



## **NOTICE OF MEETING**

### **Thames Valley Berkshire City Deal (Elevate Berkshire) Joint Committee**

**Tuesday 26 September 2017, 11.30 am**

**Stratus - 100 Longwater Avenue, Green Park, Reading, RG2 6GP**

**To: THAMES VALLEY BERKSHIRE CITY DEAL (ELEVATE BERKSHIRE) JOINT COMMITTEE**

Councillors Brunel-Walker (Bracknell Forest Council), Chadley (West Berkshire Council), Lovelock (Reading Borough Council), Munawar (Slough Borough Council), Munro (Wokingham Borough Council) and Rankin (Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead)

**cc: Substitute Members of the Panel**

Councillors Heydon (Bracknell Forest Council), Hussain (Slough Borough Council) and Jones (West Berkshire Council)

#### **Co-optees:**

Katharine Horler, Thames Valley Berkshire LEP  
Tim Smith, Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

#### **EMERGENCY EVACUATION INSTRUCTIONS**

- 1 If you hear the alarm, leave the building immediately.
- 2 Follow the green signs.
- 3 Use the stairs not the lifts.
- 4 Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

If you require further information, please contact: Derek Morgan  
Telephone: 01344 352044,  
Email: [derek.morgan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk](mailto:derek.morgan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)  
Published: 15 September 2017

**Thames Valley Berkshire City Deal (Elevate Berkshire) Joint  
Committee  
Tuesday 26 September 2017, 11.30 am  
Stratus - 100 Longwater Avenue, Green Park, Reading, RG2  
6GP**

Sound recording, photographing, filming and use of social media at meetings which are held in public are permitted. Those wishing to record proceedings at a meeting are however advised to contact the Democratic Services Officer named as the contact for further information on the front of this agenda as early as possible before the start of the meeting so that any special arrangements can be made.

**AGENDA**

Page No

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

To receive apologies for absence and to note the attendance of any substitute members.

**2. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

**3. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members are asked to declare any personal or disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of any matter to be considered at this meeting.

*Any Member with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter should withdraw from the meeting when the matter is under consideration and should notify the Democratic Services Officer in attendance that they are withdrawing as they have such an interest. If the Disclosable Pecuniary Interest is not entered on the register of Members interests the Monitoring Officer must be notified of the interest within 28 days.*

**5. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING**

To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 24 January 2017.

5 - 10

NB: Members may also wish to refer to the papers circulated for the proposed meeting on 7 July 2017 which was subsequently cancelled:

<https://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=658&Year=0>

**6. URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

Any other items which, pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chairman decides are urgent.

7. **ELEVATE BERKSHIRE - ESF UPDATE**

To provide the Joint Committee with an update on the Elevate Berkshire European Social Fund Programme.

11 - 38

Key Updates:-

- Item 1 - General Update
- Item 2 - Performance and Funding (each partner to give an update)
- Item 3 - Project Change Request
- Item 4 - ESF Compliance (Article 125)
- Item 5 - Sustainability of the Elevate brand and model

8. **BUILDING BETTER OPPORTUNITIES**

To receive an update on Building Better Opportunities.

9. **ELEVATEME BERKSHIRE**

To receive an update on ElevateMe Berkshire

This page is intentionally left blank



**THAMES VALLEY BERKSHIRE CITY  
DEAL (ELEVATE BERKSHIRE) JOINT  
COMMITTEE  
24 JANUARY 2017  
9.50 - 10.45 AM**

**Present:**

Councillor Marc Brunel-Walker, Bracknell Forest Council  
Councillor Roger Croft, West Berkshire Council  
Councillor Jo Lovelock, Reading Borough Council  
Councillor Sohail Munawar, Slough Borough Council  
Councillor Stuart Munro, Wokingham Borough Council

**Co-opted Members:**

Tim Smith, Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

**Also Present:**

Paul Gresty, Elevate Berkshire (City Deal Berkshire) Programme Manager  
Mark Browne, West Berkshire Council  
Laura Davis, Ways Into Work  
Hilary Hall, Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead  
Rhian Hayes, Wokingham Borough Council  
Nigel Horton-Baker, Reading UK CIC  
Emelye Janes, Elevate Central Team  
Amy Lenderyou, Prince's Trust  
Rebekah Malcolm, Elevate Central Team  
Kashif Nawaz, Bracknell Forest Council  
Louise Sarginson, Elevate Central Team- Compliance Manager  
Grant Thornton, Reading Borough Council  
Philip Wright, Slough Borough Council

**Apologies for absence were received from:**

Councillor Jack Rankin, Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead  
Katharine Horler, Thames Valley Berkshire LEP

**10. Election of Chairman**

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Stuart Munro be elected Chairman of the Joint Committee.

**11. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Marc Brunel-Walker be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee.

12. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

13. **Urgent Items of Business**

There were no urgent items of business.

14. **Minutes and Matters Arising from the Last Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the last formal meeting held on 22 January 2016 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

In addition, the Committee received the notes of the inquorate meeting held on 22 July 2016.

15. **Elevate Project ESF Update**

The Joint Committee received an update on the pan-Berkshire Elevate programme (Year 1 November 2015 to October 2016) by way of a presentation from Paul Gresty which along with the report also provided information on recent conversations with the managing authority, the Department for Work and Pensions, around current underperformance; and put forward a number of recommendations to members to mitigate the risk of claw-back during years 2 and 3.

The Joint Committee noted that, during the first year, the programme had continued to deliver the necessary systems change around the way the skills and employment agenda was being delivered operationally. Across the local projects and collective programme, 'real' supported employment was the model of support that had added most value and delivered the best results for the hardest to reach young people. Activity funded and managed centrally, such as that by the Prince's Trust and Ways into Work, had also highlighted the value in providers working 'pan-Berkshire'. However, the programme had fallen foul of a lack of guidance at its inception in November 2015 which had meant that partners had not been collecting evidence of engagement of those helped between then and May 2016 when the guidance had finally been released. Whilst some retrospective gathering of the evidence including birth certificates and passports had been possible, this was not going to be possible in all cases. Only the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead had evidence to confirm that it had met its target due to the tighter processes it had implemented from the outset. Others were now being required to follow a consistent approach to ensure all numbers were covered. Based on known figures, the year one targets had almost certainly been met but without the subsequently required evidence. Discussions were therefore taking place with the DWP about accepting the fact that the partners had acted in good faith and engaged with the required number of young people in the period in question without any guidance, with a view to allowing some flexibility in counting these participants.

