



Taith Advisory Board Meeting - Minutes
Wednesday, 21st June 2023
10.30am – 12.30pm
Meeting held via Teams

Attendance List	
In Attendance:	<p>(KW) Kirsty Williams, Advisory Board Chair (CM) Craig Matthews, The Local Authorities' Principal Youth Officers Group (PG) Paul Glaze Council for Wales of Voluntary Youth Service (RH) Rob Humphreys, Learning and Work Institute Wales (BC) Ben Calvert, Global Wales Partnership (HB) Harriet Barnes, Higher Education Funding Council Wales</p>
Alternates:	<p>(APE) Angharad Penny Evans, Welsh Government (PD) Paul Davies, NUS Wales (DH) David Hagendyk, ColegauCymru (LM) Lisa Mytton, National Training Federation Wales (EF) Elin Forsyth, Welsh Local Government Association/Association of Directors of Education in Wales (KR) Kieron Rees, Universities Wales</p>
Apologies:	<p>John Nash, National Training Federation Wales Calum White, Welsh Government Colin McInnes, Wales Higher Education Brussels Amanda Wilkinson, Universities Wales Maria Hinfelaar, Wrexham Glyndwr University Siân Holleran, ColegauCymru Delyth Lewis, Welsh Youth Parliament Zachary Edge, NUS Wales Gareth Morgans, Welsh Local Government Association/Association of Directors of Education in Wales</p>
Taith Programme Executive (TPE):	<p>(SG) Susana Galván (EM) Dr Elid Morris (EB) Ellie Bevan (WB) Walter Brooks (BW) Bethan Williams</p>
Secretariat support:	<p>Michele Convery</p>

Minutes		
Agenda item	Item	Actions (A) - Discussion (D)
1	Welcome and introductions (KW)	
1.1	KW welcomed all members to the meeting. KW also welcomed alternates Angharad Penny Evans (on behalf of Calum White from Welsh Government), Paul Davies (on behalf of Zachary Edge from NUS Wales), David Hagedyk (on behalf of Sian Holleran, ColegauCymru), Lissa Mytton (on behalf of John Nash, National Training Federation Wales, Elin Forsyth (on behalf of Gareth Morgans, Welsh Local Government Association/Association of Directors of Education in Wales) and Kieron Rees (on behalf of Amanda Wilkinson, Universities Wales).	
1.2	KW informed the Advisory Board (AB) that the meeting was being recorded to support minute taking and asked members to reserve the chat function for the purposes of operational matters.	
2	Minutes and actions of the last meeting (KW)	
2.1	KW received agreement from the members that the Minutes from the last meeting are an accurate reflection of discussion.	
3	Matters arising (KW)	
3.1	There were no comments from the AB on the previous minutes and actions.	
4	Update from the Taith Executive (SG)	
4.1	A highlighted update was presented from the Taith Executive as the detailed paper (paper 2) had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The following questions were raised relation to the update:	
4.1a	BC asked how the data around inclusivity and outreach was captured and if this data is demonstrating any impact.	
4.1a(i)	EM clarified that currently the data being collected is for Pathway 1 2022 projects, as these are the live projects. A steady stream of information is starting to emerge as the projects begin to mobilise. Going forward, the Taith Programme Executive will start to examine this data from a strategic and holistic perspective, and the outcomes of this data will be presented to the ILEP Board of Directors and the Advisory Board.	

