Dumfries and Galloway Local Employability and Skills Improvement Plan 2021-22

The Dumfries and Galloway Local Employability and Skills Partnership (D&GLEP) have recently undertaken a rigorous self-assessment process to critically assess their effectiveness and establish a baseline of how well the partnership meets the ambitions of No One Left Behind and Young Person's Guarantee. The Self-assessment challenged participants to reflect upon recent performance and to reach consensus on identifying areas for improvement.

The self-assessment contained statements relating to Leadership & Relationships, Governance, Use of Evidence, Community Engagement & Participation, Focus on Outcomes, Use of Resources, Accountability, Performance Management and Reporting and Impact. This evaluation supported the partnership to gather the feedback required to strengthen the partnership and produce a collective and collaborative Improvement Action Plan as set out below.

Based on the responses submitted and a follow up session with LEP partners, the key improvement themes identified to enable successful delivery of LEP objectives were Governance, Performance Management and Reporting and Impact.

Progress on these improvement actions will discussed at LEP meetings and monitored and evaluated across the partnership, embedding the LEP as an effective strategic group aligned with the ambitions of No One Left Behind and delivering our local partnership vision of:

a collaborative, effective and easily understood employability and skills system, focused on positive outcomes which are flexible, person-centred and provide pathways to sustainable and fair work.

through our agreed objectives:

- To drive forward and implement the shared ambitions and actions of No One Left Behind to ensure the right support is available in the right way at the right time, with a focus on delivery of the Young Persons Guarantee within an all-age employability support service.
- To use a range of labour market data and evidence including the actual experience of service users to coordinate and inform decision making, identify priorities and support effective partnership delivery.
- To agree shared local governance to streamline the employability landscape, support collaborative working and coordinate resources to improve opportunities and outcomes.
- To set and monitor quality standards for employability provision and encourage compliance by providers.
- To encourage employers to adopt fair work principles and promote inclusive growth which is sustainable for people and planet.

Action Plan notes/key

- Executive Group refers to a group comprised of the LA Employability Lead and chairs of the delivery subgroups
- PMO refers to the Project Management Officer responsible for joint delivery and support to the Local Employability & Skills Partnership
- RAG Status:

| 2. Governance | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | |
| | | | | ry of the NoLB Local Delivery Plan | | |
| | | | wed. | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| DGC | Lack of engagement by LEP | June 2022 | Workshop for partners to | All partners in LEP will be aware of | | |
| | members | | take place with positive | and have agreed their individual | | |
| | Time and staff | | evaluation | responsibilities within the LEP and | | |
| | | | | have a better understanding of each | | |
| | | | Presentation by chair of | partners organisations' activities to | | |
| | | | each LEP subgroups to | better set targets and measures for | | |
| | | | _ | the LEP. | | |
| | | | _ | | | |
| | | | and responsibilities | Increased engagement by LEP members | | |
| | | | Output – NoLB Operating | | | |
| Fire stables and the | | A: 1 2022 | | All LED manufacture have a place | | |
| executive group | - | April 2022 | | All LEP members have a clear | | |
| | | | , | understanding of how the LEP will manage and mitigate potential risks | | |
| | | | Teviewed | as we move forward. | | |
| | | | | as we move fol ward. | | |
| | | | All members understand | Effective processes in place to ensure | | |
| | | | | conflict is resolved timeously and risks | | |
| | | | ' | are identified to consider | | |
| | | | Commict | contingencies/mitigation | | |
| | formally agreed the nanism in place for | [Risk, Cost, Resource] formally agreed their respective roles and responsible nanism in place for managing collective risks, which ad means by which the partnership resolves issues/of DGC Lack of engagement by LEP members Time and staff | Target Date [Risk, Cost, Resource] Formally agreed their respective roles and responsibilities in relation nanism in place for managing collective risks, which is regularly reviewed means by which the partnership resolves issues/conflict DGC Lack of engagement by LEP members June 2022 | Target Date [Risk, Cost, Resource] Formally agreed their respective roles and responsibilities in relation to the partnership and deliver nanism in place for managing collective risks, which is regularly reviewed. Indicate the partnership resolves issues/conflict DGC Lack of engagement by LEP | | |

| 3. Use of Evidence | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | |
| 3.3 The LEP has a good understar | nding of the distrib | ution of positive and negative out | comes across its | area, including information r | elating both to inequalities (e.g., | | |
| education, income, health) and t | he range of equalit | es groupings (e.g., age, race, gen | der, disability). | | | | |
| 3.3 | DGC Policy & | Time | Ongoing | Data dashboard updated | LEP will have current and local data to | | |
| Continued development and | Partnerships | Staff | | monthly | inform decisions | | |
| implementation of local data | Team | | | | | | |
| dashboard to effectively | (Gregor | | | Utilised by subgroups and | | | |
| monitor, analyse and report on | Docherty) | | | reviewed at LEP meetings | | | |
| distribution of outcomes and | | | | | | | |
| inequalities within LA | | Links to 9.1 | | | | | |

