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1. Introduction

1.1 Following a Youth Employment (YE) Summit in August 2013, Glasgow City Council (GCC) believed that the current approach to YE could be strengthened. Although Glasgow has improved its YE position on several fronts, it was recognised that the Council’s approach could be further improved by ensuring that it delivers youth employment services in the most co-ordinated way it can to complement partner services and business requirements.

1.2 Glasgow Community Planning Partnership (GCPP) agreed to conduct a review of YE services across the city. The purpose of the review was to identify how best to deliver services that prepare young people for employment in Glasgow and give them the best possible chance of competing for the jobs available. This report provides the results of the review.

Youth Employment Programme of Work:

1.3 The YE Review set out a programme of work to

- Assist Glasgow City Council and its GCPP partners in refining Glasgow’s vision for YE within the context of the Glasgow economy as it is currently and the skills and employment needs of businesses now and in the future;
- Investigate how Council Family services could be delivered in a co-ordinated more efficient way that complement partner services and are client centred, meet economic needs and are focussed on interventions at the local level. This links in to GCPP’s implementation of the Joint Working and Resourcing Agenda (see Section 2.9) as it pertains to YE;
- Utilise market intelligence to help to make decisions about the targeting of Council and partner resources across the city and the design of interventions that meet the needs of both business and young people.

1.4 The YE Project was divided into two workstreams:

- Workstream 1: Strategic Review;

1.5 Workstream 1: The strategic review comprised of the following key areas:

- Identifying the plans and strategies across Council families/partnerships and using recommendations from the “Wood” Commission report¹ to determine the key areas to focus on in terms of YE;

¹ Education Working for All! Commission for Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce Final Report, Sir Ian Wood, June 2014
• Utilising data and intelligence to highlight the levels of unemployment and growth sectors in Glasgow and how this may impact in the future e.g. analysis of School Leaver Destinations and 18-24 old Job Seekers Allowance claimants by multi-member ward;
• Identifying gaps within Labour market intelligence and how these gaps may potentially be addressed;
• Analysis of the findings of the Employer Attitude Survey to determine how working with employers can support YE.

1.6 Workstreams 2: An “As-Is” Review was undertaken of the current Council Family, CPP and YEP current YE structures and service provision that support the delivery of demand and supply side interventions targeted at young people. The Workstream 2 programme of work was taken forward through the already established structures of the GCPP. A consultation process involving partners, employers and young people ensured that a co-production approach was taken that would gain commitment and ownership of the report recommendations and actions.

1.7 Appendix 1 describes the consultation methodologies used to provide both quantitative and qualitative information for the “As-Is” Review. In summary, the methods utilised were:

• A survey questionnaire to map out the youth employment provision, infrastructure and delivery resources across the city;
• Interviews with stakeholders to find out views on what the city needs to do better and where our youth employment services can be improved through a more joined-up and cohesive way;
• Focus groups with partners and young people to identify key issues and gaps in current services and to identify potential solutions;
• Workshops with 3rd Sector organisations and the business community to consider service improvements and their roles in service improvements.

1.8 This report provides the YE Review findings arising from

• A strategic review that identified current business needs and growth sectors of the Glasgow economy;
• A mapping exercise of the Glasgow City Council (GCC) Family; Glasgow Community Planning Partnership (GCPP) partners and external organisations’ current YE provision across the city including;
  o The current YE financial framework;
  o The current range of interventions that are currently delivered to a) prepare young people for the world of work when in school, at transition point and post school and b) support businesses to recruit and train young people;
  o How GCC, as an employer, supports young people into work;
  o A review of GCC Family/GCCP roles and responsibilities.
2. **Youth Employment Strategic Review**

2.1 The strategic review considered key policy drivers, economic trends and forecasts for the city. The analysis of policy drivers, economic trends and forecasts would provide a perspective on YE in the city to assist the development of the GCC/GCPP YE vision for the future and how young people will be supported within this vision.

2a. **Strategic Review - Employment Policies/Strategies**

2.2 The first part of the strategic review was a literature review looking at current GCC/GCC Family/GCPP/Youth Employment Partnership (YEP) plans/ that currently exist for YE employment in the city. The specific list of overarching Glasgow city plans and strategies which link specifically either to youth employment/employability agenda is provided below:

- GCC Strategic Plan 2012 to 2017
- City Deal
- Glasgow Single Outcome Agreement
- Poverty Leadership Panel: Action Plan for Change
- Glasgow Economic Commission/ Glasgow Economic Leadership Action Plan
- Glasgow Works Strategy
- Youth Employability Partnership Strategy/Framework
- Education Services: Employment Skills and Partnership Team Service Plan
- Glasgow Life ‘Making it Work’ Employability Strategy (2012)
- Jobs and Business Glasgow Strategy 2013 to 2018 (Exec Summary)
- Community Safety Glasgow
- Clyde Gateway URC/ Clyde Gateway LOAN Report (TERU, 2012)
- Social Work Services: Joint Adult Services Plan 2013/15
- Glasgow CJA Learning Skills and Employability Core Group Action Plan

A summary of each of the above as they relate to YE is presented as Appendix 2.

2.3 The majority of the plans and strategies surveyed for the YE Review identify YE as a key priority and list specific targets to support YE. Some organisations’ plans do identify approaches for supporting specific groups of young people that are disproportionately likely to be unemployed (e.g. young people in and leaving care, young people from black and minority ethnic groups and young people with disabilities). However, there are limited equality targets/outcomes within the surveyed strategies. The “Wood” Commission identified among its recommendations that a long term structural multi-agency approach is required to successfully address this issue of disadvantaged youth groups within employment (Appendix 3).
2.4 Glasgow’s Single Outcome Agreement (SOA) not only identifies YE as one of its three key City priorities but it also extended the YE priority age group from 16-19 to 16-24. The SOA reflects the targets set across these plans. Through its focus on supporting vulnerable groups, the SOA links directly to the differentiation and drive towards creating an equitable suite of services that provide additional supports to our most vulnerable young people.

2.5 Many of the plans directly reference the key priority areas identified through the Youth Employability Partnership (YEP) plan – launched in 2012 - which was designed by the YEP as the key strategic driver for youth employment related activity in the city. Given the considerable shift in emphasis of Government policy, at both a UK and Scotland-wide level since the publication of the YEP plan, it should be acknowledged that the YEP plan has been overtaken by the development of the Single Outcome Agreement, with its amended YE Age Group, and the revised Glasgow City Council Strategic Plan (2012/17).

2.6 In addition, a number of recent developments have further changed the policy context and landscape around the area of youth employment nationally and within the city. In particular, the following developments have and will impact on YE policy in the city:

- The introduction of the National Opportunities for All initiative and related performance measures underpinned by the national Youth Employment Strategy;
- The publication of the Scottish Government Sponsored report ‘Education Working for All!’ from the Commission for Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce – led by Sir Ian Wood, (“the Wood Commission”);
- The Joint Statement of Ambition agreed by the Scottish Government and Cosla; and
- The awarding of City Deal status to Glasgow and surrounding region.

The rapid pace of change in policy development around youth employment is not currently reflected in changes to the local planning structures for youth employment services, which are still based on mechanisms outlined in the 2012 YEP plan.

2.7 The Opportunities for All Initiative launched by the Scottish Government in 2012 is an extension and formalisation of its More Choices, More Chances policy from 2006 and its subsequent update in 2009 (16+ Learning Choices). Opportunities for All afford a guarantee of a place in employment, education or training for every young person who needs one. Opportunities for All continues to be implemented across Scotland with its performance measure – a bi-annual official measure, from a real time status tracking database, of every young person’s ‘participation’ in post school economic or learning activity set to overtake current methods.
of measuring official youth unemployment numbers in Scotland and by Local Authority and ward area by 2015.

2.8 The “Wood” Commission for Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce, established by the Scottish Government to explore ways of improving the skill base of Scotland’s young people and helping to create increased and sustainable economic growth for the country, produced its final set of recommendations as part of the ‘Education Working for All!’ report published in June 2014. The recommendations can be found at Appendix 3.

2.9 Following the Joint Statement of Ambition\(^2\) agreed in March 2012, The Scottish Government and COSLA further agreed three core proposals for implementing the Statement of Ambition. These proposals build on the existing duties of community planning partners and clarify the responsibilities of Community Planning Partnerships. The initial proposal was

*Strengthening duties on individual partners through a new statutory duty on all relevant partners, (whether acting nationally, regionally or locally), to work together to improve outcomes for local communities through participation in community planning partnerships and the provision of resources to deliver the SOA.*

In light of this, GCPP established a Joint Working & Resourcing Group, chaired by Lynn Brown (Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Financial Services, Glasgow City Council). The group’s initial focus has been on the SOA priority of Young Employment with partners initially asked to identify and articulate the current resources and investment made around the youth employment agenda. The work of this group has been running concurrent to the YE Review with a report due later in 2014.

2.10 The recent award of City Deal status to Glasgow & Clyde Valley is the most significant example of a City/Region approach being taken toward regeneration thorough direct funding for large-scale infrastructure developments across the city and the wider city region. The terms of the City Deal as directed by the UK Government do not provide direct funding to support youth employment but it marks a significant change of approach that potentially provides major opportunities to support youth employment in the city (e.g. through targeted re-investment of the increase in Gross Value Added (GVA)\(^3\) created by the initial cash investments and the economic growth that accrues from the improved infrastructure within the city region).

2b. **Strategic Review – Labour Market Intelligence**

\(^2\) The Statement of Ambition can be accessed at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Government/local-government/CP/soa

\(^3\) Gross value added (GVA) is a measure of the value of goods and services produced in an economy. GVA + taxes on products - subsidies on products = Gross Domestic Product.
2.11 The second element of the strategic review was a review of labour market intelligence to provide details on the recent and current YE position and to identify future trends that would impact on the YE situation in Glasgow. The focus for this section is a) economic forecasts for Glasgow and b) trends on school leavers’ destinations; benefit claimants and youth employment/unemployment rates.

Strategic Review - Economic Forecast for Glasgow

2.12 Glasgow City Council commissioned Oxford Economics to forecast the labour market position for Glasgow for the near future. Oxford Economics is the world leader in global forecasting and quantitative analysis for business and government and the report from which analysis shall be drawn was published in June 2012.

Source: Oxford Economics  Note: Figures Rounded to Ten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1: Changes in Employment by Sector - Glasgow 2012 -17</th>
<th>2012-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin and Support Services</td>
<td>11,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific &amp; Technical</td>
<td>8,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale &amp; Retail Trade</td>
<td>3,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Activities</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service Activities</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Communication</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Storage</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial &amp; Insurance Activities</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GROWTH SECTORS</strong></td>
<td>33,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Fishing</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; Quarrying</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas &amp; Steam</td>
<td>-230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply &amp; Waste Management</td>
<td>-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Health &amp; Social Work Activities</td>
<td>-970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration &amp; Defence</td>
<td>-3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DECLINING SECTORS</strong></td>
<td>7,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>25,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 Table 2.1 shows that Oxford Economics estimated that there would be a 25,600 increase in jobs in Glasgow between 2012 and 2017 – a 6.2% increase. 21,520 of these new jobs would lie in the business related industrial sectors of Administration and Support Services, Professional, Scientific & Technical, and Real Estate Activities. Therefore, the level of Glasgow’s recovery of jobs, post-recession, is dependant upon the success of Glasgow’s role as a centre for business service companies. It is also predicted that a recovery in the Consumer and Tourism related industries would also cause an additional 7,000 jobs to be added by 2017.

2.14 Oxford Economics argue that while Manufacturing based employment is a key component of a UK wide-recovery post-recession, they place more
emphasis on expanding business related activities as this would also cause complementary success in the manufacturing industry. Increasing manufacturing alone would more likely cause a halt in job losses but it would not cause a recovery and subsequent expansion in later years.

Source: Oxford Economics  Note: Figures Rounded to Ten

<p>| Table 2.2: Expansion Demand by Occupation - Glasgow 2012-17 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professional &amp; Technical Occupations</td>
<td>5,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers &amp; Senior Officials</td>
<td>4,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Occupations</td>
<td>2,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Occupations</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupations</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades Occupations</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; Secretariat Occupations</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Customer Service Occupations</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process, Plant &amp; Machine Operatives</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15 As illustrated in Table 2.2, educational attainment has been predicted as key for the future job growths in Glasgow, as much of the new job growth is likely to occur in sectors where “high levels of educational attainment are a prerequisite”. Approximately just over half of all jobs are categorised as occupations typically filled by graduates in the professional, scientific, and technical sub-sector of business related industries. The largest percentage increases in occupations are:

- Associate Professionals (5,014 – 10.2% increase)
- Managers & Senior Officials (4,560 – 10.6% increase)
- Personal Service Occupations (2,166 – 7.0% increase)

School Leaver Destination Returns

2.16 Since 2010/2011, there has been a 2.8 percentage point increase in the level of Glasgow’s school leavers moving into positive destinations after school. As of 2012/13, Glasgow has 89.2% of its school leavers moving into positive destinations. Glasgow has narrowed the gap between local and national destination figures each year since 2010. However, as at 2012/13 Glasgow’s level of school leavers moving into a negative destination was still 2.2 percentage points higher than the Scottish average and 2.3 percentage points higher re school leavers, whose destination was unemployed.

