

Local Employability Partnership Maturity Self-Assessment 2024

Final Report

May 2025



CONTENTS

SECTION 1: Overview Page 3

- Overview
- Background
- Purpose
- Process
- Completion Rate
- Emerging Themes
- Organisational Responses
- Reports and Recommendations to LEPs

SECTION 2: Review of Responses Page 8

- LEP Ratings
- Section Ratings

SECTION 3: Areas for Improvement Page 9

- Leadership and Relationships
- Governance
- Use of Data and Evidence
- Stakeholders and Resources
- Performance, Accountability, and Impact
- No One Left Behind Products
- Collated Recommendations

APPENDICES Page 17

<u>APPENDIX 1</u>	LEP Maturity Assessment- Briefing Paper.....	Page 17
<u>APPENDIX 2</u>	LEP Maturity self-assessment questions	Page 19
<u>APPENDIX 3</u>	Interim report- Emerging Themes	Page 22
<u>APPENDIX 4</u>	Overview Summary – without comments	Page 28
<u>APPENDIX 5</u>	Sample recommendations shared with LEPs.....	Page 41

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

The Local Employability Partnership (LEP) Maturity Self-Assessment was carried out over autumn 2024 with almost 300 completed submissions from employability partners from across all 32 local authority areas.

This exercise was designed to support action 1.2 in the Employability Strategic Plan 2024 – 2027, in relation to Priority 1 – Continuing to Improve the Employability System. Action 1.2 within the plan states: We will work collectively to review the Local Employability Partnership (LEP) Framework to ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities, supporting further capacity building and strengthening of representation across communities and sectors.

This most recent self-assessment was the third time that LEPs had been asked to review their wider relationships, processes, and structures, with the first two iterations being closely aligned with the Public Sector Improvement Framework process. The previous assessments were carried out in Spring 2021 and Autumn 2022.

A small working group of officers from the Improvement Service (IS), Scottish Government (SG) Employability Improvement team and Office of the Chief Economic Advisor (OCEA) met to review the assessment questions and agreed that a slightly different, and shorter, process would align with the requirements to evidence progress in strengthening Local Employability Partnerships.

The topics that were agreed for inclusion were:

- Leadership and Relationships
- Governance
- Use of Data and Evidence
- Stakeholders and Resources
- Performance, Accountability, and Impact
- No One Left Behind Products

PURPOSE

The key aim of this self-assessment was to support LEPs in reviewing areas such as governance, accountability, leadership, and performance management, ensuring that LEPs recognise the jointly developed LEP Framework and to help them deliver on the No One Left Behind ambitions.

It was planned that individual LEP Maturity Reports would be collated, including all partner responses, and could then be used at a local level to review strengths and areas for improvement, leading to the development of an improvement plan for the LEP.

It was also intended to provide a local and national overview of what was working well and highlight where improvement was required. This would also provide a baseline that LEPs could use to assess progress in future years.



An additional benefit was that national organisations, such as Department for Work and Pensions and Skills Development Scotland, would be able to use the information to further develop consistent offers and support more effective engagement with LEPs.

The final expected outcome was that examples of good practice would emerge and there would be a better understanding of areas for improvement across the wider SLAED People network. A series of thematic workshops and capacity building sessions would then be planned, to support upskilling of employability teams and wider partners.

PROCESS

A meeting was held with LEP Chairs in September 2024, who were asked to cascade the briefing note and the link to the survey to their own LEP members. Many of the Chairs then hosted their own local briefing sessions for partners, before rolling the survey out via a Smart Survey link. The survey was open for a total of 7 weeks to allow for completion.

Briefing Note shared with all partners can be found at [Appendix 1](#).

There were 40 questions across the six topics, the majority of these were multiple choice with one final question at the end of each section to allow for free text to comment on any of the questions and/or provide feedback on any relevant point.

The breakdown of all the questions is available at [Appendix 2](#).

COMPLETION RATE

There were 297 completed responses from across the 32 LEPs – with response rate of between 2 returns and 17 completed submissions. The one area with two responses did not receive a completed report due to lack of information provided to make it worthwhile.

Of the 297 responses, there were a total of 850 individual comments across the whole survey. Within these, there was a blend of comments and statements highlighting suggested areas for improvement, along with others sharing perceptions of things that were working well.

Responses varied across LEPs and organisations, with a good number being received from:

- Local Government Employability – 63
- Local Government Other - 47
- Skills Development Scotland – 38
- Further/Higher Education – 25
- Third Sector Interface – 22
- Department for Work and Pensions – 21
- Third Sector Other – 17

There was a disappointingly low number of responses from NHS – with only 12 from NHS Workforce and 7 from Public Health. Business Gateway and Chamber of Commerce were both underrepresented, with a total of five from across both organisations.

The full number of responses by organisation can be seen in the Overview Summary at [Appendix 4](#).

EMERGING THEMES

An interim report was produced in November 2024 which highlighted the emerging themes that were identified during the first read through of results. This report is included at [Appendix 3](#).

Some of the key themes that emerged were:

- perception of uneven levels of participation across some stakeholders.
- underrepresentation of private sector and/or employers in most areas.
- a call for greater transparency in decision making.
- requirement for more service user voice in service design.
- a request for better data from all partners; and
- a real interest in learning from other areas.

There were also several comments which suggested that some LEPs could do better at communication and information sharing, some agreed that they should review their structures and ensure that relevant sub-groups were established, and the majority recognised that they could do more around supporting the voice of lived experience in service review and design.

Data was a key theme throughout, and some members requested more effective performance monitoring and identified that better sharing of information was required to support evidence-based planning. There was a mixed opinion of how well partners shared resources and information – with many suggesting that all partners could do more to share local resources and information on budgets.

There needs to be more accountability of sharing the required data to support the LEP do what it needs to do, and this needs to happen in a timely manner.

Many agreed that there was still some work to be done on rationalising activity and avoiding duplication and that a more targeted approach to reaching those who are inactive or not engaged with other services.

And finally, most agreed that they could do with a refresher and wider sharing of NOLB products, with a few suggesting that an induction pack and/or handbook would be useful for new partner representatives. Sharing of best practice across wider networks was also suggested as a way to help develop service offers and support improvement.

I think it would be beneficial for new members to be provided with an overview and induction into the LEP and the NOLB tools and products to ensure that they have a full understanding of what is available and are able to contribute effectively.

ORGANISATIONAL RESPONSES

Collated responses from the national partners, Skills Development Scotland, Department for Work and Pensions, Third Sector (interface and other) and Health – including Boards, Workforce and Public Health - were shared with pre-identified managers for the purpose of reviewing their representative's perceptions and helping to strengthen future engagement.

The collated responses for each 'partner' were generally consistent with the overall feedback across the wider survey. A summary from the feedback to each organisation is noted below:

Department for Work and Pensions:

The majority of respondents are confident in the LEP membership and discussions. There were some points raised around the structure which needs to be clearer with better outputs to hold organisations to account and there was however a recurring theme on the lack of pace in meeting the needs of customers. On the whole there appears to be great relationships and collaboration.