| 4. Community Engagement and Participation | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | | |
| 4.2 Input from individuals and communities influences the NOLB Delivery Plan and LOIP | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 Input from individuals and communities influences the activities undertaken and the way they are delivered. | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5 Each LEP member has articul | | • • | • | , , , | • | | | |
| 4.6 The LEP is committed to desi | | | the earliest stage | | i · | | | |
| 4.2 4.3 | Subgroup on | Lack of meaningful | Ongoing | Service users' feedback | Greater link between customer | | | |
| LEP members to map current | service design | engagement/small sample of | | evident in plans and | feedback and service delivery | | | |
| work with client input to | and client | feedback leading to skewed | | delivery | | | | |
| service delivery | engagement | feedback | | | | | | |
| | | | | Collaborative template | | | | |
| Identify gaps and explore | | Funding restrictions | | used and data analysed | | | | |
| systematic and rigorous | | Increased staff time to engage | | for LEP | | | | |
| approach based on SATSD via | | in client feedback, forums and | | | | | | |
| customer focus events and a | | lived experience groups | | | | | | |
| range of opportunities | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Co-designed universal | | | | | | | | |
| template used by all LEP | | | | | | | | |
| partners when collecting | | | | | | | | |
| data/feedback from | | | | | | | | |
| participants | | | | | | | | |
| NAME OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNE | | | | 1 1 1 1 | 1.6 | | | |
| Map, review, and revise | | | | Local website updated to | Information on opportunities easily | | | |
| communication channels | | | | reflect partnership | accessible | | | |
| (websites/portals/social | | | | activity | | | | |
| media) and consider links with | | | | Links made to national | | | | |
| national sites (including new | | | | | | | | |
| YPG website) for consistency; | | | | website – particularly YPG | | | | |
| simplicity; shared branding | | | | | | | | |

| 4. Community Engagement and Participation | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | |
| 4.5, 4.6 | TSD&G | Resource required for | June 2022 | Customer engagement is | By engaging more effectively with | | |
| Create a systematic and | DGC | engagement | | a standing item on LEP | local communities we will gain a | | |
| structured approach to | | Risk of not engaging with the | | agenda | better understanding of local | | |
| community engagement and | | hardest to reach – user must | | | challenges and issues and by using | | |
| use of community intelligence | | be at the certain for Scottish | | Understanding of Scottish | service design techniques we will | | |
| to help shape the operational | | Approach to Service Design | | Approach to Service | incorporate their views into our LEP | | |
| plan and improve outcomes | | Links to 9.5 | | Design is improved | delivery plan | | |

| 6. Use of Resources | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | | |
| 6.6 - The LEP has in place a robus | 6.6 - The LEP has in place a robust commissioning and procurement process that enables co-design, co-production, co-delivery, and co-commissioning of services to best | | | | | | | |
| meet the needs of users, evidence | ced by the needs of | individuals and local/regional ge | ographies. | | | | | |
| 6.6 | DGC/ ES&P | | April 2022 | Develop timetable for | Fair and transparent commissioning | | | |
| Develop clear written | Manager with | | | approach | processes | | | |
| processes and protocols for the | Procurement | | | | | | | |
| LEP commissioning group | Team | | | Process and protocols agreed and shared with | LEP partners understand what funding is available and the rationale behind | | | |
| Support to local providers on | DGC, Supplier | | January 22 | update to ToR if required | funding decisions | | | |
| how to bid for contracts | Development | | | | | | | |
| | Programme | | | | | | | |
| | TSD&G | | | | | | | |
| Ongoing CPD and networking | Forums inc. | | Ongoing | | | | | |
| opportunities for employability | T&PF and TSEF | | | | | | | |
| key workers so that they are | | | | | | | | |
| aware of the support available | | | | | | | | |
| within the locality and labour | | | | | | | | |
| market opportunities | | | | | | | | |