The Joint Committee's attention was drawn to the following key successes:

- System change and centralised Elevate system - Elevate had been the catalyst for conversations around the operational delivery of skills and employment activity and instrumental in culture change.
- Co-location of key partners - partners were now working together for mutual benefit and the partnership was growing as providers began to realise the

value of being associated with something that had the capacity to draw down money.

- BASE project – the pan-Berkshire project focusing on employment for young people with disabilities.
- Elevate Brand – the Elevate brand was growing locally with visits by senior Civil Service leads and the Head of the ESF.
- Referral/Caseworker Model - Elevate had implemented a new person-centred pathway; whereby services delivered by the partners were wrapped around the individual via the holistic Elevate service.
- Central project management system and ESF workshops - the central team had been working with partners to operationalise compliance considerations.
- Partnership Working - Elevate continued to build a culture of collaboration amongst partners who were seeing the added value of working together)
- Project sustainability and aspiration to deliver an ageless Elevate Berkshire model using Elevate as the vehicle.

The Joint Committee was reminded that the programme had been set a collective output of engaging with 3,380 young people and a collective result of 43% on the overarching outcome target. Each partner had been assigned output and result targets, that collectively met the collective programme targets. The collective targets had been indicatively profiled over 3 years. The project was currently 'underperforming' against the indicative profile of collective outputs and results despite a great deal of work being undertaken to ensure projects were bringing in eligible young people and delivering a 43% result. The DWP had been asked how the targets had been determined as it was not clear on what basis the numbers had been arrived at. It was evident that the target was challenging, particularly as unemployment figures were at an all time low. Employers were struggling to fill vacancies with the likelihood that the situation would worsen as major new employment opportunities such as the Lexicon Bracknell came on stream. It had become increasingly evident that the partners were seeking to engage with hard to reach young people and those who were NEET were not necessarily in a position to move into work. Paul indicated that all NEETs and 19-24 year-olds signed up with Job Centre Plus should be signed up with Elevate.

The Joint Committee noted that the DWP was concerned about the under-performance and had so far refused to agree a revised set of outputs and results. It had insisted that the programme had to deliver the outputs and results and that money could be 'clawed-back' if it did not meet the collective targets. It had, however, held off actioning the under-performance methodology until the fourth claim had been made on 4 February 2016, which it was hoped would lead to some catch-up against the targets. Normally, action would have been initiated after two consecutive claims missing the outputs.

Concerns were expressed about the position that the programme was now in due to the moving of goalposts and seemingly arbitrary targets. With uncertainty over the success of the discussions with the DWP, it was suggested that representations could be made at the forthcoming meeting of the ESIF Sub-Committee in March 2017.

The Joint Committee also noted that the collective programme would be subject to an Article 125 audit by the DWP contract managers. The central team would be continuing to provide support to ensure compliance in terms of delivery; and operationalisation of ESF requirements.

To mitigate the risk of 'claw-back' and non-compliance, the Committee was invited to consider the following:

- Local projects should look at 'what worked' in year 1 and re-focus resource in year 2 and 3 to 'direct' delivery to ensure targets were met with money linked to 'system change' re-directed to pay providers to deliver outcomes.
- Centrally, it was proposed to allocate £70k of ESF money and match held centrally to commission providers selected by the central Elevate team, on a payment by results basis to deliver activity in Slough, and to a lesser degree Reading. In addition, it was proposed to match ESF money held centrally against the original Cabinet Office money still held by Slough which would enable the collective programme to count activity in Slough. The greater number of eligible participants were known to be in Slough and Reading. Focusing money on Slough would help the collective programme deliver its targets and mitigate the risk of claw-back.

Slough was happy to participate but stressed that a separate provider would be needed as the Council was not in a position to do the work itself. This would build on the Borough Council's own Elevate work and build the sustainability of the work. It was noted that working with businesses as much as the young people in Slough was seen as an important step towards creating the opportunities for the young people.

The Joint Committee endorsed both proposals, and also agreed that £92,000 allocated to Labour Market Intelligence should remain as such rather than being re-directed to 'direct' delivery as the Labour Market Intelligence was regarded as a vital contribution to the partners' initiatives.

The DWP had also confirmed that the programme could realise its targets over a longer period of time but the Joint Committee believed that no decision should be taken on this until the results of the actions being taken became clearer.

Paul added that each partner needed to health check their project evidence with the support of the central team. They also needed to have operationalised the ESF requirements. In addition, each partner needed to provide an up-to-date financial profile and project plan for the next six months at least, clarifying the actions being taken to increase participants.

Paul stressed that failure to provide the necessary evidence could result in the central team opting not to process claims or allocate further funding if it was not satisfied with a partner's results. He indicated that the greater the amount of money drawn down without improved outputs increased the risk of programme failure as a whole. Not submitting an unsatisfactory claim would therefore help protect the interests of the others and the scheme as a whole.

Having noted the issues and welcomed the update on action being taken by Paul, the Joint Committee

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1 The immediate risk posed to ESF funding be noted and the proposal to re-focus resource to direct delivery be endorsed as re-focusing resource as outlined during the meeting would mitigate the risk of not delivering programme targets.
- 2 The impending Article 125 audit be noted with a view to ensuring local projects mitigate risks around non-compliance with ESF regulations.
- 3 £92,000 allocated to Labour Market Intelligence should remain as such rather than being re-directed to 'direct' delivery.

**CHAIRMAN**

This page is intentionally left blank



<b>TO:</b>	<b>ELEVATE BERKSHIRE JOINT COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	
<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Elevate Berkshire (City Deal) Update</b>		
<b>LEAD COUNCILLOR:</b>	<b>CLLR MUNRO (WBC)</b>		
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>BOROUGHWIDE</b>		
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Emelye Janes</b>	<b>TEL:</b>	<b>07912 068 916</b>
<b>JOB TITLE:</b>	<b>Project Manager – Elevate Berkshire</b>	<b>E-MAIL:</b>	<a href="mailto:paul.gresty@reading.gov.uk">paul.gresty@reading.gov.uk</a>

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 This report provides Elevate Berkshire Joint Committee with a progress update on the pan-Berkshire ‘Elevate’ programme, specifically focusing on:-

- Item 1 – General Update
- Item 2 - Performance and Funding
- Item 3 - Project Change Request
- Item 4 - ESF Compliance (Article 125 Audit)
- Item 5 - Sustainability of the Elevate brand and model

1.2 There was no meeting in July 17. Due to the number of apologies, the meeting would have been in-quorate. The paper and actions produced for the meeting in July 17 were resolved by members electronically and can be accessed here - <https://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ielListMeetings.aspx?CId=658&Year=0>

**2. RECOMMENDED ACTION**

2.1 That Joint Committee note the success of the collective Elevate Berkshire programme and endorse the actions, proposals and agreements within the briefing paper; to ensure the programme continues to be delivered in-line with ESF processes.

