

Committee(s)	Dated:
Education Board – For decision	21 May 2015
Subject: Livery Education Review 2015	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

This report details the Livery Education Review of 2015, on the consultation about the future of educational support. Given the broad support for establishment of a central Livery Education and Training Office (LETO), it is proposed that Alison Truphet, who conducted this review, in conjunction with a small group of Livery Company members, prepares a business plan for such LETO for submission and approval of all Livery Companies and their various decision making protocols. Such business plan shall include mission statement, governance and management structure plus self-funding proposal from subscribers.

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that Members of the Education Board

- note the contents of this report
- approve the preparation of a business plan for the central LETO for submission and approval of all Livery Companies and their various decision making protocols

Main Report

Background

1. This report arises from work commissioned by the City of London Corporation following their Strategy Document and the Livery Education Working Group report (attached at appendices A and B). City of London Corporation recognises the contribution to education made by LCs and reaffirms its intention to work with Livery Companies in partnership for the benefit of education and training in its widest sense. The consultation meetings sought to establish the objectives of LCs, whether they would value support from a central office and if so, the extent to which they would be able to contribute to its running.

Consultation findings

2. Members are asked to note that those who attended the meetings expressed views which have been taken as representative of the view of the overall Livery.

3. There was universal agreement that support for education, training and the maintenance of high professional standards lies at the heart of every Livery Company (LC) regardless of the trade, industry or profession they represent. Where industry links no longer exist, LCs have in most cases, dedicated their charitable efforts tirelessly to the support for education. LCs involvement at all levels in education and training has been consistently under-reported, so that even other Livery Companies were sometimes unaware of the achievements of fellow Companies. LCs are rightly proud of their charitable support for education. Some reported that their giving is not always subjected to suitably rigorous review, and would welcome an opportunity to conduct a thorough review of their funding. Many are proud of contributions which they see as unique. A central resource would enable LCs to find new opportunities for both corporate support by the Company and for individual involvement.
4. There was general support for the consultation process and the opportunity to express views frankly.
5. There was broad support for a central Livery Education and Training office which would provide up to date relevant information, perform a coordinating function between LCs, and between LCs and schools/other educational organisations, organise events and help LCs develop links with schools both in Greater London and beyond. It was recognised that LSL had limited impact due to lack of resource but that its remit was sound. A better resourced, more effective organisation at the heart of the livery which was able to make a greater comprehensive impact would be welcomed and nearly all those consulted thought that there would be support for the LC to belong to a central organisation even if they did not intend to participate in any way or benefit from the services offered. Consolidating existing partnerships, refreshing them with new ideas and starting up new relationships were all ideas well received. A central database and website would be crucial. More support for teachers, as opposed to students, would be a popular development. Many LCs saw a central resource as an opportunity to engage their young liverymen in educational activity.
6. Helping young people in the transition from education to employment was an important consideration for many. LCs who have not thus far been specifically connected with schools because they felt that their trade links precluded this, agreed the need to raise awareness in schools of the career paths and job opportunities in their trades and industries. There was broad agreement that there would be more applicants for apprenticeship and work based training schemes if schools had access to the right advice and information. The various existing LC associations could be helped to collaborate more effectively in this area.
7. Many LCs without staff were very receptive to the suggestion that a central resource might support their educational involvement for a fraction of the cost of employing a member of staff. Furthermore, a few who did not feel they would need a central resource nevertheless supported the principle.

8. There were some concerns. Some were unconvinced of the need for funding to run another tier of administration which would divert funds from individual beneficiaries and may duplicate effort. Some expressed caution over raising the profile of Livery Companies, a couple actually saying they preferred to stay below the radar. There was also concern that the initiative to develop a Livery Education and Training office should be free from interference by the City of London Corporation. Where this was expressed, LCs were generally reassured to know that City of London Corporation were fully supportive of all that LCs were doing in education and would prefer to work in partnership than in any other capacity.

Next Steps

9. Function of a central livery education and training office
 - Upkeep of interactive database and website
 - Brokerage of new partnerships between LCs and educational establishments, whether in governance, management or financial support
 - Establishment of new programmes not yet in place elsewhere
 - Close collaboration with organisations and agencies delivering suitable services and programmes which LCs could link into (SGOSS,EBP, Brokerage City Link, Future First)
 - Support for LCs in meeting their objectives and responding to requests for help
 - Provision of a series of training events and briefing sessions for LCs, including support for all liverymen wishing to be school governors.
 - Organisation of key education and training events in the City and beyond
 - Facilitation of funding reviews by LCs.
 - Responsibility for maintaining contact with educational establishments through personal contact and visits and developing new contacts.
 - Support for the development of links for LCs with education outside London.

Funding

10. There was widespread agreement that a central office, with charitable status, should be funded by LC contributions and managed by a board made up of LC representatives and that such an organisation would support all aspects of LC involvement in education and training in the widest sense. It would make sense for such an office to operate under the umbrella of the Worshipful Company of Educators
11. Results were collected from 105 LCs. Of those, only 3 have said they would not wish to subscribe to a Livery Education and Training organisation. Of the 10 not met, 3 are LSL members. Assuming that all the LCs who have said they would belong, did indeed sign up at a subscription of say £200/£250 per

annum, a worst case scenario would be a membership of 105 LCs raising £21,000. Other contributions offered amounted to £17,750, bringing the total initially pledged to £38,750, subject to confirmation by LCs. There may be other organisations such as CoLC who wish to subscribe as fellow members or partners of the organisation. An important objective would be to avoid any duplication of effort where other organisations were already effective. It may therefore be that other organisations and agencies would be invited to subscribe to a Livery Education and Training organisation in return for opportunities to collaborate and develop their programmes. Subscriptions levied from these groups would support the funding of the office. There were also offers of support from LCs for meeting and event space, gifts in kind and volunteers.

Governance Structure

12. A management board might be set up comprising 9 LC representatives (3 from each of the Educational, Training and Donor groups) with the Master Educator as an ex-officio post
13. The Livery Education and Training office would be staffed by an Education and Training Officer and an administrative assistant. There is sufficient work and scope for these 2 posts to be full time. However, it is highly unlikely that funding will be available to facilitate this. It is therefore proposed that funding is secured for 2 part-time posts on a 3 day a week basis, subject to review.
14. The structure will be drawn up in more detail in consultation with LCs.

Appendices

A City Education Strategy

B Livery Education Working Party report

C Report on the LSL Consultant submitted to the Education Board on 16 October 2014

D Terms of reference for the Livery Education Review

E Analysis of responses from Livery Companies

Alison Truphet

Consultant Project Manager

Alistair MacLellan

Town Clerk's Department

Alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk