inequalities</li> <li>✗ Possible loss of some economies of scale</li> <li>✗ Not very accessible to 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</li> </ul>
<b>3. CA Commission contract against the 9 LA footprint (9 contracts)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Meets procurement law as competitive process</li> <li>✓ Enables quality of provision to be secured through a quality and V4M assessment</li> <li>✓ Facilitates a wider breadth of provision across different sectors</li> <li>✓ Strong provider market</li> <li>✓ Smaller contracts more accessible to 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</li> <li>✓ Clarity of providers</li> <li>✓ Balances risk of contract failure</li> <li>✓ Will be able to compare performance</li> <li>✓ Local Ownership – more accessible to 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</li> <li>✓ Opens up greater opportunity for market</li> <li>✓ No TUPE implications</li> <li>✓ Clear accountability for performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Increases management and administration</li> <li>✗ Increases contract management requirements</li> <li>✗ More difficult to performance manage</li> <li>✗ Massive increase in cost of commissioning and procurement</li> <li>✗ Loose economy of scale</li> <li>✗ Fragments provision across SCR</li> <li>✗ Postcode lottery potential</li> <li>✗ More challenging to evaluate</li> <li>✗ Harder to align to JCP/increases complexity of referrals</li> <li>✗ Adds complexity to data security and information sharing</li> <li>✗ Challenging to deliver through complex EU funding regulations.</li> </ul>

<p><b>4. Delivered directly by the Combined Authority through its member organisations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Clarity of providers</li> <li>✓ Will be able to compare performance</li> <li>✓ Able to integrate within existing LA services</li> <li>✓ Local Ownership</li> <li>✓ Clarity of accountability for performance</li> <li>✓ Trusted service provider</li> <li>✓ Experienced at managing EU funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Will have multiple decision making processes</li> <li>✗ Will need to recruit so TUPE implications</li> <li>✗ Recruitment process likely to be lengthy</li> <li>✗ Likely to face challenge as there is a strong provider market in the private and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</li> <li>✗ Increases management and administration</li> <li>✗ Increases contract management requirements</li> <li>✗ More difficult to performance manage</li> <li>✗ Loose economy of scale</li> <li>✗ Fragments provision across SCR</li> <li>✗ Postcode lottery potential</li> <li>✗ More challenging to evaluate</li> <li>✗ Harder to align to JCP/increases complexity of referrals</li> <li>✗ Some participants may not trust their LA/see them as experts in employment support</li> <li>✗ Adds complexity to data security and information sharing</li> <li>✗ Ability to flex delivery arrangements</li> <li>✗ Challenging to deliver through complex EU funding regulations.</li> <li>✗ Unlikely to position SCR well for future Devolution</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Delivered directly by JobCentre Plus</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Trusted provider of employment support</li> <li>✓ Enhance their existing resources</li> <li>✓ Builds on their existing skill sets and contracts</li> <li>✓ Experienced at managing EU funds</li> <li>✓ Clear referral process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ JCP resources are already stretched</li> <li>✗ Local ownership lost</li> <li>✗ Clients may not feel that this is anything different to business as usual</li> <li>✗ Perceived as nothing new</li> <li>✗ Not agreed with DWP in the appraisal process</li> <li>✗ Challenging to invest EU Funding</li> <li>✗ Unlikely to position SCR well for future Devolution</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Create a new delivery vehicle underneath the Combined Authority – A Community Interest Company: SCR Work &amp; Health service</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ No perceptions completely new</li> <li>✓ Clarity of provider</li> <li>✓ One contract, simpler to manage/lower cost</li> <li>✓ Efficiencies in management fees</li> <li>✓ Enables contract alignment with clarity of a single provider</li> <li>✓ Simpler to evaluate</li> <li>✓ Easier to align to JCP</li> <li>✓ Clear accountability for performance</li> <li>✓ Independent delivery organisation unlikely to feel that information will be shared</li> <li>✓ Easier to manage data security/information sharing</li> <li>✓ Enables other provision to be drawn into the company</li> <li>✓ Is able to draw on other financial resources</li> <li>✓ Clear referral process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Will take longer to mobilise</li> <li>✗ Miss funding window</li> <li>✗ Will have multiple decision making processes</li> <li>✗ Will need to recruit so TUPE implications</li> <li>✗ Recruitment process likely to be lengthy</li> <li>✗ Likely to face challenge as there is a strong provider market in the private and 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Reject Government Offer to deliver the Early Intervention Employment Support Pilot</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Able to focus on local service alignment</li> <li>✓ Maximise existing provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Unlikely to secure future devolution deals in this area</li> <li>✗ Reduces capacity to support</li> <li>✗ Will not bridge the gaps in current employment support</li> <li>✗ Will not resource employment support alignment</li> <li>✗ Reputational damage</li> </ul>

**SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**6<sup>th</sup> April 2017**

**SCR Employment Support – Health Led Employment Trial**

**Purpose of Report**

The Board is being asked to endorse the SCR Health Led Employment Support Trial proposal, noting that acceptance of the grant is a decision of the CA. Following endorsement work will continue on the implementation of the Trial. Referrals are expected to start in September 2017.

**Thematic Priority**

Develop the SCR skills base, labour mobility and education performance.

**Freedom of Information**

This paper is not exempt from FOI requests.

**Recommendations**

- Endorse the SCR Health-Led Trial proposal and its principles.

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1** The newly formed Work and Health Unit, a joint unit in central government between Department of Health and Department for Work and Pensions, invited all Devolution Deal Areas to express interest in developing a trial with them to test the impact of better connecting employment and health support. The reason for this is that many people identify stress and back problems as a reason they are out of work or off sick for long periods of time. Studies find that being in good work also improves mental and physical health.
- 1.2** The SCR was one of the only two of the Devolved Deal Areas who had their expressions of interest accepted for a trial, the other is the West Midlands. Both areas are now progressing trial design.
- 1.3** There are around 85,000 SCR residents in receipt of out-of-work benefits and with health issues, and employers and employees tell us that more needs to be done to support those in work and with health issues to remain there.
- 1.4** The trial has been co-designed with the active involvement of the Work and Health Unit and local stakeholders across all areas, comprising representatives from, Local Authorities, health partners (CCGs & GPs) and service users. It is a positive example of the strength of collaborative working across the SCR.
- 1.5** On 29 February 2017, the Work and Health Unit approved our trial design for further development. The next step involves formal Ministerial approval and the successful progression through the Medical Ethics committee.

**1.5** The SCR Health Led Employment trial will introduce a new work and health support service consisting of employment specialists in a GP surgery, or other healthcare settings, taking voluntary referrals from health professionals or individuals will be able to self-refer. This voluntary trial is for SCR residents with mental health and/or musculoskeletal issues (e.g. back problems) whether they are out-of-work- and seeking to move into paid work or in employment but off sick or at risk of losing their employment because of their health issue.

The details of the trial are still being co-designed but we hope to start delivery of the service

**1.6** in the Autumn with around 7,500 referrals into the trial in total (50% of which receive the enhanced offer).

The current trial value is estimated at £6-£8m, this will be 100% funded through the Work and Health Unit's Innovation Fund, with in kind contribution locally through officer time. As

**1.7** the design is finalised over the coming months a financial due diligence process will be undertaken.

The initial trial geography will cover the South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw districts of the

**1.8** Sheffield City Region. We will continue to work with the Derbyshire Districts to share learning from the trial and explore opportunities for future engagement.

## **2. Proposal and justification**

**2.1** The design process of the trial involves consideration of the best route to its implementation and delivery. These options are being worked through with Work and Health colleagues based on lessons collected through the existing trial being delivered in Islington.