**Item 1 – Key successes**

**Elevate Berkshire continues to make good progress in delivering programme aims as set out in the original call. Some key successes to date include:**

- **System change and centralised Elevate system** (Elevate has been the catalyst for conversations around the operational delivery of skills and employment activity. It has been instrumental in a culture change).
- **Co-location of key partners** (partners are working together for mutual benefit and the partnership is growing as providers begin to realise the value of being associated with something that has the capacity to draw down money).
- **BASE project** (pan-Berkshire project focusing on employment for young people with disabilities).
- **Elevate Brand** (Elevate brand is growing locally and we have been visited by Senior Civil Service Leads and the Head of ESF).
- **Referral / caseworker model** (Elevate has implemented a new person-centred pathway; whereby services delivered by the partners are wrapped around the individual via the holistic Elevate service)
- **Central project management system and ESF workshops** (the central team have been working with partners to operationalise compliance considerations).
- **Partnership Working** (Elevate continues to build a culture of collaboration amongst partners who are seeing the added value of working together)
- **Project sustainability and aspiration to deliver an ageless Elevate Berkshire model (using Elevate as the vehicle).**
- **Good new stories** We have provided the managing authority with several good news stories from some of the many people that the Elevate Berkshire programme has helped to date. Appendix A is a selection of some of these stories which demonstrate the positive impact the programme is having on some of the people it has supported to date.

## **Item 2 - Performance and Funding**

### **Performance**

The programme has a set of collective outputs (3380) and collective result (43% result on overarching outcome target). Each partner has been assigned an output and result target – that collectively meet the pan Berkshire programme targets. The partner and collective targets were indicatively profiled equally over 3 years.

- The central Elevate Berkshire team updated Joint Committee members on individual and collective performance at the meeting in January 2017.
- In January 2017, the programme was underperforming against the indicative profile of outputs and results. As ESF money can be withheld or clawed-back for underperformance, it was agreed that local Elevate projects could not continue to draw down ESF funding when the necessary outputs and results weren't being achieved. It was also agreed that if performance did not improve then funding released back to partners, by the central team, would need to be looked at in relation to performance (i.e., outputs and results delivered, not just resource spent); as set out in section 13.10 of the pan Berkshire Partnership Agreement

- In line with section 13.10 - Elevate partners were therefore tasked by Joint Committee with increasing the number of outputs and results over the next 6 months (between February 17 and July 17). Appendix B - highlights partner performance over the last 6 months, current outputs and results achieved and remaining targets for each partner. It also highlights how many young people have actually been worked with across the programme. The table also highlights the amount of ESF money claimed by each partner and how much ESF funding remains, to deliver the remaining targets.
- Members will note that partners have not delivered the necessary performance improvement since the last Joint Committee meeting in January. Moreover, the collective Elevate programme is still under-performing against the indicative profile of outputs and results given to DWP.

## Funding

- To date, DWP have paid 4 claims (covering the period Nov 15 to Dec 16). The programme is still awaiting payment for claim 5 (£477,504.84) and claim 6 (£287,245.12), with claim 7 due in October 17. As above, Appendix A sets out how much partners have claimed, total values of payments received and have available to claim going forwards.
- The central Elevate team released 100% of the funding to partners for claims 1, 2 and 3 (based solely on resource spent). However, as above and as agreed at Joint Committee in January 17 and the Elevate Steering Group meeting in September 2017, performance has been taken into consideration in relation to payments for claim 4. As there has not been the necessary performance, a percentage of partner(s) claims will be withheld.
- Appendix C – sets out the ESF under-performance methodology for the 14-20 ESF programme. This is the methodology that DWP will apply to the programme – should it look to claw-back ESF funding for under-performance.
- Appendix D – shows how the central team have applied the percentage weighting to each partner's claim – based on their performance from November 15 to June 17. The final amount to be paid back to partners is set out in each partner tab. (Performance was not looked at between Nov 15 and Dec 16 as in Dec 16, there were very few compliant records these were reported to Joint Committee in January 2017).

The money retained will be kept centrally, until a time when partners are delivering their outputs and results in line with their current approved profile. (Please see section regarding project change requests and profiles).

Going forwards, partners need to see the financial claim process as being based on both resource spent and performance. From claim 4, the central team will look at performance, not just the resource spent, when releasing ESF money drawn down via DWP. Future claim payments will be based on the performance of the most recent claim submitted – to acknowledge there is a lag with payments and partners will have continued to have delivered outputs and results since the claim was submitted. I.e, if money for Qtr 1 2017 (Jan, Feb, March 17) was paid by DWP in October 2017, we would look at the performance of Qtr 2 2017 claim (April, May and June), submitted in August.

## Item 3 - Project Change Requests

Currently, the programme has one Project Change Requests (PCR) being reviewed by DWP (the first PCR having been agreed by DWP in early September):-

PCR 2 - All primary delivery partners have agreed to extend the realisation of project outputs and results to June 2019 – to mitigate the risk of not meeting collective programme targets. This extension has been formally submitted to DWP Contract Managers.

Using Appendix A - each partner has been tasked with re-profiling their project (budget and outputs) to June 19, and providing an updated project plan which brings to life how the money remaining, will be spent to deliver the remaining targets.

#### **Item 4 - ESF Compliance (Article 125 Audit)**

The collective Elevate Berkshire programme was the subject of an Article 125 Audit on the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> May 2017. This involved two Senior DWP auditors, working on behalf of the ESF, spending two days with the central Elevate Berkshire team (Paul Gresty / Emelye Janes); reviewing defrayed expenditure for Qtr 2 of 2016 (April, May and June).