2.17 The relatively higher level of negative destinations in Glasgow for school leavers in 2013 was further added to as “follow up” information provided in June 2014 indicated that 4.5 percentage point fewer school leavers in 2013 remained in positive destinations than the initial measurement on leaving school. Among the positive destinations categories, “Training” is the category that had the highest drop percentage in both 2011/12 and 2012/13.
2.18 Graph 2.1 illustrates that, since the recession, there have been improvements in the unemployment rate throughout Scotland, including Glasgow. Glasgow outperformed the Scottish average between 2012 and 2013 as Glasgow’s youth unemployment rate fell by a substantial 7.9 percentage points whereas the Scottish working age youth unemployment rate fell by 0.1% points.

2.19 The recent improvement in Glasgow youth unemployment post-recession has seen Glasgow close the unemployment gap with the Scottish average. In 2012 the working age unemployment rate gap stood at 3.8 percentage points, which decreased to 2.9 percentage points in 2013. The youth unemployment rate gap has decreased from 11.7% points to 3.9% points in the same time period.

2.20 The economic recession had a significant impact upon the level of youth unemployment in Glasgow. The number of young JSA claimants in Glasgow increased by 52% in the three years from August 2008 rising to a rate of 9.6% in August 2011. This increase was significantly less than the 86% increase experienced in the rest of Scotland during that period. The effect of the recession was felt across Glasgow as all 21 Multi Member Electoral (MME) Wards in Glasgow experienced an increase between 2008 and 2011 in the number of 18-24 year olds claiming JSA. It should be noted that the negative impact on the number of young JSA claimants was felt most in the MME Wards that already had the highest number of young JSA claimants.

---

4 “To get JSA you must be over 18 …there are some exceptions if you are 16 or 17” (https://www.gov.uk/jobseekers-allowance/eligibility). Currently there are no 16 year olds and only forty 17 years old receiving JSA in Glasgow so the JSA analysis in the report is based on 18-24 years olds.
2.21 Graph 2.2 illustrates that the number of young JSA claimants in Glasgow has reduced by 46% since the recession (autumn 2011). The level of reduction means that the current number (3,915) of young JSA claimants in Glasgow is 875 less than it was pre-recession (autumn 2008). The current rate of young JSA claimants is 20% lower than the rate before the recession (August 2008 6.7%, August 2014 5.4%). During the same period, the rest of Scotland has experienced a 7% reduction in the rate of young JSA claimants.

2.22 Graph 2.3 illustrates that

- Glasgow has currently the 2nd highest young JSA claimant rate among the 11 UK cities surveyed. Glasgow’s current rate of young JSA claimants is more than twice the rate currently in Bristol and Edinburgh;
- When compared with August 2008, Glasgow had the third largest numerical reduction in the number of young JSA claimants but the fifth smallest percentage reduction in the rate of young JSA claimants;
- English cities have, in general, recovered better post recession with six of the eight English cities having larger reductions in their young JSA claimant rates than Glasgow;
- Since August 2008, Liverpool has experienced the largest reduction in both the number and rate of young JSA claimants. Edinburgh has experienced the smallest reduction in both the number and rate of young JSA claimants.

Graph 2.4 - Number of 18-24 JSA Claimants by MME Ward

Source: NOMIS Claimant Count Dataset.

Map 1: Rate of Young JSA Claimants - August 2014

Source: NOMIS Claimant Count Dataset. Rates calculated using the 2011 Census 18-24 population

2.23 Graph 2.4 and Map 1 present the current young JSA claimant position within Glasgow and illustrate that

- All 21 MME Wards currently have a lower number of young JSA claimants than pre recession (August 2008).
- There is significant variation in the number and rate of young JSA claimants across the city (e.g. four times more young JSA claimants in Canal Ward than in Langside; a 18-24 year old resident in North East MME is ten times more likely to be claiming JSA than an 18-24 year old resident in Anderston/City MME Ward
• There is a correlation between the distance from the City Centre and the number/rate of young JSA claimants. The six MME Wards that have a young JSA claimant rate above 7.5% are relatively distant to Glasgow City Centre and the three MME Wards with a young JSA claimant rate below 2.5% are all located in or close to Glasgow City Centre.

2.24 Currently, there is a higher rate of young JSA claimants among the 16 – 19 years than among 20-24 years olds. Given that the Glasgow SOA priority of Youth Employment has extended the priority YE age group from 16-19 to 16-24, it is worth noting that 72% of the current young (under 25) JSA claimants in Glasgow are aged 20 - 24.

Long Term (more than 1 year) Young JSA Claimants:

![Graph 2.5 - Rate of Long Term Young JSA Claimants Aug 2008-14](image)

Source: NOMIS Claimant Count Dataset. Rates calculated using the mid-year resident population aged 18-24.

![Graph 2.6: % of Young JSA Claimants that are Long Term Claimants](image)

Source: NOMIS Claimant Count Dataset

2.25 Whilst there has been a halving in the Glasgow rate of long term young JSA claimants since 2012, Charts 2.5 – 2.6 illustrate that
The current Glasgow rate of long term JSA claimants is still more than three times higher than it was in 2008. As of August 2014, there were 505 long term young JSA claimants in Glasgow compared to (150) in August 2008. Glasgow position has improved relative to the rest of Scotland since 2008 but since August 2012, Glasgow has experienced an almost identical reduction in the level of long term young term claimants than experienced in the rest of Scotland;

More than one in eight (13%) of young Glasgow JSA claimants have been claiming JSA for more than a year which is more than four times higher than the percentage in August 2008. The percentage of young JSA claimants that are long term has dropped significantly in the last year (19.6% October 2013) which indicates that in the last year, there has been a greater reduction in the number of long term JSA claimants than in short term JSA claimants.


2.26 Map 2 illustrates that in terms of long term young JSA claimants it is a very similar picture to the picture (Map 1) for all young JSA claimants as

- There are significant variations across the city in the rate of long term young JSA claimant rates; and
- A correlation between the distance from the City Centre and the rate of young JSA claimants.

**Youth Employment**

2.27 Based on the information above, it is evident that the last two years has seen a reduction in the rate of unemployed young people and in the rate of young JSA Claimants. However, the reduction in the youth unemployment rate and youth JSA claimant rate has not coincided with an increase in youth employment.
2.28 Labour Force Survey information (Graph 2.7 – 2.8) illustrates that

- Whilst there has been an increase in the last year, the current youth employment rate in Glasgow is still lower than it was at the end of the recession (2011) and significantly lower than it was pre-recession (2008);
- The reduction in the young unemployed/benefit claimants has not been matched by an increase in the youth employment rate but has been almost matched by an increase in the percentage of young people in full time education.

The number of young people currently (Apr 2013-Mar 2014) in employment in Glasgow is estimated to have reduced by 10,500 since 2005/06, including a reduction of 4,500 since 2010/11. Since 2005/06, the number of 18-24 year olds in full time education has increased by 9,900. Without a commensurate growth in employment, the increase in young people in full time education means that there is the potential of higher rates of unemployment within the 20 – 24 age group when the students enter the labour market seeking employment.
Graph 2.9 illustrates that, in comparison with the other surveyed UK cities, Glasgow relative position has dropped from having the highest percentage of its 18-24 year olds in employment in 2006 to currently having the fifth highest employment rate among the eleven surveyed UK cities. Since 2006, Glasgow has experienced the second largest reduction both in the number of employed young people and in the youth employment rate.

In summary, the current employment position in Glasgow is that the number of jobs in Glasgow has stabilised since 2010, more Glasgow residents are in employment but that this is among the over 25s as a decreasing number of young Glasgow residents are in employment.

2c. Strategic Review - Glasgow City Council Family – Opportunities for Young People

The Council Family provides employability support to young people through:
- Commonwealth Employment Initiatives
- Work Experience
- Intermediate Labour Market Opportunities
- Employment

Commonwealth Employment Initiatives

The Commonwealth Employment Initiatives encompass 4 programmes; Commonwealth Apprenticeship Initiative (CAI), Commonwealth Graduate Fund (CGF), Commonwealth Jobs Fund (CJF), and the Commonwealth Youth Fund (CYF). The Jobs Fund targets all ages and the three other programmes are primarily targeted at the 16-24 year old age group.

The Commonwealth Employment Initiatives have recently been reviewed and the findings of this exercise were used to develop its successor programme, The Glasgow Guarantee. Full details of the aims, objectives
and operation of The Glasgow Guarantee are scheduled to be announced at the State Of the City Economy Conference in November.

| Table 2.3: CAI successful candidates and employer involvement - 2010 - August 2014 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| No. of Successful Candidates | % Total | No. of Employers | % Total |
| Baillieston | 306 | 7.9 | 40 | 5.6 |
| North East | 303 | 7.8 | 19 | 2.7 |
| East Centre | 243 | 6.2 | 24 | 3.4 |
| Greater Pollok | 236 | 6.1 | 10 | 1.4 |
| Shettleston | 232 | 6.0 | 45 | 6.3 |
| Linn | 225 | 5.8 | 18 | 2.5 |
| Craigton | 222 | 5.7 | 18 | 2.5 |
| Canal | 214 | 5.5 | 28 | 3.9 |
| Calton | 191 | 4.9 | 49 | 6.9 |
| Drumchapel/Anniesland | 191 | 4.9 | 15 | 2.1 |
| Govan | 180 | 4.6 | 63 | 8.8 |
| Maryhill/Kelvin | 164 | 4.2 | 24 | 3.4 |
| Springburn | 164 | 4.2 | 19 | 2.7 |
| Garscadden/Scotstounhill | 148 | 3.8 | 5 | 0.7 |
| Partick West | 141 | 3.6 | 39 | 5.5 |
| Anderston/City | 139 | 3.6 | 190 | 26.7 |
| Hillhead | 131 | 3.4 | 29 | 4.1 |
| Southside Central | 130 | 3.3 | 31 | 4.4 |
| Langside | 129 | 3.3 | 15 | 2.1 |
| Newlands/Auldburn | 116 | 3.0 | 14 | 2.0 |
| Pollokshields | 88 | 2.3 | 17 | 2.4 |
| **Total** | **3893** | **100.0** | **712** | **100.00** |

2.34 Table 2.3 provides data on the successful candidates from Commonwealth Apprenticeship Initiative (CAI) since 2010 and illustrates that:

- Nearly four thousand (3,893) young people have received or are receiving an apprenticeship through CAI;
- Over a quarter of the employers who provided apprenticeships were located in the Anderston/City MME Ward, which was more than three times higher than any other MME Ward in the city;
- The North/East of the city accounted for the highest number of successful candidates (n1439: 37%). The South of the City accounted for 1326 (34.1%) successful candidates whilst the North West was the sector with the lowest number of successful candidates (n 989: 25.4%).

2.35 Questionnaires were issued to the Council Family to identify the extent of the opportunities provided to 16-24 year olds. Tables 2.4-2.5 provide information on employment, Modern Apprenticeships (MAs), Commonwealth Graduates and Work Experience.
Table 2.4: Employment and Commonwealth Initiative: Council/ ALEO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>MA13/14</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Building Glasgow</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Marketing Bureau (GCMB)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 illustrates that Glasgow City Council employs a relatively low proportion of 16-24 year olds compared to City Building.

Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council (inc. Glasgow Life)</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Building Glasgow</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCMB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs &amp; Business Glasgow</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.36 The Council offers a wide range of work experience opportunities to young people with the main focus on young people in school. There is a move within Education Services to offer a more flexible, customised approach to work experience placements tailored to young people's needs and interests. Glasgow City Marketing Bureau utilises the Club 21 scheme to take on FE/HE students on work experience placements. This approach has had a positive effect on recruiting young people into GCMB. Job offers have been made to a number of Club 21 students who have subsequently joined GCMB as employees.