**2.2** Working across several local authority and health districts presents a need to ensure that the trial has a set of consistent trial principles. In summary, these principles include:

- **Building on what works:** we will embed the principles of a successful and well-evidenced service supporting people with severe mental health issues within our Trial. The SCR will apply these to a new cohort comprised of people with common mental health and muscular skeletal issues.
- **A commitment to test and learn:** we will deliver a scalable and replicable trial so we maximise the value of this health-led trial not only for central government but also for local partners. We will secure robust evaluation of the trial through a randomised control model.
- **Protecting patients at all times:** The trial will have no impact on DWP benefits and all participants will get support across trial areas. All personal data will be anonymised and only what is needed for evaluation will be collected.
- **Co-production:** continued active co-design partnership working between Local Authority and health stakeholders integrating work-health support.
- **Support for both out of work and in work residents:** in response to the dynamic nature of the current labour market and feedback from employers and local areas.
- **Standard inclusion/exclusion criteria:** we will have a single approach for the trial across its footprint offering clear and consistent guidance for GPs and other referral sources.
- **Training and capacity building:** we recognise that changing cultures and practices requires a structured and audience-specific approach to training and capacity building.

**2.3** In order to deliver these principles, the recommended approach for the SCR is that SCR retains Programme Management, ensuring ongoing strategic and delivery alignment, but that an NHS organisation is invited to undertake the contracting on behalf of the CA meaning that the trial will be delivered through an NHS contracted approach.

## **2.4 Contracting within the NHS offers a number of benefits:**

- It gives comfort to patients that they are in an employment trial which is driven by health allaying any concerns that data will be shared with DWP.
- GP's are more likely to refer into another NHS delivery agent.
- Contracting within the NHS gives access to NHS data and systems. Gaining approval otherwise would be a lengthy and complex process.
- It strengthens the work-health relationship within the SCR, aligning the employment support activities across the two systems.

## **2.5 As a consequence it is therefore recommended that the Board:**

- Endorses the SCR Health-Led Trial proposal and its principles.
- To recommend that the Managing Director of the Combined Authority Executive be asked to mobilise implementation of the Health Led Trial.

## **3. Consideration of alternative approaches**

**3.1** Alternative delivery approaches and cohort focus were considered as part of the development of the business case and throughout the appraisal process. These variables have been appraised by the Work and Health Unit (NHS England and DWP) and CLG as we have progressed through the board approval process.

**3.2** The trial is part of a national evaluation and is one of two which will go live this year, the other is in the West Midlands. Learning from the trial will shape future government policy and provide the SCR with learning to inform future programme design and devolution deal discussions. This trial, combined with our Early Intervention Pilot will provide a breadth of provision for residents working alongside other support to increase employment across the city region.

**3.3** We have considered commissioning outside of the NHS structure, however, for the reasons cited in section 2.4 this is not a preferred option at this time due, in the main, to the challenges faced in accessing health data outside of NHS contracting.

## **4. Implications**

### **4.1 Financial**

This paper notes that the CA may be in receipt of an offer from government to run a multi-year employment trial.

The nature of an innovative trial and the large value of the proposed grant brings with it inherent risks. Planning for and mitigating these risks will be central to any decision from the Authority on whether to accept the grant in accordance with the CA's procedures.

Contracting through a CCG in the manner presented in this paper may simplify arrangements and mitigate some of the identified risks. It is important that these risks be balanced against the desire - and fundamental need - for the Authority to be able to affect control on activity for which it is responsible.

Detail on how cash flows and responsibilities will fall is still awaited, and work will continue to ensure the Authority has appropriate controls and resource to undertake this activity.

## 4.2 Legal

There are no legal implications arising directly from acceptance of the grant other than it must be accepted on behalf of the CA by the s151 officer. Unless there are other conditions imposed upon the CA by the granting body, the future administration and operationalisation of the grant must be in accordance with the CA's constitutional processes – all of which are established.