- 2.2 A great deal of work was undertaken with the Elevate partners, who were fortunate enough to have an 8 week lead in time to prepare for the visit. However, there were still issues during the two days with some partners not providing the necessary evidence for resource claimed for. This put the collective programme at risk and work needed to be done continually over the two day visit to plug-gaps and evidence financial compliance.
- 2.3 Despite this, the Elevate Berkshire programme was deemed compliant – and does not have to pay back any ESF funds drawn down to date. This was a real achievement on the premise that most ESF audits end up with around 5% to 10% of money drawn down being clawed-back for a lack of eligibility.
- 2.4 The audit was a valuable learning exercise and the central team delivered an 'Audit Feedback Session' to all partners on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> July. In brief – Elevate project leads received detailed feedback on the audit and also actions that need to be delivered in preparation for future audits. It is highly likely that ESF auditors will visit again later in 2017, to audit delivery and project outputs and results (including participant records). (Appendix E) sets out the key actions that partners need to deliver, around themes headings.
- 2.5 To mitigate the risk of non-compliance in the future, revised compliance processes have been put in place on the premise that the programme could be the subject of a 'spot check' audit in the future, where we could only receive 1 days' notice of an Article 125 spot check audit. Therefore, it is vital that new processes around evidence of ESF compliance are embedded as core routine. Each project was tasked with undertaking an internal review of compliance processes.
- 2.6 Moreover, with regard to quarterly financial claims, from claim 6, the central team only submitted transaction lines where the partner has already provided adequate evidence of defrayed expenditure to mitigate risk. As a result, one partner's claim was not submitted.

#### **Item 5 - Sustainability of the Elevate brand and model**

Thought needs to be given to the sustainability of the current Elevate programme (and local Elevate projects). By the beginning of 2019, the programme (partners) will have spent over £6.0million implementing a new system and more personalised and holistic delivery models for young people 16 to 24.

Centrally, using 'Elevate Berkshire's' achievements, reputation and brand, over £2 million has been secured from the Big Lottery fund to deliver a mirroring project for inactive and unemployed people 25+. The project(s) will be aligned with 'Elevate' to deliver an ageless skills and employment offer across Berkshire.

Reading Borough Council also successfully pursued a Social Impact Bond with the Cabinet Office in April 2017 – on the back of the success of the system change instigated by the Elevate Reading project (part of Elevate Berkshire).

The central team are looking to identify new funding that will bring longevity to the Elevate Berkshire 16 to 24 project – to continue the system change and support new models and ways of working it has introduced. ESF / DWP are keen for 'Berkshire' to continue the project beyond June 2019 and has spoken positively of the way in which Elevate Berkshire has striven to knit the skills and employment system together across Berkshire. Locally, there are various positive conversations happening around evolving Elevate to become a service in its own right.

It is proposed that the central Elevate team bring together key partners to discuss future arrangements later in 2017 (including the Local Enterprise Partnership). There is the possibility that additional ESF funding could be aligned with Elevate Berkshire; possibly to develop a 'supported employment' model for the benefit of young people who require the support of a case work manager.

#### **Item 6 - A.O.B**

- Building Better Opportunities – and using City Deal Joint Committee as Governance group (as it is local authority based)
- ElevateMe Berkshire

## Appendix A- Elevate Berkshire Good News Stories



### Annex 1: ESF 2014 - 20: Consent Form & Good News story Template (Cont'd)

#### **Part 4 - PARTICIPANTS GOOD NEWS STORY** *(Completed by the provider and participant)*

Ben attended The Prince's Trust's Get Started with Robotics, as part of the ESF funded Elevate Berkshire Project.

Ben joined the course with what might seem as more of an advantage than most. He was talented in technology and science and had thus pursued a career in this field. He studied the sciences at A-Level and went on to study a year of chemistry at University.

Unfortunately, Ben soon began suffering with anxiety, depression and the nagging feeling that he had taken the wrong course with his studies. As he began to experience mental ill health, Ben additionally began to experience problems with debt which exacerbated his feelings. He left University and ended up out of education, employment or training (NEET) like so many of the young people we support.

Upon joining our programme, Ben presented his wonderful nature but also low self-esteem. He worked well with the delivery partner and the programme executive to ensure he got the most out of the programme and worked on his soft skills. The challenge was to take part in a series of robot challenges including fights and football matches. Ben overcame anxiety to contribute to the team and share his previous experience and knowledge.

During his one to one sessions with the programme executive, Ben started to get more of what he needed out of the course. He opened up about the issues that were hampering his employment chances and, together with the member of staff, drew up an action plan to help him achieve his goals. He also decided that a Prince's Trust mentor would be right for him.

Ben said that the Get Started with Robotics most helped him with setting and achieving goals. Ben's situation was tricky as his qualifications meant that he was not eligible for the apprenticeships he wanted to access. This was a tough realisation, but he quickly adapted to the idea of getting a job to prevent debt from worsening while he pursued his dream IT job. He engaged brilliantly with his mentor and they are still enjoying a successful relationship.

The achievements of this so far are evident in that Ben is now employed. He currently works a night job in Tesco's that he has been doing for four months. Most importantly, he is no longer in debt. The night shifts are hard and Ben has still had to battle for his mental health. However, now he has the confidence, he has spoken to his managers about the issues he faces and successfully requested that they make adjustments. Further to his success, he is currently supporting a dyslexic colleague to write his CV and is regularly repairing his co-workers' mobile phones! He is still pursuing his dream IT job and his Prince's Trust mentor continues to support him with this.



**Annex 1: ESF 2014 - 20: Consent Form & Good News story Template (Cont'd) Part 4 - PARTICIPANTS GOOD NEWS STORY** *(Completed by the provider and participant)*

*Please remember to make reference to the ESF funding being used in the body of your text.*

**Brief participant background – route to the provider/why did they join?**

- **What help did the provider give?**
- **What were the barriers/obstacles?**
- **Progress made, what impact has this had on the participant's life?**
- **Please include quotes from customer/adviser or employer?**
- **Does the participant have any future plans/ambitions?**

Isabelle first came to the ESF funded Elevate Reading programme on a Princes Trust course, being hosted at our premises, designed for people wanting to move into Customer Service. When she first arrived she was lacking in a lot of self-confidence and was worried she might be viewed in a negative light due to her previous health issues.

During her time with Princes Trust her confidence grew and by the end of the course she seemed like a different person. She became the natural leader of the group and the other participants looked to her for guidance and assistance, a role she enjoyed.