Employment

2.37 Table 2.6 (overleaf) provides details on the number of young people supported by Jobs & Business Glasgow (J&BG) during 2012-13 which illustrates that:

- There is a concentration of the locations for jobs placed through J&BG in Glasgow City Centre. Nearly half (44%) of the staff recruited through J&BG in 2012-13 were for businesses located in the Anderston/City or East Centre Multi Member Electoral Wards. The high level of jobs located in North East MME Ward was due to jobs placed in the Fort;
- The North East sector accounted for twice as many young people (n603; 44.5%) placed by J&BG than in the North West (n286; 21.1%).
### Table 2.6: 16-24 year olds placed into work by J&BG 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. of Jobs by Employee Location</th>
<th>% Total (exc. N/K)</th>
<th>No. of Jobs by Employment Location</th>
<th>% Total (exc. N/K &amp; outside Glasgow)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baillieston</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calton</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Central</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Centre</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumchapel/Anniesland</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shettleston</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springburn</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Pollok</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigton</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryhill/Kelvin</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garscadden/Scotstounhill</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderston/City</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlands/Auldburn</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partick West</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langside</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillhead</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollokshields</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,510</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,510</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Gaps/Weaknesses

2.38 The YE Review identified significant information gaps/weaknesses, both in terms of the data that reports on the scale of youth employment and in the client management data on young people receiving employability support. The gaps/weaknesses identified are as follows:

- The focus of information on young people who are not in any form of education, employment, or training post-school is only up to the age of 19. The age range needs to be extended to take account of changes arising from the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 and that Glasgow’s YE Single Outcome Agreement Priority covers up the 25 years old. Within the NEET Database, there are also issues relating to incomplete data entry and the updating of the client information;
- Information on unemployment rates having a 3-6 month time gap and not being available at a geographical area smaller than local authority size;
- The lack of a single client management system between the main agencies (e.g. Education, Job Centre Plus, Skills Development Scotland, J&BG and GCC Development & Regeneration Services) that tracks the employability support provided to young unemployed/under-employed people and the outcome of that support. This means that it is not currently possible to quantify the number of young people who have or are currently being supported into employment and/or
sustained in employment. Glasgow’s Single Outcome Agreement has highlighted this issue by identifying as a headline outcome the need for the development of a YE Hub. J&BG and GCC Development & Regeneration Services have recently initiated a pilot looking at the current JB&G IT system’s capacity to be used by both organisations.
3. “As – Is” Review

3.1 The As – Is Review entailed a mapping exercise of the Glasgow City Council (GCC) Family; Glasgow Community Planning Partnership (GCPP) partners and external organisations’ current YE provision across the city including:

- The current YE financial framework;
- The current range of interventions that are currently delivered to a) prepare young people for the world of work when in school, at transition point and post school and b) support businesses to recruit and train young people;
- How GCC, as an employer, supports young people into work;
- A review of GCC Family/GCPP roles and responsibilities.

3.2 The As – Is Review’s programme of work was taken forward through the already established structures of the GCPP. It was agreed, early in the planning phase, that it was important to have a wide consultation process involving partners, employers and young people to ensure that a co-production approach was taken that would gain commitment and ownership of the report recommendations and actions. Details on the consultation methods used are provided in Appendix 1.

3a. “As- Is” Review - Youth Employment Financial Framework

3.3 The financial information is based on the 62 questionnaires received that provided details on 105 projects that deliver employability related support for young people in Glasgow. However, the focus of Sections 3.5 – 3.8 is on the 39 Glasgow City Council Family/GCPP Partners’ projects as the provision of project financial information was not universal across the responses.

**YE Expenditure**: (All Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: 2013/14 &amp; 2014/15 YE by Sector</th>
<th>13/14 YE Expenditure (£000)</th>
<th>13/14 YE Expenditure (exc. colleges) (£000)</th>
<th>14/15 YE Expenditure (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector - ALEO</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>4,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector - CPP Partner</td>
<td>109,832</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>109,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector - GCC Dept</td>
<td>25,810</td>
<td>25,810</td>
<td>23,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector</td>
<td>12,186</td>
<td>12,186</td>
<td>12,186**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,412**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>154,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,966</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,617</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Throughout the report, funding has been attributed, unless indicated, to the source of the funding to minimise double counting (e.g. service delivery by an ALEO that is funding by a GCC Department has been classified under Public Sector – GCC Department).
3.4 Table 3.1 illustrates that

- £154.3m was spent on Youth Employment service provision in 2013/14 by the 62 organisations who participated in the Youth Employment review;
- £140.7m (91.2%) of the reported 2013/14 expenditure on Youth Employment provision in Glasgow was by GCC Family and GCPP Partners, in particular by Glasgow Colleges (£96.3m). Even when excluding the Glasgow Colleges expenditure, the public sector was still responsible for 76.6% (£44.4m) of the reported 2013/14 expenditure on Youth Employment;
- It is projected that there will be a 1.7% reduction (£2.7m) in YE expenditure among GCC Council Family/GCPP Partners between 2013/14 and 2014/15.

When asked re the primary focus for the service provision, the responses indicated that 98% of the project expenditure was primarily focussed on “Employability Skills Development”

GCC Family/GCPP Partner YE Expenditure

3.5 Within the GCC Family/GCPP Partners YE expenditure (£140.7m) in 2013/14, £130.4m of the expenditure was spent by the following four organisations/GCC Departments:

- Glasgow Colleges (£96.3m – 62.4% of total reported YE expenditure);
- Education Services (£13.0m – 8.4% of total reported YE expenditure);
- Skills Development Scotland (£11.7m – 7.6% of total reported YE expenditure);
- Development and Regeneration Services (£9.4m – 6.1% of total reported expenditure).

YE Expenditure by Source of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: YE Expenditure by Internal/External Source by Organisation/ Sector</th>
<th>2013/14 YE Expenditure (£000)</th>
<th>2014/15 YE Expenditure (£000)</th>
<th>Difference (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Funding</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (exc.GCC Internal Transfer)</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>£275</td>
<td>-242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector - ALEO Total</strong></td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>-269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Funding</td>
<td>32,996</td>
<td>33,006</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (exc.GCC Internal Transfer)</td>
<td>76,836</td>
<td>76,836</td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector - CPP Partner Total</strong></td>
<td>109,832</td>
<td>109,842</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Funding</td>
<td>22,496</td>
<td>22,711</td>
<td>+215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (exc.GCC Internal Transfer)</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>-2,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector - GCC Department</strong></td>
<td>25,810</td>
<td>23,391</td>
<td>-2,419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: For the purpose of the analysis, internal funding is defined as funds for which the use has been determined by the organisation. This would include funds routed thorough the GCC as part of their Grant Aided Expenditure allocation. External funding is defined as funding provide by an external funding source for a specific purpose.

3.6 Table 3.2 illustrates that

- The majority of the YE expenditure originates from a source external to the service delivery organisation. This is mainly due to the £72.2m that Glasgow Colleges received from the Scottish Funding Council. All the other GCC Department/ GCC Council Family/GCPP Partner organisations reported that the majority of the 2013/14 & projected 2014/15 YE expenditure was from the organisation’s internal funds;
- The projected reduction (£2.7m) in 2014/15 YE expenditure will be entirely due to a reduction (£2.9m) in external funding. GCC Council Family/ GCPP Partners project to actually increase their own funding towards YE expenditure by £198k between 2013/14 and 2014/15;
- 90.3% (£2.4m) of the £2.7m projected reduction in 2014/15 YE expenditure is from GCC Departments’ YE expenditure. At the time of writing, the projected 2014/15 reduction in external funding was primarily a result of Opportunities for All (£2.022m) and European Social Fund (£783k) funding being no longer available in 2014/15. However, the Scottish Government have recently announced a financial extension to the overall employability programme to cover the period between the current and the next tranche of ESF funding which will become available in 2015. For the Youth programmes this amounts to £378k.

YE Expenditure by Employability Pipeline Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>2013/14 YE Expenditure (£000)</th>
<th>2014/15 YE Expenditure (£000)</th>
<th>Difference (£000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S2 - S3</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S4 - S6</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>9,468</td>
<td>-539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre 16 Years TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,664</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,074</strong></td>
<td><strong>-590</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (Addressing Personal Attributes)</td>
<td>7,544</td>
<td>6,312</td>
<td>-1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (Addressing general attributes)</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>7,241</td>
<td>-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Addressing specialist or generic employability skills)</td>
<td>45,582</td>
<td>45,018</td>
<td>-564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 (Improving employability skills through employer led/work placement/subsidy)</td>
<td>66,708</td>
<td>67,024</td>
<td>+316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 (Improving employment sustainment)</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>-434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST 16 - TOTAL</td>
<td>129,035</td>
<td>126,948</td>
<td>-2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>140,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2,677</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figures in this table are based on project information so the expenditure is counted against the service provider rather than funding source.
3.7 Table 3.3 illustrates that

- 79.8% (£112.3m) of the 2013/14 YE expenditure was on Employability Pipeline Stages 3-4 support with £66.7m being spent on Stage 4 pipeline (i.e. improving employability skills through employer led/work placement/subsidy) support. Even when the Glasgow Colleges expenditure is excluded, nearly two thirds (64.7%) of the expenditure was spent on Stages 3-4 of the Employability Pipeline. The percentage of YE expenditure targeted on Pipeline Stages 3-4 is projected to increase to over 81.1% in 2014/15;
- In 2013/14, the YE preventative expenditure (i.e. Pre 16 expenditure and Stage 5 of the Employability Pipeline) was £13.5m (9.6%). The level of YE preventative expenditure is projected to reduce by £1m to £12.4m in 2014/15 which would equate to 9.0% of YE expenditure in 2014/15;
- Within the projected £2.7m reduction in expenditure, expenditure on Employability Pipeline Stage 4 support is expected to increase in 2014/15 by £316k. It is the only pipeline stage that is projected to increase in expenditure between 2013/14 and 2014/15.

YE Expenditure by Age Band

| Pre 16 | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4,190 (37.6%) | 4,190 (3.1%) |
| 16-19 | 8,841 (61.3%) | 766 (0.7%) | 2,599 (23.3%) | 12,206 (9.1%) |
| 16-24 | 3,794 | 107,853 | 4,351 | 115,998 |
| 20-24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Up to 24 | 1,799 | 0 | 0 | 1,799 |
| Pre 25 | 5,593 (38.7%) | 107,853 (99.3%) | 4,351 (39.1%) | 117,797 (87.8%) |
| TOTAL | 14,434 (100.0%) | 108,619 (100.0%) | 11,140 (100.0%) | 134,193 (100.0%) |

Note: The figures in this table are based on the provided project information so the total expenditure is less than the overall YE expenditure and the expenditure is counted against the service provider rather than funding source.

3.8 As illustrated in Table 3.4, less than a eighth (12.2%) of the GCC/Council Family/CPP Partner YE Expenditure is targeted at Pre 16s or 16-19 years olds, with no funding specifically targeted at 20-24 years old, who make up three quarters of the current young JSA Claimants.

3.9 Based on the responses to the question “where is the project activity focussed”, it is evident that there is almost no geographical targeting of the GCC/Council Family/CPP Partner YE Expenditure as 99.3% of the expenditure was on projects that responded “City-wide”. Even among the 3rd Sector organisations, 84% of the expenditure was on projects whose geographical focus was “City-wide”.
3.10 Similarly, the YE project information indicated that there is limited client group targeting of YE Expenditure as 90% of YE service expenditure in 2013/14 was on services that didn’t identify a service client group.

The following groups received the largest amounts of targeted YE expenditure:
- School Pupils/Leavers £4.4m;
- Young Offenders £2.1m;
- Young People with Multiple Employment Barriers £1.7m;
- Young People with Disabilities/Additional Support Needs £1.6m; and
- Care Leavers £1.4m.

3b. Youth Employment Services (All Responses)

Service Provision by Employability Pipeline Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.5: Projects by Pipeline Stages</th>
<th>ALEO</th>
<th>CPP Partner</th>
<th>GCC Department</th>
<th>3rd Sector</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S2 - S3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S4 - S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (Addressing Personal Attributes)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (Addressing general attributes)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Addressing specialist or generic employability skills)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 (Improving employability skills through employer led/ work placement/ subsidy)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 (Improving employment sustainment)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As a project can provide support that covers more than 1 stage of the pipeline, the numbers in column “Total” add up to more than the 81 projects that provided pipeline stage details.

3.11 Table 3.5 illustrates that there is a balanced spread of services providing support across the pipeline stages, especially stages 1-4. The spread of support services across the pipeline stages is different from the spread of YE expenditure (Table 3.3) where the 79.8% was spent in 2013/14 on Employability Pipeline stages 3-4.

The reason for the difference between the number of projects delivering services per pipeline stage and the amount of expenditure per pipeline stage is that the average project expenditure varies significantly between the pipeline stages. The average expenditure for projects that provide pipeline stages 3 - 4 type support is £0.9m for stage 3 projects and £1.5m for stage 4 projects, respectively, which is far higher than for any of the other pipeline stages (e.g. the average expenditure on a pipeline stage 4 project is more than 18 times higher for the average for a pipeline stage 5 project - £81k).

Among the 81 projects that provided detailed service expenditure information, 62 (77%) responded that their service expenditure covered more than one pipeline stage. 14 of the 19 projects that targeted 100% of
their resources towards one stage of the Employability pipeline were public sector projects.

Service Provision by Age Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.6: Projects by Age Group by Pipeline Stages</th>
<th>Pre 16</th>
<th>Pre 20</th>
<th>Pre 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S2 - S3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S4 - S6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (Addressing Personal Attributes)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (Addressing general attributes)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Addressing specialist or generic employability skills)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 (Improving employability skills through employer led/ work placement/subsidy)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 (Improving employment sustainment)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECTS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As a project can provide support that covers more than 1 stage of the pipeline, the numbers in column “Total” add up to more than the 92 projects that provided age group details.

3.12 Table 3.6 illustrates that the majority of projects are not targeted at a specific age group (i.e. under 16s, 16-19, 20-24). However, there are projects delivering services for 16-19s across all the employability pipeline stages with 21 projects identifying 16-19s (17 projects) or up to 19 years (4) as their target age group. Only 1 project identified 20 -24 year olds as it target group.