The concept of using the NHS as the contracting agent to operationalise the trial means that SCRCA could approach the funding by way of a Funding Agreement albeit that the NHS is not the promoter of the trial. Whatever contractual arrangement is used, it will have to reflect any of the obligations imposed upon SCRCA and include some degree of accountability for the expenditure in relation to the quantifiable outputs. Any capacity or resource issues at the SCR Executive to operationalise and deliver this initiative must be addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Board in order that the CA's ability to deliver – and thereby not breach any contractual obligations – is sustainable.

Legal advice will be sought about the funding obligations and risks both upstream and downstream as this project progresses.

## 4.3 Risk Management

A detailed risk log will form part of the contract review process.

## 4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion

An equalities impact assessment will be undertaken and this trial design will go through the Medical Ethics Committee this process will ensure that the interests of patients are protected and any moral issues are identified and addressed.

## 5. Communications

5.1 A communication and participation plan has been established and will be implemented.

Key stakeholders including service users, employers and providers have been involved in the design and development of the models and this will continue across the life of the programmes.

## 6. Appendices/Annexes

6.1 None.

<b>REPORT AUTHOR</b>	<b>Andrea Fitzgerald</b>
<b>POST</b>	<b>Senior Programme Manager Employment</b>
Officer responsible	<b>Ruth Adams</b>
Organisation	<b>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority</b>
Email	<a href="mailto:Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk">Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk</a>
Telephone	<b>0114 220 3442</b>

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at: 11 Broad Street West, Sheffield S1 2BQ

Other sources and references: n/a



## SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD

6<sup>th</sup> April 2017

### SKILLS BANK UPDATE

#### Purpose of Report

This report gives an update on the delivery of the Skills Bank Programme

#### Thematic Priority

The Skills Bank directly supports the SEP thematic priority of 'Developing the SCR skills base, labour mobility and education performance'.

#### Freedom of Information

Executive Boards do not make decisions on behalf of the CA therefore are not made available under the Combined Authority Publication Scheme however this paper is not exempt under FOI.

#### Recommendations

This report has been produced for information but board members are encouraged to identify any further questions they may have (a further special meeting with PwC has been scheduled).

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The SCR Growth Deal settlement included funding to implement an employer driven 'Skills Bank' with a focus on investment of funds for training with employers who can demonstrate growth (March 2015).

The SCR Skills Bank works in support of the SEP ambition **to increase GVA in the region by 10% (£3bn)** through delivering interventions which help employers meet their skills challenges which are serving as a blockage to growth.

The Skills Bank also helps to provide the training needed to **address a shortfall of around 30,000 higher skilled people** in the region by investing £17.1m funding across two funding streams.

- 1.2 The Skills Bank model is based around the principle of business co-investment deals, where deals are made in anticipation of an economic rate of return. This return coming through jobs, improved productivity, access to new markets, export or introduction of new processes or products. This approach led BIS to designate this a national demonstrator pilot.

## 2. Proposal and justification

### 2.1 Objectives

As a part of the overall SCR growth hub; the Skills Bank is facilitating strategic business-led skills conversations that:

- Create Skills Deals providing clear economic benefits for the region, the SFA and employers.
- Deliver training through a high quality and diverse provider network.

Signpost to other services where the skills required can be delivered through mainstream education and training.

**2.2** In response to business input in the design phase, the Skills Bank became a front facing brand for two distinct funding pots, the traditional ESF funding (aimed at SMEs, linked to traditional training / skill levels, with ESF restrictions) and the more flexible growth deal funding (able to support all sizes of businesses, and bespoke training in addition to an innovation / capacity development fund to incentivise inward investment).

### 2.3 Key Contract Deliverables

- 8,676 individuals receiving training and support through the Skills Bank.
- Delivery of an online portal which facilitates employers creating Skills Deals.
- Creation of a provider framework which provides employers with high quality choice of training partner/s.
- Develop robust fiscal guidance policies and governance which delivers value for money and high impact from the use of public funds.

Capacity and Innovation fund element which enables deals to be made which are 'bespoke' in nature. This may include but is not exclusive to transfer of knowledge and skills (none qualification).

