**Teams Meeting: Leadership and Management pilot steering group: Thursday 18th June 2020**

**Notes**

Present: Steve Drowley (SD); Emma Chivers (EC) ; David Williams (DW);

Tim Opie (TO); Kevin Ford (KF); Gareth Newton (GN)

Apologies: Paul Glaze

**Agenda Items**

1. *Welcome and Introductions*

SD opened the meeting and welcomed Kevin Ford to his first meeting of the steering group. There was a brief round of introductions. SD mentioned that he had updated the recent virtual meeting between the Education Workforce Council (EWC) and youth work sector leads on progress of the steering group to date. Keith Towler, Chair of the Interim Youth Work Board (IYWB) had also been present and it was helpful for Keith to hear first hand of the work of the steering group. The IYWB had met subsequently between the date of the EWC meeting and today. TO felt it might be beneficial to keep Jo Sims, Chair of the Workforce Development Participation Group (WDPG) up to speed on progress, despite the fact that the IYWB had decided to suspend the work of the Strategy Participation Groups for the time being. Jo had acquired new responsibilities as a result of the coronavirus pandemic and it was difficult to contact her currently.

1. *Notes of previous meeting and matters arising*

The notes of the previous meeting were approved.

TO gave a brief update on his meeting with Tegwen Ellis and Chris Lewis of the Leadership Academy The Academy had recently published opportunities for three secondments from the education sector to take forward work on the Academy’s well-being survey of leaders in the sector. One of the secondments would be working with the youth work and post-16 sectors. Once this individual had been recruited, TO and Paul Glaze would act as conduits to the sector and would be making contact to ensure that linkages with maintained and voluntary youth work providers would be both appropriate and proportionate. Currently, (given the relatively modest size of the youth work sector in comparison with schooling, for example) a focus group approach to surveying well-being in youth sector leaders was being proposed. The Leadership Academy intended that this work would lead to a published well-being strategy. TO, in consultation with Paul Glaze, would convene a stakeholder group drawn from the youth work sector to inform and comment on the Leadership Academy’s approach to well-being.

1. *Background to meeting and project*

SD gave a brief outline of the project to date. Whilst it was important to recognise that the work of the Strategy Participation Groups had been suspended temporarily, the Leadership and Management pilot programme was proceeding independently from the overall work of the WDPG: funding from the Leadership Academy to ETS for this work meant that the pilot was proceeding through a cross-sector coalition under the ETS umbrella. He referred the meeting to his update that he had forwarded to Tegwen Ellis and which had also been sent to members of this group.

1. *Overview of FPM training programmes*

KF spoke to this item, referring members to his paper, *Leadership and Management Programme for Youth Work in Wales,* which he had prepared for members’ consideration and comment. His role would be to facilitate the process of developing a pilot programme for Wales. It was his expectation that the programme would be run in Wales by Wales-based trainers. It was important for ownership of the learning that there was sufficient capacity in Wales to deliver the programme without bringing in people from outside. He was happy that there would be a new home for the training resources, which had proved effective in the past. The impact of austerity approaches in England meant that there were now fewer opportunities for public and voluntary sector organisations to undertake the kinds of developmental activity that would have been available in previous years.

In terms of the principles underlying the work of FPM Training, KF explained that leadership and management development worked best when learning was contextualised to the workplace. Access to knowledge was critical and much of the relevant knowledge required was now available online. But knowledge was only part of the equation and experiential learning, which required participants to learn together in groups, was an important part of the mix. Participants could support each other’s learning, but could also challenge each other in beneficial ways. In addition, time built in for a process of reflective learning would be integral to the success of the new programme. EC agreed with this: her previous experience with FPM Training had been beneficial for her, both personally and professionally.

GN commented that he was not certain that the capacity in Wales to carry the work forward in the way described by KF existed currently. KF suggested that it might be beneficial to use the existing links with the Leadership Academy: there would be trainers available in other educational spheres, for example.

TO brought the attention of the meeting to *Academi Wales* (which describes itself on its website as

 “ … *the centre for excellence in leadership and management for public services in Wales*.” Their annual report for 2018/19 references a wide range of leadership programmes) which had been mentioned to him by Paul Glaze. TO shared a link to the current *Academi Wales* programmes.

KF would be refreshing and rewriting the existing programme materials to meet the needs of the new pilot programme. He took the meeting through the architecture of the revised programme. It was his view, agreed by the meeting, that the value of the programme to participants would be enhanced if there were to be a number of progression routes from the programme – such as the opportunity to acquire greater knowledge / skills in regard to coaching and mentoring, or the opportunity to develop action learning sets. It was KF’s view that the programme should remain as a three-module programme, with a reflective journal as part of the learning experience. **This was agreed by the meeting**.

Following the discussion on this item, KF would reconfigure the programme to contain a core of learning, with a range of options which participants could choose to follow. It would be helpful to have a repository available for the knowledge-based part of the programme. In response to a question from SD, KF confirmed that he would be able to keep the learning resources secure. **SD would also check with Liz Rose whether an area of the ETS website could be used for this purpose, with access secured through use of as password.**

1. *Linking the programme to the policy and operating environment for leaders of services for young people in Wales*

KF asked the meeting for support in ensuring the new programme took account of the particular context for leaders of youth work in Wales. Working in this way would help to secure the sustainability of the programme, taking it beyond the initial offering.