There was some feedback that there appears to be a lack of representation from the private sector, this did not go into any further detail.

There is a lot of sharing of good information however a standout area appears to be the lack of robust up to date outcome data on NOLB support which would allow LEPs to measure effectiveness and support better decision making.

Lorna Gilmour - DWP

NHS/ Health representatives:

Generally, respondents felt things were going well and improving, however there was a sense that subgroups could be better connected into the LEPs and that there could be greater transparency around funding decisions in particular areas.

There was also a sense that there could be greater sharing of data, evaluation, and outcomes in some areas, and that respondents were not aware of how feedback from service users was gathered, analysed, and actioned.

A high proportion of respondents were not aware of NOLB product & tools or the shared measurement framework, with 59% agreeing that further training and support on these would be beneficial.

However, it is worth noting that the sample of responding Health Boards was quite small.

Rebecca Hunter – SG

Skills Development Scotland:

Majority of respondents from SDS felt that partners worked well to develop key relationships around the LEP table. However, there are concerns about the dominance of Local Authorities in decision-making which can undermine the collaborative spirit of the LEP.

Respondents felt that LEP members understand their roles and responsibilities and are sufficiently senior to make decisions. Nonetheless, there is a need for better information sharing and a more strategic focus.

The use of data and evidence is another area for improvement, with calls for more systematic data gathering and better use of lived experience data. Regular reviews of funded activities are also necessary to ensure they meet community needs.

Performance, accountability, and impact are areas where clearer articulation of key performance indicators (KPIs) and more regular service user feedback are needed. While there is awareness of No One Left Behind (NOLB) products, most respondents from SDS expressed a need for further training and support around these tools.

There is a real desire to share practice and consider ways to pull resources where it makes sense to do so.

Evonne Boyd - SDS

Third Sector:

There is an overall sense that in most areas, things are going well and improving. There are a small number of areas which seem to be stuck and are struggling to move out of a space where the LEP feels local authority dominated or discussions and funding decisions are not as transparent as they could be.

Other than sharing good practice the main areas for focus for the third sector seem to be around service design, improving sharing of performance data for learning, improving input to strategic planning and funding decisions and improving awareness and application of No One Left Behind tools.

Pegs Bailey – TSI

FINAL REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO LEPs

Final reports were shared with 31 LEPs who had enough responses to make the exercise worthwhile. Only one LEP did not receive a report as they only submitted two responses, so there was not enough useable data to collate a report.

The reports included the collated responses and comments from each partner, along with Strengths and Challenges that emerged from each section and also a series of recommendations designed to strengthen the LEP. The number of recommendations varied from eight to twelve depending on the reported areas for improvement. Sample recommendations are noted at [Appendix 5](#).

The individual reports were shared with all LEP Chairs over December 2024 and January 2025.

SECTION 2: REVIEW OF RESPONSES

LEP RATINGS

The Employability Partnership Manager, who was the only individual to have oversight of all returns, undertook an exercise to review the ratings of each section of the survey for each LEP and devised a simplistic approach to rating these, based on both scoring in each section and comments from partners.

Please note that this scoring is subjective and will only be used to offer support to enable future development of relevant LEPs.

LEP POSITION STATEMENT	Number meeting criteria	Percentage
LEP is extremely effective 5 sections = good	13	42%
LEP is very effective 4 sections = good	3	10%
LEP is somewhat effective 2-3 = good + 2-4 = ok	9	29%
LEP is not so effective 1-4 = good/ok + 1-2 = poor	3	10%
LEP is not at all effective 3+ = poor	3	10%

Early contact has been made with the three LEPs in the lowest category and some guidance has been offered to help review the recommendations and to support further development of the LEP.

A further session will be arranged with the SLAED People Executive group to understand what other support may be effective, and whether there is capacity to offer further support or mentoring to the other LEPs in the next lowest category.

SECTION RATINGS

As above, an exercise was also undertaken to review how many LEPs met the Good, Average or Poor ratings for each section, and these are noted below. As above, this is purely subjective and reflect an average scoring based on number of responses who agreed/disagreed with each comment in the section.

RATING/ SECTION	Leadership & relationships	Governance	Data & evidence	Stakeholders & resources	Perform, account & imp
GOOD	20	22	16	20	26
AVERAGE	9	7	10	7	2
POOR	2	2	5	4	3

Data and evidence emerged as the area which most respondents suggested required some work to ensure that all partners provided, had access to and were using the same data in their area.

SECTION 3: AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT & PARTNERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

** Throughout the following section, the 'Percentage who agree' is based on Strongly agree and Agree responses*

Leadership and Relationships

93% agree that the key organisations were involved and contributed effectively to relationships.

85% agree that all sectors are represented on the LEP.

88% concur that members work effectively together; and

86% agree that all members have an equal voice.

*No issue with leadership.
Relationships could be improved
with more proactive
collaboration from all LEP
partners.*

The structure of most LEPs seems to be working well and members appear to be in agreeance that they have appropriate representation. However, from the comments, there were a few who felt that some partners were more active than others and that there was a distinct lack of input or representation of, or from, employers.

There was also a suggestion that the roles of partners on the LEP require to be clarified, with expectations of what a particular organisation could be contributing. Some partners felt that, in certain areas, the LEP was very much LA led, in both the alignment of priorities and decision making. This is something that will be addressed through the review of the LEP Framework which is currently underway.

Whilst there is representation on a few LEPs from Developing Young Workforce (DYW) or their local Chamber of Commerce or Business Gateway, quite a few partners suggested that there was a distinct lack of representation from employers.

*I feel there is not a strong enough voice of employers in the LEP.
I would like to hold a dedicated employers meeting once per year.*

Recommendations

- Consider the addition of specific roles and responsibilities of partners to be included in the review of the LEP Framework.
- Review the membership of LEPs and investigate whether there is a better way to establish more effective employer engagement and interaction – potentially at national level.
- Encourage local and national employer interface events, to secure input to LEPs at a local level and to ensure that the voice of employers is heard and considered at national policy level.

Governance

89% of members understand their roles and responsibilities.

90% of members are sufficiently senior to make decisions.

87% agree the LEP has a vision and strategic direction.

86% say all members are committed to the vision and direction.

75% have appropriate structures and sub-groups in place.

87% share information from their organisation to the LEP to influence decision making.

78% agree they share information back to their organisations from the LEP.

We have discussed sub-groups as a LEP and are keen not to introduce more groups if possible. However, I do believe that there is still work to do to ensure a golden thread between groups is developed.

Whilst the majority agree that members understand their roles and are sufficiently senior to make decisions, the two areas which scored lowest in this section were around structure and sub-groups and also around the sharing of information back to partners own organisations.

Whilst some said that they have recently established sub-groups, or are currently reviewing their effectiveness, it was suggested that there could be too many groups, and that LEPs needed to be clearer on the reasoning behind the sub-groups created. This will take careful consideration and sharing of best practice from other areas to ensure that the structure of each LEP is appropriate for the needs of their own communities.

Some of the information sharing issues experienced locally may be directly related to misunderstanding around what was sensitive information and what could be for public consumption. It was suggested that it should be made clear within each meeting, what level of detail could and should be fed back to colleagues.

We need to ensure that there is consistent guidance and support provided to LEP members as to role and expectations within LEP work and in relation to information sharing within their own organisation.

Recommendations

- Support gathering of examples and sharing of best practice on LEP structures and sub-groups through the LEP Chairs Network.
- Facilitate discussion across networks on appropriate information sharing and host a thematic workshop on Information Sharing best practice.

Use of Data and Evidence

82% agree the LEP has access to the data it need to support future planning.

87% agree that members share data, knowledge, and evidence to help plan and evidence success.

78% agree that the LEP regularly reviews funded activity to ensure it meets requirements.

71% agree they seek feedback from service users on quality and suitability.

Whilst all scores in this section were slightly lower than previous sections, and data has been recognised throughout the whole assessment as being lacking in many ways, the two main areas for improvement highlighted are around regular review of funded activity and seeking service user feedback to evaluate the quality and suitability of provision.

We need to agree a data set for use in planning. A gold standard needs identified. All partners need to bring evidence to the collective approach.

More than a few admitted that the local authority may collect and consider this, but there was a perceived lack of transparency as it wasn't very often shared at the LEP. Many thought that this was a missed opportunity and would help the LEP to ensure that funded activity was reviewed and evaluated, providing evidence and rationale for supporting future planning and funding decisions.

There were many mentions of investigating better service user involvement, both in reviewing provision, but also in supporting service design. Whilst some providers have mechanisms in place and lead the way in gathering service user feedback, this is rarely shared at LEP level.

I am not sure that anything other than numerical data is collected or there is any accountability for organisations that do not meet the targets they set in their applications.

Recommendations

- Work with national partners to investigate the production of a consistent dataset, building on the DWP external labour market packs, which have recently been produced.
- Support discussion at LEP Chairs Network around what local data and evidence would be relevant and appropriate to share at LEP meetings to support better review and evaluation of local provision.
- Help build confidence in the use of lived experience panels and user involvement in service design through ongoing promotion of the Service Design Group and community of practice.
- Host thematic workshops on both effective use of data and in how to facilitate lived experience input.

Stakeholders and Resources

74% agree the LEP has effective engagement and communication strategies to seek feedback.

66% think a wide range of partners have been involved in developing strategy and services.

86% agree their LEP engages with other public services.

84% think their LEP knows what resources are available across partners.

83% agree their organisations share resources to improve outcomes and strengthen delivery.

Again, the lowest percentage responses relate to communication and engagement with partners and service user involvement in developing services. This has been identified as a clear area for improvement and development and will require some concerted effort from all stakeholders to ensure that it is effective and more than a tokenistic activity.

The LEP is aware of the importance of engaging with stakeholders and is in the early days of making a plan for this.

There was also some recognition of the need for wider involvement of other council departments, who could help support better engagement with potential participants through their services. It was acknowledged that diminishing funding and resources across some departments would mean that partners would require to be more creative in aligning their resources and budgets to ensure better outcomes across the system.

Some partners alluded to the fact that the local strategy was really just the 'council' strategy and was also associated with funding conditions that came with the No One Left Behind grant offer. Communication of the wider benefits of employability, to support better understanding of the policy areas that it impacts on, was required both locally and at a national level.

A priority for the LEP is to speak with one voice and ensure that we all can represent and advocate for the LEP. Although we engage with a range of public services, we can always do more. I think it is important to have a shared identity.

Recommendations

- Ensure that lived experience/ service user involvement is included on the LEP Chairs Network agenda for discussion and sharing of good practice and consider minimum standard of engagement for input to service planning and review.
- Work with partners to develop a national employability communication plan to raise the profile of the wider employability offer and support better local communication and engagement.
- Work with COSLA to develop a briefing note and possible ongoing communications, along with a capacity building session for elected members.

Performance, Accountability, and Impact

81% understand the reporting requirements attached to NOLB funds.

78% agree the LEP regularly considers performance data to drive improvement.

87% agree the LEP can evidence investment are in line with NOLB principles.

83% agree that investment decisions made by the LEP have improved accessibility.

80% agree that investment made by the LEP has helped reduce duplication.

77% agree that investment has helped ensure value for money.

80% agree that investment decisions help meet the needs of the community.

Reference was again made to the section on data and evidence, again partners suggest that more could be done to review performance and help drive improvement. Whilst it may not be appropriate to share performance data in full LEP meetings, it may be worth considering a performance review sub-group which would then report into the full LEP with any sensitive data removed.

Evidence is increasing and we are improving ways to ensure this can feed into delivery/decisions for future years. Ability to be data driven relies on staffing resource to make this happen.

The late allocation of funding – both from Scottish Government to Local Authorities, and then the time it takes to cascade out to providers – does have an impact on the overall provision of services – including value for money and duplication of services. Some of these issues were also highlighted in relation to lack of information shared by other organisations, local and national, who do not report into the LEP.

The idea that multi-annual funding would allow LEPs to fully review and streamline their funded activity, by ensuring that performance reviews and longer-term funding management could be implemented, was shared by a few.

The most shared comment was that performance and other relevant data requires to be shared by all partners to allow for thorough evaluation and planning of investment.

Funding a manager in the third sector interface has supported significant improvement in performance, alignment, and value for money. The impact of this has not yet been measured and explicit support for evaluation would be helpful.

Recommendations

- Establish a minimum level of performance data of LEP funded provision to be shared with LEP partners – or at the very least, a sub-group who can provide a level of assurance on delivery.
- Ensure appropriate representation on the Research Advisory Group to support future evaluation of the No One Left Behind delivery and ambitions.

No One Left Behind Products

48% are fully aware of the No One Left Behind tools and products available – 47% aware of some.

60% agree that LEP members encourage the use of products and tool to support delivery.

59% are aware of the Shared Measurement Framework with 32% being vaguely aware.

67% agreed that it would be useful for their LEP to receive further training on tools and products.

Whilst the majority of respondents (95%) had some awareness of the range of No One Left Behind tools and products that have been developed and produced over the last few years, use of these and understanding of the Shared Measurement Framework (SMF) could be improved.

Not sure what has already been shared, but making full use of training around these or having inductions to bring new LEP members up to speed on these may be good to consider.

Members who were newer to the LEP suggested that they identified it as a need, but that longer-term members may be more aware of the suite of products so may not need a refresher. Again, it was suggested that the products should be included as part of an induction pack for new members.

The SMF was the most mentioned gap in relation to lack of knowledge or understanding, but many other suggested that a general overview of all tools would be useful, with the potential to look at rolling out a programme of upskilling sessions around the different products.

There were also comments around sharing of structure, processes, and best practice from across all the LEPs, with input from Scottish Government and Improvement Service where relevant. It was also suggested that there was the opportunity to showcase and expand on how things like customer charter, service standards and service design had been implemented locally.