<p>4.1b</p> <p>4.1b(i)</p> <p>4.1b(ii)</p> <p>4.1b(iii)</p> <p>4.1b(iv)</p> <p>4.2b(v)</p>	<p>RH asked about data collections and if there is an even and proportional spread and was mindful of examining unsuccessful applicants to check for any patterns emerging on why they were unsuccessful.</p> <p>KW explained that Funding Committee members have asked the same questions and gave an example of 5 schools that applied last year and were not successful, were successful this year. These schools had been supported with their reapplication, and this needs to be done on a consistently.</p> <p>EM - there are sub-data sets around participant profiling, and this can be shared with the Advisory Board by written procedure. Information is currently available on the website in terms of county breakdown. Funding is spread across Wales in a beneficial way.</p> <p>EB - schools' applications from areas of deprivation have been higher than expected – over 50% of applying schools this year were in the bottom two quintiles of the Welsh index of multiple deprivation. In the Youth sector, there are a lot of organisations working in deprived areas. There is a real focus on providing additional support to make sure that organisations working with those with the greatest barriers can access the opportunities available. As more data comes in, it will be easier to identify the gaps.</p> <p>WB - the Taith Programme Executive has asked independent assessors to provide more detailed feedback to candidates who have been unsuccessful and give guidance on where they can improve the rate of success. There is also a greater diversity of applicants in the Adult Education sector.</p> <p>SG – there is work to be done with the HE sector to make sure their applications have clear links to target widening participation.</p>	<p>A – Taith Programme Executive to share the sub-set of data around participant profiling via written procedure.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Taith Strategy refresh (SG/EB)</p>	
<p>5.1</p> <p>5.1a</p> <p>5.1b</p> <p>5.1b(i)</p>	<p>EB presented the proposed strategy refresh of the Taith Programme (paper 3) and advised that this paper has been presented to the ILEP Ltd. Board of Director and will be sent to the Minister of Education and Welsh Language. The aim is to publish late summer/early autumn. The following questions were raised relation to the proposal:</p> <p>PG congratulated the team on the succinct and focused paper.</p> <p>KW asked the Board to comment on issues around inclusivity/broadening participation/equality and if it is adequately reflected and clear as a central mission.</p>	

<p>5.1b(ii) 5.1b(iii) 5.1b(iv) 5.1b(v) 5.1b(vi) 5.1b(vii) 5.1b(viii) 5.1b(ix) 5.1b(x) 5.2b(xi)</p> <p>5.2c</p>	<p>HB commented that having the specific naming of disadvantaged groups, i.e., learners/disabled people/those with additional needs is less inclusive because naming particular groups is always a problem as some groups are missed out.</p> <p>KW → HB the aim was to be explicit but, took the point that it is a difficult balance.</p> <p>DH from his experience, unless the underrepresented groups are named explicitly, then it doesn't get the required drive.</p> <p>DH questioned the term demonstrable impact and how this is measured?</p> <p>EB → HB - need to be explicit about the area/groups being targeted. Acknowledged there are lots of barriers to access and participation and the Programme is trying to progress this and break down as many barriers as possible.</p> <p>EB → DH agreed that there is a need to think about how this is captured – also need to look at qualitative detail and case studies and feed this into reporting.</p> <p>BC highlighted that there is evidence of a relationship between international exchange and career development.</p> <p>RH questioned the term (under Wider Impacts in annex 1 of the paper) promoting 'Welsh language and culture' (under Wider Impacts in annex 1 of the paper) and asked to think about changing the wording around this.</p> <p>EB → RH –agreed with the point and would look to expanding the language around this to make clear that it includes the richness of the culture and not just the Welsh language.</p> <p>EB → BC – beginning to see a lot of data coming in and this is currently being evaluated to assess the impact of the programme. This needs to capture all the impacts across all sectors as they will be different.</p> <p>KW asked those with sector expertise to pass on feedback/thoughts on the best way to capture demonstrable impact.</p> <p>KW asked the Board if they were happy to endorse the strategy.</p>	<p>A – Advisory Board to pass on sector expertise to the Taith Programme Executive on the best ways of capturing demonstrable impact.</p> <p>D - The Advisory Board endorsed the Taith Strategy Review.</p>
--	---	---

