

Consultation Paper

Review of the Redcar and Cleveland Partnership

Published 22 July 2011

1.0 ABOUT THE CONSULTATION

- 1.1 This paper presents the outcomes of a review that has taken place in relation to the Redcar and Cleveland Partnership. The review, which involved an inclusive workshop event, discussions between the LSP Chairs, and research carried out in relation to other LSPs, has resulted in a set of proposals regarding the structure, role, remit and governance arrangements of the Partnership going forward. It is anticipated that the outcome of this restructure will be a Partnership that is based on relationships not hierarchy, that engages effectively with local people, and has a clear focus on delivering improved outcomes for local people. The proposals are presented in a structure diagram in Appendix 1.

The Partnership Board is now embarking on a 12 week consultation period, during which we will seek comments and views from all of our Partners. The deadline for sending comments is **Friday 14th October 2011**. Once this deadline has passed, comments will be taken into account and the final structure, governance arrangements and revised constitution will be prepared and presented to the Annual General Meeting for formal adoption.

Any comments should be sent either by e-mail or in writing to Kerry Carter, no later than Friday 14th October 2011:

**Kerry Carter, Policy and Partnership Assistant
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
Corporate Resources Department
Town Hall
Eston
TS6 9AR**

Kerry_carter@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

For any queries about the proposals, or to discuss them in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact any of the following:

Brian Footitt, Chair, Redcar and Cleveland Partnership

Brian@footitt.org.uk

07770970064

Jo Waldmeyer, Policy Specialist

Joanne_waldmeyer@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

01642 444629

2.0 STRUCTURAL ISSUES

2.1 LEADERSHIP FORUM (formerly known as the Board)

2.1.1 All of the Partnerships we spoke to are retaining some kind of executive and/or board function although there is a great deal of variation in the role and membership of these groups. In Redcar and Cleveland, the current board has 29 members from across the public, private and voluntary and community sectors. Feedback has confirmed there is widespread support for retaining a Board type group, but one which has a new focus that reflects the new environment within which we operate.

2.1.1 Purpose, Role and Added Value

Given that the Partnership no longer has funds with which to commission activities, it will have less of a decision-making role, and more of a role in agreeing strategic priorities, enabling delivery, and monitoring progress and performance in relation to the Statement of Priorities. This group will be the heart of the Partnership, and it is recommended that it is called the “Leadership Forum.” A suggested “purpose” or “mission statement” for this groups is:

“The Leadership Forum will enable the delivery of the Redcar and Cleveland Partnership’s agreed priorities. We will achieve this by providing leadership, direction and governance to the Partnership, ensuring a collaborative, unified and innovative approach to achieving improved outcomes for local people”.

2.1.2 The Leadership Forum will add value to the work of the Partnership and its members by focussing on the following objectives:

- Working with the Partnership to reach a consensus about the outcomes we want to achieve, agreeing a collaborative approach to tackling issues of strategic significance, and reviewing priorities as necessary
- Developing a common understanding of the Borough’s needs and aspirations, as well as key pressures and opportunities faced by each of our organisations and sectors.
- Leading the development and implementation of governance arrangements for the Partnership and the Statement of Priorities, including an Outcomes Framework that will enable us to effectively manage the performance of the Partnership
- Hold Thematic Partnerships to account for delivering priorities through effective monitoring of activities and performance, and where necessary, agreeing a course of action to mitigate risks to delivery.
- Where appropriate, liaising with organisations within, and external to the Partnership to influence the deployment of resources, remove barriers to achieving priorities and identify scope for joint working.
- Lobbying within and beyond our Borough as appropriate in order to ensure delivery of our Statement of Priorities
- Identifying and realising opportunities to promote Redcar and Cleveland and attract funding to support the delivery of our priorities
- Sharing information about activities taking place within Thematic Partnerships, Area Partnerships and member organisations in order to ensure a co-ordinated and unified approach to improving outcomes.
- Ensuring key messages and information about Leadership Forum activities are effectively communicated throughout the wider partnership, its member organisations and elected members
- Establishing an on-going dialogue with local people, primarily through our neighbourhood approach, ensuring they have opportunities to influence the Partnership through consultation and participation, and to see how their influence has made a difference.

