



**Action Notes from the meeting of the  
South West Regional Skills Partnership Performance Monitoring Group  
Friday 28 September 2007 at SLIM, St Luke's Campus, University of Exeter**

Present:		
SB	Sarah Beeson	GOSW
LC	Lucy Church	HEFCE
MC	Mark Colton	Jobcentre Plus
BH	Brian Humphreys	LSC
BN	Ben Neild	Marchmont SLIM
JW	John Wilkinson	Reports to the CBI on RSP
Note taker:		
RC	Ruth Carey	SWOOP
Apologies received from:		
CE	Chris Evans	Marchmont SLIM
		South West RDA

GENERAL NOTES	ACTION
<p><b><u>Introduction</u></b> SLIM had been asked to develop a new performance monitoring framework for the RSP. CE will lead this. BN is chairing the group on her behalf today. Papers had been distributed in advance: (1) Role and Remit (2) Draft framework (3) Proposed Indicators.</p> <p>BH would share LSC's representation with Pete Gisborne, each attending alternate meetings.</p> <p>JW, acting as the RSP Board representative on the Group, pointed out that as the RSP has no real 'funds', improved dialogue &amp; co-ordination between partners was key to success. The Performance Monitoring Framework could support this. A Board away-day in January would review the data we provide them and that the real value would be getting the Board to discuss what it means for their priorities.</p> <p>The group agreed that a detailed review process, once per year, to a) consider the Strategic Indicators / PSAs and b) review the priorities in the light of this would be valuable. Due to partners' reporting and planning timetables, this should happen in October of each year.</p>	<p>A presentation should be made at the RSP's away day in Jan 08</p> <p>Propose annual review by Board in October each year</p>

<p><b><u>Membership of the Group</u></b>  SLIM was still seeking representation from SW RDA, who were considering who could best represent them.</p> <p>SB felt that a representative from GOSW's young people's directorate would sit on the group.</p> <p>BN explained that the region's Skills for Business managers had been invited but were unable to attend.</p> <p><b><u>Role and remit</u></b>  It was agreed that the group should meet quarterly a few weeks in advance of Board meetings.</p> <p>JW's suggestion that CE prepare a 'holding report' for the 16 October Board meeting, and that instead of a full data report, we should let the Board know what we plan to report and when and get confirmation that this is what they want was accepted.</p>	<p>BN to speak to RDA</p> <p>SB to speak to Peter Cloke</p> <p>CE to prepare paper for Oct Board meeting</p>
<p><b><u>Draft framework</u></b>  The draft framework was discussed and approved.</p> <p>It was proposed that all reports should seek to be brief. Any necessary detailed analysis should be given in Annexes. Reports should adopt a principle of 'reporting by exception', ie they should include an introduction or brief front page that flagged up issues that needed attention and discussion.</p>	
<p><b><u>Reporting</u></b>  BH stated that January was not a good month for strategic planning as the LSC had largely agreed annual plans by Jan. October was better. LC agreed that October would work well for HEFCE.</p> <p>It was suggested that reporting on the RSP Priority indicators should be at 6 monthly intervals, in April and October.</p> <p>BH asked if the RSP would want reports on particular themes at different times of year. BN thought that the Action Groups, e.g. on Leadership &amp; Management &amp; STEM, would need to report progress, at least annually. How this fitted with our six-monthly reports on the RSP Priorities in general was not yet clear. JW felt it important that there be only one source of indicators / measures of progress.</p> <p><b><u>Partner indicators.</u></b>  SB asked that the ESF indicators be expressed in percentages, rather than numbers. The fact that the data was for a 3-year period should also be made clear. The national ESF Evaluation Sub Group will have a SW representative on it, though it wasn't clear who yet. SB and Jim Neilson would sit on monitoring committees regionally and nationally. Clearly regional work needed to fit with national evaluation plans and activities.</p> <p>SB explained that the quarterly cycle for ESF claims would be Feb/May/Aug/Nov. Quarterly reports against targets would fit with this. They use a green/amber/red approach in their reporting and this shows very clearly what's good and what's weak.</p>	<p>Six monthly reporting for RSP Priorities to be adopted</p> <p>ESF indicators to be expressed in percentages. BN to clarify that ESF data covers 3 yrs</p>

