

## Learning Network Evaluation

<b>What was the most effective part of the Learning Network?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The chance to develop a strong relationship with DWP &amp; other gov't depts</li><li>• It brought the pathfinders together</li><li>• Discussions over dinner with DWP &amp; pathfinder colleagues</li><li>• Round table discussions</li><li>• It was good to present their views to Ministers</li><li>• A chance to listen to what Ministers had to say</li><li>• The session on the Commissioning strategy</li><li>• Some of the topics gave them a better understanding of procedures</li><li>• Getting all the CSPs together and to have one voice</li><li>• Gaining an understanding of policy direction and impact on CSPs</li></ul>
<b>What could have been done better?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some meetings were more worthwhile than others, however it has begun to show dividends</li><li>• Too many topics are discussed, therefore important issues were often skimmed over. Some presentations were too broad. More time should have been spent on issues challenging to all areas i.e. employer engagement &amp; making partnerships work</li><li>• Meetings could have been themed by Pathfinder direction, the updates given were very brief</li><li>• Use the full two days, effectively it is less than one days debate</li><li>• More opportunities for pathfinders to learn from one another</li><li>• Would have liked better info about what is going on, on the CSP agenda</li><li>• The second day tours on some of the 1<sup>st</sup> learning networks were not particularly useful</li><li>• Communications from the learning network could have been improved</li><li>• Working through some practical examples / issues</li></ul>

<p><b>What could have been done differently?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater agreement as to the direction of CSP</li> <li>• More facilitation of dialogue, less presentation</li> <li>• A more structured approach to CS partnership updates</li> <li>• Too much time was spent on Enabling Measures</li> <li>• Facilitation was good, however CESI led by the nose rather than engaging with Pathfinders in developing solutions</li> <li>• Some members of CESI had too much air time and retranslated some of what had already been said when they fed back. However would not want to loose them altogether just restrict their role and buy in someone else specifically for the LN</li> <li>• CSPs could have consulted more on the agenda and asked CSPs to input more</li> <li>• The Networks could be used as a 2-way dialogue with government departments</li> <li>• The networks could have provided CSPs with clear direction on policy</li> </ul>
<p><b>What recommendations do you have?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LN should continue to address pathfinders learning &amp; strengthen govt relationships.</li> <li>• Regular themed pathfinder meetings with DWP to share info &amp; learning. The quarterly meeting could then focus on links with other depts &amp; raising the profile with Ministers</li> <li>• It should be more learning focused – possibly more workshops, group sessions and interaction with fewer presentations</li> <li>• Integration with CLG</li> <li>• Evaluate the LN</li> <li>• More good practice examples. Topics could be put forward in advance with a few pathfinders presenting their work on the issue, followed by Q&amp;A</li> <li>• It would have been nice to have a forum or board to share info</li> <li>• The Learning Network should continue, it should build a network between the CSPs – share across the CSPs with a more practical approach, improve communications between the CSPs and DWP [possibly a web page],</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSPs should be asked what they want to appear on the agenda</li> <li>• The Learning Network should still offer the CSPs access to Ministers as this has been really useful</li> </ul>
<p><b>How can the stimulation of new thinking, developed by the Learning Network, help Pathfinders in England to incorporate the WNF arena into their landscape and help prioritise worklessness in smaller wards in the devolved administrations?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sharing of good practice in detail &amp; agreement to develop key papers for wide govt circulation</li> <li>• Continuation of the discussion with CLG</li> <li>• Influencing LSP in CS areas to adopt the objectives &amp; targets agreed by CSPs &amp; to pool WNF support to deliver this.</li> <li>• In Scotland they measure deprivation at data zone level (smaller than ward level). The Fairer Scotland Fund enables local areas to prioritise action based on data zone info</li> <li>• Agreement and circulation of good practice</li> <li>• CLG / DWP asking boroughs in CSP areas to work with CSP to pull together delivery plans within their area and ensure links to CSP</li> <li>• Working with WNF areas / DCLG will be a real mistake. It has been hard enough working with 14 Pathfinders never mind adding to the mix</li> </ul>