Once the course with Princes Trust had finished, Isabelle continued to engage with staff at Elevate Reading. Through Elevate Reading she was enrolled onto a Maxis Project course where her confidence continued to grow and she was given 1:1 help with job applications and looking for work. Isabelle visited Elevate Reading regularly, using the computers to do job search in her spare time. She showed interest in doing some work experience as well and was put in touch with Central Berkshire Education Business Partnership to begin looking for a suitable placement for her.

Isabelle also engaged with Elevate Reading's Mencap colleagues who ran the supported employment contract for Reading Borough Council. Through this link Isabelle was enrolled onto the Ikea employment assessment sessions happening at the Job Centre. She attended the interview sessions and did very well, going on to be offered a role at the new store.

Isabelle said, "I am so thankful for all the help Elevate has offered me. Being able to come back to show the progress and personal developments I made since I first came to Elevate is amazing. I have gained such a sense of pride in myself and look forward to progressing even further!"

**Please turn over...**



**Annex 1: ESF 2014 - 20: Consent Form & Good News story Template (Cont'd) Part 4 - PARTICIPANTS GOOD NEWS STORY** *(Completed by the provider and participant)*

Please remember to make reference to the ESF funding being used in the body of your text.

Harry attended the New Directions Reading Borough Council placement induction in October 2015. He was interested in customer service within the council. Harry then found out he had a temporary job so did not take up the placement. In February Harry was contacted to ask whether he was still interested in a placement. He was invited to an interview at the beginning of May 2016 and was offered a position with Elevate Reading, where he started on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016.

In the first week Harry was given an induction to Elevate Reading going through Health and Safety procedures, he also met with the job coach from Elevate ESF Project. His project for the first week was to redesign the job club flyer. Harry was very quiet at first, it took him a few days to find his feet but after that he fitted in well with the team and the job role. Over the 8 weeks Harry redesigned many leaflets and flyers not just for Elevate but other organisations as well, he also filmed an induction. Harry was invited to sit on the interview panel for July placements. This gave him an insight into how Reading Borough Council conducted their interviews, also how other people reacted under interview questions. In the last two weeks of his placement Harry was given some administration work to complete, including spread sheets, he did this very well.

Harry came on this placement unsure what he wanted to do as a job and low in confidence. He also had issues with the job centre not being able to claim any money. DWP, New Directions and Elevate's ESF Job Coach supported Harry with claiming, getting him to speak to the right people and giving him time off to deal with the situation. Harry realised what he wanted to do as a job within 3 weeks of his placement. He was interested in an apprenticeship within the council. Through the placement Harry was given support by the ESF Job Coach from Elevate with looking over his CV and help with applying for work. Harry applied for an apprenticeship within the council in housing; he also applied for an apprenticeship with Sovereign Housing in their IT department. He was successful in getting the job at Sovereign which he will start on the 22nd August 2016.

In the last week of the placement Harry had to train the new placement that would take over from him. Harry had to go through what he had been doing, go through Health and Safety and hand over the memory sticks, badge and to give any other information that is needed to help the new placement.

This has been good for Harry as he will be able to use what he has learnt and put it on his CV. At the end of the placement you could tell that Harry had grown in confidence and was able to see his own strengths.

*Elevate really boosted my confidence and made me realize I can do anything if I put my mind to it. All the staff supported me and congratulated me when I found an apprenticeship. I had a great time designing posters for the company.*

Please turn over...

## Appendix B- Partner Performance Table

Partner Outputs and Results			REPORTED TO JOINT COMMITTEE IN JAN 17. Partners were tasked with increasing O&R over the next 6 months and to report back to JC in July 17		Outputs & Results as per Q2 '17 Claim (April-June)			Remaining £ and Targets- July '17 onwards			
Partner		Partner Outputs Target	Total Output as of Q4 '16 Claim	% performance against target Nov '15- Dec '16	Outputs as of Jun 17	% performance against target Nov '15- Jun '17	% Performance Increase over 6 months	Funding claimed as of June 17	Funding paid to date	Remaining money Aug 17 to June 19 to deliver the necessary O&R	Remaining outputs/results to deliver until June '19
					* Delivered by Adviza since April 2017						* To be delivered by Adviza
Reading	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	754	11	4%	177 *(19)	50%	46%	£644,035.40	£283,375.73	£233,291	577 *(381)
	CO01- Unemployed	529			134 *(11)	54%		Expenditure Adviza (44,144.51)		£233,291	395 *(248)
	CO03- Inactive	190			43 *(8)	48%					147 *(80)
	O6- No basic skills	134			27 *(5)	43%					107 *(58)
	CO14- Single parents	29			7 *(0)	50%					22 *(33)
	CO5- Ethnic minorities	105			66 *(12)	135%					39 *(59)
	CO16- Disabilities	62			47 *(2)	162%					15 *(13)
	R3- Gaining basic skills	5			0 *(0)	0%					5 *(3)
	R5- Entering employment or training	324	3	2%	29 *(1)	19%	17%				295 *(173)
	Reading result rate (Outputs into results)						16%				
Wokingham	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	277	22	20%	125	97%	77%	£180,152.60	£83,717.06	£115,343.40	152
	CO01- Unemployed	194			96	106%					98
	CO03- Inactive	70			29	88%					41
	O6- No basic skills	49			12	52%					37
	CO14- Single parents	11			2	33%					9
	CO5- Ethnic minorities	39			12	66%					27
	CO16- Disabilities	23			29	100%- 3 year Disability target achieved					3 year Disability target achieved
	R3- Gaining basic skills	2			0	0%					2
	R5- Entering employment or training	116	8	18%	22	41%	23%				94
	Wokingham Result Rate (Outputs into results)		43%				18%				
West Berks	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	575	0	0%	57	21%	21%	£307,734.60	£146,873.49	£304,877	518
	CO01- Unemployed	303			33	23%					270
	CO03- Inactive	145			23	46%					122
	O6- No basic skills	102			31	66%					71
	CO14- Single parents	22			1	10%					21
	CO5- Ethnic minorities	80			1	3%					79
	CO16- Disabilities	48			19	83%					29
	R3- Gaining basic skills	2			4	100%- 3 year Disability target achieved					3 year Disability target achieved
	R5- Entering employment or training	247	0	0	31	27%	27%				216
	West Berkshire Result Rate (Outputs into results)		43%				54%				