| 7. Accountability | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | | |
| 7.2 - All LEP members play an | 7.2 - All LEP members play an active role in agreeing, monitoring, and taking action to improve local employability outcomes, offering constructive criticism | | | | | | | |
| and regularly challenge each of | other and the part | nership as a whole to 'do mor | e' in achieving t | he Delivery Plan outcomes | • | | | |
| Delivery will be remitted to the | Executive Group | Transparency and shared | March 2022 | Performance | Each LEP operational partnership has | | | |
| LEP subgroups: | | ownership - partners do not | | management reporting | a clear action plan with measurable, | | | |
| YPG partnership | | have equal access to update | | arrangements developed | aligned outcomes aligned to the key | | | |
| • NOLB 25+ | | information, data sharing | | to monitor delivery | objectives identified by the LEP. | | | |
| PACE partnership | | issues | | | | | | |
| Employer Engagement | | | | Overall performance | robust scrutiny body with clear roles | | | |
| Partnership | | Resource needed for the | | monitoring a standing | and responsibilities | | | |
| Apprenticeship subgroup | | capacity and capability | | item on LEP agenda | | | | |
| And guided by forums: | | building in the third sector | | | High levels of partnership, trust, and | | | |
| Training and Practitioners | | | | Milestone targets | robust outcomes for participants. | | | |
| Forum | | and Promotion - articulate | | overseen by a scrutiny | | | | |
| Third Sector Employability | | ambitions and outcomes so | | group with high levels of | Increased third sector delivery | | | |
| Forum | | creating strong local buy-in. | | accountability around | | | | |
| | | | | collective actions | | | | |
| Seek funding for a resource | TSD&G | | Mar 22 | Postholder and SLA in | Increased capacity and capability | | | |
| within TSI similar to Fife model | DGC | | | place | within third sector | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| LEP partners will have separate | All partners | | Mar 22 | Phase 2 NoLB – increased | Localised delivery and support in | | | |
| structures and processes for | | | | third sector delivery | areas of need as identified by LEP | | | |
| decision-making about policy | | | Mar 23 | Phase 3 NoLB | operating plan | | | |
| and delivery | | | | | | | | |

| 8. Performance Management and Reporting | | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------|----------|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | | |

- 8.1 The LEP can clearly articulate its collective performance expectations on the necessary steps to reduce inequalities in and between local communities and has effective arrangements to evaluate its own performance.
- 8.4 The Delivery Plan clearly expresses what the partnership understands improvement will look like locally and is ambitious in driving effective service/partnership working to achieve its ambitions.
- 8.6 The LEP has effective arrangements to evaluate its own performance, with an efficient and robust system in place for recording progress made towards the achievement of outcomes.

| achievement of outcomes. | | • | | • | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 8.1 | DGC Policy & | Data licences | April 2022 | Agreement reached on | LEP will have an effective mechanism |
| Collectively agree on | Partnerships | Time | | priorities. Positive and | to monitor and evaluate progress |
| groups/communities facing | Team | Staffing | | negative outcomes | against outcomes |
| inequalities to enable LEP | (Gregor | | | scrutinised, and | |
| members to target | Docherty) | | | improvement measures | Evidence of successful and sustained |
| improvements in these areas. | | | | put in place as required | transitions to positive destinations for |
| | | | | | priority groups within NOLB |
| Timetable a progress check on | | | March 22 | Inequalities scrutinised by | |
| improvements on inequalities. | | | Dec 22 etc | LEP on six monthly basis | Inequalities reduce. |
| 8.4 | Executive Group | Time | March 2022 | Agreed collaborative | Improved planning and collaborative |
| Utilise Scottish Government | | | | NoLB Operating Plan in | delivery resulting in better outcomes |
| template for NoLB Operational | | | | place for NoLB Phase 2 | for our local communities and |
| Plan 2022-2025 | | Links to 7.2 and 9.5 | | implementation in 21-22 | citizens. |
| 8.6 | All LEP delivery | LEP members don't engage | | Development of | Impact of LEP collectively recognised |
| LEP members to provide | partners | Competing priorities | | performance report | by members and valued by the |
| reports on outcomes resulting | | outwith scope of members | | Dashboard implemented | employability support sector |
| from LEP activity in their | | Difficulty attributing success | | Agenda items | |
| organisation. | | to LEP | | LEP members engage in | |
| | DGC ES&P | Costs and time associated | | process | |
| LEP to consider how to provide | Manager | with implementation of | | | |
| the role of Project | | Project Management | | Reports shared at | |
| Management to support the | | | | meetings and acted upon | |
| monitoring and evaluation of | | | | | |
| strategy and action plans | | | | | |

| 9. Impact | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Improvement actions | Lead | Implications [Risk, Cost, Resource] | Target Date | Measure | Outcomes | |
| 9.1 The LEP is able to evidence th | ne impact its decision | ons for employability investment | locally have had | on local needs and national th | nemes addressing | |
| 9.5 The LEP is progressing the No | One Left Behind p | rinciples locally reducing duplicat | ion and complexi | ty in the employability lands | cape while ensuring services delivered | |
| meet the needs of individuals, lo | cal communities, a | nd labour market. | | | | |
| 9.1 | DGC | | | Annual report and | Greater visibility of impact and | |
| Annual report to CPP should | | | | quarterly updates to CPP | connection to communities | |
| include evidence of impact | | Links to 3.3 | | | | |
| 9.5 | DGC and | Contextual changes to funding | March 2022 | Agreed collaborative | Improved planning and collaborative | |
| Strengthen delivery planning to | Executive Group | require quick changes and | | NoLB Operating Plan in | delivery with reduced duplication and | |
| ensure maximising our impact | | flexible response | | place for NoLB Phase 2 | silo working resulting in better | |
| on local communities by | | LEP partners don't engage | | implementation in 2021- | outcomes for our local communities | |
| completing NoLB Operating | | | | 22 | and citizens. | |
| Plan for 2022-2025 | | Staff | | | | |
| | | Time | | | | |