Service Provision by Client Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.7: Projects by Target Group by Pipeline Stages</th>
<th>Care Leavers</th>
<th>NEET/ UE</th>
<th>School Pupils/ Leavers</th>
<th>Young Offenders</th>
<th>YP with Disability / ASN</th>
<th>YP with multiple barriers</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S2 - S3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16 Years S4 - S6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (Addressing Personal Attributes)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (Addressing general attributes)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Addressing specialist or generic employability skills)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 (Improving employability skills through employer led/ work placement/subsidy)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 (Improving employment sustainment)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECTS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As a project can provide support that covers more than 1 stage of the pipeline, the numbers in column “Total” add up to more than the 41 projects that identified targeted client group service provision.

3.13 Table 3.7 illustrates that among the 90 projects that provided service details:
• There are more (49) projects without a target client group than projects (41) with a target client group;
• Services exist for Care Leavers and Young People with Disabilities across all the Employability Pipeline Stages.

YE Project Staffing

3.14 In completing the questionnaires, 89 projects provided details on the projects staffing levels and the type of staff. The total number of full time equivalent (FTE) staff identified as working in the 89 projects was 2,498. 1,851 (74.1%) of those staff were based in Glasgow Colleges.

Of the remaining 647 FTE staff, the largest number of staff was located in GCC – ALEOs (264) and the 3rd Sector (210). Ten projects didn’t provide details on the occupations of their project staff but for the 569 staff that details were provided about, 81% (463) were in service delivery provision. The percentage of the service delivery staff in projects across the three main sectors was:

• 94.8% GCC – ALEO projects
• 71.7% 3rd Sector projects
• 66.2% GCC Department projects

YE Project Service Users

3.15 Based on projects target “number of young people engaged on project during last full year”, 45,583 young people attended the 84 projects that provided service user details. This figure includes 26,115 young people who attended the Glasgow Colleges.

3.16 Excluding those attending a Glasgow College, the number of project attendees by sector is as follows;

• 7,564 (38.9%) GCC Department
• 6,534 (33.6%) GCC ALEO
• 4,944 (25.4%) 3rd Sector
• 426 (2.1%) Other

YE Project Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.8: Project Target</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided with advice &amp; guidance</td>
<td>6461</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number securing employment</td>
<td>3578</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in non-accredited training</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number remaining in work after 13 weeks</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in accredited training - skills level 3</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number into Apprenticeships</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing into further training</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in accredited training - skills level 2</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing into further &amp; higher education</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.17 Excluding those attending Glasgow Colleges, Table 3.8 illustrates that

- 26.4% of project users had either secured employment (18.4%) or an apprenticeship (8.0%);
- 12.3% had remained in employment for more than 13 weeks;
- 12.1% had received accredited training; and
- 7.7% progressed into Further/Higher Education (3.1%) or Further Training (4.6%).

3.18 When analysing only those projects that allocate part or all of their resources to Stage 4 Employability Pipeline activity, the percentage that secured employment in the last full year rose to 38%. However, it has not been possible in this review to directly correlate the level of staffing/expenditure to the number of service users/service outcomes across the Employability Pipeline stages. This is due to the majority of projects indicating that they deliver support across more than one Employability Pipeline stage.

3c. Strategic Interviews

3.19 Twenty three interviews took place with senior representatives of 21 organisations. The organisations interviewed (listed in Appendix 1) covered GCC Council Family; GCPP Partners and representatives of Glasgow’s Voluntary and Business Sectors. The interview format was based on an agreed topic guide with the following sections being the responses to the main topics covered in the interviews.

Youth Employment Role

3.20 Eleven organisations’ representatives responded that YE is core business for their organisation. A further eight organisations indicated that whilst YE was not core business for their organisation, their organisation did have a role to play relating to YE. Two organisations stated that presently that had no YE role to play and they didn’t envisage that this would change in the future, beyond potentially an increase in staff recruitment. The information from these two interviews is not included in the analysis provided in this report, unless indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.9: Organisation’s YE Role</th>
<th>Core Business</th>
<th>Non Core Business Role</th>
<th>No Role</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Planning/Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Funder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Role re YE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.21 Table 3.9 illustrates that the majority of the organisations (both core and non core) responded that their organisation had a YE “service delivery”

---

6 Representatives from each of the three Glasgow colleges were interviewed but their responses have been counted as one for analysis purposes.
role to play. The majority of the “core” YE organisations also responded that they had or should have a role to play in service planning and development. No organisation identified a role beyond the three identified in Table 3.9.

YE Strategy/Vision

3.22 Eleven organisations replied yes to the question “do you feel that there is a clear City strategy/vision for supporting and sustaining young people into employment?” However, the majority of the “core” YE organisations answered no (five responses) to the question or expressed concerns (two responses) as to how clear and coordinated the approach is between partners. One interviewee commented that “you need to be in the know” and it is noticeable that the five negative responses included two business representative organisations and three other organisations that would have less regular involvement with GCC/GCPP.

3.23 When asked re specific strategies, the balance in responses changes as the majority (six responses) of the “core” YE organisations stated that their organisation is “presently contributing to the progress of the Single Outcome Agreement” and that there is an expectation that this role with continue/be enhanced in the future. In total, 10 organisations responded that “presently contributing to the progress of the Single Outcome Agreement”.

3.24 All the GCC/Council Family Departments/Organisations responded that they had a role and would continue to play a role in achieving the GCC Strategic Plan key priority of Economic Growth.

3.25 When asked “Is Youth Employment a central tenet of any of your Departments/ALEO/Organisation’s strategies/plans?” the responses generally tallied with whether they viewed YE as core business for their organisation. The entire “core” YE organisations responded that YE was a central tenet for their strategies/plans. The majority of the organisations who didn’t see YE as core business for their organisations responded that YE was not a central tenet for their strategies/plans. However, there wasn’t much detail provided on the specific strategies/plans for which YE is a central tenet.

3.26 Going forward, some organisations (e.g. Wheatley Group) believed their organisations would have an increased role both in terms of service delivery and service planning & development.

Service Delivery

3.27 Table 3.10 (overleaf) illustrates limited targeting of service delivery as half the core YE organisations responded that their YE service delivery covers all five stages of the post 16 Employability Pipeline. Only one core YE organisation stated that their service delivery was focussed on only one stage in the pipeline i.e. Stage 4. Service delivery was more targeted
within the Non Core YE organisations with the emphasis being on Stages 4 – 5, primarily through apprenticeship programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.10: Organisation’s Service Delivery</th>
<th>Core Business</th>
<th>Non Core Business Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 16/School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 - S3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 - S6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 (Addressing Personal Attributes that are barriers to participation in the labour market)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 (Addressing general attributes that are barriers to participation in the labour market)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Addressing specialist or generic employability skills that are barriers to opportunity)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4 (Improving employability skills through employer led/work placement/subsidy)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5 (Improving employment sustainment)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.28 Going forward, the majority of organisations did not identify an employability pipeline stage where they could play a future role in service delivery. The three areas that organisations stated that there was a need and that their organisations could play a future role in were:

- Developing stronger school/further education and business partnerships;
- Providing more work/volunteering experience for school pupils/young people to enhance their work readiness; and
- Supporting young people’s progression in work.

**Partnership Working**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.11: Effective Partnership Working?</th>
<th>Core Business</th>
<th>Non Core Business Role</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer/N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.29 When asked “do you feel that there is an effective partnership approach taken towards supporting and sustaining young people into employment?” there was a mixed response as most organisations had good and bad experiences of partnership working. Allowing for those mixed experiences, Table 3.11 illustrates that twice as many organisations answered No than answered Yes. The prevalent reasons given for the No responses were
a) The YE landscape was too complicated and cluttered with too many agencies involved;
b) A lack of a coherent approach at a city wide level.

3.30 Among YE Core organisations, only 2 organisations answered Yes and both responses had caveats to their replies. It should still be noted that the three organisations that answered No to this question also answered
No to the interview question as to whether there is a clear YE strategy/vision. The response that best expresses this view was “the landscape is too complicated and cluttered. Good work can be done on specific projects but because we lack an overall vision/strategy for employability or clear leadership on the issue, individual roles are often unclear and therefore effective partnerships become difficult”.

3.31 Four organisations did express the view that going forward, clear YE structures and a city wide SOA implementation plan should make partnership working more effective through identification and support to the most effective service delivery approaches.

3.32 Whilst organisations may have questioned the effectiveness of partnership working, only one organisation said that they didn’t work with another organisation in delivering YE services. 10 organisations identified organisations/structures that they are involved with for service planning & development with GCPP structures being the most common response.

Youth Employment Structures

3.33 As part of a consultation process on the proposed Youth Employment structures for the city, organisations were asked “what role do you think your Department/ALEO/Organisation could/should play?”

The follows are the comments made on the proposed new structures:

- Who represents the business community within the structures and what role does the business community play within the structures...GEL workstreams/Leadership Groups could have a valuable role to play;
- Youth Employment structures make sense with YEP/YEG structure tied into Community Planning structures. The missing element is that structures need to link into the GCPP sector partnerships;
- It would be useful if a directory of who sits on each group could be cascaded/ communicated to all participants… felt the current structure around Employability focus with CPPs and YEG and Learning Forums confusing and need clarity and also who make decisions about who sits on each of these groups;
- There is a gap in the structure as the Senior Officer Group is omitted as are the Senior Officer Group sub groups... Previously the YEGs were not well positioned to drive the post 16 scenarios. In the new structure it is important that appropriate individuals chair the groups. The reason the SOG youth employment sub groups work is that individual representatives take on tasks, complete them and feed back to the main group. For YEGs to be successful they need to be more outcome focussed and representatives take responsibility for tasks and actions;
- Where is the engagement with young people on the proposed structures and when the structures are operational? What will be the reporting and monitoring arrangements for the structures?
3.34 Table 3.12 outlines the organisations responses to the question and whether the involvement should be at a citywide and/or local level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.12: What role do you think your organisation should play in proposed YE structures?</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Citywide and/or Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Lottery Fund</td>
<td>Transitions Workstream</td>
<td>3 sector level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Colleges</td>
<td>At all level of the structures</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Glasgow</td>
<td>Transitions &amp; Post School Workstreams</td>
<td>3 sector level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector</td>
<td>At all levels of the structures as would be the only representative of the 3rd sector</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Employer Board</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring Scotland</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Centre Plus</td>
<td>Transitions &amp; Post School Streams</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Enterprise</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Fire &amp; Rescue Services</td>
<td>Continue to play a role, where appropriate, at all levels of the CPP structures</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Links</td>
<td>We could sit on the citywide group - Youth Employment Workstream?</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Building</td>
<td>School/Transitions/Post School Workstream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Gateway</td>
<td>Could be involved at strategy level of structure</td>
<td>Clyde Gateway area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordia</td>
<td>Youth Employment Workstream</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council - LES</td>
<td>YEGs/ School &amp; Post school Workstream</td>
<td>3 sector level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council - Social Work Services</td>
<td>ASL YEG &amp; Local YEGs</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Life</td>
<td>Youth Employment Workstream; ASL &amp; Local YEGs</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Scotland</td>
<td>Continue to play a role, where deemed appropriate, at all levels of the CPP structures</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatley Group</td>
<td>Youth Employment Workstream and ASL YEG; Post school workstream</td>
<td>City/3 Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finance

3.35 Despite the commitment of CPP partners set out above, it was evident that, at the time of the interviews, a majority of the interviewees remained unfamiliar with the Joint Resourcing approach (see Section 2.9). Although these interviews were conducted only a few months after discussions began on Joint Resourcing, and those interviewed were operational managers, rather than financial managers, there will be a challenge to communicate and fully embed the approach into service planning and development. Therefore, it was understandably difficult for interviewees to make firm commitments to YE Joint Resourcing on behalf of their organisations. However, it is noteworthy that nine interviewees indicated that their organisations would be willing to consider joint targeting of
resources for agreed priority areas and/or commit to providing in kind support (e.g. staff time; facilities; training officers/courses; joint funding applications). There is some evidence that this is already beginning to happen e.g. in the College sector.

**Barriers to Employment/Ideas for Improvements**

3.36 Diagrams 1a and 1b provide the interviewees’ responses to the following two related questions:

- Based on service experience, what do you see as the significant barrier(s) to young unemployed people getting employment?
- If there was one thing that you would change, one initiative that you would enhance or one idea that you would introduce to improve the employment situation for young people what would it be?

The responses have been grouped based on whether the barriers to employment/improvement area relates to a systemic barrier/improvement or relates to a personal barrier/improvements.

3.37 A similar number of systemic or personal barriers were stated by the interviewees with the most commonly identified barriers being:

- The current labour market situation with a high level of competition for every job vacancy;
- That some young people weren’t “Work Ready”. The respondents highlighted that this is due to a lack of work experience and in some instances a skills deficit, including literacy/numeracy and social skills;
- Lack of knowledge among young people on current and future employment options and their own capabilities

The consequence of these is that some unemployed young people are not putting themselves forward for the available employment opportunities and that employers, in general, will choose a person (more likely to be older) who has work experience and understands better the working environment.