Bracknell	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	639	11	13%	183	61%	48%	£176,442.20	£79,766.35	£504,639.80	456
	CO01- Unemployed	448			139	67%					309
	CO03-Inactive	161			44	59%					117
	O6-No basic skills	113			36	68%					77
	CO14-Single parents	25			3	25%					22
	CO5-Ethnic minorities	89			15	36%					74
	CO16-Disabilities	53			60	100%- 3 year Disability target achieved					3 year Disability target achieved
	R3-Gaining basic skills	5			0	0%					5
	R5-Entering employment or training	324	0	0%	21	14%	14%				303
	Bracknell Result Rate (Ouputs into res ults)	43%				11%					
RBWM	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	423	108	76%	159	80%	6%	£262,155	£120,457	£188,295	264
	CO01- Unemployed	296			72	52%					224
	CO03-Inactive	106			86	175%					20
	O6-No basic skills	75			8	23%					67
	CO14-Single parents	16			0	0%					16
	CO5-Ethnic minorities	59			28	104%					31
	CO16-Disabilities	35			43	100%- 3 year disability target achieved					3 year Disability target achieved
	R3-Gaining basic skills	3			0	0					3
	R5-Entering employment or training	174	3	4%	22	27%	23%				152
	RBWM Result Rate (Ouputs into res ults)	43%				14%					
20 WIV	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	120	0	0	33	59%	59%	182,011.40	81,766.93	£117,988.6	87
	CO01- Unemployed				17						
	CO03-Inactive				19						
	O6-No basic skills				4						
	CO14-Single parents				1						
	CO5-Ethnic minorities				5						
	CO16-Disabilities	90			35	83%					55
	R3-Gaining basic skills				0						
	R5-Entering employment or training	52	0	0%	3	17%	10%				49
	WIV Result Rate (Ouputs into res ults)	43%				9%					
PT	O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive	468	12	8%	129	59%	51%	£345,948.40	£161,601.26	£410,051.60	339
	CO01- Unemployed	224			97	93%					127
	CO03-Inactive	49			32	140%					17
	O6-No basic skills	29			21	150%					8
	CO14-Single parents	6			1	30%					5
	CO5-Ethnic minorities	80			41	110%					39
	CO16-Disabilities	40			40	100%- 3 year disability target achieved					3 year Disability target achieved
	R3-Gaining basic skills				1						
	R5-Entering employment or training	275	0	0%	38	23%	23%				237
	PT results Rate (Ouputs into res ults)	43%				29%					

Collective	<b>O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are unemployed or inactive</b>	3380	164	12%	863	55%	43%	£2,346,584.87		£2,453,415	2393
	CO01- Unemployed	2370			585	53%					1406
	CO03- Inactive	850			278	70%					445
	O6- No basic skills	600			132	47%					363
	CO14- Single parents	130			15	25%					94
	CO5- Ethnic minorities	470			164	74%					284
	CO16- Disabilities	280			272	209%					8
	R3- Gaining basic skills	24			5	45%					12
	<b>R5- Entering employment or training</b>	1453	14	2%	137	24%	22%				1346
	Collective Result Rate (Ouputs into results)	43%				19%					

## Appendix C- DWP Underperformance Methodology

Methodology for assessing penalty for project underperformance ( FAL Schedule 4)						
The methodology below will be used to run scenarios and assess appropriate financial penalty for an operation's underperformance in delivery of outputs.						
The methodology is flexible and allows :						
1) Outputs to be varied according to what has been contracted / is most appropriate for specific Priority Axes and individual operations.						
2) Weightings to be varied depending upon the level of underperformance :						
a) Where underperformance is between 16% and 25% a weighting of 5% would normally be applied						
b) Where underperformance is between 26% and 50% a weighting of 10% would normally be applied						
c) Underperformance of over 50% would normally result in a weighting of at least 15%.						
NB: Variance of up to 15% would normally be dealt with via change request.						
Underperformance weightings are suggested only and, with justification approved by the GDT senior management, can be reduced or increased as appropriate.						
Identification of the outputs to be included and weightings to be applied is entirely at the discretion of the GDT team .						
Methodology for calculating penalty for operation underperformance						
Methodology						
OUTPUTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALCULATION (Up to 4 outputs to be selected according to Priority Axis and those contracted for this operation)	OUTPUT 1	OUTPUT 2	OUTPUT 3	OUTPUT 4	OUTPUT 5	OUTPUT 6
	Output reference / ID	Output reference / ID	Output reference / ID	Output reference / ID	Output reference / ID	Output reference / ID
	Output description / Indicator	Output description / Indicator	Output description / Indicator	Output description / Indicator	Output description / Indicator	Output description / Indicator
Basic Facts	Total Project Value ( a )	£ value as per schedule 1 of FAL / details as per latest variation				
	Contracted Target ( b )		Number contracted as per schedule 3 of FAL	Number contracted as per schedule 3 of FAL	Number contracted as per schedule 3 of FAL	Number contracted as per schedule 3 of FAL
	Evidenced / actual achievement ( c )		Number actually achieved at time of calculation			
Calculated Variance	Variance (number) ( d )		( b ) - ( c )	( b ) - ( c )	( b ) - ( c )	( b ) - ( c )
	Variance (%) ( e )		( d ) / ( b ) x 100	( d ) / ( b ) x 100	( d ) / ( b ) x 100	( d ) / ( b ) x 100
Weighting	Up to 15% below target = normally deal with via project change process		identify weighting as appropriate ( see e )	identify weighting as appropriate ( see e )	identify weighting as appropriate ( see e )	identify weighting as appropriate ( see e )
	16% and 25% below a weighting of 5% would normally be applied					
	26% and 50% below a weighting of 10% would normally be applied					
	Over 50% below would normally result					
	Indicator Value (£) ( g )		Weighting * total project value			
Establish the value of the variance for each indicator as a proportion of the value of the operation.						
Penalty	Underperformance value (£) ( h )		( g ) x ( f )	( g ) x ( f )	( g ) x ( f )	( g ) x ( f )
	Potential Reduction Value (£) ( i )	sum all ( h )s				









# Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

## Methodology for assessing penalty for project underperformance

The methodology below will be used to run scenarios and assess appropriate financial penalty for an operation's underperformance in delivery of outputs.

The methodology is flexible and allows :

- 1) Weightings applied to the O2 outputs target and the R5 result target
- 2) Weightings to be varied depending upon the level of underperformance :
  - a) Where underperformance is between 16% and 25% a weighting of 5% would normally be applied
  - b) Where underperformance is between 26% and 50% a weighting of 10% would normally be applied
  - c) Underperformance of over 50% would normally result in a weighting of at least 15%.

