

UDL Management Committee Meeting Minutes – 14 September 2006

Meeting Minutes – 14.09.06

Antipodean Room, 4th Floor, 84 Eccleston Square, London SW1V 1PX
10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Attendees:

Liz Loughran (GLA)
Leon Yates (LB Lewisham)
Caroline Kearey (RB Kingston)
Will Dorman (LB Islington)
Anna Tennent (LB Harrow)
David Ubaka (TfL)
David Stacey (TfL)
Kevin John (TfL)
Esther Kurland (UDL)
Olubusola Daodu (UDL)

Apologies:

Cllr Terry Neville (LB Enfield)
Damian Price (ALG)
Deborah Ganley (ALG)
Ron Presswell (LB Waltham Forest)
Maggie Urguhart (LB Hounslow)
Rodney Keg (LDA)
Caroline Fraser (CABE)

Recommendations and Actions:

1. EK chaired the meeting and explained the objective of the management committee, namely to input in the delivery of UDL's work programme.
2. UDL to invite English Heritage to next committee meeting.
3. EK gave a brief on the tenders received for the training programme. Actions and recommendations as follows:
 - E-learning: EK suggested that e-learning be put on hold because tenders submitted were poor with regards to what the content of the e-learning package would be. She suggested that UDL put this on hold until the seminar series were developed and use the material from the seminars to write the e-learning package. DU however objected, suggesting instead that UDL continue with the e-learning package, using material from IHT's seminar programme, especially their workbook as EK suggested. However, committee felt that IHT should be given the option of sourcing for suppliers with the expertise to help them develop the

seminars as an e-learning package. The alternative would be for UDL to write the e-learning programme and then commission one of RUDI or Universities Consortium to deliver the package?

- DU suggested that UDL provide an evaluation matrix of the tenders received.
- Seminars: EK was in favour the IHT Consortium being commissioned to deliver the seminar series because theirs was the best tender in this class and this was their area of expertise. In addition costs quoted by suppliers were in close range. Their tender also included the production of a workbook, intellectual property rights of which UDL intended to own subject to negotiation of contract terms. The IHT Consortium however did not bid for the e-learning programme.
- TfL would be happy with an informal accreditation by UDL.
- CK indicated that there would need to be some sort of incentive to encourage borough officers to attend the sessions. TfL already solved this problem through the use of performance reviews.
- It was suggested that Councillors and especially Design Champions as well as Chief Executives and Chief Planning officers and Development Control be engaged, they would in turn ensure officers in their respective boroughs went on the training courses. AT, WD and LY to forward OD contact names in their sub regions so that they can be invited to the Champions induction programme on the 9th October. This would serve to engage them.
- It was also suggested that the Mayor's advisers be engaged as well. UDL to send invite for 9th October to Nicki Gaveron, Debbie McMullen and Eleanor Young.
- UDL to put together a brochure detailing training modules available and prices.
- EK suggested that R99 project managed master classes and seminars in light of the fact that this was their strong point and especially as this post was still vacant within UDL. No objections were raised to this.
- Master classes: EK suggested that UDL commission both IHT and Universities consortium because each proposal had its own merit. The IHT proposal was strong on hands- on learning and therefore would be more beneficial to borough officers. The Universities consortium proposal was strong on theory content and had good speakers lined up, which EK suggested might be better suited to councillors/ design champions. There was no objection to this.
- LL suggested that classes could be made compulsory for councillors in order to ensure take up of classes. EK to speak with Damian Price of ALG in more detail about this.
- DAP: EK gave brief on proposals submitted. Universities consortium's proposal was considered the strongest. It was also suggested this would serve as an opportunity for the Universities to see what was going on in practice. There was no objection to this.
- Concern with Universities doing DAP because they are better teachers rather than practitioners.
- EK suggested that UDL could commission both IHT Consortium and Universities Consortium to deliver DAP subject to availability of funds.
- AT suggested that UDL market the training programme as its own brand to enable officers show the value that the organisation offers.
- Reading List: Generally agreed that the reading list was good. Suggestions to help improve it included adding on publications from the GLA and English Partnerships as well as TfL's UD Policy as soon as it is published.