3.38 In response to the barriers identified, the focus of the responses was clearly on tackling the barrier of not being “Work Ready”. There were no ideas put forward to tackle the barrier of lack of jobs for young people through job creation with the only related idea being about greater support for employers to take up incentives relating to employing young people. The most commonly suggested improvements were:

- Training/Preparing youths for employment while they are in full time education;
- More vocational training at an earlier stage;
- Provision of holistic individual support for hard to reach young people to built up trust and confidence – some young people have a range of barriers to employment (inc. additional support needs) and each barrier can’t be tackled in isolation;
• Simplify the employability model for young people and employers – one door approach. Many young people and employers would benefit from a clear, approved range of initiatives and services set out by one agreed source.

3.39 Based on the interviews, there is a prevalent view that young people need to be provided earlier, preferably at school, with a wider range of options (e.g. vocational training opportunities, workplace experience, individual support and information on current and future employment opportunities) that will prepare them better for the available employment opportunities.
Diagram 1a: Systemic Barriers to Employment/Ideas for Improvement

Barriers

- Lack of Jobs/Competition for Jobs/Economic Situation (6)
- Youth People that are most in need are hardest to reach (1)
- Transitions points are not managed as well as could be (1)
- Lack of knowledge among providers of available progression routes on completion of their programme (1)
- Over complicated service landscape for employers and young people (1)
- Over prescriptive funding preventing flexible delivery of services (1)
- Employers prejudice and preconception (1)
- Living Wage (1)
- Recruitment is time consuming especially as abundance of applicants (1)

Suggested Improvements

- More vocational training at an earlier stage as not all school kids are suited by academically focussed curriculum - colleges to grow provision at National 4 to provide progression routes for school leavers; (4)
- Simplify the employability model for young people and employers – one door approach. Many young people and employers would benefit from a clear, approved range of initiatives and services set out by one agreed source; (4)
- Support infrastructure to encourage employers to take up incentives to recruit young people; (2)
- Develop School/College & Business Partnerships; (2)
- More engagement with employers including SME employers; (1)
- Earlier intervention in schools to prevent young people getting to Work Programme; (1)
- Young people should have a voice and should be consulted on their opinions and experiences of youth employment ;(1)
- Project Board that could release money based on the merits of an idea rather than shoehorn projects into mainstream provision; (1)
- New structures with a common vision/purpose and are outcome focussed; (1)
- A citywide implementation plan that rolls out the best and most effective YE initiatives together into a single method of delivery and good practice; (1)
- Funding for/Decisions on service interventions should be based around more than cost
- More support to sustain people in employment (1)
Diagram 1b: Personal Barrier to Employment/Ideas for Improvement

Barriers

- Poor level of Work Readiness in terms of
  - skills - not just qualifications but basic skills, (literacy/numeracy) and social skills;
  - confidence - limited personal expectations/aspirations; and/or
  - work experience. Schools don’t reflect the reality of employment and young people do not understand what is expected of them in a working environment. (9)
- Lack of knowledge among young people on current and future employment options and their own capabilities (3)
- Little or no home support – chaotic home lives (3)
- High levels of youth illiteracy in Glasgow (1)
- Territorial Issues – travel outside area can be problematic depending on the travel route (1)

Suggested Improvements

- Training/Preparing young people for employment while they are in full time education
  - Increase the number of certificated work placements;
  - look at work placement provision during holiday time;
  - Community Jobs Fund/Future Jobs was successful model;
  - Bring professionals into schools to engage with young people, getting across the importance of and benefits from work and provide positive role models (6)
- Provision of holistic individual support for hard to reach young people to built up trust and confidence – some young people have a range of barriers to employment (inc. additional support needs) and each barrier can’t be tackled in isolation (3)
- Support for young people beyond 25, for as long as they need it (3)
- Young People encouraged to enter apprenticeship training (1)
- Pipeline Stage 1 and 2 Programmes need to be an absolute minimum of 10 -16 weeks as need to address individual needs (1)
- Raise ambitions & celebrate achievement by young people (1)
3d. Focus Groups

3.40 Four focus groups were carried out with partners with a total of 45 participants attending. Three focus groups were organised for young people, two for young unemployed 19-24 year olds and one for young people leaving school in May 2014. A total of 42 young people were involved in the process. The purpose of the focus groups was to engage with partners and young people to identify issues, gaps and solutions to improve youth employment in the city.

3.41 Participants were provided with statements and asked to rate from 1-10 the extent they agree with the statement with 1 being least and 10 being the most in agreement. They were then asked to identify what needs to be improved, what currently works well and what can be done to improve employability services across the city.

3.42 The first statement provided to partners for comment was:

‘Employability services in Glasgow cater for all young people that need support’. Partner participants rated the statement at a level of 36%.

3.43 The second statement provided to partners and young people for comment was:

“Young people are supported to develop their full potential once they have successfully engaged in employment”. Partner participants rated this at 28% and young people at 52%. Young people about to leave school were more likely to agree with the statement than any other group with a 62% rating.

3.44 The areas most commonly identified as in need of improvement across all focus groups are outlined below:

**Employability Support and Training/Education Provision**

3.45 *Advice and Guidance:* Whilst young people identified advice and guidance services in a positive way, they also identified it as an area that required improvement. Of benefit were employability support services such as mock interviews, CV building, careers materials and information, careers fairs, my world of work, “planit plus”, “mappit”, Careers advisors and pastoral care teachers, extra courses in schools to teach about various jobs, e.g. culinary excellence, help with finding suitable training, jobs and building confidence.

Young people in school and post school suggested that other areas of improvement included

- more information in school about options other than higher education;
- more support with applications and CV’s;
- work experience and job/college trials;
- careers advisors being in schools more often;
• up to date information and information on support available;
• the need for help for people to start there own business/work for themselves “Something to help people start there own business/work for themselves, cost of tools, courses etc.”

Flexible Provision

3.46 It was suggested that there is a need for good assessment processes to identify the needs of young people and then to tailor programmes to address identified needs. Barriers that need to be considered should not be exclusive to employability but include specific barriers such as access to childcare, numeracy, literacy, qualifications, drug, alcohol, lack of goals/aspirations, learning difficulties, health and homelessness.

A common view from partners was that provision is often service centred rather than young person focussed and young people need on-going flexible support to help them to sustain and progress in education, training and employment. It was felt that there is a lack of opportunities for young people at stages 1 and 2 of the pipeline and that these programmes are often too short to adequately meet the needs of an individual. This results in young people being unable to progress through the pipeline.

It was suggested that there needs to be better systems in place to identify and then support young people at transition points. This needs to take account of young people that have multiple transitions and should include college and university leavers. Partnership working is required to ensure young people do not drop out of the system. It was recognised that ‘arrival’ in employment is not a final destination and that some young people need on-going flexible services that can help them sustain and progress e.g. care leavers and others who may not have family support. Outcome payments generally rate success as employment and not sustainability in employment and there are no incentives for providers to continue to support young people in employment. One young person commented on the aftercare service offered to them as follows:

“Done a course with Prince’s Trust then got a job through it and they stay in touch up to months later for further support.”

Employer Engagement

3.47 Recognition of the important role that employers should play was identified by both partners and young people. The support employers can provide included support with employability skills prior to young people leaving school and in post school training and education such as mock interviews, work experience, job trials.

In work training, not exclusive to Modern Apprenticeships, was viewed as being important to motivate and skill young people for a career rather than just a job.
Designing training programmes with employer involvement and to ensure programmes meet the needs of the labour market was cited as an example of good practise. It was reported that where this approach has been taken the employment outcomes are particularly high.

It was suggested that more support should be offered to employers, particularly to SMEs, to understand employment/training terms and conditions and funding sources for staff development. It was also felt that employers should be provided with information on support services available to young people. Other suggestions included tax or rate breaks for employers who develop staff or employ young people and higher funding to recruit apprentices.

**Partnership Working**

3. 48 It was reported that where there is good communication between partners, understanding of partner services and effective referral and case management approaches for young people that young people benefit. Such approaches provide holistic and seamless services that meet the needs of each individual. It was reported that partnership working is patchy across the city and an area, if improved, could have an impact on employment outcomes for young people.

**Suggested Areas of Improvement**

3.49 Other suggested ways to improve employability services for young people included:

- GCC should provide a vision that partner organisations are aware of, adhere to, believe in and work together for.
- Data sharing between partners
- Employability targets should include training and qualifications so that young people are being up skilled and are more likely to aspire to a career rather than any job.
- More involvement of mental health and addiction services in the development and delivery of employment services.
- Increase availability of access to Intermediate 1 and 2 courses which allows young people to move forward.
- Organisations should provide staff development opportunities on specific issues such as criminal justice, literacies, ESOL
- Provide more financial support for young people starting work such as clothing, travel, finance for work related training.
- Improve partner understanding of services available to young people to improve signposting to relevant services.
- In work support services such as mentoring to enable young people to sustain employment.
3e. Employer Attitude Survey

3.50 The survey was undertaken in August 2014. The aim of the survey is to examine the attitudes of Glasgow employers to recruiting young people aged 16 to 24 and on improving youth employment opportunities in Glasgow, that will undoubtedly have an overwhelmingly positive impact on Glasgow’s economy as a whole. The findings of the survey will inform tailored training, awareness raising and professional development programmes to ensure young people are equipped with the skills and experience needed to meet the needs of an employer. In addition, the survey findings will recommend how interventions can be implemented to ensure that young people are being equipped with the employability skills required to be successful. The survey captures the following topics:

- Employer information-includes capturing the sector; size of the workforce and classification of organisation;
- Recruitment - growth in the last 12 months and next 12 months; recruitment channels, how many new employees recruited
- Training - do employers provide pre-recruitment training
- Skills -Top 3 benefits and weaknesses of employing a young person;
- Geographical Variance - how many young people living in Glasgow have they recruited
- Engagement with schools;
- Awareness of government schemes/initiatives.

3.51 The main findings from the report are:

- By and large, employers do seem to have recruited a proportionate number of young people into full-time jobs in the last 12 months. However, 16-18 year olds appear to be getting more part-time employment opportunities and are therefore under-represented when it comes to securing full-time positions in Glasgow. 19-24 year olds are more likely to gain full-time positions and appear to be fairly represented in this category within most sectors. Whilst there may be a gap in the number of 16-18 year olds securing full-time vacancies it should still be recognised that most sectors in Glasgow do appear to have recruited a proportionate number of 16-24 year olds within the last 12 months and this is very encouraging;

- It is evident that the employers in Glasgow, from all sectors, are providing high levels of employee development training. However, this is evidently not the case for pre-recruitment training. All sectors provide significantly lower levels of pre-recruitment training although that being said; the third sector does provide considerably higher levels of pre-recruitment training when compared to the private and public sectors. From the questions asked in this survey, it is not possible to gauge why most employers do not provide pre-recruitment training. Further study into why employers do not provide this training and ways in which they feel they could be supported in doing so would arguably be very
beneficial and would allow the CPP to find ways in supporting employers to provide this training;

- The findings from the skills section emphasises the importance of equipping our young people with valuable work experience. Over a third of employers described a lack of work experience as the biggest challenge to recruiting young people. The fact that employers feel this is more of a challenge than a lack of skills is perhaps quite unfair, if young people are not being given the opportunities to get work experience then this will disadvantage them when attempting to access the labour market;
- These findings strongly reiterate that there is an evident gap in the partnerships between schools and employers. If employers are able to work with schools in order to provide work experience and skills to those young people who are more likely to enter the labour market as opposed to FE or HE then this transition may be made easier through the experience and networks gained by working with and engaging with a local employer;
- There does not appear to be a geographical variance in where employers from Glasgow are recruiting young people from. The majority of employers said they had no preference in what local authority a young person comes from and as can be seen from Chart 9, only 43% of the young people who were recruited into part-time or full-time vacancies lived in the Glasgow boundaries and this is reflective of the pop. So, employers might not be directly or intentionally recruiting young people from outside Glasgow but the evidence certainly suggests that young people from Glasgow are losing out, quite considerably, to young people from surrounding areas.

The full survey findings will initially be presented to the Glasgow Works Board.

3f. 3rd Sector/Business Community Workshops

3rd Sector Workshops

3.52 Over the course of the two workshops a number of issues and developmental opportunities were raised and explored by discussion groups. The broad areas covered include:

- The limitations of short term funding in developing solutions to complex problems;
- The linear and outcome focused characteristics of the ‘skills pipeline’ approach to funding – and specifically how this can be unhelpful in supporting under-represented / equalities groups – e.g. BME Communities, young people with disabilities;
- Need to support more early intervention and long term approaches which take a more holistic approach to the support of our vulnerable and marginalised groups in the city – more recognition and value placed on areas like volunteering and social enterprise;
• Opportunities to make better use of voluntary sector agencies as employers as well as service providers.

**Business Community Workshop**

3.53 A presentation and discussion group, with 15 representatives from Glasgow’s business community organised by Glasgow Chamber of Commerce took place towards the end of the review, to complement discussions from the work stream leads conclusions and recommendation setting workshops.

3.54 The discussion re-enforced many of the findings and recommendations from the Chamber’s, employer-led Youth Employment Action Group report, published in early 2014.

