



<b>Attending</b>	Paddy Bradley (PB) Matt Eade (ME) Iain Hatt (IH) Mike Holliday (MH) Ruth Lambert (RL) Morag Sullivan (MS) – representing Sally Burnett Mandy Timbrell (MT) Steve Wain (SW) Mandy Paterson (MP) Peter Wragg (PW) Phil Townsend (PT) Mike Ashworth (MS) Andrew Steele (AS) Andrew Lord (AL)
<b>Guest(s)</b>	Dragana Houston (DH) / Debby Skellern / Chris Stevens (CS) / Shona Taylor (ST) / Keeran Vetriko
<b>Apologies</b>	Sally Burnett (SB) Amanda Burnside (AB) Katie Cross (KC) Chris Dutton (CD) Helean Hughes (HH) Guy Keith-Miller (GKM) Carole Kitching (CK) Matt Leach (ML) Karen Leigh (KL) Ash Nandurkar (AN) Jean Scrase (JS) Karen Taylor (KT) Adam Wallbank (AW)
<b>Chair</b>	Paddy Bradley (PB)
<b>Minutes</b>	Deborah House (DKH)
<b>Venue</b>	Via video / telephone conference
<b>Start time</b>	2pm
<b>Finish time</b>	4pm

Item	Topic	Deadline
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	
	PB welcomed attendees and explained that AB had been called into a meeting regarding education re-start so he would Chair the meeting. Apologies were noted.	



<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes, matters arising and Conflicts of Interest</b>	
	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2020 were reviewed and approved.</p> <p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GDPR data - CEC funding meeting coming up and ST was requested to take this issue up with them.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conflicts of Interest</b></p> <p>None were declared.</p>	
	<b>Partners' round up – impact of Covid 19 on skills in each of the attendees' area of work</b>	
	<p><b>Steve Wain (Swindon College)</b></p> <p>Consideration of government expectations and guidance for the return of students on 1 June was proving challenging. The college was assessing the readiness position but there was no way it would be ready by 1 June and not before 8 June at the earliest. The Trade Unions saw no sense in opening prior to September, but the matter had become highly politicised. The college was spending this week going out to stakeholder groups, employees and employers regarding apprenticeships. It was impossible for apprentices to come into college whereas it was still possible to go into some businesses. The college was talking to both parent and pupils about the situation.</p> <p><b>Iain Hatt (Wiltshire College &amp; University Centre)</b></p> <p>Workplace assessments were still being carried out for apprentices. In addition, some students would be on delayed assessment between now and September. So, they should be ready to progress in September.</p> <p><b>Andrew Steele (WASH)</b></p> <p>Experiencing lots of the same issues as above. He believed that Primary Headteachers had the hardest task for opening. AS dealt with Years 11-16 so was not under that same pressure. The school was offering reassurance for Year 11 students as post-16 providers were holding a place if one had already been offered. It could be possible to open on 8 June and the school would undertake academic monitoring to see how the students had coped with home learning. The numbers allowed back into school would only be small so home learning would still be the main source of education for most. This could also be the exact same position in September. Staff wanted to get back to work, but also had their health and childcare issues to consider.</p> <p><b>Mike Holliday (GWP)</b></p>	



For GWP members the biggest worry was around apprenticeships, the current ones and future volumes and numbers. The places were decreasing rapidly as employers withdrew their apprenticeship places. Cash flow for providers was therefore going to be affected significantly. ASK programme, awareness via skype etc. vacancies were decreasing.

**Mike Ashworth (DfE)**

MA stated that he was at the opposite end to IH and SW. DfE was ascertaining the extent to which Government support packages may be useful and the extent to which institutions could remain open, with some learning online. The DfE was mindful of the financial impact on providers. At the moment it was managing the thirst for information to Government; what was practically possible for vulnerable learners and what was being done to engage with them? Now the conversations were about re-opening as per IH and SW.

**Phil Townsend (Littelfuse)**

PT advised that Littelfuse was manufacturing globally to a lesser or greater extent. There was some home working but manufacturing still had been carried out in production areas, including components for ventilators across the world. He wanted to express his appreciation for the education sector. The engineering assessor at Wiltshire College had been excellent at keeping in touch from a distance. UWE had also been very good, converting to an online offering and assessment almost immediately. He praised Helean Hughes and her team and the support from the Local Authority to Heads and Chair of Governors had been exceptional.