### 2.4 Performance

The Skills Bank went live in April 2016. Performance data suggests The Skills Bank will exceed planned learner number targets by the end of 2017. To the end of February 2017 and against a contract target of 8,676 learners:

- 2,471 learners have approved skills deals
- A further 32 learners have an approved deal via the capacity and innovation fund element of the programme
- A further 1,169 learners are in the appraisal stage of the process
- The Skills Bank has a pipeline of 10,043 learners (note: pipeline is those employers who are looking to submit deals within the next 6 months)
- 30 deals have been rejected
- 117 employers have advised they are not interested or have no requirement for training and support

The paper included as Annex 1 includes headline figures on the performance of the Skills Bank.

A geographic breakdown is available.

**2.5** The unit cost associated with each learner is less than planned for (this is due to SFA amending funding approach for ESF between negotiation of the spec and contracting), however funding remains within the Skills Bank to support additional deals and numbers of learners.

**2.6** As part of changing the culture of public funded support away from a subsidy against predetermined units of training or qualifications to co-investment based upon realising the

growth aspirations underpinning the SEP, the Skills Bank has declined deals for a number of reasons which include but are not exclusive to the following:

- Employer wishing to market their own products (not training)
- Employer seeking funding to train their staff in systems they have already purchased/are already in house and being used
- Employer seeking funding for mandatory training courses

### **3. Consideration of alternative approaches**

**3.1** The model is driven by business demand and business co-investment and was developed by a business working group Chaired by the Vice Chair of the LEP and Co-Chair of the Executive Board. The service will require recommissioning in 2018 due to the devolution of AEB to the SCR, the funding currently used by the SFA as co-financed match for the ESF element. This provides an opportunity to modify and adjust the delivery model, whilst maintaining the principle of a business co-investment fund.

**3.2** Working through the SFA presents continuous challenges. The nature of the Skills Bank, as a national demonstrator project, driven by economic indicators and decision making principles is disruptive both to the culture and systems of SFA management of workforce development programmes. Recommissioning and devolution present an opportunity to more fully align the Skills Bank as one of SCR Growth Hub spokes and business funds.

### **4. Implications**

#### **4.1 Financial**

Discussions are on-going with colleagues from the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) in terms of understanding the policy around programme underspends. There is an acknowledgement that there will be an underspend on the programme due to the delay in the launch and also the fact that the management information thus far is showing us that the average contribution per learner on ESF is under £500.00 which is much lower than the £2,000 profiled for.

Any underspend and subsequent claw back of funds by the CA (for the growth deal element) will need discussion and sign off by the s73 (CA Finance) officer.

#### **4.2 Legal**

There are currently no legal implications arising from this current report, however, as the LEP / CA develop the phase 2 Skills Bank the SCR Legal adviser will determine legal implications.

#### **4.3 Risk Management**

The Skills Bank Governance Board actively manage risks associated with the programme. The current high risks are:

- SFA approach thwarting the business designed model of the Skills Bank;
- Insufficient transformative deals, not securing the impact required;
- Market penetration and poor brand awareness;
- Procurement of providers to a framework structure thwarting innovation in the provider market.

#### **4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion**

Reporting on beneficiaries is standard ESF reporting and is being monitored.

### **5. Communications**

**5.1** PwC have a marketing and communications calendar of events. SCR comms colleagues have worked closely with PwC in order to ensure communications are released on a timely basis and are in line with SCR brand guidelines.