3.55 Specific issues raised include:

• Need for clear branding and simple messages for employers to encourage and achieve their support and ongoing commitment to work with public sector partners – a media campaign to support a clear vision and common set of commitments to young people and business in the city was identified as a key priority to address this;
• Simplification and greater flexibility of funding streams to support apprenticeship programmes and targeted wage subsidy / employer recruitment incentives;
• Clear, consistent ‘asks’ of the business community from public sector stakeholders in respect of employing young people and associated requirements – e.g. work experience, internships etc;
• More flexible supports for small and micro-businesses, to encourage youth employment – could include HR functions, sign-posting, financial incentives etc. The crucial element of any support should be its flexibility and needs led approach.
4. Youth Employment Review Conclusions

4.1 Based on the findings in Sections 2 and 3 of the report, the main review conclusions are as follows:

**Employment Policies/Strategies**

4.2 There have been significant changes recently in the national and city YE strategic framework through the recommendations from the “Wood” Commission for Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce and the decision that Young Employment is a Glasgow City SOA Priority. The policy landscape has shifted to focus much more clearly on a continuum of coherent supports from school right through to 24 – our current organisational approach sees a split between school transitions and everything that happens thereafter.

4.3 Glasgow’s strategic YE vision needs to more clearly established so that it becomes integral to the strategic and operational frameworks for the organisations that support youth people into employment and for business that employ Glasgow young people. The City Deal for Glasgow and the Wood Commission Recommendations present a very clear set of opportunities for investment and a coherent direction of travel.

4.4 The issue of under-representation of disenfranchised groups in the labour market is underpinned by a complex set of structural factors requiring a more comprehensive set of responses than can be delivered by one single programme or set of ‘employability’ initiatives in the short-term. The new SOA and associated planning structures along with the additional resources afforded to the city through City Deal present an opportunity to develop longer term approaches to transformational change which could address the complex set of barriers currently preventing particular groups of young people from fulfilling their economic potential.

**Market Intelligence**

4.5 Allowing for data limitations, the conclusions to be taken from the market intelligence are that

- There has been recent success in reducing the number of young unemployed/young benefit claimants. Glasgow has been successful in reducing the youth unemployment rates when compared with the unemployment rates for the wider population in Glasgow and with the rest of Scotland but has had less success when compared with comparable English cities;
- The reductions in the youth unemployment rate and young benefit claimants has not been due to an increase in the level of youth employment but due to an increase in the numbers of young people in full time education;
- There is a correlation between the distance from the City Centre and the number/rate of young JSA claimants;
There is a need for agencies to take a more integrated approach to the collection, management and provision of information pertaining to Youth Employment;

There are still issues that require tackling relating to
- the lower than average school leaver positive destination rate
- the higher levels of young unemployed in communities that are further away from Glasgow City Centre
- the levels of long term (more than 1 year) young unemployed
- the need for growth in the labour market to provide opportunities for those presently not in employment and/or due to enter the labour market, including the increasing number of young people presently in FE/HE.

Infrastructure/Partnership Working

4.6 The conclusions from the policy review and the interview responses are:

- Given the change in the priority YE age group from 16-19 to 16-24 and the changing YE policy landscape, the Youth Employment Partnership Plan and the structures associated with the YEP plan are no longer fit for purpose;
- The partnership approach needs to be improved as more organisations said there wasn’t an effective partnership approach than said there was;
- There were some concerns about the proposed YE structures especially around a) determining the role of and identifying the most appropriate group(s) representing the business community and b) young people’s involvement within the structures.

Financial Framework

4.7 A summary of the financial information provided by the organisations, who participated in the review, has highlighted that:

- A significant (c. £58m without and £154m with colleges) level of funding is targeted annually in Glasgow toward Youth Employment;
- Within this funding:
  - More than 90% of the YE expenditure is by public sector organisations;
  - 80% of the public sector YE expenditure is on Employability Pipeline Stages 3-4 support;
  - The majority of the current YE expenditure is not targeted by age group, by geography or by client group;
- The YE expenditure is projected to reduce by 1.7% (2.7m) in 2014/15 due to a reduction in external funding.

Service Provision

4.8 The service questionnaires and the interview responses highlighted that:
• There is limited targeting of service delivery in terms of prioritising
  o specific group of young people to target;
  o geographical areas within the city; and
  o specific employability pipeline stages;
• The vast majority of service staff were front line staff delivering support directly to young people;
• There is variable success in achieving employment targets, even for those services whose activities were for young people close to employment;
• In terms of future service delivery, the following service areas were mentioned as areas of need:
  o Developing stronger school/further education and business partnerships;
  o Providing more work/volunteering experience for school pupils/young people to enhance their work readiness;
  o Supporting young people’s progression in work; and
  o Support for those presently in a positive destination (i.e. employment/training or full time education) that are at risk of moving into a negative destination.
• The main barriers to employment are the current competitive nature of the Labour Market and that some young people are not “Work Ready”. There was a prevalent view as to how to tackle the barrier of “Work Ready” by providing young people at the earliest opportunity (i.e. at school) with a wider range of options inc:
  o Vocational training
  o Workplace experience
  o Soft skills training
  o Information on current and future employment opportunities

4.9 The YE Review has highlighted strengths and weakness to Glasgow’s current approach to tackling the priority issue of YE with the current position in terms of youth unemployment being significantly better than two years ago. As a result, the question has been asked “Do we require a specific YE strategy?” The answer based on the review findings is Yes!

4.10 The reason for this answer is that the current responses (increasing number of young people in full time education; public sector wage subsidy through apprenticeships programmes) may have lessened the impact of the recession but have not impacted on increasing the level of young employment in the city. These responses do not provide a long term structural solution that will prevent more young Glaswegians joining the already too high number of adult “workless” Glaswegians and provide more resilient young people in the event of a future economic downturn.

4.11 Since the deindustrialisation of the city, Glasgow has had an imbalance between the demand and supply of the labour force as it has a larger than average percentage of a) highly qualified young people and b) unqualified young people. Whilst it is undoubtedly a positive that Glasgow has so many highly qualified young people, it means that unless there is employment opportunities that match their skills, these highly skilled
young people take up entry level positions in employment sectors that
don't match their skills. This further lessens the employment opportunities
for unqualified young people.

4.12 Thus, there is a requirement for a two pronged approach that a) provides
more young people with the skills that meet the current and future labour
market requirements and b) creates growth in sectors that match the skills
of the current and future highly qualified young people. This is an
approach that will tackle the supply and demand imbalance in Glasgow’s
labour market.
5. Youth Employment Review Recommendations

The Youth Employment vision for Glasgow is encompassed in the principles of the Glasgow Guarantee.

5.1 The Glasgow Guarantee:

- Every young person aged 16-24 in Glasgow will be guaranteed support to access continuing education, training, an apprenticeship or employment
- Every young person at school in Glasgow will be equipped with the knowledge, skills and experience they need to ensure their ability to compete for and sustain employment

The following recommendations have been drawn up based on the Youth Employment Review findings and conclusions and will support the delivery of the Glasgow Guarantee:

1. All CPP Partners, GCC Services and ALEOs should sign-up to the refreshed Glasgow Guarantee
2. The responsibility for strategic oversight of all youth employment work within Glasgow City Council should be led by one named senior responsible officer – who will chair the city-wide Youth Employment Partnership
3. The Single Outcome Agreement should supersede all other youth employment strategies for the city
4. The Council should do more to encourage business growth in the sectors which provide employment and career development opportunities for young people
5. By 2020 the Glasgow Guarantee should support young disabled people, ethnic minorities, women and care leavers into sustained employment in line with the share of population
6. There should be an enhanced level of support for the following vulnerable groups:
   - School leavers
   - Young people who have been unemployed for more than 6 months
   - Young people furthest removed from the labour market
7. There should be greater availability of employment focused, accredited learning opportunities leading to employment through the expansion of partnerships between schools, further education and businesses.
8. There should be a longer term approach to developing young people’s aspirations, particularly with under-represented groups, in growth sectors

9. There should be enhanced support for career development within employment to reduce the current “churn” within some employment sectors and to tie in with Glasgow’s SOA priority of tackling in work poverty;

10. Through a joint resourcing approach the community planning partners should create a more flexible package of practical supports for young people

11. There should be a Youth Employment Performance Management and Information Framework and all employability programmes within the Council family should move onto a single client management system

12. These recommendations should be developed and implemented through a co-produced action plan led by the Youth Employment Partnership comprising of members from the public, private and third sectors
Youth Employment Review: Consultation Methodology

The “As–Is” consultation methodology was developed by the Youth Employment Review Team and agreed by the Youth Employment Workstream Leads. The consultation methods used in the review were as follows:

A. Survey Questionnaires:

145 organisations were requested to complete either a Survey Monkey questionnaire or a Word Form questionnaire to map out the current youth employment provision, infrastructure and delivery resources across the city. The questionnaire covered general questions on the organisations overall level of resources (expenditure and staff) targeted towards Youth Employment and more detailed questions on any Youth Employment services that the organisation provided for young people.

The aim of the extended consultation was to enable as comprehensive an “As-Is” mapping as possible. Thus, the organisations that were invited to complete a questionnaire ranged from organisations (private, public and 3rd Sector) whose core remit is employability support to organisations that may provide employment support to young people as part of a range of supports (e.g. youth services; housing associations). As such, it was inevitable that there would be a significant level of non returns as the Youth Employment Review would not be applicable to all the organisations.

60 questionnaires were completed with a further two organisations provided project funding details but not in a questionnaire format.

B. Semi Structured Interviews with Stakeholders:

The following organisations were interviewed as part of the Youth Employment Review. The analysis in the report has been grouped based on the interviewee’s assessment as to whether Youth Employment is core business for their organisation.

Core Business
Big Lottery Fund
Glasgow Colleges: City of Glasgow; Clyde College & Kelvin College
Community Safety Glasgow
Glasgow Chamber of Commerce
Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector
Glasgow Employer Board
Inspiring Scotland
Job Centre Plus
Scottish Enterprise
Scottish Fire & Rescue Services
Working Links
Not Core Business but Associated Role
City Building
Clyde Gateway
Cordia
Glasgow City Council – Land & Environment Services
Glasgow City Council – Social Work Services
Glasgow Life
Police Scotland
Wheatley Group

No Role
City Property
Glasgow City Marketing Bureau

The interviews were based around a semi structured topic guide that discussed the following topics, with standard questions and follow up questions:

- Organisation’s YE role
- YE Strategy/Vision
- Service Delivery
- Partnership Working
- Finance
- Summary Questions

C. Focus Groups

7 Focus groups took place with employability staff and young people to identify key issues and gaps in current services and to identify potential solutions. 45 people participated at the 4 staff focus groups and 42 young people at the 3 young people focus groups.

The participants were asked initially to rate from 1-10 the extent they agreed with the following statements, with 1 being least and 10 being the most in agreement.

“Employability services in Glasgow cater for all young people that need support”. This statement was asked of employability staff.

“Young people are supported to develop their full potential once they have successfully engaged in employment”. This statement was asked of employability staff and young people.

Following their response, participants were asked to
- identify what needs to be improved,
- what currently works well and
- what can be done to improve employability services across the city.

D. 3rd Sector/Business Community Workshops
Further workshops are taking place in early October with 3rd Sector organisations and with employer representatives to consider service improvements and their roles in service improvements.

In summary,

- 15 GCC Council Family/GCPP Partner organisations provided details on their YE service funding/provision;
- 46 external organisations completed a Survey Monkey questionnaire;
- 23 interviews were undertaken; and
- 87 strategic individuals (this number will increase when Third Sector and Employer workshops are completed) were given the opportunity to contribute to the consultation process through focus groups with young people; front line staff; meetings with 3rd Sector organisations and employers.
## Internal Scoping of Existing Strategies and Plans relating to Employment/Youth Employment

### 1. Overarching City Plans and Strategies

#### 1.1 Glasgow City Council Internal Plans and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Links to Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GCC Strategic Plan 2012 to 2017 | - Sets out the Council’s priorities for the next five years along with a medium term view of the actions that the council will take to deliver on these priorities.  
- Informed by Labour Manifesto amongst other inputs.  
- 5 Key Priority Areas for the city with Economic Growth being the overarching priority  
- Lead for Economic Growth for Council is DRS & reports through ASPIR framework  
- Key delivery mechanism for Plan is via The Council Family Group. This is the business model through which the council delivers services. It is a model based on a council group of directly provided services and wholly and jointly owned companies that share core key objectives, priorities and values drawn from the Council Strategic Plan. | **P1: Economic Growth**  
- Ongoing commitment to Glasgow Guarantee; specific target to create 1,000 new jobs every year for young people, graduates and those aged over 50 through the CWGF/CWJF.  
- Commitment to build on improvement in positive destinations by introducing a Glasgow Guarantee aiming to provide all 16 to 24 year olds seeking work with support in terms of an apprenticeship, training or work.  
- And increase the number of apprenticeships delivered by the council by 10% every year from 2013. | - 1,000 new jobs every year for young people, graduates and over 50s via CGF and CJF  
- Provide all 16 to 24 year olds seeking work and who meet the scheme conditions with an apprenticeship, training or work (*more defined target than above)  
- Via Glasgow Guarantee increase the number of apprenticeships delivered by council by 10% every year from 2013 |
| City Deal (though wider than just GCC) | - The City Deals represent a strategic agreement between the UK Government and the City Region, which sees enhanced | **P4: Vulnerable People**  
- Specific commitment to care leavers via guaranteeing all children leaving care a job or college place and, most importantly, find innovative ways to support them to sustain the place and to attend college or training. | |
local governance and responsibility in return for increased resources or flexibilities from UK Government.

