

240

Prime Minister 4

1. Under f. 000 in Jan 70 - many places. It doesn't make sense to run down no. of efficiency or other take on various



PRIME MINISTER

THE YOUTH TRAINING SCHEME AND THE CIVIL SERVICE

One of the key proposals in the Government's White Paper "A New Training Initiative: A Programme for Action" was that by September 1983 a new Youth Training Scheme would be introduced building on the experience gained from the Youth Opportunities Programme. Places for some 300,000 young people would be provided in 1983-84.

At A is a minute from John Vereker and Alan Walters arguing against any involvement by the Civil Service in the Youth Training Scheme. I would have thought private sector employees would understand the policy better than I should. Agree that I should put the points in the minute at A to Lady Young and Mr Tebbit, and seek their reactions? Yes

LM  
6/5

The Secretary of State for Employment is asking all employers, private and public, to contribute and has written to me saying that he hopes that the Civil Service as an employer will play its part in providing places. I think it important that we should make a good contribution, both for its own sake and in order to give a lead. In fact, Departments generally are keen to do so. As a first step they will be running pilot schemes designed to provide about 200-400 good quality places by September 1982. This will give the experience needed to enable much more large-scale provision to be mounted by September 1983.

If the Civil Service is to do its share it should provide places for about 8,000 young people and this will require up to 200 people in Departments to train and supervise the young people concerned. If Departments are going to take part on this scale - and if we are going to get the trade union support we want - the manpower side of the Treasury will need to recognize this in its manpower ceilings. I therefore plan as a next step to write on the lines of the attached draft to the Chancellor of the Exchequer seeking his co-operation.

I thought you would like to know of this development and hope it has your support.

Baroness Young

BARONESS YOUNG

5 May 1982

It is important to get points fed in places for Y.O.P.

ML

I am very strongly  
opposed to this. The private sector has  
to pay for our business.  
ms.

DRAFT LETTER FROM THE LORD PRIVY SEAL TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER

YOUTH TRAINING SCHEME AND THE CIVIL SERVICE

One of the key proposals in the Government's White Paper "A New Training Initiative: A Programme for Action" was that by September 1983 a new Youth Training Scheme would be introduced building on the experience gained from the Youth Opportunities Programme. The new scheme would offer a training programme of up to a year for all unemployed minimum age school leavers, consisting of planned and supervised work experience together with properly designed opportunities for off-the-job training and further education. The aim is to provide places for some 300,000 young people in 1983-84.

No - I don't agree.

Norman Tebbit and I are both keen that the Civil Service as an employer should, in common with other employers play its part in providing these places. Clearly it would strengthen Norman's hand with private sector employers, whose co-operation we need if the scheme is to be successful, if the Civil Service were seen to be making a major contribution. My officials have agreed in principle with officials of other departments, through the Establishment Officers' meeting, that the Civil Service should aim to provide between 200 and 400 high quality places by September 1982 in a variety of departments and locations on a pilot basis. These pilot schemes would provide the basis for a large expansion within the Civil Service from September 1983. The proposals do however have implications for Civil Service manpower and that is why I am writing to you now. It is already established that MSC funded trainees on schemes of this kind are not civil servants and are not therefore included in the manpower count.

In existing YOP programmes in the Civil Service which are geared overwhelmingly to work experience, the staff resources involved in supervision and administration are in general balanced by

the contributions made by the trainees so that there is no need for provision for extra staff. With the new proposals the staffing requirements will be much greater because of the amount of formal training required and the need to provide more varied and more carefully structured work experience. It is difficult to estimate in advance what extra staff resources would be needed and the proportions will vary from place to place. The best guess that we can make at present is that one additional person may be needed for every 40 trainees. The pilot schemes starting later this year will enable us to assess this more accurately. A proportionate share for the Civil Service of the 300,000 places sought for September 1983 would be 8,000 trainees, and on this basis an extra 200 staff would be required in participating departments.

Departments are conscious that these demands will fall on them just when they will be finding it hardest to meet the April 1984 manpower target and they do not think that they can be expected to participate in the Youth Training Scheme without some easement of manpower ceilings to allow for the extra staff required. Although the numbers involved are small, I sympathise with them.

The staffing point is also one that will be of major interest to the unions, whom we have yet to approach formally. Union agreement is required for schemes operated under the Youth Opportunities Programme and the same will be true of the Youth Training Scheme. The Civil Service has not done its share in existing YOP work experience schemes, largely because of the opposition of the CPSA and the SCPS. Without some assurance that adequate staff resources will be made available, there is little likelihood of union agreement to participation in the Youth Training Scheme. Is there room for some dispensation in relation to the Civil Service manpower count? Alternatively should we make provision out of the "contingency margin" within the existing 630,000 target?

I believe departments will be able to find staff to run the pilot schemes which start later this year out of existing manpower provision, but we need to settle this point quickly if they are to prepare for a very substantial expansion in 1983 and if consultation with the unions is to begin. In other words progress with this year's pilot scheme is linked with assurances on manpower for 1983.

I am sending copies of this letter to the Prime Minister and Cabinet colleagues.

BARONESS YOUNG