**Andrew Lord (Alabaré)**

AL dropped off the call but provided an email update.

- Residents in care homes and hostels sick with COVID-19 symptoms but lack of testing meant they did not really know.
- Concerns over PPE (although they did not run out).
- High staff absenteeism, although thankfully number actually sick had been low.
- Other agencies withdrawing service, meant greater pressure on housing and care staff.
- Cancellation of fundraising events. 20% of the charity's income was from fundraising.

**Ruth Lambert (FSB)**

RL stated that she could relate to the comments about apprenticeships. A survey carried out at the end of April found that 46% of business had closed, with 37% not sure whether they were going to re-open. Therefore, it was



easy to understand why they would postpone apprenticeships as they were simply focussed on survival.

**SW posed a question for MA regarding September starts**

The demand for apprenticeships was looking to be very low, so colleges would experience a significant drop in places next year. The demand would be higher for 16-18-year olds on full-time courses. 19+ students would be looking for some form of education or training. The market was going to change. How would this be funded?

**The response from MA** was that he did not have an immediate answer. The DfE was talking to every college, and each college had its own set of circumstances and challenges. DfE had been looking short-term and just dealing with the immediate crisis but was now beginning to look to the future. It would be a different world next year, and the ways DfE funded education were based on assumptions that were no longer true.

**Matt Eade (Military)**

The Military staff had been working from home as much as possible. Delivery had paused but was due to restart next month and would take the form of an OU type model. Capacity was down as not everyone had access to IT that enabled use of Microsoft Teams etc. There had not been as much of a demand on military personnel as expected through the Covid-19 crisis, so they were moving back to their usual work.

**Mandy Paterson (Inspire by Wessex Chamber)**

MP advised that the Chamber had moved to virtual engagement with its clients, which was more efficient and had therefore increased outputs and reached many more businesses. A lot of this new way of working would now stay. Some of the clients had their heads in the sand and were prepared to wait until everything returned to normal. Others were very proactive and were working on their business in lockdown. We had yet to see the impact properly and some businesses may indeed go to the wall. But even those who were working well during the crisis were producing new strategies and may make redundancies as they implemented the new ways of working.

**Chris Stevens (SWLEP Growth Hub)**

Businesses had been surveyed very early in this crisis on what support they felt was needed. The Growth Hub operated a Triage+ service and Wiltshire Council members of staff from the skills department had brought the total number of navigators to six. Thanks were given to MT and the team for their support. The Growth Hub had been contacted by over 500 businesses with 300+ needing more comprehensive support. Referrals had



now slowed down, but CS anticipated that when the Local Authority Discretionary Fund went live there would again be an increase.

**Shona Taylor (Careers Hub)**

The Careers Hub went into a virtual model very quickly as staff could not deliver into schools and anticipated that the online delivery model would be used for some time. 1:1s with Careers Leaders were held over the 'phone and a Sharepoint site had been set up for documents. 68 Career Leaders had recently been on such a call. The termly face-to-face meetings were now taking place every two weeks virtually. One discussion point at a future meeting would be Experience of the Workplace and another would be Labour Market Intelligence (LMI) led by DH and CS. Enterprise Advisor Employers were keen to carry out some work as things had started to settle down and were offering interviews and CV writing at a distance. The Hub did not intend to go back to sitting in cars for hours on end for meetings but would use some of these new learnings in future working practices.

**Morag Sullivan (Swindon Borough Council)**

SBC had focused on the hardship element of the crisis and redeployed staff. It was gathering intelligence around the economy and ascertaining what support programmes were available. The ESFA was setting up an apprenticeship recovery programme, which was as yet unknown. SBC's Education, Skills & Learning Dept was working on meeting the educational needs of vulnerable people during this time and managing the risk of young people Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEETs). Some of those that had embraced working from home were struggling with their mental health. MS asked the meeting not to underestimate the impact of mental health issues on employees at this time.

**Mandy Timbrell (Wiltshire Council)**

Wiltshire Council had been extremely busy operating several different "cells" during this difficult time.

- Schools cell – coordinated free school meals and IT connectivity. And for the early years pupils ensuring that enough settings were open for those that were classed as vulnerable
- Economy cell – redeployed employees to the Growth Hub
- Vulnerable cell – operated the Wilts Wellbeing Hub

Working with the Careers Hub to identify those students most at risk of NEET in case of any redundancies or changes to their destinations and working with SEND schools for students on supported internships.