- Glasgow is leading the City Deal on behalf of the 8 local authorities which make up the CVCPP.
- The proposal has an Infrastructure Fund at its core which along with Labour Market and Business Development, form a “Growth Plan” for the Region as outlined in the Economic Strategy 2011-2016.
- These plans are being developed to operate from 2015/16 onwards.

- For the purposes of the city deal proposal it will be necessary to develop existing employability structures across the region into one that is capable of governing a clear programme of work – the vehicle for this could be the CVCPP with some additional work.
- *Young Labour Market Entrants* currently proposed as one of three key target groups for LM programme.

The specific content of the Labour Market elements are still in draft form however some of the early proposals include:

- A comprehensive Guarantee Scheme for specific groups including 16 to 24 year olds i.e., a ‘City Region Guarantee’ for 16 to 24s.
- Further leveraging of labour market clauses within Community Benefit Clauses and the development of a universal “offer” for employers and developers.
- Enhanced in-work support service for both labour market entrants; those at risk of unemployment and to enhance social mobility.

### 1.2 Partnership Strategies and Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Links Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GCPP Single Outcome Agreement</strong></td>
<td>Sets out a small number of key priorities and outcomes for the next ten years focussing on added value and where the partners have agreed that the greatest progress can be achieved by working together.</td>
<td>The Youth Employment Priority has 3 underpinning outcomes and encompasses young people aged 16 to 24 versus the focus on the YEP on 16 to 19 years.</td>
<td>Final targets are still to be agreed but headline ones include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key priority areas agreed relate to <em>alcohol, youth employment, and vulnerable people</em> along with a</td>
<td>Draft Implementation Plan in development.</td>
<td>- Increase in youth employment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The existing YEP and YEG structures in the city have been tasked with taking forward the monitoring, development and delivery of the youth employment priority.</td>
<td>Percentage of jobs in Glasgow occupied by young Glaswegians aged 16 to 24 incl. differentiated measures for young people with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recently agreed by GW and GCPP that the YEP/YEGs will be re-positioned as a workstream of</td>
<td>claimants by 10,000 over next 4 years compared to reductions of 5,000 over the last 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
focus on tackling inequalities within specific neighbourhoods via a thriving places approach.

- This reflects GW own refreshed strategy and renewed focus on Youth Employment.
- The SOA Vulnerable Groups priority may well have additional read across into Youth Employment.

| Poverty Leadership Panel Action Plan for Change | Core focus of Work and Worth is on improving the accessibility of quality paid work and recognising the value of unpaid work i.e., to not only help people in poverty into employment, but also into a job where pay and conditions can sustain them and their families.
- 5 key goals agreed plus associated actions including a focus on volunteering as having intrinsic value.
- No specific focus on youth employment in WW and/or read across to other employability strategies in city at this time.
- But clear linkages to SOA VG, in work poverty priority and to new GW focus on people in-work at risk of losing job. |

- PLP made up of public, private and third sector partners and ‘sponsored’ by the Leader’s Office.
- Reducing poverty key priority for GCC.
- 6 priority areas agreed of which the most relevant is Work and Worth (WW). Lead is DRS.
- Link to GCC Strategic Plan, Priority 2, A World Class City & commitment to tackle deprivation and poverty via a strategic approach with CPP.
- And in-work poverty strand of SOA

- Mix of quantified and non-quantified targets from WW:
  - Increase in business base by 10% by 2017.
  - Increase in number of employee jobs by 2017.
  - Female and male labour force participation rates.
  - Proportion of Glasgow’s employees receiving living wage as a minimum.
  - Increase in levels of volunteering in those localities in the bottom 15% of the SIMD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Links Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Glasgow Economic Commission/ Glasgow Economic Leadership Action Plan | GEC established to review and recharge city’s joint economic strategy in light of economic downturn
- GEL est. 2011 to oversee the implementation and delivery of the recommendations made by the Glasgow Economic Commission and to enhance the growth of Glasgow and the city-region economy.
- Key sector workstreams set up under GEL tasked with developing | Primary focus of GEC/GEL is on ‘harder’ end of economic regeneration versus social.
- However people and skills a key theme/priority within both GEC and GEL key sector workstreams
- Not necessarily focussed on most disadvantaged and/or young people
- But links made to GW Partnership Board (and vica versa) to ensure close alignment of national and local employment programmes (e.g. Commonwealth Jobs Fund) and (private, public sector and Third Sector) providers with the skills needs of key sectors and those sectors with known demand.
- Apprenticeships, internships and more broadly the | Could not identify targets from available documents |
skills and employability of the city’s young people feature strongly within some of the key sector action plans e.g., Engineering, Design and Manufacturing, Financial and Business Services.

Other Plans with potential links/read across:

- One Glasgow & specifically Reducing Reoffending Workstream with its focus on young offenders.
- Digital Glasgow Roadmap – digital participation and training, skills and employment strands: already a strong focus here on young people and hence future targeting might focus on vulnerable groups.
- City Plan and how it will help deliver on GCPL SOA specifically vulnerable groups and thriving neighbourhoods priority
## Specific Employability Plans and Strategies

### 2.1 Partnership Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Glasgow Works Strategy**            | - GW Partnership established 2006 as DWP city strategy initiative but also lead strategic structure for employability in the city.  
- Original business plan written in 2006 with a focus on the time on the NEET group.  
- GW strategy recently refreshed along with 3 key priority groups including a renewed focus on youth employment defined as under 25s.  
- Reflects Christie Commission focus on prevention.  
- Delivery mechanism is via YEP | - Young people aged 16 to 24 one of 3 key priority groups for GW Board  
- YEP now firmly established as a workstream of the GW Board and thus ongoing lead role in relation to youth employment agenda in the city  
- GW strategy proposes an initial focus on 3 key areas: transitions to work (16-19); solutions to tackle long term unemployment (20-24); coordinated approach to employer engagement/ subsidies. | Targets to be agreed.  
Strategy refresh notes the following baseline information:  
- Since 2006 the youth unemployment rate has nearly doubled rising from 17% to 31%.  
- A cautionary note is that upwards of 30% of the young unemployed are full-time students looking for part-time work.  
- 16% of 16 to 24 year olds have no qualifications and thus potentially vulnerable to in-work poverty. |
| **Youth Employability Partnership Strategy/Framework** | - The city’s approach to youth unemployment and increasing employability opportunities has to date, been largely led and directed by the strategic multi-agency Youth Employability Partnership (YEP).  
- Est. 2008, YEP jointly sponsored and chaired by DRS and Education Services.  
- Historical links to GW Partnership Board  
- Focus to date on 16 to 19 years | - Two core strategic documents: YEP Strategy and the YEP Framework  
- Strategy linked to SOA at the time  
- Both Strategy and Framework focussed on 16 to 19 years versus wider focus now on 16 to 24.  
Two Core aims:  
- To increase and sustain the number of Glasgow’s young people aged 16-19 progressing to education, employment or training  
- To ensure that all young people have the necessary supports and offers of appropriate learning opportunities to allow them to remain in a | 2011-2012:  
- Comprehensive set of targets set for key groups plus Youth Gateway/Youth Pipeline.  
- Too lengthy to replicate here – see Youth Employability Framework doc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Target Groups:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 15 to 16 year olds reaching their school leaving date at risk of not making a successful transition from school (NEET Prevention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 16 to 19 year olds who are not in education, employment or training (NEET Reduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Young people aged 15 to 21 with additional entitlements afforded through ASL Legislation; including Young people aged 15 to 21 in and leaving local authority care/care leavers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2. Glasgow City Council Service Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Education Services, Employment Skills and Partnership Team Service Plan** | - The ESP Service Plan outlines how the team will achieve its core goal of ensuring that every young person in the city is supported to leave school with the information, attributes and skills they need to maximise their competitiveness and begin their journey towards a fulfilling and stretching career.  
- Key focus of work of team will be on working closely with partners, and particularly schools to ensure that employment and skills-focused activity becomes a core component element throughout the curriculum in every school. | - The Plan is being taken forward via 5 workstreams:  
1. Enterprise  
2. Business Partnerships  
3. Skills and Aspirations  
4. Inclusion; and  
5. Transitions  
- In relation to the Transitions theme, a key priority will be to redefine the role of the ESP Team within a refreshed and re-focused youth employment structure incorporating the additional responsibilities assigned through the new Single Outcome Agreement.  
- The Partnership Manager will work with colleagues from DRS to establish the strategic lead partner (between Education and DRS) for youth employment related activity dependant on age and stage. *We will seek to continue as the strategic lead for youth employment for young people until a young person is supported into their first destination from school.*  
- In terms of Business Partnerships, the ESP team has also *drafted a Schools Business Partnership Framework* with the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce aimed at better coordinating the schools/business interface and ensuring that this is aligned to the city’s key growth sectors as identified by GEL and other key sectors that employ significant numbers of young people. | - In terms of targeting the plan refers to an increased focus on improving outcomes for the most vulnerable in 2013-2014.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| **Social Work EPIG Action Plan 2013 to 2014** | - EPIG is part of GCC SW/NHS GG&C Planning Structures and is one of 4 cross-cutting/thematic PIGS                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | - One of key actions identified is to monitor and manage current EPIG targets; and support each care group to develop an employability action plan.  
- EPIG targets not included in action plan                                                                                                                                                                                                 | - Target in Joint Adult Services Plan for 2013 to 2014 – upwards of 2,500 SW service users will be supported into employment.                                                                                                                                                                 |
- Initially established under Equal Access to Employment Strategy and mainstreamed within SW planning framework circa 2008
- Attended by care groups reps plus NHS and reports into Adult Services Executive Group (ASEG) annually

**Aim of group:**
- To increase the number of health and social care service users accessing effective employability supports by maximising and complementing their use of specialist and mainstream services.
- Chaired by Alison Eccles

- No specific focus on young people and/or youth employment
- Specific areas of joint work with GW relate to information management of Bridging Service Clients; funding for a range of specialist employability services supporting health and social care service users; and ESF priority five redesign.
- Action Plan makes specific reference to working with Glasgow Works but no similar link to the YEP.
- However potential to make a stronger contribution around Youth Employment agenda particularly in relation to the 20-24 age group at risk of long term unemployment.

