

BRISTOL

LEARNING CITY

MINUTES / ACTION NOTES LEARNING CITY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING 14 MARCH 2018

Actions Summary

Agenda Item	Actions from meeting	Who	When
Moving forward - priority work strands and Board membership	Further work to be taken forward to articulate / refine the proposed priority work strands as discussed at this meeting, and potential future Board membership with a view to a fully worked-up proposal being shared with the Board.	Tommy Jarvis	March-April 18

Attendees, Board members:

CLlr Anna Keen, Bristol City Council Cabinet member for Education & Skills - Chair
Karl Brown, Bristol Junior Chamber
Chris Curling, Society of Merchant Venturers
John Hirst, Destination Bristol
Laurence Pitt, Primary Heads Association Bristol
Sue Rogers, Bristol City Council
Steve West, University of the West of England
Phil Winfield, We The Curious

Apologies:

Jon Angell, Bristol Secondary Head Teachers and Principals Association
Claire Doherty, Arnolfini
Lee Probert, City of Bristol College
Adam Powell, West of England LEP
Professor Judith Squires, University of Bristol

Other attendees:

Tommy Jarvis, Learning City Strategic Lead
Victoria Bleazard, Programme Manager, Bristol City Council
Ian Hird, Bristol City Council Democratic Services

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Cllr Keen, chairing the Board for the first time in her role as BCC Cabinet member for Education & Skills, welcomed attendees to the meeting. Attendees introduced themselves.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked Phil Winfield (who is standing down from the Board) for his work and contribution to Learning City, particularly in relation to his chairing and leadership of the Learning in Communities Challenge Group.

1. MOVING FORWARDS

Outcomes and targets:

The Board noted a paper setting out draft Learning City outcomes and targets.

Role of Board / Learning City moving forwards:

Context for discussion:

It was suggested that at today's meeting the Board needs to consider the following questions/issues:

- Are we clear about what a Learning City looks like? Is the Learning City vision clear in practical terms? Is it clear to others?
- If the Board can agree that the areas of focus for the targets are accurate and relevant, (and tied clearly into the One City Plan), we may need to focus on two/three things on an annual basis and then review for each year.
- A Learning City strategy needs to deliver a meaningful impact. We need to create an appropriate strategic plan which can be shared with partners. This plan needs to show how we are involving partners in the construction and delivery of the activity – i.e. they have ownership of activity and outcomes, and that we are clear how the Board is holding itself to account for improvement on the described outcomes. Schools, for example need to be clear about what the Learning City offer is.
- Could/should we consider setting the 2-3 key priorities under (some of) the strands set out below? If so, the idea of a sponsor for each strand is very relevant. The sponsor would then draw the appropriate resource around them to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach to the outcomes required.

Potential strands:

- Careers Information, Advice and Guidance (CIAG) - an annual programme that is focused on activity we know will make the difference we are looking to make focused to what schools tell us they want/need.
- Attendance.
- School improvement bid/programme.

- Should the 3 current challenge groups be stood down, on the basis that the sponsored activities will create their own task and finish group to produce the strategy and appropriate actions?
- A performance framework can be created for the Board against the outcomes from each strategy plan with their identified impact measures. This needs to capture activity as well as impact and outcome measures. At each Board meeting, a “RAG” rated framework could be presented to Board members to show progress against the activity.
- Board membership – does this need to be reviewed, in the context of decisions about the above?