## 6. Appendices/Annexes

### 6.1 Annex 1 – Performance update – Skills Bank

<b>REPORT AUTHOR</b>	<b>Roz Bentley</b>
<b>POST</b>	<b>Contracts Team Leader</b>
Officer responsible	Ruth Adams (Deputy Managing Director)
Organisation	<b>Sheffield City Region Combined Authority</b>
Email	<a href="mailto:Roz.bentley@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk">Roz.bentley@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk</a>
Telephone	<b>0114 2203471</b>

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at: 11 Braod Street West, Sheffield S1 2BQ

Other sources and references: n/a

## Sheffield City Region Programme Update

Programme Area:	Skills Bank (to the 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2017)
<p><b>Progress Update:</b></p> <p>Total training cost (approved deals only) of £1,727,234.90. 35% of this has been invested by employers in SCR (£598,202).</p> <p>In terms of spend the contract is currently behind profile as the average contribution per learner is £456.91 which is a marginal increase on the January accumulated average of £455.00. In designing the specification for contract we have worked the numbers out based on an average of £2,000 per learner.</p> <p>Delivery is currently at 18% of profiled funding in 2016/17 but it must be noted the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) have imposed a flat profile which includes funding within months where the contract was not operational. A re-profile has been re-worked with the SFA as the contract holders but SCR are currently awaiting a policy decision in relation to growth funding which is holding up making a decision on how this is taken forward.</p> <p><u>Headline figures</u></p> <p>853 (increase of 115 from January 2017) employers are registered on the website.  586 (increase of 37 from January 2017) registered employers have completed skills assessments and are currently reviewing the training catalogue online.  267 (an increase of 84 from January 2017) skills bank applications have been received to date with 190 (increase of 43 from January 2017) approved and 77 (increase of 41 from January 2017) currently in appraisal.  2,471 (increase of 151 from January 2017) learners have approved skills deals with a further 1,169 (increase of 111 from January 2017) learners in the appraisal stage. This represents 40% (increase of 3% from January 2017) of the contracted learner target. The current pipeline suggests that the learner number target set out within the contract will be hit within the next 6 months.  To date we have received 92 (increase of 18 from January 2017) bespoke requests. Of these requests, 28 (an increase of 3 from January 2017) have been approved as a deal in principal and we are completing contracting and due diligence processes. Total bespoke learners  261 (an increase of 66 from January 2017) learners have now completed their training.</p> <p>There is a local authority disaggregated report available on request.</p> <p><u>Large Employers working with the Skills Bank</u></p> <p><u>McLaren</u></p> <p>Due to the flexibility of the Growth Deal funding to support larger companies and bespoke deals Sheffield City Region Skills Bank has negotiated an initial £300k of support towards the skills development and training for the new workforce/key personnel at McLaren. This offer is following the successful proposal to establish a production facility in Sheffield undertaking carbon fibre manufacture and manipulation which on opening will employ in the region of 80-100 employees. The proposal is being worked through with HR representatives of McLaren and is expected to also include Apprenticeship training.</p>	

## Savannah

Sheffield City Region have prepared a skills bank deal of £800k of support towards the skills development and training of staff at a potential MRO training centre in Doncaster. We are awaiting the outcome of this proposal.

## XPO Logistics (Barnsley)

Sector – Fossil Fuels and Logistics - 169 learners undertaking varying qualifications/training.

## Northfield Construction (Sheffield)

Sector – Building and Construction - 170 learners undertaking varying qualifications/training.

## Capacity and Innovation Deals

2 deals totalling £666,850 of Skills Bank contributions (50% of total costs). One of these deals relates to a knowledge transfer programme which will enable the company in question to understand techniques in relation to deep tunnel boring which will enable them and their supply chain to bid in for contracts in relation to the HS2 programme both within the SCR and nationally. There are only 2 specialist companies in the world currently which have to expertise to undertake this type of work.

# SHEFFIELD CITY REGION SKILLS BANK

## WHAT HAVE WE ACHIEVED IN 2016?

### The Skills Bank in 2016

Since the Skills Bank was launched in May 2016, the service has been going from strength to strength. We have highlighted some of our achievements to date below and we will build on this success in 2017. We will continue to work across all areas of the Sheffield City Region to tell businesses how we can support them to invest in skills and expertise to drive their business growth.



