**W O R K S H O P 1**

Please discuss the following questions. Main points should be recorded on post-its and stuck on relevant section.

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 1:* What aspects of your plan are going well?  GROUP 1  Plans are in place, but already thinking about the next one.  Various sub-groups that contribute to overall plan.  General ‘disconnect’ between the strategic and operational plans.  Improved learning plans locally.  Delivery of CCB / partnership using resources such as M.I.C.  Mandate for including all partners in ongoing self-evaluation and review.  Self-evaluation is crucial to both strategic and operational, recognise the value and contribution of the 3rd sector.  GROUP 2  Delegation of specific tasks to one team member (Argyll & Bute).  Widening participation to CPP (South Lanarkshire).  Good local partnerships.  Themed work (Argyll & Bute).  December leaver programme (Argyll & Bute).  Themed meetings – interested partied attend (South Lanarkshire)  Learning Lunches (East Dunbartonshire)  GROUP 3  Making progress against main actions.  Strong progress where based on existing partnerships.  Consultation process good.  Increased partnership support.  GROUP 4  Bringing CLD partners together (were disparate).  Statutory requirement. No longer inspecting around a school.  Consultation is positive – Youth Voice.  Skills for Learning, Life and Work – Employability Providers Forum developed and going really well.  Increase in attainment and achievement.  Improved partnership working with 3rd Sector and other L.A. services.  North Lanarkshire – long history of CLD partners working together, therefore, we were building on strong foundations.  Local audit of CLD delivery by core partners.  GROUP  Development of more robust plan for next plan. Partnership buy in high in inputting priorities and cohesive reporting measures that are shared.  Focus for reporting back via sub-groups.  Work with partners/networking happens a lot more organically. Helps to prevent/minimise duplication of work.  Process for reporting back through sub-groups on what is working in communities and identifying gaps in provision.  Plans now being put into action. Key focus. Partners working on key issues identified via research and local people’s views.  Mapping of community groups and agency/dept involvement through place agenda which fed into sub-groups and CLD Plan.  Staff involvement in process of developing plan and highlight groups and work and training.  Regular partnership / practitioner events.  Delivery of services.  We have an outcome/output focused approach to CLD Plan production (positive and negative).  We have a shared understanding with partners of responsibility (if not ownership)  Re-focus on ‘the need’ addressing this. |

**W O R K S H O P 1 : Cont.**

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 2:* What challenges are you facing?  GROUP 1  Other partners still see the inspection as part of what CLD does?  Those who deliver a service area very busy to deliver on priorities and not seeing the links to CLD plan.  Measuring impact – We need a CLD statistician to measure impact eg. Health have Clinical Governance.  GROUP 3  Collecting evidence across range of partners delivering on plan.  How much plan is valued strategically.  Dealing with landscape of LA….. wide spread.  Raising profile of plan in communities.  Partners understanding of role, or seeing plan as priority.  Complexity and scale.  GROUP 2  Time to co-ordinate.  Time to release staff for training/upskilling.  Very target driven (numbers) – impact on quality.  ‘Too many fingers in too many pies’.  Challenges of geography.  Familiarity of processes / language when participation is widened.  Staff to deliver, staff reductions make the process of meaningful engagement difficult.  Lack of national outcomes to measure against.  GROUP 4  CLD strong on areas of need – some areas have less need – capacity!  Engaging partners to do stuff!  Pupil Equity Fund.  Locality plans and sub-locality plans – capacity!  Reduced resources going forward.  Lack of partners (3rd sector). Buy in when looking for lead roles (due to others commitments. eg. Funding, staffing etc.)  Significant restructure since plan was developed.  Significant budget reduction.  Working around budget cuts – 3rd Sector too.  GROUP 5  CLD Service vs CLD activity understanding with partners.  As activity levels decline or ‘Reade’ reduces, due to cuts, ambitions are further from reality.  Understanding where we sit on the plan and how we feed into it as a worker on the ground.  Development of new plans. Staff previously involved in process moved on/retired etc.  Experience/structure changing will be a challenge.  Management staff changes have implications on interpretation of plans.  Inclusion and development of other place areas through current service delivery.  Continuing to deliver on action plans given huge staff cuts.  Provision of new services and groups with limited resources.  Local **need** not getting funded but national needs are funded healthily – process pointless.  Old issue of bottom up and top down. Scot Exec not funding bottom up intelligence!!  The CLD plan is not just for the councils CLD team – it is the partnership plan. |

**W O R K S H O P 1 : Cont.**

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 3:* How are you keeping the plan up-to-date / reviewing?  GROUP 1  Regular self-evaluation and client feedback.  Regular input and review by partners.  GROUP 2  Coming together to review plan (Glasgow CLD).  Consultation with partners Kato (Dunfermline).  Looking at further education, lifeskills and employment (Young Scot).  GROUP 4  Six-monthly reports on Actions to Exec Group.  Marlon Cognisoft.  No joint MIS with partners.  More about sharing and consolidations.  Improvement data.  Regularly updated via website.  Quarterly Youth Alliance meetings.  Annual self-evaluation.  Workforce development support.  CLD Planning tool.  GROUP 3  Update through partnership working groups – updates on line.  One day conference.  2 years - one to go to see where at.  CLD guidance needs refreshed.  Councils to see what we are doing.  Refocus.  Look at **changing focus** – shift on provision/increase on family learning.  GROUP 5  Reviewed locality plan.  Update sub-groups action plans.  Feedback to NL Partnership.  Live work through local CLHP.  Reality, where and what will **future funding from SG** dictate what we do?  Disjuncture between what SG says about CLD and what if does through its funding streams.  Management Information System.  Generating reports quarterly.  Staff complete monthly returns with impact and outcomes.  Partners report into a template which is discussed and shared with our service return completed as guidance. |
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|  |
| --- |
| *Question 4:* How do the plans impact on practise?  GROUP 1  Themes – to areas.  Focus people/partners on piece of work.  Working together and focus.  GROUP 2  No major changes (Youth).  Broader opportunities for workforce development.  Operational structures have changed eg. Themed sub-groups, areas of focus.  New roles / types of work. Eg Employability sub-group working with young people prior to choosing their options.  GROUP 3  CLD approaches now part of CPP.  Strategic objectives allowed various activity.  Changed priorities in Youthwork.  New programmes / projects developed as a result.  Mental Health now a key priority. |
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|  |
| --- |
| *Question 5:* What support / CPD have you had? Can this be shared with other practitioners?  GROUP 2  Education Scotland Leaders for the Future programme.  NLP session re: autism awareness (Argyll & Bute).  Future training need identified: Mental Health (Focus on young people).  Learning lunches (East Dunbartonshire).  Chance to focus and stay up-to-date with emerging issues.  Session on i-Develop.  GROUP 1  None around plans.  GROUP 3  CLD Plan built into induction.  GROUP 4  Workforce Development input.  Improved methodology – PDSA. |