EC mentioned the Professional Learning Passport (PLP) which was a product of the EWC and thus not available in England. This allowed those on the EWC Register to input their learning to the Passport and to benefit from the range of learning materials associated with it. EC felt that there was an overlap between the materials available through the Passport and keeping a reflective journal. KF asked if he could explore the PLP. TO thought that the PLP was only available to EWC Registrants, **but he would see if there was information available that he could send to KF** (this action was completed during the meeting).

*Key issues and points for the new programme? What do leaders and managers need to do well / better?*

It was DW’s view that any elements of coaching and mentoring in the programme should have a strong peer-to-peer focus. It was important to create opportunities for leaders to get together. This may also help to connect the sector more strongly to the PLP, since there were currently no compelling reasons to do so. Speaking from his perspective as a local authority principal youth officer, he told the meeting that some local authority leaders of youth work did not have a professional background in youth work and may, correspondingly, not have a detailed knowledge of youth work principles and values. It was his view that the new programme should not be promoted, and the content developed, in such a way so as to deter such individuals from applying. There remained the possibility that an additional module could potentially be added to the programme at some point to function as a “bridge” to Master’s level learning.

GN mentioned the need for participants to develop the confidence to move beyond the last decade’s “defensive” approach to youth work (because of the need to protect youth work principles / ways of working at a time of shrinking budgets and a stronger focus on targeted work) to articulating strongly the value of youth work and the benefits of youth work approaches at a time when the well-being of young people is higher on the political agenda and much higher in the public’s consciousness.

SD thought that a particular focus of the programme should be on how best to influence the opinions and behaviours of others. TO agreed with this: the ability to influence the views and opinions of others was critical. He also agreed with GN about the importance of developing the confidence and willingness of leaders to speak openly and positively about youth work.

EC wanted to be confident that the views of the voluntary sector were being taken into account. SD mentioned that PG is a member of this group and that CWVYS was being used as the conduit for bringing the views of the third sector to the table. KF said that he was intending to have a number of discussions with individuals not represented on this group. He was hoping to speak to PG as part of those discussions. TO reminded the meeting that PG had a significant input to the policy context paper, so there was a strong congruence between voluntary and maintained sectors in regard to the matters set out in that paper.

In light of EC’s comment, DW said that – whilst the pilot Leadership and Management Development Programme was a stand-alone programme – it was important for it to be seen as part of the work of the WDPG. The voluntary sector had strong representation on that Group and it was important for the sector to feel an integral part of the process. TO agreed: the steering group should try to avoid giving the impression that all this was taking place in an ivory tower. EC wondered whether there could be an update on the work of the steering group as part of one of the youth work newsletters published by the Welsh Government.

1. *Co-production – involvement of likely trainers*

There had been some discussion of this earlier in the meeting. DW felt there may well be trainers with the required skills and knowledge embedded in existing organisations, but without the capacity to be released to do the work on the pilot programme. SD said this was the reason why a secondment approach to this issue was sensible. Secondments were a regular feature of the formal education sector and there was no obvious or logical reason why this approach should not be available to the youth work sector.

KF told members that the programme would work best with two trainers, perhaps one drawn from the voluntary sector and one from the maintained sector. Such an approach would help sectoral ownership of the programme and using home-grown trainers would assist the sustainability of the programme over the medium and longer terms.

**KF would work on the basis that further down the line resources would be made available to build capacity for delivering the programme in Wales. He would also reference the need to build capacity in coaching and mentoring opportunities into the programme.**

1. *Linking the programme with wider workforce development.*

GN had a series of conversations in February and March with representatives of a small number of voluntary sector organisations in Wales about attitudes to workforce development and what their priorities might be for a new workforce development strategy. He had turned these conversations into a discussion paper for the WDPG, but the cessation of its work meant that the paper had not been presented. Some members of the steering group had seen the paper. **GN would send the paper to members of the steering group, but asked members not to circulate the paper more widely.**

Discussion followed on how the leadership and management programme might lead on to other opportunities. SD commented that any progression to higher level learning would be dependent on a process of comprehensive and longitudinal discussions with HEIs in Wales. The intention was to submit the pilot programme for endorsement / approval by both the Leadership Academy and ETS. Doing so would serve to cement the status of the new programme within the youth work sector.

1. *Timetable for refreshing materials and developing the new programme*

KF thanked members for their input and would begin work on the first draft of the new programme. He would have the draft ready for discussion by the steering group in August. He would also be using the time to follow up on discussions with individuals.

SD asked members whether it would be helpful to have an interim meeting of the steering group in order to discuss further some of the matters raised today. **Members agreed that it would**. There was an invitation for KF to attend if he should wish, but no expectation that he should do so.

1. *AOB*

There were no additional items brought forward by members

1. *Date of next meeting(s)*

Thursday 23rd July 2020: 11 am – 1 pm

Thursday 20th August 2020: 11 am – 1 pm (with KF)