## Methodology for calculating penalty for operation underperformance

Methodology				
OUTPUTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALCULATION		O2- Participants (below 25 years of age) who are	R5-Entering employment or training	
Basic Facts	Total Claim Value-Q4 Claim (Oct-Dec 2016)		£42,483.39	£42,483.39
	Contracted Target (Nov'15-Jun'17)		242	97
	Evidenced / actual achievement ( Nov'15-Jun'17 as submitted with		159	22
Calculated Variance	Variance (number)		83	75
	Variance (%)		42%	90%
Weighting	-16% and 25% below a weighting of 5% penalty will be applied -26% and 50% below a weighting of 10% penalty will be applied Over 50% below would normally result in a weighting of at least 15%		10%	15%
Penalty	Establish the value of the variance for each indicator as a proportion of the value of the operation.			
	Underperformance value (£)		4,248.34	6,372.51
	Total penalty value		£10,620.85	
	Total Claim Payment		£10,620.85	





**Appendix E- Partner Actions August '17 Onwards**

Work Stream / (ESF Requirement)	Programme Requirement / Overview	Relevant updates from the Elevate Berkshire Steering Group meeting, Elevate Berkshire Audit Workshop (July) and information from the Auditors	On-going Partner Actions August 17 (in Glasscubes with key milestones)
<p>Programme Governance</p>	<p>Centrally, the programme is required to have a robust governance arrangement. The Governance arrangements for Elevate Berkshire are:-</p> <p>Joint Committee – meets once a year and then on an extraordinary basis. Made up of a Member from each local Authority (and key stakeholders).</p> <p>Project Sponsors – Held every quarter (at the same meeting of the Steering Group). The first 30 minutes of those meetings will be project sponsors and the central Elevate team only – after which project leads will join the meeting.</p> <p>Elevate Steering Group (central) – Monthly meeting attended by all partner project leads; and quarterly by project sponsors.</p> <p>Operational Partner Elevate Steering Group meetings - Each</p>	<p>No update</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Each partner to ensure there is evidence of a monthly operational Elevate Steering group meeting (since November 2015). There must also be minutes and an action plan</li> <li>2. All partners to sign the addendum to the current Elevate Berkshire Partnership Agreement</li> <li>3. The Joint Committee meeting in July was cancelled as the meeting would have been inquorate. Joint Committee is the legal decision making body for Elevate Berkshire and it is vital that each partner is represented (member and project lead) at each meeting. The next meeting is the 26<sup>th</sup> September</li> <li>4. Projects leads to attend, as core routine, monthly Elevate Berkshire SG meetings</li> </ol>

31	<p>partner has a formal minuted monthly steering group meeting – where updates from the central steering group are disseminated.</p> <p>Elevate Partnership Agreement – each primary delivery partner, as executed as a deed, a PA as equal partners. Updates are given to BCEX on a bi-monthly basis</p> <p>The central team will facilitate these meetings (apart from partner operational group meetings) and produce the necessary paperwork. The central team also report to the LEP, BIS and DCLG each month.</p>		
Programme and Project Management	<p>The central Elevate team works on behalf of the primary partners – facilitating the ESF programme and acting as a critical friend. The central team brings together the collective Elevate Berkshire programme.</p> <p>Each local Elevate project has a project team – that reports to the central team and manages the project on behalf of the Local Authority or other primary partner.</p>	With regard to claims – it is crucial that the project team check claims for accuracy, prior to them being sent to the central Elevate Team	1. Each partner to review the current project management and coordination structure.
Glasscubes (project)	The programme has a centralised project management system	Migrated to Glass-cubes on 26 <sup>th</sup> June 17	1. Prior to the next audit – which will focus on cross cutting themes and the

<p>management system)</p>	<p>(Glasscubes) – implemented by the central Elevate team. Each partner has access to Glasscubes and each local project has its own Glasscubes folder</p> <p>The central team maintain the central Glasscubes folders.</p> <p>Partners are responsible for partner folders (and sub-folders).</p> <p>Glasscubes is the central repository for programme and project evidence and is structured by ESF requirement theme</p>	<p>All partners are responsible for their partner Glasscubes folder. It is the responsibility of each partner to ensure ‘all’ evidence is available to the central team and auditors. Evidence refers to financial, performance and compliance evidence. Partners to health-check the evidence in their partner folder – to mitigate the risk of having to pay money back during future audits.</p>	<p>operationalisation of ESF requirements in delivery – each partner to review the quality of project paperwork and evidence in their Glasscubes folder</p>
<p>Programme and Project Plans (activity and deliverables are clearly set out to auditors)</p>	<p>A central programme plan has been developed; that all local partner plans feed into.</p> <p>The central, collective, programme plan sets out all the work across Elevate Berkshire and how it will deliver the system change and outputs and results – put forward in our collective application.</p> <p>The central programme plan is updated on each month (strategic) and local partner updates from partner project plans are fed into the collective programme plan.</p>	<p>Each project is required to have a detailed project plan, located in the project plan folder in Glasscubes. Partners to update their project plan to ensure it accurately reflects their financial profile (actual spend) on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>It is crucial that the central team know what each project is delivering. This will also help put together a schedule of activity across the programme.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners are to provide a narrative in the project plan template each month – against key deliverables. These updates must be provided by the 24<sup>th</sup> of each month; after-which the central team collates all updates into one progress report for DWP Contract Managers.</li> <li>Partners to re-profile their project plan and until June 2019 (an overview document has been provided by the central team to assist with this re-profiling). The deadline is Monday 21<sup>st</sup> August</li> </ol>