**645** employers in the region registered with us to apply for funding in 2016



Over **2,200** learners have been approved for training



Value of Skills Bank funding to date is **c.£1.5m**



In 2016, we have over **16,500** visits to our website



Website: [sheffieldcityregionsskillsbank.co.uk](http://sheffieldcityregionsskillsbank.co.uk)  
Freephone (9am – 5pm): 0800 328 1844  
Email: [skillsbank@uk.pwc.com](mailto:skillsbank@uk.pwc.com)  
Tweet us: @SCRskillsBank / #SCRskillsBank



\*Please note all figures are accurate as of 30/12/2016

© The Sheffield City Region Skills Bank ("Skills Bank") is a project funded by the European Union's European Social Fund (ESF), and the Sheffield City Region (SCR), and is led and administered by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) 2016.

**SKILLS, EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION EXECUTIVE BOARD FORWARD AGENDA PLAN**

April				May				June			
Items	Title	Method	Speaker	Items	Title	Method	Speaker	Items	Title	Method	Speaker
<b>Introduction</b>				<b>Introduction</b>				<b>Introduction</b>			
1	Welcome & Apologies	Verbal	Chair	1	Welcome & Apologies	Verbal	Chair	1	Welcome & Apologies	Verbal	Chair
2	Declarations of Interest	Verbal	All	2	Declarations of Interest	Verbal	All	2	Declarations of Interest	Verbal	All
3	Urgent items	Verbal	All	3	Urgent items	Verbal	All	3	Urgent items	Verbal	All
4	Minutes of the last meeting & Matters arising	Paper	Chair	4	Minutes of the last meeting & Matters arising	Paper	Chair	4	Minutes of the last meeting & Matters arising	Paper	Chair
<b>Business items</b>				<b>Business items</b>				<b>Business items</b>			
5	<i>Performance dashboard/Devolution Update</i>	n/a		5	<i>Performance dashboard/Devolution Update</i>			5	<i>Performance dashboard/Devolution Update</i>	tbc	tbc
6	<i>Business case endorsement &amp; change requests:</i>	n/a		6	<i>Business case endorsement &amp; change requests:</i>			6	<i>Business case endorsement &amp; change requests:</i>	tbc	tbc
7	<i>Scheme Scrutiny/Project Updates</i>	n/a		7	<i>Scheme Scrutiny/Project Updates</i>	Paper	tbc	7	<i>Scheme Scrutiny/Project Updates</i> • Skills Capital Update	tbc	tbc
<b>Discussion items</b>				<b>Discussion items</b>				<b>Discussion items</b>			
8	Employment and Skills Strategy	Presentat ion	TA	8	Mobilising Employment Support in the SCR	Paper	AF	8	Devolution of AEB	Paper	DB
9	Devolution of AEB	Paper	KW	9	Careers Strategy & Plan	Paper	KD	9	Skills Bank	tbc	DB
10	Institutes of Technology	Paper	DB	10	Devolution of AEB	Paper	KW	10	Stakeholder Mobilisation	tbc	AG
11	Early Intervention Pilot	Paper	AF	11	Institutes of Technology	Paper	DB	11	tbc	tbc	tbc
12	Work and Health Trial	Paper	AF	12	tbc	tbc	tbc	12	tbc	Tbc	tbc
13	Skills Bank Update	Paper	RB	13	tbc	tbc	tbc	13	tbc	tbc	tbc
<b>Actions &amp; Forward Planning</b>				<b>Actions &amp; Forward Planning</b>				<b>Actions &amp; Forward Planning</b>			
14	Agree action & summary for Resolution Record	Verbal	Chair	14	Agree action & summary for Resolution Record	Verbal	Chair	14	Agree action & summary for Resolution Record	Verbal	Chair
15	Forward Plan	Paper	Chair	15	Forward Plan	Paper	Chair	15	Forward Plan	Paper	Chair
16	AOB	Verbal	All	16	AOB	Verbal	All	16	AOB	Verbal	All

**This page is intentionally left blank**