Main points raised in discussion:

Priority strands for future activity:

1. There was general agreement that the Board must now focus on 2-3 key priorities/strands as suggested above.
2. The approach must add value through collaboration and achieve outcomes that can only be achieved through this approach. The work taken forward as priority strands must be very intentional, and make genuine impacts that can be measured. There must be complete clarity and a suitably relevant narrative about the work being undertaken and no duplication of other activity already taking place. Crucially, the work/outcomes must make a tangible difference to young people.
3. There is a particular need to re-engage with head teachers. Head teachers must be given clarity about (and involved as appropriate in developing) the Board’s priorities and where it is seeking to add value and make a difference.
4. **Attendance** was felt to be a key area of focus to prioritise moving forwards, as this is a particular issue for Bristol. The focus must be on attendance **and** engagement, recognising the crucial importance, for example, of re-engaging disaffected year 7 and year 8 students, and also of engaging parents.
5. In terms of the challenge groups, it was felt that the Learning for Work challenge group is working effectively; this is not the case in relation to the Learning in Education challenge group. It was noted also that with imminent departure of Phil Winfield, the Learning in Communities challenge group has probably run its course; however, it will be important to retain a community “lens” in terms of assessing the impacts of future actions within communities across Bristol. It will also be important to retain the active engagement of the voluntary sector.
6. **CIAG** was also felt to be a key area of focus to prioritise. Steve West gave an update on the approach being taken forward currently, under the sponsorship of UWE, to deliver a careers pilot platform, offering careers guidance and support, and toolkits to support teachers and participants. This work was commercially sensitive currently but it is hoped that the approach will be finalised within the next 2-3 months. The intention is that this platform will form a city region offer. UWE could therefore potentially be the sponsor for this in the context of CIAG

being an area of priority for Learning City, joining up with other key areas of activity such as the WORKS project and Future Quest.

7. Another priority area of focus could be the development of a project **that adds value in primary /early years**. This can also be valuable in terms of re-engaging primary heads with Learning City. It will be important to engage primary heads to ensure their buy-in to a targeted piece of work – this might include taking forward specific actions to try to close the gap (by year 3) for those year 1 pupils who are assessed as being below where they need to be educationally.

One City Plan:

Victoria Bleazard gave a brief overview of the current work on the development of the One City Plan. Further work, including further discussion with stakeholders would be taking place through March - April ahead of the launch of the draft plan on 8 June.

The One City approach involves working to embed place based leadership and in doing so:

- unite public purpose in the city.
- mobilise energies (& resource) across the city.
- make additional contribution over-and-above existing agencies.
- through a co-ordinated approach, target our limited resources for greater impact & bring new funds to Bristol
- and, in doing so, drive down inequality.

The Chair suggested that in the context of the One City Plan, it may be useful to instigate an annual review / liaison meeting, involving representatives from the key partnership boards, including Learning City and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Membership:

In discussion, it was felt that the Board membership needs to be reviewed to ensure it is fully fit-for-purpose in the context of the Learning City vision and in delivering the identified priorities moving forwards. This may involve some adjustment to membership although the following “sectors” should be involved (in each case, senior level representation is essential – Board members must be able to influence their own and other organisations, and think creatively):

- BCC Cabinet member for Education & Skills (Chair)
- Business sector
- BCC education and skills
- Universities
- Secondary schools
- 16-19 college sector
- Primary schools
- Voluntary sector

Conclusions/next steps:

The light of the above discussion points, it was agreed that the following areas can be considered as key strands/areas of focus for the Board moving forwards, with sponsors to be identified for each strand:

1. Attendance and engagement: a strategy group will need to be formed to act as the effective sponsor, involving key BCC officers and relevant partners. The group will need to develop a strategic plan and a programme of measurable activity.
2. CIAG: UWE to potentially be the sponsor for this strand, linking in with the developing careers platform proposal, as discussed earlier at this meeting.
3. A primary/early years specific project.

It was noted that Tommy Jarvis will undertake further work to articulate / refine the proposed priority work strands and potential future Board membership with a view to a more fully worked-up proposal being shared with the Board.

3. LEARNING CITY UPDATES

NOTES AND ACTIONS FROM LAST MEETING – 8 NOVEMBER 2017

The notes of the 8 November meeting were confirmed as a correct record and noted, together with an update on actions taken arising from that meeting.

**** Meeting close: 6.40 pm ****