I would welcome our LEP Partners understanding how other LEPs function and also the sharing of good practice across LEPs. We could then introduce actions that we feel may be relevant and would support improvement in our own LEP - all LEPs should be open to this.

Recommendations

- Identify what existing tools and products should form a local induction pack for new members of LEPs.
- Establish a timetable of thematic workshops for wider employability networks, including examples of good practice for each topic.
- Consider whether there could be ongoing/ recorded webinars, training modules and a bank of information available and accessible by all members and delivery staff. This could be part of the role of the soon to be established Cross-sector Skills and Qualifications Group.

COLLATED RECOMMENDATIONS TO SUPPORT WIDER CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Leadership and Relationships:

- Consider the addition of specific roles and responsibilities of partners to be included in the review of the LEP Framework.
- Review the membership of LEPs and investigate whether there is a better way to establish more effective employer engagement and interaction – potentially at national level.
- Encourage local and national employer interface events, to secure input to LEPs at a local level and to ensure that the voice of employers is heard and considered at national policy level.

Governance:

- Support gathering of examples and sharing of best practice on LEP structures and sub-groups through the LEP Chairs Network.
- Facilitate discussion across networks on appropriate information sharing and host a thematic workshop on Information Sharing best practice.

Use of Data and Evidence:

- Work with national partners to investigate the production of a consistent dataset, building on the DWP external labour market packs, which have recently been produced.
- Support discussion at LEP Chairs Network around what local data and evidence would be relevant and appropriate to share at LEP meetings to support better review and evaluation of local provision.
- Help build confidence in the use of lived experience panels and user involvement in service design through ongoing promotion of the Service Design Group and community of practice.
- Host thematic workshops on both effective use of data and in how to facilitate lived experience input.

Stakeholders and Resources:

- Ensure that lived experience/ service user involvement is included on the LEP Chairs Network agenda for discussion and sharing of good practice and consider minimum standard of engagement for input to service planning and review.
- Work with partners to develop a national employability communication plan to raise the profile of the wider employability offer and support better local communication and engagement.
- Work with COSLA to develop a briefing note and possible ongoing communications, along with a capacity building session for elected members.

Performance, Accountability, and Impact:

- Establish a minimum level of performance data of LEP funded provision to be shared with LEP partners – or at the very least, a sub-group who can provide a level of assurance on delivery.

- Ensure appropriate representation on the Research Advisory Group to support future evaluation of the No One Left Behind delivery and ambitions.

No One Left Behind Products:

- Identify what existing tools and products should form a local induction pack for new members of LEPs.
- Establish a timetable of thematic workshops for wider employability networks, including examples of good practice for each topic.
- Consider whether there could be ongoing/ recorded webinars, training modules and a bank of information available and accessible to all members and delivery staff. This could be part of the role of the soon to be established Cross-sector Skills and Qualifications Group.

Susie Donkin
Employability Partnership Manager
May 2025

APPENDIX 1

LOCAL EMPLOYABILITY PARTNERSHIP (LEP)

MATURITY SELF-ASSESSMENT 2024 BRIEFING NOTE

Purpose:

To collate perspective from all partners across all LEPs, to review progress on the development of each LEP and support continuous improvement in the oversight and delivery of the Scottish and Local Government No One Left Behind ambitions.

This follows on from two previous LEP self-assessments, carried out in Spring 2021 and Autumn 2022.

Method:

A questionnaire has been developed by Improvement Service with support from the Scottish Government Employability Team and Office of the Chief Economic Advisor (OCEA) to ensure that the questions relate to the intentions of the original LEP Framework Document and are cognisant of the No One Left Behind ambitions and principles.

The survey is hosted in Smart Survey and consists of 40 questions in total – mainly multiple choice. The survey should take 10 – 15 minutes maximum if you choose to add personal comments after each section.

The survey will be distributed via the LEP Chairs to each of their partners. A minimum period of 15 working days will be allowed to ensure comprehensive feedback.

Themes:

The questions have been devised around the main themes of Leadership and Relationships, Governance, Use of Data and Evidence, Stakeholders and Resources, Performance, Accountability, and Impact, and No One Left Behind tools and products.

There is a sliding scale of five options for responses – from ‘strongly agree’ through ‘neither agree nor disagree’ to ‘strongly disagree’, an additional option of ‘don’t know’, with space for comment after each of the six sections.

Outputs:

Each LEP Chair will receive the compiled results for their own area to share with partners and various reports will be compiled at a national level – i.e., collated responses from partners such as DWP, SDS, Third Sector etc – to show strengths, challenges, and overall progress.

These organisational responses will be shared with an agreed senior officer for each organisation – i.e., National Third Sector Employability Engagement Manager, DWP Employer and Partnerships Lead, for sharing with their own organisations.

A national overview will be prepared by the National Employability Partnership Manager for sharing publicly with wider partners and available on the Improvement Service website.

It is envisaged that the individual LEP reports will support future development and improvement of the LEPs in each LA area, establish common challenges that can be tackled jointly with SG and other partners, as well as highlighting best practice and supporting ongoing capacity building.

It will also feed into the review and updating of the jointly developed [Local Employability Partnership Framework](#) document.

Timescales:

One LA/ LEP area has already trialled the survey, and this took place during the month of August. After a short review to ensure that the survey had been user friendly and delivered useful reports to the LEP, it will be rolled out to other LEPs by the end of September 2024.

For further information:

Please contact your LEP Chairperson or Susie Donkin, Employability Partnership Manager on 07885 582 870 or email Susie.donkin@improvementservice.org.uk

If you have any problem accessing or completing the survey, please contact Susie Donkin, as above.

APPENDIX 2

LEP MATURITY ASSESSMENT 2024 – List of questions

1. Please select the local authority area of the LEP you are a member of. If you are a member of more than one LEP, please complete a separate response for each LEP:
2. Which organisation do you represent on your LEP?
3. Please provide your email address:

Below is a list of statements relating to various aspects of LEP Framework. Please indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with each one of them:

CHOICES: Strongly Agree – Agree – Neither agree nor disagree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree – Don't know.

LEADERSHIP AND RELATIONSHIPS

4. The key organisations named in the LEP Framework are involved and contribute effectively to relationship development.
5. There is representation on our LEP from across Public, Private and Third sectors.
6. LEP members work effectively together to agree and achieve a shared purpose
7. All LEP members have an equal voice.
8. Is there any way that leadership and relationships within the LEP could be improved? Please tell us how.

GOVERNANCE

9. Overall, our LEP members understand their roles and responsibilities
10. Our LEP members are sufficiently senior to make decisions
11. Our LEP has a vision and strategic direction
12. All members are committed to our LEP's vision and direction
13. Our LEP has appropriate structures and sub-groups in place to support shared and effective decision making
14. LEP members share information from their own organisations to contribute to and influence decision making within the LEP.
15. LEP members share information on developments and decisions made at the LEP with their own organisations, to ensure collective understanding of the wider NOLB ambitions
16. Could any of the aspects of governance mentioned above be improved? Please tell us how.

USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE

17. Our LEP has access to the data it needs to contribute to the delivery plan and to highlight gaps in provision

18. LEP members share organisational data, local knowledge, and anecdotal evidence to help plan activity and illustrate success
19. Our LEP regularly reviews funded activity to ensure that it is meeting the requirements of the communities it serves
20. Our LEP seeks feedback from service users on the quality and suitability of services.
21. Is there any way the use of data and evidence used by your LEP could be improved? Please tell us how.

STAKEHOLDERS AND RESOURCES

22. Our LEP has effective engagement and communication strategies to seek feedback from relevant stakeholders
23. A wide range of partners, including service users, have been involved in developing local strategy and co-production of employability services, in line with the Scottish Approach to Service Design.
24. Our LEP engages with other relevant public services as required (such as those delivering money advice, housing and homelessness support, health and wellbeing and community justice)
25. Our LEP knows what resources (financial, staffing, assets etc) are available locally and how to access them
26. LEP member's organisations share resources (such as: information, training, premises, support) to improve outcomes and strengthen delivery.
27. Is there a way that engagement with stakeholders and use of resources could be improved? Please tell us how.

PERFORMANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND IMPACT

28. LEP members understand the reporting requirements attached to NOLB funds
29. Our LEP regularly considers performance data to help drive improvement and transformation
30. Our LEP is able to evidence that their employability investment decisions are in line with the NOLB principles
31. Investment decisions made by our LEP have improved accessibility to employability services in our area.
32. Investment decisions made by our LEP have helped reduce duplication
33. Our LEP can demonstrate that investment decisions have helped meet the needs of our communities.
34. Could data and evidence be better used to support performance, accountability, and impact? Please tell us how.

NOLB PRODUCTS

35. Are you aware of the range of NOLB products and tools that are available (for example: principles, service standards, customer charter, data toolkit, ERI framework etc)
36. LEP members encourage the use of NOLB products and tools across wider partners to support the delivery of employability services

37. Are you aware of the Shared Measurement Framework
38. Would it be useful for your LEP to receive further training and support around the NOLB tools and products?
39. If yes, please specify which tools?
40. Is there a way that we could support better use of the NOLB tools and products mentioned above? Please tell us how.

APPENDIX 3

REPORT: DRAFT THEMES EMERGING FROM THE LEP MATURITY SELF-ASSESSMENT – November 2024

INTRODUCTION

This initial report to share with the Partnership Assurance Group was drafted by the Employability Partnership Manager, with support from Improvement Service Public Sector Improvement Framework team, SG Employability Improvement Team, and Chat GPT. Given that there were 780 comments in total, across the six main sections, the IS PSIF team supported use of Chat GPT to analyse the comments and provide a summary on the top five themes in each section.

The information provided from Chat GPT was reviewed against a first read of the comments by the Employability Partnership Manager and was agreed as an initial high-level summary, with further manual review required to highlight examples and suggest recommendations. This will be carried out as part of the National Overview Report.

COMPLETION INFORMATION

Responses were collected between 23rd September and 8th November. There was a total of 438 submissions, with 141 incomplete responses. A total of 297 fully completed responses were made within the period. Only completed responses are included in the report.

Whilst responses were made by members from every LA area, the LEP with the most responses were Midlothian (17), with the least number of completed surveys being received from Shetland (2). Further analysis of each individual LEP will be undertaken to identify where there are gaps in representation, and to recognise where there is good practice with a wide range of organisations being represented and contributing.

Participants were also asked to identify which organisation they represented on their LEP. Whilst over one third of responses came from local government, across various directorates, there was excellent representation from Skills Development Scotland – 38 responses, with a full return across every area and additional officers contributing in some areas, Department for Work and Pensions with 21 responses and the third sector – with a total of 39 responses across Third Sector Interfaces and a number of other third sector representatives who are represented on their respective LEPs.

Further and Higher Education was fairly well represented, with 25 responses, with NHS including Workforce, Public Health, and Health – Other, contributing 22 responses.

The sector least represented across the exercise was business and employer organisations. This has also been mentioned in some of the comments.

1. LEADERSHIP AND RELATIONSHIPS

In all sections of the survey, the overwhelming majority of the responses – between 70 – 90% for each question – was made against ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’. It is important to note that the wording of the free text questions allows for comments and suggestions on areas which could be improved, rather than asking feedback on what was going well. However, there are many comments stating that respondents thought that activity – whether that be collaboration, data, information sharing etc - in their area was going well or was improving.

The first section of the survey focussed on the balance of representation, in line with the existing LEP Framework. It sought to identify whether there was a level of representation across the public, third and private sector, and whether there was agreement that members worked effectively together and shared a vision and voice.

This first section had most comments, with 167 responses. The top five themes are:

1. **Leadership and Governance:** Concerns about the level of influence the Local Authority (LA) has over decision-making in the LEP, with calls for more shared leadership and active involvement from other sectors in the decision-making process.
2. **Collaboration and Partnership:** The importance of strong relationships and collaboration between the public, private, and third sectors is emphasised, with a particular call for increased private sector/employer involvement and more active participation from all partners.
3. **Equality of Voice and Participation:** There are concerns about uneven levels of participation, with some partners contributing more than others. The desire for more equal representation and collaborative decision-making is a key point.
4. **Private Sector Engagement:** The underrepresentation of the private sector/employers in the LEP is highlighted as a significant issue. There is a call for greater involvement from businesses, either through direct participation or advisory roles, to ensure employer needs are addressed.
5. **Clarity and Transparency in Decision-Making:** A need for greater transparency in decision-making processes, particularly regarding funding allocations and resource use, is stressed. Clearer communication, better tracking of progress, and the use of performance indicators are also seen as essential.

2. GOVERNANCE

A focus on roles and responsibilities, vision, strategic direction, and the sharing of information to support understanding and decision making were the main topics of section 2.

The top five themes from 130 comments made in this section are:

1. **Communication and Information Sharing:** A central theme is the need for improved communication within the LEP, especially in terms of sharing meeting minutes, decisions, and updates across member organisations to ensure alignment and transparency.
2. **Governance and Decision Making:** The comments highlight the importance of strengthening governance structures and decision-making processes within the LEP. There is a desire for

clearer roles, responsibilities, and processes to enhance overall functioning and accountability.

3. **Sub-Groups and Collaboration:** The effectiveness of sub-groups is a key theme. Members express a need for more focused and structured sub-groups that encourage collaboration across sectors and regions to address specific issues and challenges.
4. **Strategic Direction and Planning:** The need for a clearer strategic vision, long-term planning, and better alignment with regional goals is emphasised. There are calls for a more focused and forward-looking approach to planning within the LEP.
5. **Engagement and Accountability:** Active engagement from all members is essential. Some members raised concerns about inconsistent participation and attendance, with a call for stronger accountability to ensure members are contributing meaningfully toward shared goals.

3. USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE

Data and evidence were the focus of this section, with questions around whether the LEP had enough access to data and effective data sharing between partners to support development of delivery plans. It also asked whether delivery was reviewed, and service users were consulted to support evaluation of quality and suitability.

Based on 146 comments, here are the top five themes that emerge in this section:

1. **Data Collection and Sharing:** A major theme throughout the comments is the challenge of data sharing, especially among different agencies and stakeholders within the LEP. There are concerns about inconsistent data collection methods, data protection issues, and the difficulty of accessing or sharing essential data across various organisations. There's a push for improved data sharing agreements, standard platforms, and more systematic collection methods.
2. **Lived Experience and Service User Feedback:** Another prominent theme is the need for more involvement from service users and individuals with lived experience in decision-making and service design. Many comments suggest that while data is available, it doesn't always capture the qualitative insights that could better inform decisions. Increasing the voice of service users in LEP activities, including through dedicated panels or more structured feedback systems, is repeatedly emphasised.
3. **Data Maturity and Evidence-Based Planning:** There is a strong emphasis on improving data maturity to better support planning, monitoring, and decision-making. LEP members are calling for a more coordinated approach to collecting and using data, a "gold standard" for datasets, and the development of a more evidence-based approach to planning, which would lead to more targeted and effective strategies.
4. **Collaboration and Co-ordination:** Many comments highlight the importance of stronger coordination between different organisations within the LEP, including local authorities, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Skills Development Scotland (SDS), and other stakeholders. There are concerns that data is sometimes siloed within organisations, which can hinder the LEP's ability to have a holistic understanding of local needs and gaps in service provision.
5. **Performance Monitoring and Accountability:** The need for more effective performance monitoring is discussed frequently, with calls for clearer data on the impact of funded programs, service outcomes, and whether these efforts are truly addressing local needs.

There is also a desire for better tracking of the effectiveness of different service delivery models, ensuring that funding is appropriately allocated, and its impact is clearly demonstrated.

4. STAKEHOLDERS AND RESOURCES

Section 4 of the survey sought to understand whether the LEP had developed wider relationships and links with local stakeholders, and to help understand whether they were making best use of relevant services, local knowledge, and resources to offer a more holistic support.

Summary of the 112 comments in this section focus on the following key areas:

1. **Stakeholder Engagement & Communication:** There is a strong focus on improving engagement with various stakeholders, including service users, employers, public services, and third-sector organisations. A recurring suggestion is to enhance communication strategies, such as developing formal engagement plans, improving internal and external communication, and increasing visibility through digital platforms and shared spaces.
2. **Co-production & Lived Experience:** The importance of involving service users and individuals with lived experience in service design and delivery is a key theme. There is a call for more formal structures to include service users' feedback in co-design processes, and some suggest employing a lived experience officer to strengthen this involvement.
3. **Resource Sharing & Collaboration:** Many participants highlight the need for better sharing of resources, both financial and in-kind, among partner organisations. This includes sharing physical spaces, training, and staffing resources to maximise efficiency and reduce duplication. Collaborative efforts across organisations, including local authorities, the third sector, and employers, are seen as critical to success.
4. **Funding & Strategic Planning:** Issues around funding are a consistent theme. Concerns include the delays in Scottish Government funding, the impact of short-term financial arrangements on long-term planning, and the need for more multi-year funding options to ensure sustainability and allow for forward planning. There is also a call for better understanding of funding streams and more flexibility in resource allocation.
5. **Improvement of Service Delivery & Holistic Support:** A recurring theme is the need to improve the delivery of services, including addressing silos within organisations, enhancing co-operation between different departments, and making services more integrated and accessible. Participants advocate for a more holistic approach to employability and related services, ensuring that various public and third-sector agencies work together more effectively to meet the needs of individuals.

5. PERFORMANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND IMPACT

Many of the questions in this section were around reporting requirements, how data and other evidence is used to review and drive improvement and how the LEP use this to improve accessibility, reduce duplication and ensure value for money in line with NOLB principles.

From the 106 comments in this section, below are the five key themes:

1. **Data and Evidence Usage:** The importance of using data to inform decision-making, track performance, and measure impact is a recurring theme. There is an emphasis on improving data collection, sharing, and analysis to guide future actions and ensure more effective and targeted interventions. This includes the development of tools like an Employment Index, better tracking of data from multiple partners, and using evidence to assess the effectiveness of programs.
2. **Duplication and Coordination:** Several references discuss the challenge of reducing duplication in services across different organisations, ensuring that funding is used efficiently, and avoiding overlap in service delivery. There is a call for more collaboration and better coordination to streamline services and reduce inefficiency.
3. **Performance and Impact Evaluation:** The need for a consistent framework to assess the effectiveness of funding and programs is highlighted. There are calls for more frequent and transparent sharing of performance data with all stakeholders, as well as using that data to continuously improve service delivery and achieve better outcomes for the target populations.
4. **Funding and Resource Allocation:** The text highlights concern about the timing and uncertainty of funding, especially with year-to-year allocation processes. There is a need for better planning and long-term investment strategies to ensure sustainability and value for money in employability initiatives.
5. **Targeting and Inclusivity:** There is a strong emphasis on ensuring that employability services reach the most vulnerable or underrepresented groups, such as economically inactive individuals, ethnic minorities, and those facing multiple barriers to employment. Efforts to improve targeting and ensure services meet local needs are a key theme.

6. No One Left Behind Products

This section of the survey focused on the awareness of No One Left Behind products and tools, with a specific ask on Shared Measurement Framework (SMF). It also sought to identify how active LEP members were in encouraging delivery partners to utilise these products and tools and gauge appetite for further training.

Based on 119 responses, here are key themes that emerge:

1. **Need for Regular Refresher and Overview Sessions:** Many comments emphasised the importance of offering refresher sessions or overview workshops for all tools and products related to the LEP. These sessions would help new members understand available tools and resources and allow existing members to stay up to date, ensuring all partners can use these tools effectively.
2. **Importance of Induction and Onboarding for New Members:** A recurring suggestion is to provide more formal onboarding for new members, particularly by offering induction sessions on the NOLB tools and frameworks. This would help new members quickly grasp how to navigate and contribute to LEP activities, ensuring they understand the tools' relevance and application.
3. **Specific Interest in the Data Toolkit and Shared Measurement Framework (SMF):** There is a strong focus on increasing awareness and usage of the Data Toolkit and Shared Measurement Framework. Respondents highlighted that further training or a refresher on

these tools would be valuable, as they are key resources for evaluating effectiveness and measuring progress.

4. **Training and Support for Wider Engagement:** Several respondents pointed out the need for continuous training, especially for partners with less direct involvement in the tools or those who may not be as familiar with them. Smaller training sessions, either for front-line staff or specific partner groups, could help improve engagement and utilisation of these tools.
5. **Sharing Best Practices and Cross-LEP Learning:** Some respondents suggested that regular sessions focused on sharing best practices and learning from other LEPs would be beneficial. This could involve discussing how other LEPs are using the tools effectively and integrating that knowledge to improve the practices within their own LEP.