<p>BH explained that the LSC commissioning plan for 08/09 contained different aspirations, though the 07/08 plan would still be used for reporting this year. BN asked for a note of what's likely to be different in the new plan. BH explained planning process and asked that reference to LSC 'aims' be changed to 'aspirations'.</p> <p>BH explained there may be alterations to LSC processes. National performance review info will now be reported in Feb &amp; July. This would be reviewed by LSC Board a month later, in March &amp; Aug. Reporting to the RSP Board in April and Sept therefore looked reasonable.</p> <p>There was concern re the possibility that both LSC and GOSW reports might contain ESF outcomes. BH agreed to find out how ESF provision is covered in LSC reporting.</p> <p>The Group discussed the Local Government section of the framework document (3.3). It was felt that many of the indicators were not v relevant and should be removed. Only parts of the first two are appropriate</p> <p>LC felt the proposals and sources of data are sensible. HEFCE are currently reviewing some of their own performance indicators.</p> <p>BN asked if HEFCE / HESA / HERDA provided an analysis of the performance data at regional level. JW thought this might be a role for HERDA. JW felt the key issue for the RSP was the question: "do we have the right subjects being taught to ensure our priorities are met in the region?"</p> <p>LC responded that HEFCE (unlike the LSC) is not a planning body.</p> <p>BH stated that brokerage monitoring information now comes through the LSC and can be reported with LSC performance reports.</p> <p>MC pointed out that JC+ reports to SMRC 6 monthly, usually around March/April and September. This made reporting to the RSP Board in May and October appropriate.</p> <p>SB pointed out that some GOSW programmes, eg Millennium Volunteers, were no longer current. A discussion re GOSW reporting was needed.</p> <p><b>Strategic Indicators</b> BN explained that a national framework was being developed. This was still under development. BN would send information to the group as it develops and it was agreed that the Strategic Indicators and national reporting framework should be discussed in detail at a future meeting.</p> <p><b>RSP Priorities</b> JW asked if business schools were covered. BN explained that if the school is HE funded then it would be picked up. Purely private schools would not be.</p> <p>Leadership South West funded activity was felt to be missing. Information on number supporting each quarter would be useful.</p>	<p>BH to provide the new LSC table for 08/09 when available</p> <p>BN to change 'aims' for 'aspirations'. BN to make it clear that the data is 3-year.</p> <p>BH to find out the LSC's line on 'double reporting'.</p> <p>BN to remove irrelevant local government indicators</p> <p>SB to speak to Peter Crouch re GOSW reporting</p> <p>BN to send details as these emerge &amp; put national / strategic framew'k on future agenda</p> <p>Leadership South West to be added to the indicators.</p> <p>BH to consider how LSC funded 'management'</p>
--	---

<p>BH felt the LSC definition of 'management' problematic. The current indicator may not encompass all that LSC funded leadership / management related activity. This was complex and required thought</p> <p>The fact that the data on skills gaps and shortages was only produced bi-annually meant that it wasn't very useful as an 'indicator'. The group felt that it was best removed from the framework.</p> <p>On Enterprise Skills, the use of VAT registration data did not really match the make-up of South West companies. JW suggested SLIM look at what further data on smaller enterprise might be available. LC suggested the inclusion of data on spin-offs/start-ups from HE institutions from the HE Business &amp; Community Interaction survey. .</p> <p>On STEM, JW requested BN forward to him stats on GCSE STEM exam results. The group felt that looking at the conversion rate between application and take-up was important, in that it reflected on the balance between demand and supply. BN to check that both Chemistry &amp; Physics are included in the definition of 'physical sciences' used as an indicator.</p> <p>On migrant there was a discussion about the inadequacy of data. SB wondered if it was possible to assess the portion of the whole population who are asylum seekers/refugees/migrant workers - perhaps by surveying employers. BN explained that SLIM was likely to be doing some further work on migrant working and that this might produce better data on both numbers and English language skills deficits. The use of migrant numbers as a proxy for language training needs was clearly misleading, as migrants from Australia etc spoke English. BN should assess whether the RSP priority was on migrant working, language skills or both. SLIM should strip those from English-speaking countries country from the figures if required.</p> <p>On IAG it was agreed that the headline figures are OK as indicators, but the complexity of the data may require changes in the data to be put in context.</p> <p><b><u>Reporting matrix</u></b> BN presented the draft reporting matrix. The matrix supported the idea of 6 month reporting, though it remains incomplete.</p> <p>It was clear that there was a need to think about possible thematic reports for the Board across the year, linked to reports from the priority Action Groups.</p>	<p>activity can best be captured</p> <p>BN to seek data on non VAT reg enterprise and on HE business activity</p> <p>BN to forward the stats on exams results to JW.</p> <p>BN to check that Chemistry does fall under one of the broader headings.</p> <p>BN to review SLIM work on migrant working</p> <p>BN to produce migrant data for non English language speaking nations</p> <p>SLIM to examine with RSP fit with reporting by Action Groups</p>
<p><b><u>Future meetings</u></b> JW suggested the next meeting take place in Taunton. Ideally the group would meet up 2-4 weeks prior to the Board meetings. It was agreed that the group would meet early in January as the next Board meeting is 22 January.</p>	<p>Provisionally agreed the group would meet very early in Jan 08.</p> <p>BN to circulate dates of the RSP board meetings (also see below).</p>

<b>RSP Board Dates</b>	<b>Papers to be forwarded to RSP Team by</b>	<b>Papers to be Issued to Board Members by</b>
22 January 2008	08 January 2008	15 January 2008
22 April 2008	08 April 2008	15 April 2008
22 July 2008	08 July 2008	15 July 2008
21 October 2008	07 October 2008	14 October 2008