6	Taith Governance Review: the review of the Advisory Board (SG/EM)	
6.1	<p>SG provided, using a slide deck, the Advisory Board with an update on progress on the implementation of the Governance review, with a specific focus on the proposed model and timeline for the review of the Advisory Board (paper 4). The following questions were raised relation to the review:</p> <p>6.1a KW asked for any questions around the governance review aspect of the update or on the changes to the ILEP Ltd. Board of Directors and noted her gratitude to Cardiff University for providing the infrastructure that allowed the Taith Programme to be established.</p> <p>6.1a(i) DH questioned the balance of voting members on the newly constituted ILEP Board of Directors.</p> <p>6.1a(ii) KW→DH confirmed that there would be three members from Cardiff University and three independent directors.</p> <p>6.1a(iii) BC wondered why the Board of Directors required so many members from Cardiff University and if the number of independent directors could be increased.</p> <p>6.1a(iv) KR asked who on the Board of Directors had the casting vote.</p> <p>6.1a(v) KW→KR confirmed the chair had the casting vote as per usual meetings.</p> <p>6.1a(vi) RH welcomed the proposal, which offers transparency and greater potential to engage with wider sectors and questioned the continued development of policy.</p> <p>6.1a(vii) PG agreed that it was time to do this and questioned the make-up of the proposed AB membership, will it be on individual expertise. Also, regarding stakeholder groups, would the intention be to use existing groups and would these be managed by Taith.</p> <p>6.1a(viii) SG→BC as set out in the Grant Agreement Letter (GAL), there should be a maximum of 6 directors on the Board of Directors. The Taith Programme Executive is satisfied with the 3/3 split, but this is open for discussion.</p> <p>6.1a(ix) SG→RH the AB review will follow the timeline as set out in the presentation and in parallel there will be conversations with the sectors. Policy discussions will be taken out of normal governance but will continue to happen in parallel this this.</p> <p>6.1a(x) RH asked for confirmation that this is just a one-off because of the sequencing of events.</p> <p>6.1a(xi) SG→RH confirmed that it was, and policy discussion will be part of the stakeholder’s group and will be fed back to the Advisory Board.</p>	

6.1a(xi)	SG → PG sensible to use existing infrastructure. Over the summer, the Taith team (along with the AB) will unpack practicalities. Regarding the types of members, there will be a mixture of individual and organisational skills.	
6.1a(xii)	DH questioned what the role of the new AB would be and what it would be advising on. Also, expressed concerns about losing the voice of some valuable organisations (if they were not eligible to sit on the new AB) and how it would be difficult to get others (who are not currently on this group) with the expertise, there is a risk of diminishing the voice of the sector. Stakeholder groups would need assurance that their views are fed back to the AB and Board of Directors.	
6.1a(xiii)	BC asked for clarity on how the voice of stakeholders will be directly heard. Stakeholder groups: use international networks to avoid duplication. Also, there is potential for missing connectivity and integration.	
6.1a(xiv)	CM – asked for confirmation that formal stakeholder groups will be overseen by programme managers and how big/small the stakeholder groups are anticipated to be.	
6.1a(xv)	SG → CM – Programme Teams will coordinate the stakeholder groups, and these will be formally minuted.	
6.1a(xvi)	EB → PG how it all works is up for discussion in terms of who chairs the stakeholder group. The aim is to make these groups as open and accessible as possible and representative of the sector as a whole. There is a need for consistency across the groups, while recognising the sectors can be very different.	
6.1a(xvii)	KR asked about the role of regulators who are not beneficiaries.	
6.1a(xviii)	KW asked where the user voice in this will be and how it will be captured.	
6.1a(xix)	HB asked about having open selection versus nominating bodies.	
6.1a(xx)	SG → BC there will be more detailed discussions on what the stakeholder groups will look like to ensure collective voices are not lost.	
6.1a(xxi)	SG → DH acknowledged concerns about the diminishing of voices but, conversely, saw it as an amplification. However, these concerns are noted and will be considered going forward.	
6.1a(xxii)	SG → HB Regulator discussion will be part of future discussions with the Welsh Government.	
6.1b	KW summed up and asked the Board if there was an agreement in principle for the proposal to move forward in the suggested way. There will be ongoing discussions around the practicalities of the information, the mitigation of risks, or the answers to some of the varied and legitimate challenges that have been highlighted at this meeting.	D – The Advisory Board agreed with the principles of the proposal.
6.1b(i)	KW advised that the proposal is to communicate the principle to the Board of Directors and to the Welsh Government for approval, and there would then be an additional meeting of this group in September to	

	satisfy the AB that the work has been done. The target is to have this new Advisory Board in place by February 2024.	
7	Any Other Business (KW)	
7.1	No other business was raised.	