This is a summary of the main themes that emerged from a first review and AI supported summary. Further analysis and review of comments to support the identification of recommendations require to be carried out before this is presented more widely.

SUSIE DONKIN
Employability Partnership Manager
25 November 2024

APPENDIX 4

LEP Maturity Self-Assessment 2024










Overview Summary – No Comments

2. About you
















1. Please select the local authority area of the LEP you are a member of. If you are a member of more than one LEP, please complete a separate response for each LEP:

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Aberdeen City	<div></div>	2.36%	7
2	Aberdeenshire	<div></div>	2.69%	8
3	Angus	<div></div>	3.03%	9
4	Argyll & Bute	<div></div>	2.02%	6
5	Clackmannanshire	<div></div>	4.04%	12
6	Dumfries & Galloway	<div></div>	2.02%	6
7	Dundee City	<div></div>	1.35%	4
8	East Ayrshire	<div></div>	5.05%	15
9	East Dunbartonshire	<div></div>	2.69%	8
10	East Lothian	<div></div>	1.68%	5
11	East Renfrewshire	<div></div>	3.03%	9
12	Edinburgh, City of	<div></div>	3.37%	10
13	Eilean Siar	<div></div>	1.68%	5
14	Falkirk	<div></div>	3.03%	9
15	Fife	<div></div>	3.70%	11
16	Glasgow	<div></div>	3.70%	11
17	Highland	<div></div>	2.36%	7
18	Inverclyde	<div></div>	3.37%	10
19	Midlothian	<div></div>	5.72%	17
20	Moray	<div></div>	1.68%	5
21	North Ayrshire	<div></div>	5.39%	16
22	North Lanarkshire	<div></div>	2.69%	8
23	Orkney Islands	<div></div>	4.71%	14

1. Please select the local authority area of the LEP you are a member of. If you are a member of more than one LEP, please complete a separate response for each LEP:






24	Perth & Kinross		3.70%	11
25	Renfrewshire		4.71%	14
26	Scottish Borders		1.68%	5
27	Shetland Islands		0.67%	2
28	Stirling		3.03%	9
29	South Ayrshire		3.37%	10
30	South Lanarkshire		2.69%	8
31	West Dunbartonshire		4.38%	13
32	West Lothian		4.38%	13
			answered	297

2. Which organisation do you represent on your LEP?







Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Local Authority Employability		21.21%	63
2	Local Authority Education		6.73%	20
3	Local Authority - OTHER		9.09%	27
4	Department for Work and Pensions		7.07%	21
5	Skills Development Scotland		12.79%	38
6	Developing Young Workforce		5.05%	15
7	Third Sector Interface		7.41%	22
8	Third sector - OTHER		5.72%	17
9	Further / Higher Education		8.42%	25
10	NHS Workforce		4.04%	12
11	Public Health		2.36%	7
12	Health - OTHER		1.01%	3
13	Business Gateway		1.01%	3
14	Chamber of Commerce		0.67%	2
15	Business representative - OTHER		0.00%	0
16	Scottish Government		0.00%	0
17	OTHER		7.41%	22
			answered	297

3. Leadership and Relationships







4. The key organisations named in the LEP Framework are involved and contribute effectively to relationship development.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		43.43%	129
2	Agree		49.49%	147
3	Neither agree nor disagree		3.37%	10
4	Disagree		2.69%	8
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		1.01%	3
			answered	297

5. There is representation on our LEP from across Public, Private and Third sectors.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		44.11%	131
2	Agree		41.75%	124
3	Neither agree nor disagree		6.06%	18
4	Disagree		6.73%	20
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		1.01%	3
			answered	297







6. LEP members work effectively together to agree and achieve a shared purpose.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		39.06%	116
2	Agree		49.16%	146
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.41%	22
4	Disagree		3.37%	10
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		0.67%	2

6. LEP members work effectively together to agree and achieve a shared purpose.






answered 297

7. All LEP members have an equal voice.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		41.75%	124
2	Agree		44.11%	131
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.41%	22
4	Disagree		5.39%	16
5	Strongly disagree		1.01%	3
6	Don't know		0.34%	1
			answered	297

4. Governance







9. Overall, our LEP members understand their roles and responsibilities

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		30.30%	90
2	Agree		58.59%	174
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.07%	21
4	Disagree		2.69%	8
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		1.35%	4
			answered	297







10. Our LEP members are sufficiently senior to make decisions

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
----------------	--	--	------------------	----------------






10. Our LEP members are sufficiently senior to make decisions

1	Strongly agree		35.35%	105
2	Agree		54.55%	162
3	Neither agree nor disagree		6.40%	19
4	Disagree		1.68%	5
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		1.68%	5
			answered	297







11. Our LEP has a vision and strategic direction

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		43.10%	128
2	Agree		44.44%	132
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.42%	25
4	Disagree		2.36%	7
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		1.35%	4
			answered	297







12. All members are committed to our LEP's vision and direction

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		37.37%	111
2	Agree		48.82%	145
3	Neither agree nor disagree		10.10%	30
4	Disagree		1.68%	5
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		2.02%	6
			answered	297






13. Our LEP has appropriate structures and sub-groups in place to support shared and effective decision making

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		31.99%	95
2	Agree		43.43%	129
3	Neither agree nor disagree		13.80%	41
4	Disagree		6.06%	18
5	Strongly disagree		1.01%	3
6	Don't know		3.70%	11
			answered	297

14. LEP members share information from their own organisations to contribute to and influence decision making within the LEP.







Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		37.84%	112
2	Agree		49.66%	147
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.11%	24
4	Disagree		3.72%	11
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		0.34%	1
			answered	296

15. LEP members share information on developments and decisions made at the LEP with their own organisations, to ensure collective understanding of the wider NOLB ambitions







Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		27.27%	81
2	Agree		50.84%	151
3	Neither agree nor disagree		12.46%	37
4	Disagree		2.36%	7
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		7.07%	21
			answered	297

5. Use of data and evidence







17. Our LEP has access to the data it needs to contribute to the delivery plan and to highlight gaps in provision

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		25.25%	75
2	Agree		56.90%	169
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.74%	23
4	Disagree		5.05%	15
5	Strongly disagree		2.02%	6
6	Don't know		3.03%	9
			answered	297







18. LEP members share organisational data, local knowledge, and anecdotal evidence to help plan activity and illustrate success

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		32.32%	96
2	Agree		54.55%	162
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.41%	22
4	Disagree		5.05%	15
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		0.34%	1
			answered	297

19. Our LEP regularly reviews funded activity to ensure that it is meeting the requirements of the communities it serves







Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		35.35%	105
2	Agree		43.10%	128
3	Neither agree nor disagree		10.44%	31
4	Disagree		5.05%	15
5	Strongly disagree		1.35%	4
6	Don't know		4.71%	14
			answered	297

20. Our LEP seeks feedback from service users on the quality and suitability of services.





Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		22.90%	68
2	Agree		48.15%	143
3	Neither agree nor disagree		15.15%	45
4	Disagree		6.06%	18
5	Strongly disagree		1.68%	5
6	Don't know		6.06%	18
			answered	297

6. Stakeholders and Resources



22. Our LEP has effective engagement and communication strategies to seek feedback from relevant stakeholders

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		24.92%	74
2	Agree		49.83%	148
3	Neither agree nor disagree		15.82%	47
4	Disagree		4.38%	13
5	Strongly disagree		0.67%	2
6	Don't know		4.38%	13
			answered	297







23. A wide range of partners, including service users, have been involved in developing local strategy and co-production of employability services, in line with the Scottish Approach to Service Design.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		23.23%	69
2	Agree		42.76%	127
3	Neither agree nor disagree		19.19%	57
4	Disagree		3.70%	11






23. A wide range of partners, including service users, have been involved in developing local strategy and co-production of employability services, in line with the Scottish Approach to Service Design.

5	Strongly disagree		1.35%	4
6	Don't know		9.76%	29
			answered	297



24. Our LEP engages with other relevant public services as required (such as those delivering money advice, housing and homelessness support, health and wellbeing and community justice)

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		38.38%	114
2	Agree		47.81%	142
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.41%	22
4	Disagree		2.02%	6
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		4.04%	12
			skipped	0


25. Our LEP knows what resources (financial, staffing, assets etc) are available locally and how to access them

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		31.65%	94
2	Agree		51.85%	154
3	Neither agree nor disagree		9.76%	29
4	Disagree		2.69%	8
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		4.04%	12
			answered	297

26. LEP member's organisations share resources (such as: information, training, premises, support) to improve outcomes and strengthen delivery







Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		32.32%	96
2	Agree		51.18%	152

26. LEP member's organisations share resources (such as: information, training, premises, support) to improve outcomes and strengthen delivery







3	Neither agree nor disagree		12.12%	36
4	Disagree		2.36%	7
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		2.02%	6
			answered	297

7. Performance, Accountability, and Impact







28. LEP members understand the reporting requirements attached to NOLB funds

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		28.28%	84
2	Agree		53.20%	158
3	Neither agree nor disagree		9.09%	27
4	Disagree		3.70%	11
5	Strongly disagree		0.67%	2
6	Don't know		5.05%	15
			answered	297







29. Our LEP regularly considers performance data to help drive improvement and transformation

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		29.63%	88
2	Agree		48.15%	143
3	Neither agree nor disagree		12.46%	37
4	Disagree		4.71%	14
5	Strongly disagree		2.36%	7
6	Don't know		2.69%	8
			answered	297







30. Our LEP is able to evidence that their employability investment decisions are in line with the NOLB principles

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		37.37%	111
2	Agree		49.16%	146
3	Neither agree nor disagree		8.08%	24
4	Disagree		0.34%	1
5	Strongly disagree		0.67%	2
6	Don't know		4.38%	13
			answered	297







31. Investment decisions made by our LEP have improved accessibility to employability services in our area.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		33.33%	99
2	Agree		50.17%	149
3	Neither agree nor disagree		7.41%	22
4	Disagree		1.68%	5
5	Strongly disagree		1.01%	3
6	Don't know		6.40%	19
			answered	297







32. Investment decisions made by our LEP have helped reduce duplication

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		22.56%	67
2	Agree		47.14%	140
3	Neither agree nor disagree		18.86%	56
4	Disagree		2.02%	6
5	Strongly disagree		0.67%	2
6	Don't know		8.75%	26
			answered	297

33. Investment decisions made by our LEP have helped ensure value for money




Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		24.24%	72
2	Agree		52.86%	157
3	Neither agree nor disagree		13.47%	40
4	Disagree		2.02%	6
5	Strongly disagree		0.34%	1
6	Don't know		7.07%	21
			answered	297

34. Our LEP can demonstrate that investment decisions have helped meet the needs of our communities.






Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		27.61%	82
2	Agree		52.53%	156
3	Neither agree nor disagree		12.46%	37
4	Disagree		1.35%	4
5	Strongly disagree		0.67%	2
6	Don't know		5.39%	16
			answered	297

8. No One Left Behind Products




36. Are you aware of the range of NOLB products and tools that are available (for example: principles, service standards, customer charter, data toolkit, ERI framework etc)

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		47.81%	142
2	Some of them		47.47%	141
3	No		4.71%	14
			answered	297



37. LEP members encourage the use of NOLB products and tools across wider partners to support the delivery of employability services

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		14.14%	42
2	Agree		46.80%	139
3	Neither agree nor disagree		24.58%	73
4	Disagree		5.05%	15
5	Strongly disagree		0.00%	0
6	Don't know		9.43%	28
			answered	297

38. Are you aware of the Shared Measurement Framework

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		58.59%	174
2	Vaguely aware		31.99%	95
3	Not at all		9.43%	28
			answered	297

39. Would it be useful for your LEP to receive further training and support around the NOLB tools and products?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		67.34%	200
2	No		32.66%	97
			answered	297

APPENDIX 5

SAMPLE RECOMMENDATIONS SHARED WITH LEPs

Below are examples of some of the recommendations that were included in the individual LEP Maturity Self-Assessment Final Reports shared with individual LEPs.

General:

- Further develop/ review LEP Improvement Plan, ensuring that it covers the topics contained within the Maturity Assessment.

Leadership and relationships:

- A full and frank discussion on roles, responsibilities, commitment, and governance processes should be undertaken. This should include the role of the council as the Lead Accountable Body.
- A review of membership should be carried out to ensure representation from across all sectors, especially third sector/ private sector/ Education/
- All partners should encourage consistent representation from their organisation at every LEP meeting, with one/two named officers, who are senior enough to make decisions.

Governance:

- Consideration should be given to a co-chair arrangement being put in place.
- Sub-groups and/or Thematic Meetings should be reviewed/ agreed to ensure they are meeting the needs of the LEP, with relevant Leads established to drive forward activity and report back to the wider LEP membership.
- Discussion with other local boards, such as the Community Planning Partnership, should take place to establish better links and shared purpose.

Use of Data and Evidence:

- A local data pack/ toolkit should be developed by LEP members to ensure that standardised data is being used by all partners.
- The establishment of a lived experience panel as a sub-group of the LEP should be considered, to support review and future development of employability provision.

Stakeholders and Resources:

- An annual employability consultation event should be considered to ensure that relevant stakeholders and those with lived experience are invited to feedback on local provision and provide some input to future employability planning.

Performance, Accountability and Impact:

- A mid-year review and evaluation of funded activity should be undertaken by the LEP annually, to help understand performance and relevance to local priorities. This will help inform future delivery plans.
- Communication and information sharing processes should be developed and agreed by all LEP members – especially around reviewing performance and outcomes to evidence that activity represents value for money, reduces duplication and meets the needs of the community.