PB stated that we had all seen the power of digital during the crisis and it would become the accepted way forward. We would see a considerable



	<p>difference and people would need these new digital skills for life and employment. The Higher Futures programme had always been to raise skills levels to Level 4 and above. However, we may need entry level skills in certain areas, not just into Higher Education.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>LEP role in response to Covid 19 and next steps for the Skills &amp; Talent Subgroup</b>	
	<p>SWLEP was working with both councils and the Business Representative Organisations' Group (BROG) to make sure that we were aligned as much as possible with messaging.</p> <p>Two elements within the emerging Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) were gathering pace; the Business-led Cyber Centre and the Centre for Innovation in the Circular Economy both of which SWLEP had identified as growing sectors of the economy. However, the tourism and hospitality sectors, which included the Great West Way, were under great pressure during the crisis. If the lockdown continued for longer some tourism and hospitality operations may need the support of the rural levelling up programmes, so this might need to be accelerated.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Skills Plan</b>	
	<p>(PB offered those members who attended the Working Group earlier, and had already heard the discussions, the opportunity to drop off the call.)</p> <p><b>Update on draft content</b></p> <p>DH presented to the meeting. The presentation can be accessed on the website via the following link:</p> <p><a href="https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/sub-groups/skills-talent/swlep-skills-plan-narrative-covid-19-impact-s-t-sg-18may2020.pdf?sfvrsn=5c402315_2">https://swlep.co.uk/docs/default-source/sub-groups/skills-talent/swlep-skills-plan-narrative-covid-19-impact-s-t-sg-18may2020.pdf?sfvrsn=5c402315_2</a></p> <p>A schedule had been drawn up for the progress of the Skills Plan as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To share with Working Group members via email on 16 June</li> <li>• Feedback requested by 23 June</li> <li>• To share with Subgroup members via email on 30 June</li> <li>• Feedback requested by 7 July with a recommendation to the Board</li> <li>• Board papers were due to be issued on 14 July</li> <li>• Board meeting scheduled for 22 July</li> </ul> <p><b>Labour Market Intelligence (national trends and local analysis)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analysis carried out by the University of Bath used the latest available national data from 2018. It provided national comparisons</li> </ul>	



	<p>but could not provide an up to date picture of labour market trends or skills provision and demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SWLEP had commissioned a piece of work to look at products on the market which provided up to date skills and labour market intelligence (LMI). The options under consideration included a free product being developed by a group of Government departments which was in beta testing and existing products on the market available through paid licence fees.</li> <li>• The SWLEP made a decision to use both EMSI and Labour Insight products, purchasing the necessary licences.</li> </ul> <p>If the Plan were approved at the Board Meeting on 22 July, the start date for implementation could be as early as 1 August. The Plan would be reviewed annually based on our analysis of the data and kept under constant review.</p> <p>IH suggested that recognition of the structural changes, for example, the levy, be included in the presentation with some context and add specific markers to demonstrate what had happened at what point to explain the impact.</p> <p>The meeting was not aware if the apprenticeship levy would continue in its current format.</p> <p>MT shared her screen and demonstrated a sample Risk Register she had been working on during the meeting. More work was required, and it was suggested that the Register be circulated to other members of the Group for their input and review. A nominated person would then be responsible for a particular action on the Register.</p> <p><b>Action: DH to ensure that the risks were written into the Skills Plan.</b></p> <p><b>Action: MT and IH to discuss outside the meeting for initial input.</b></p> <p>MS advised that Honda was looking for an update on LMI which had previously been prepared. SWLEP wished to assist, DH was aware and would start work on it shortly.</p> <p><b>Action: DH to liaise with SBC.</b></p>	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Monday, 13 July – 2pm-4pm</b> Rooms D001/D002, Wiltshire College &amp; University Centre, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, SN15 3QD</li> </ul>	





	<p><b>NOTE:</b> it was possible that the meeting would again be held virtually.</p> <p><b>Future meetings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Monday, 14 September – 2pm-4pm</b> Location to be advised</li><li>• <b>Monday, 9 November – 2pm-4pm</b> Location to be advised</li></ul> <p>PB thanked those present for attending and for their contributions.</p>	
	<b>Meeting closed at 3.50pm</b>	

Anade D. ie

17 July 2020