*engaged with employability services*
- See also section 3.1
### 2.3 Wider Council Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Glasgow Life ‘Making it Work’ Employability Strategy (2012) | - Internal GL strategy that sets out its approach and contribution to the city’s wider employability agenda including youth employment via cultural, sporting and learning programmes.  
- Overseen by GL Employability Group that reports into Glasgow Life Learning Forum  
- Strong focus on enabling access to work experience opportunities in GL  
- Link made to GCC Strategic Plan and Economic Growth Priority  
- Refers to GRA as the city’s strategic lead for employability with DRS and Education retaining responsibility for Youth Employment (2.4, p.3)  
- Acknowledges that its programmes, particularly skills development could benefit from a more coherent alignment to employability outcomes.  
- And GL could improve how they assess the impact of their interventions on employability outcomes.  
- Emphasises the role of delivering via partnership working  
- Lead is Ken Gibson | - **Youth Employability** highlighted as a key priority within the strategy  
- Ongoing commitment to working via YEP and YEGs plus Glasgow’s learning partnership.  
- Big focus on GL as a provider of work experience opportunities; 2nd largest provider or 26% of total provided by Council and wider Council Family (reference made to the DRS Intern Report on Work Experience).  
- And volunteering and the link to improving youth employment prospects – highlights that GL already offers broad range of volunteering opportunities however could be better aligned to employability agenda.  
- Refers to a consistent application process for work experience to be introduced plus a consistent approach to graduate internships using the same web based system. | - Strategy contains a detailed action plan but no specific targets in relation to employability and/or youth employment. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs and Business Glasgow Strategy 2013 to 2018 (Exec Summary)</td>
<td>• Sets out ‘guiding principles’ of JBG for next 5 years. Mission: • To work in partnership to create a more resilient business base and support residents to compete for employment opportunities in and beyond the city. Two Strategic Goals: 1. Improve the competitiveness of residents and help to increase Glasgow’s employment rate; reducing the gap with Scotland and better performing UK cities 2. Improve business resilience and increase the number of sustainable small businesses in Glasgow; moving towards the levels achieved by better performing cities • Emphasises the importance of working in partnership both in relation to its employability and business objectives and also helping GCC and other ALEOs deliver on city’s wider economic development agenda. • Hence references to GEL; key sectors and making a contribution to the wider economic development agenda.</td>
<td>Identifies 7 key projects: • Wrapping around Work Programme • Engaging Glasgow’s hard to reach • <strong>Enhancing and sustaining Youth Gateway</strong> • Growing Glasgow’s small business base • Consolidate Employer Engagement – building on St. Enoch working partnership approach • Supporting Glasgow’s regeneration – build a best practice LOAN service • Maximizing JBG assets</td>
<td>• No specific targets in Exec Summary though strategic goals suggest aspiration to benchmark performance against Scotland and better performing UK cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Youth Employment</td>
<td>Specific Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community Safety Glasgow | - No relevant strategy documents found on website  
Vision: 'To work in partnership with other agencies and communities to create a safer, better, cleaner Glasgow, where equality and respect are paramount'  
- Website refers to an **Offender Management Strategy** which targets offenders aged 12 to 25.  
Key elements of this which potentially relate to youth employment include:  
- engaging individuals in alternative activities that could potentially divert them from future offending; and  
- tracking and managing the offending behaviour of individuals, and ensuring that there is a continuum of intervention measures in place to deal with them.  
- CSG are a core partner in the One Glasgow Reducing Offending Workstream.  
- Currently member of YEP. | - CSG are involved in delivering a number of employability activities. Some of these focus specifically on Young People and others on the wider group of offenders they work with as part of their contract with GCC CJSW as a provider of Community Payback Orders: unpaid work placements.  
- These should ideally get picked up in more detail via the mapping.  
**ChoiceWorks**  
- ChoiceWorks is part of a range of programmes delivered by the Offender Intervention service to identify and engage with young people involved in offending. Along with offender interventions it offers employability skills training and a 3 month work placement.  
**Community Payback Orders**  
- Work in partnership with APEX Scotland who provide employability advice and support to individuals on unpaid work placements with CSG.  
- In addition to providing unpaid work placements, CSG has recently set up the Recreate volunteer programme for those coming to the end of their placements. Funded via S27 budge, the 60 6-month placements will involve work with LES, RSLs, and voluntary work with CWG. | - ChoiceWorks will have targets to meet under P5.  
- No targets re. community payback orders and employability interventions.  
- Targets re. employability and learning may be included in future CPO contracts by CJSW. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Clyde Gateway URC/ Clyde Gateway LOAN Report (TERU, 2012)                            | - Staff at Clyde Gateway highlighted this report as most relevant given its focus on the role of Clyde Gateway in relation to linking opportunity and need (LOAN) in partnership with delivery agencies such as JBG and Routes to Work South (Lanarkshire).  
- Report jointly commissioned by GRA (now JBG) and Clyde Gateway with core purpose of identifying a set of recommendations to help improve the LOAN approach in the Clyde Gateway.  
- LOAN is defined as the process of connecting local residents to the jobs and opportunities created from investments in an area.  
- The need for LOAN interventions reflects the fact that jobs do not automatically trickle down to local residents – and even less so to disadvantaged residents. | Some key messages from report:  
- Over a third of working age residents are claiming out-of-work benefits. Of these, a disproportionate number are in receipt of incapacity benefits, male and aged over 25 years old.  
- In view of the worklessness statistics presented in Chapter 2 (i.e. more males, more claiming incapacity benefits, more claimants aged 25-49 and more claimants longer unemployed), engaging and supporting older client groups would appear to be a key priority.  
- This also reflects partners’ belief that there is **good quality and joined up provision for Clyde Gateway’s young unemployed** (particularly 16-19 year olds) through local authority youth structures and Clyde Gateway-specific projects.  
- This suggests that the efforts of Clyde Gateway and its partners delivery agencies such as JBG may be targeted at older residents i.e., 25 plus.  
- However report does highlight good practice in relation to Street League and Clyde Gateway URC programme uses football and referrals from organisations such as SDS to help engage young people.  
- Hence scope to better integrate mainstream employability content into more attractive delivery vehicles that are not explicitly job-related which may be worth considering when analyzing findings from the Youth Employment Project. |
|                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                         | The report does not include specific targets but broadly recommends:  
- a need to establish more systematic monitoring of LOAN activities across partners.  
For example, on a quarterly or six monthly basis, partners should be expected to provide information on:  
- Clyde Gateway residents engaged in last three or six month period.  
- Clyde Gateway clients actively engaged in mainstream employability services.  
- Clyde Gateway clients entering positive destinations.  
** worth considering how any of the above outcomes for young Glaswegians will feed into the bigger city picture as potential for double counting.  
** and how to ensure that any commissioning via Clyde Gateway targeting young people adds value as per recommendation in the TERU report. |
2. **GCC Associated Plans and Strategies:** whereby employability and/or youth employment is a strand within a services and/or ALEOs wider strategic plan. This is largely the legacy of the work of the Equal Access/Glasgow Works New Connections Team.

3.1 GCC Service Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Links to Employability/ Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Services</td>
<td>Joint Adult Services Plan 2013/15</td>
<td>Plan contains numerous references to employability throughout however no specific focus on young people/youth employment. The main focus is on the following: - Health and Social Work Services will continue to work in partnership with Glasgow Works, the strategic employability partnership, to develop specialist employability services to more effectively meet the needs of people who may have been long term unemployed and have significant barriers to overcome. - All health and social work assessment processes (including the Self Evaluation Questionnaire relating to Self Directed Support) now include a section on ‘employability aspirations’, which allows the service user to choose whether they would like to find out more about their options for work, training, education or volunteering. - Services will work to increase the number of service users accessing employability support as appropriate and ultimately moving into employment, maximising the range of employment opportunities linked to the Commonwealth Games in 2014 as well as supporting service users to access the volunteering opportunities, which will be available.</td>
<td>Increase number of services users engaged with employability services to 2,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets out the overall vision for adult and older people’s services in Glasgow. Sets out the key targets for 2013/15. Covers the following service areas/care groups: - Alcohol and Drugs - Mental Health - Homelessness - Adults with Disabilities - Older People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glasgow Integrated Children Services Plan, 2013 – 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Priorities include:</strong></td>
<td><strong>CJSW deals with adult offenders (aged 18 plus) and hence has tended to align itself more with Glasgow Works agenda versus YEP/youth employment.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is the core plan for children’s services in the City. Within Glasgow, the Glasgow Community Planning Partnership has devolved the responsibility for the planning and delivery of children’s services to the Children’s Service Executive Group.</td>
<td>• Raise Attainment and Achievement for all children.</td>
<td>• Between 11 April to 12 March 2012 CJSW staff made 493 referrals to the Bridging Service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Children’s Services Executive Group is a multiagency group that provides overall leadership and direction for children’s services in the City.</td>
<td>• Reduction of Child Poverty</td>
<td>A key focus for 2013 will be continuing to increase the proportion of service users engaged with employability services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This group is responsible for the development of the Plan and setting out our vision, aims and priorities for children services in the City.</td>
<td>• Looked after children; care leavers, youth crime are key focus areas in plan.</td>
<td>And making the most of the opportunity to provide employability support as a formal part of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GIRFEC is underpinning approach</td>
<td>• Links to work of Education/ESP Team, PLP/Child Poverty Group, Youth Justice, and Care Leavers Employment Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focuses on services that target the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children aged 0 to 18 years that require care and support from a number of agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CJSW Strategic Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Links to employability:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes the planning structure, partnership working and the activity that is taking place to achieve national and local priorities.</td>
<td>• <strong>Further embed Community Payback Orders</strong> Improve the quality of unpaid work: pilot a social enterprise scheme which improves opportunities for offenders to change through enhancing employment opportunities. See also CSG entry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledges that an ex-offender is less likely to break the law if he or she has stable accommodation, has supportive family relationships and employment opportunities.</td>
<td>• <strong>Employability</strong> identified as one of 4 key priority outcomes for offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan sets out proposals to improve service response to these key issues</td>
<td>• In relation to employability the plan highlights joint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Strategy/ Workplan 2013-2015</td>
<td>No specific references to employability in Youth Justice Strategy</td>
<td>Youth Justice Service works in part to GIRFEC framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth Justice sits under Children and Families.</td>
<td>• A key aim in the Youth Justice Workplan under preventing and diverting young people from offending is to ensure the links between YJSG and training/employability strategic work in the city. Lead partner: Education.</td>
<td>• An increase in the number of young people reaching positive destinations in relation to training or employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The service is responsible for the case management of young people aged 12-21 who are involved in both the Children's and Adult systems</td>
<td>• In relation to mapping work, another key aim identified in the workplan is to map, monitor and evaluate diversionary services in Glasgow with a timescale given of Dec 2013. Lead partners: GCPL, GL, 3rd sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The multi-agency Youth Justice Strategy Group in Glasgow has responsibility for planning and strategic development of services for young people involved in offending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• JBG and Education are members of YJSG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All of these agencies share joint responsibility for implementing the Youth Justice Strategy and ensuring that Glasgow’s young people achieve the best outcomes in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education: Early Years and Extended Service Strategy 2008-2013</th>
<th>The employability elements of the ECES strategy are focused more on parents than young people.</th>
<th>None found.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The ECES strategy has a strong focus on employability and tackling poverty/child poverty and the contribution that early year’s education and childcare can make.</td>
<td>• The Employability strand of this strategy will involve partnership working with Glasgow Works to deliver a comprehensive programme of Employability training and awareness raising for Council staff in Education establishments across the City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This work was supported by the GW New Connections Team however this picture is now out of date.</td>
<td>• This replicates the approach taken across Social Work, which has resulted in a significant increase in the number of people being referred from frontline Social Care to employability provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ** note this is a multi-agency strategy | | |
The ECES Strategy Group has drafted an Employability Action Plan with the following key aims:
- Ensure the highest quality of services to children
- Develop new employability practices
- Raise awareness of the employability agenda
- Increase engagement with parents – work with them in designing solutions.
- Build on the strengths and further develop the capacity of workers within the Early Years’ establishments
- This work was complemented by a revised admissions and pricing policy geared at supporting parents to return to work plus 5 pilot programmes to introduce the Employability Initiative.

** Progress with this work requires updating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land and Environment Services</th>
<th>No specific plans found relating to employment/youth employment nor references to provision of apprenticeships/work placements on Connect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity reported in relation to the provision of work placements (for both JBG and CSG clients) and apprenticeships should be picked up via the internal mapping exercise and the consultation with strategic stakeholders being taken forward via Workstream 2/3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 **Wider Council Family** – none identified, strategic plans/policies of ALEOs should be captured in Section 2.
### 4. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service &amp; Strategy/Plan</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Links to Employability/ Youth Employment</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Glasgow CJA Learning Skills and Employability Core Group Action Plan | - This plan has been included under **Other** due to its links with the Glasgow Works Board.  
- The GCJA LSE Group grew out of the original **Glasgow Offenders and Employability Strategic Group** set up jointly by the Boards of GW and the GCJA in 2010 as a short life policy group.  
- It was chaired by Cllr Stephen Curran and charged with reviewing the employability landscape for offenders/ex-offenders with a view to making improvements linked to the reducing reoffending agenda.  

**Key outputs of the strategic group included:**  
- Citywide consultation event with to raise awareness of issues/gaps and consult with 3rd sector and other agencies on solutions/improvements  
- Carrying out the **Mapping of employability support for Offenders in Glasgow 2011** with an accompanying set of recommendations for city partners to consider.  
- In partnership with the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, the group carried out a detailed consultation with employers the result of which was the publication of the | - The current LSE Core Group action plan is focused on offenders/ex-offenders 18 years plus.  
- It is led by the Glasgow CJA and chaired by Cllr. Pauline McKeever.  
- The action plan is being taken forward via 3 workstreams: Community, Prison, and Into Work  
- The action plan is more operationally focused than the original strategic group with a predominant feature being establishing clear referral pathways between the justice sector and employment and learning providers in the city.  
- In many ways this is now delivering on the recommendations from the original strategic group where possible.  
- The into work workstream is less directive and encompasses a number of developments relating to social enterprise/ILM type activities specific to offenders including Braveheart Industries, the CSG Recreate model, Open Gates, and work with the Grameen Bank. | None at this time. |
| Recommendations of the **Glasgow Employers' Advisory Group on Ex-offenders** |  |  |
The Education Working for All! Commission for Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce recommendations that have been accepted by the Scottish Government cover 6 broad areas, as follows:

- **Better preparing school leavers for the world of work** – to be achieved through
  - **expanding the scale and scope of young people’s interactions with and experiences of the workplace through quality assured and extended opportunities for work experience**;
  - **co-creation of school curricula between educationalists and business and**
  - **more opportunities for business mentoring and direct school and business partnership arrangements**

- **College education focused on employment and progression in learning** –
  - **greater focus on creating clear and coherent pathways from school, into college and into employment**
  - **greater role for industry involvement in the design and part delivery of credible business recognised qualifications throughout**

- **Modern Apprenticeships (MA) focused on higher level skills and industry needs as well as the introduction of ‘Foundation Apprenticeships’ for young people in their final year of school based education** –
  - **identification of the need to create industry based alternatives to and complementary learning for theoretical based higher education programmes delivered in college and university,**
  - **the potential to deliver some elements of practical based learning with young people whilst still on a school roll**

- **More employers engaging with education and recruiting more young people** –
  - the Commission identified the advantages for employers to form much closer partnership working with schools and colleges in the development of the key assets for their future success

- **Advancing Equalities** - specifically with reference to gender, ethnicity, disability and care leavers with a recognition that a long term structural multi-agency approach is required to successfully address this issue; and

- **Successful Implementation- Success Targets** – strong recommendation that the aspirations set out in the report should be underpinned by stretching targets set by the Government and addressed locally through partnerships between schools, colleges, business and training providers.