



Steering Group	Paddy Bradley (PB), SWLEP CEO	✓
	Daniel Busson (DBs), Lead Employer Capita WFM – arrived at 1.08pm	✓
	Sally Burnett (SB), Swindon Borough Council	✓
	Scott Green (SG), Regional Lead CEC	✓
	Steven Haines (SH), Wiltshire Council	Apologies
	Vicky Dunncliffe (VD), Lead SEND Provider, Fairfield Farm College	Apologies
	Louise Stanton (LS), Lead School, Malmesbury School	Apologies
	Shona Taylor (ST), Wiltshire Council	✓
	Mandy Timbrell (MT), Wiltshire Council/SWLEP Skills Lead	Apologies
	Amanda Walton (AW), Lead College/Post 16, New College, Swindon	✓
Guests:	Laura Arlott (LA), SWLEP	✓
Chair	Paddy Bradley (PB)	
Minutes	Deborah House (DKH)	
Venue	Via video / telephone conference	
Start time	1pm	
Finish time	3pm	

Item	Topic	Deadline
1.0	Welcome and apologies, Conflicts of Interest	
	The meeting started at 1.01pm. PB welcomed attendees to the meeting and apologies were noted. Conflicts of Interests None were declared.	
2.0	Review of minutes and actions from 10 February 2022	
	The minutes from the meeting on 10 February 2022 were reviewed and approved. Matters arising transferred to Action Log. The updated Action Log from the meeting on 10 February 2022 was reviewed.	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmark 1, a stable careers programme, would benefit from a top-down approach and support from SLT was fundamental in achieving this. Letters had been written on 25 February to chairs of SASH and WASSH and countersigned by Headteacher at Malmesbury School. Update: Subsequently, individual reports on a school's performance had been posted to head teachers. Although the Careers Hub had not received any direct feedback from this, anecdotally comments were that it had been hugely helpful and had made Heads and members of SLTs have follow-up conversations with Careers Leads. <p>Action: Careers Hub to issue such reports after each data capture in September, January and April via email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compass: to produce a flow chart showing who received what type of information and when it was issued. Update: This would show how much time had been spent in the school which could be tracked manually via EAs. This information could also be included in the above report. This level of detail would be appreciated within the school, so well worth including. • Elective Home Education: Update: A Hub Incubation Project bid was submitted to the CEC about researching how best to support parents of electively home educated young people to ensure they have a good careers programme as part of their curriculum. Outcome of the bid is expected by 10 June 2022. 	
<p>3.0</p>	<p>Careers Hub progress to date and impact and targets for 2022/23</p>	
	<p>Latest data overview ST presented to the meeting. The presentation can be accessed by following the link below.</p> <p>https://static.swlep.co.uk/swlep/docs/default-source/sub-groups/skills-talent/careers-hub/2022/12-may-2022/careers-hub-progress-to-date-overview.pdf?sfvrsn=59413548_4</p> <p>The presentation outlined the journey travelled by the Careers Hub since its inception in September 2018 to the end of its fourth academic year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been significant progress for the majority of Gatsby Benchmarks, but Benchmark 5, encounters with employers and employees, and Benchmark 6, experiences of workplaces, although improved, had suffered more impact as a result of the pandemic. • Benchmark 1, a stable careers programme, had improved with the provision of a bursary as an incentive. • Benchmark 2, learning from careers and labour market information (LMI), had improved with access to one site and one source. 	



- With Benchmark 7, encounters with further and higher education, there was still work to be done on progression and access to FE and HE.
- The Careers Hub was pleased with progress on Benchmark 8, personal guidance. Staff members were now becoming qualified, so there was a gradual improvement, but there was still a deficit in staff numbers.

Overall, the was performance good, with performance above the national average.

There was debate on the direction and aims of the Careers Hub and how to improve Benchmarks which were not performing so well. Should the Careers Hub focus on specific Benchmarks for improvement or go for significant systematic consistency across the area, making understanding of the world of work not dependent on a personal relationship between individual teachers and employers? There was pressure on Careers Hubs from CEC to focus on Benchmark 1 and on institutions which were failing to complete three Benchmarks. The CEC to some degree dictated where we put our focus.

The provision of Careers Advice should be treated like a subject in its own right and become as consistent as possible. EAs should share their understanding within schools and identify any differences. Annette Holdsworth and Rose Hiron-Grimes were working on providing this type of resource for EAs and meetings were being launched over the next few weeks in time for the start of the new academic year.

Providers were struggling with Benchmark 3, addressing the needs of each student, as the challenge was to collect enough evidence. The biggest issue was the collection of three years' worth of data. The Team had done work with schools via focus groups and workshops to try to move this forward. There would be a meeting on 12 July for data managers together for data sharing agreements, so this may move forward next year. Schools and colleagues had their own data sharing agreements with Local Authorities.