<p>Programme and Project Finance Profile</p> <p>33</p>	<p>Centrally – the central team maintains the collective programme profile of £4.8 million.</p> <p>The requirement is that ESF and DWP must be able to reconcile our collective programme to the penny.</p> <p>The central profile relates to the central programme plan (made up of local activity from financial profiles and project plans).</p> <p>Local finance profiles feed into the central profile. This is reported to DWP each month and quarter.</p>	<p>Members agreed the proposal to extend the realisation of project outputs and results beyond October 2018 to June 19. The reasons for this are set out in the Joint Committee paper from July 16 - <a href="https://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=658&amp;Year=0">https://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=658&amp;Year=0</a>.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Each partner to review, and re-profile their financial profile document – up until June 2019 (using the standardised template). The profile will deliver the activity set out in project plans (above) and deliver the remaining partner outputs and results. Re-profile documents must be sent to <a href="mailto:Emelye.janes@reading.gov.uk">Emelye.janes@reading.gov.uk</a> by Monday 21<sup>st</sup> August and placed in Glasscubes in a folder called “re-profiling” August 2017</li> <li>3. Partners to review profiles every quarter – post quarterly claim process. Differences between profiles and actual spend need to be discussed with the central team so we have an accurate forward profile of projected spend, as set against actual spend. This document is to be sent to <a href="mailto:Emelye.janes@reading.gov.uk">Emelye.janes@reading.gov.uk</a> 2 weeks after claim submission</li> </ol>
<p>Quarterly ESF claims and ESF compliance requirements</p> <p>(including programme and project changes AND compliance evidence)</p>	<p>ESF funding is based on the evidence of defrayed resource over the previous quarter. A claim will only be paid – if 100% of the claim is compliant.</p> <p>Partners have been provided with an ESF claim process document / have been provided with claim templates (which include guidance) and have been on ESF workshops, delivered by the central Elevate team.</p>	<p>From claim 6 – the central team will only include partner claims / transaction lines where evidence has been provided in the partner quarterly claim folder and all trigger dates have been adhered to.</p> <p>The risks of not meeting the trigger dates have been set out numerous times to partners (workshops, SG). The central team has questioned the care and accuracy of some partners claims.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partners to work up claims at the end of each month – and not leave it until the end of the quarter.</li> <li>2. Partners to REVIEW ALL FINANCIAL CLAIMS TO DATE (claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) and ensure that claim 7 is completed using the latest version of the transaction list and schema.</li> <li>3. All partners to re-read guidance around evidence requirements for defrayed expenditure and corresponding naming conventions</li> <li>4. All partners to provide evidence of Tax</li> </ol>

	<p>The central team collates the collective Berkshire claim on behalf of the primary delivery partners.</p>		<p>and NI contributions (for all claims past and going forwards)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. All partners are responsible for FULLY completing the claim participant data schema for all participants they put forward as part of a claim. Where there are gaps in participant information – participants will be removed from the collective data schema</li> <li>6. All partners to provide a detailed progress report and future financial profile (based on the actual spend to date)</li> <li>7. All partners to provide fully completed contact details schema for all participants who have achieved a result in that quarter.</li> <li>8. All partners to review claims for accuracy PRIOR to submission to the central team</li> </ol>
<p><b>ESF Policies and Procedures – Cross Cutting Themes</b>  <b>(MEETING AND EVIDENCING COMPLIANCE IN PARTNER DELIVERY)</b></p>	<p>Centrally, the central Elevate team has produced programme policies and procedures and has implemented the necessary project management systems – these haven been discussed and shared with partners via ESF workshops. The central team reports against these collective policies / procedures and requirements each month – to DWP (the Managing Authority)</p>	<p>The auditors stressed the importance of ESF cross cutting themes etc etc. Each partner has been provided with a project action and risk template – which includes cross-cutting themes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By the 24<sup>th</sup> of each month – each partner to have provided a narrative against project cross cutting themes (equality and diversity / sustainability, state aid (if applicable), procurement) within partner action and risk templates in Glasscubes. The central team will then lift this information into the collective programme progress report.</li> <li>2. All partners to evidence, via Glasscubes, how they have operationalised the various policies and procedures. Each partner <b>MUST</b> have cross cutting theme action plans; reporting back, for example, on how the project has used equality and diversity data to influence project activity. To be in Glasscubes by 21<sup>st</sup> August 17</li> </ol>

			<p>3. <b>Marketing and Branding-</b> all partners to ensure they are using the correct version of the ESF logo for any marketing and branding e.g. black and white version of logos. All partners to ensure they have an ESF poster where the project is being delivered. To be in Glasscubes by 21<sup>st</sup> August 17</p>
<p><b>Performance</b></p> <p><b>Outputs and results</b></p> <p><b><u>Including -</u></b></p> <p><b>TRACKING SYSTEM -DATA SCHEMA</b></p>	<p>The programme has a set of collective outputs and results. These have been broken down by partner. The project has to work with eligible unemployed and inactive participants (eligible to the programme) – evidence of eligibility to work in the UK must be provided for each participant (hard copy and electronic version)</p>	<p>It was agreed that Elevate Berkshire extend the realisation of programme outputs and results beyond October 2018 to June 19.</p> <p>The central team provided partners, at the beginning of August 17, with an updated partner and project performance document.</p> <p>The document sets out what each partner is / will be delivering to deliver outputs and results.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All partners to arrange a time for Rebekah to come and audit both hard-copy and electronic files, in anticipation of participant files being audited.</li> <li>2. Partners to provide Rebekah with access to their IYSS system.</li> <li>3. All partners to ensure that participants put forward in the data schema are in an ESF compliant system</li> <li>4. All partners to ensure their local project have the necessary relationships in place with key stakeholders to ensure that all eligible 16-24 year olds are part of the Elevate project.</li> <li>5. Partners to be mindful of the amount of money they are drawing down in relation to the performance against outputs and results targets to date.</li> <li>6. All partners to report on a monthly basis, via the monthly report template, their performance against outputs and results.</li> <li>7. Partners to ensure that new data schema template is used for claim 6 onwards.</li> <li>8. Partners to review systems to ensure all relevant evidence is present.</li> <li>9. Partners to ensure that all evidence is signed, dated, and the declaration uses</li> </ol>

			the correct wording.
<b>MONITORING / QUALITY / AUDIT</b> in preparation for future audits (by DWP and the European Commission)			
<b>PROGRAMME AND PARTNER RISK AND ACTION LOG</b>  36	The programme has a central Action and Risk Log – to track delivery of the above ESF programme requirements.  Actions and Risk have been combined on the premise that actions are in-fact risks from an ESF compliance point of view (as the whole programme is ESF).  The central risk log (containing strategic and operational risks) is updated on monthly and is used to track the risk of non-compliance across the programme.  The central risk log is reported to DWP and BCEX and information from it – is used as part of the quarterly claim.		1. To reiterate the above, all partners to update their action and risk log by the 24 <sup>th</sup> of each month.
<b>AUDIT &amp; COMPLIANCE (Internal and</b>	The central team will lead on all ESF and DWP audits as it did with the PIV and first Article 125 audit.		1. All partners to review internal processes around compliance to ensure there is a



This page is intentionally left blank