There was good activity within the Enterprise Advisor Network, but there was just not enough EAs on board. Annette Holdsworth had done a good job of recruiting, but there was still more work needed. A speed networking, face-to-face event was being planned.

A suggestion was made about bringing in enterprise or industry experts to buddy up with Careers Leaders. This would help to inform enterprise what Careers Leaders do inside schools, and also would bring an enterprise focus into the Careers Lead function. There were people recently retired in the



	<p>area that may be interested in working in this way with schools. The role needed to be defined, but the idea was worth investigating further.</p> <p>Additional information provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • although it had been a long journey, the SEND schools were now better matched; • 100 Iraqi and Ukrainian 100 students were being assisted through NEETs project; • the Maths for girls HIP project had received positive feedback from schools. Evaluation and resource development would take place over the summer, but as Jaime would be coming across to the Careers Hub permanently, this work would be outsourced; and • Steve Haines had been working with developers on providing LMI data for SEND students which had been costed at £4,000. <p>Action: ST to check whether this licence was also with Emsi.</p> <p>The education sector was not driven enough by its customers, the young people and employers. They were provided with what we thought they needed, but did young people think they were getting what they needed at the time they needed it? More evidence gathering was required from the students as the learner voice was not right and there did not appear to be an appropriate mechanism available. Employers had a very strong role in skills both for social value and CSR reasons, but also, they needed to recruit the right skills. The Careers Hub was providing a service to help schools and colleges offer better experiences to students so that employers would have a larger choice of employees. And also, the Careers Hub was providing a good service to education providers so that young people would benefit overall. But we did not have the means to check this assumption. Did our customers and beneficiaries like what we did? Think about ways of finding out from our customers and beneficiaries. What did our employers think of the work of the Careers Hub? A reasonable sample would be helpful; some of this information would come from Annette's project.</p> <p>What difference did achieving Benchmarks actually make? The CEC was asking this very question.</p> <p>The CEC had recognised the mismatch between the eight Gatsby Benchmarks and the new seven co-ordinated actions and was working to get this resolved and moving more to an impact statement.</p>	<p>June 2022</p>
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Stakeholder discussion</p>	
	<p>Many of the issues about the past year had been discussed in the Item 3.0.</p>	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Key strategic themes for 2022/2023</p>	
	<p>PB thanked everyone for contributing to the debate.</p>	

The second co-ordinated action was for a self-improving system. In order to improve on the system, we would have to obtain ALL views, good and bad, on what people think about what we did by:

- getting feedback from schools and colleges at the end of this academic year which would become the baseline measure;
- feedback from the young people would be better in the spring when they have had a chance to encounter the Careers Hub; and
- the business view would be sought in autumn of this year.

This would need to be completed over a period to time in order to track the change.

There is a fine balance between the local determination of the system programme and other issues where we have to put effort. What was the combined effect of what the Careers Hub was carrying out and trying to achieve, for example, the maths HIP, LMI for SEND, apprenticeship campaign and technical education? How did that all fit together to get an agglomerated effect which would then be beneficial for a high percentage of young people in Swindon and Wiltshire? Year on Year sustained improvement in every single Benchmark would demonstrate the Careers Hub improving the lot for every student. Would like to see an improvement at every reporting period.

A lot of activity had been provided that every young person had the chance to access. We would do targeted work on the schools which were under-performing.

The seven co-ordinated actions underpinned a system change. There were significant variations in ambition across the system as a whole which was reflected in the data.

For some providers this would be a partnership-type plan, for some we would have to sell the idea to them, and for others there would have to be a degree of pressure exerted to get engagement. Where are they on this plan?

We needed to deliver on the KPIs as this was linked to the CEC contract.

Action: SG to provide the work already undertaken by CEC.

June 2022

Action: ST to circulate an outline plan to the Steering Group for input and to bring back to the next meeting.

July 2022

Some of these issues would be discussed at the upcoming Careers Hub conference. This function should be a collaborative effort to the benefit of all students, not just an add-on. A great deal of effort and resource had gone



	into T levels, so the Careers Hub could ride on their success. Careers Hubs may not be funded in the same way going forward.	
6.0	AOB	
	<p>ST drew the meeting's attention to the situation regarding staffing within the Hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rose Hiron-Grimes was taking up a lecturing position at the University of Bath. • Jaime Williamson, who had been seconded from DSTL for the HIP project, would be moving into Rose's role and the evaluation and report for the project would be outsourced; • Another team member was also due to move on, but this was still confidential. • It was anticipated that it was going to be a difficult couple of months until autumn when the new team was in place, but it may need additional support. <p>Next Meeting Monday, 11 July – 11am to 1pm</p> <p>Future Meeting dates for 2022: Thursday, 15 September – 9.30am to 11.30am Thursday, 8 December – 2pm to 4pm</p>	
	Meeting closed at 2.51pm	

Paddy Bradley

11 July 2022