- Ensuring that the work of the Partnership positively contributes to the advancement of equality and good community relations
- Upholding the Constitution of the Partnership

2.1.3 Membership

It is recommended that the membership of the Leadership Forum is as follows:

Partnership Chair

Thematic Partnership Chairs (x5) (or appropriate representatives)

Leader of the Council (or appropriate representative)

2 representatives from the Voluntary Sector Forum

Suitable representatives from Area Partnerships (2 per partnership to include at least one community representative)

MPs (x2)

Chief Executive of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

District Commander, Redcar and Cleveland Police

Director of Public Health for Redcar and Cleveland

Senior representative(s) from the Health Trust(s)

District Manager, Cleveland Fire Brigade

Senior Representative, Job Centre Plus

Chief Executive, Coast and Country Housing

Private Sector Representative

- 2.1.4 Membership has been designed to ensure it includes the most influential public sector decision-makers in the Borough as well as representation from Thematic Partnerships, Area Partnerships and the voluntary, community and private sectors. .

2.1.5 Frequency of Meetings

Given that many of the members of the Leadership Forum have several other Partnership commitments, and we need to be mindful of reduced capacity, it is recommend that the burden of meetings is reduced by holding quarterly meetings. At present, meetings are held 6 weekly (8 per year). If meetings are to be reduced, the agendas will need to be very tightly focussed on the Statement of Priorities and other emerging issues of strategic significance. There will be strong emphasis on accountability of Thematic Partnerships in their work to delivering our priorities.

2.2 GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

- 2.2.1 One of the main purposes of the refresh of the LSP will be to strengthen the governance/performance management arrangements for the Partnership to ensure the Partnership is delivering better outcomes.

2.2.2 Outcome Based Accountability (OBA)

It is proposed that delivery of our priority objectives will be assessed using “Outcome Based Accountability” which is a “disciplined way of thinking and taking action that can be used to improve the quality of life in communities”¹ Key features of this approach include:

- Common use of simple and clear language
- The distinction between population accountability whereby a partnership takes on responsibility for improving the wellbeing of a whole population in a geographic area; and performance accountability - the performance of a particular services, project or programme
- The collection and use of relevant data
- Being clear on how outcomes will be measured
- Agreeing “what works” to improve outcomes, and capturing actions in a strategy
- Understanding whether individual programmes, projects and agencies are making a difference

¹ Friedman, M (2009) Trying Hard is Not Good Enough p11

- The involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, including service users and the wider community, in achieving better outcomes

2.2.3 Embedding OBA in the Partnership

OBA is an ideal approach to strategic planning and performance reporting within the partnership arena, be they Borough wide partnerships (i.e the LSP) or Neighbourhood/Area Partnerships. The Councils Policy and Performance Team and Neighbourhood Management are working together to develop a single Outcomes Framework that can be used by both Area Partnerships and the LSP to ensure that our activities are focussed on improving outcomes, and that there is synergy between the work of Area/Neighbourhood and Thematic Partnerships. This will provide us with a clear overall picture of how outcomes are being improved both in the borough and in our neighbourhoods, contributing to the delivery of the Statement of Priorities.

2.2.4 The Statement of Priorities is ideally suited to OBA methodology. The Partnership has already articulated its Outcomes, each of which is underpinned by measurable priorities that will help us to quantify the achievement of our outcomes. The challenge going forward will be for Thematic and Area Partnerships to agree what needs to be done to help us deliver improvements, who is responsible, and how performance of individual organisations or programmes of activity will be measured.

2.2.5 Accountability

Thematic Partnerships should be primarily focussed on developing a strategic approach to delivering the Outcomes in the Statement of Priorities and each Thematic Partnership will be allocated lead responsibility for one or more objectives. They will do this by directing the work of sub (action) groups and task and finish groups, and by working collaboratively with Area and/or Neighbourhood Partnerships.

2.2.6 Performance in relation to each of the priority objectives will be reported to the Leadership Forum using a simple report card template that captures key information including up-to-date data, new information about factors that are influencing performance, who is involved in delivering the objective, and “what works” in terms of actions required to make a positive difference. Action groups will be required to report to Thematic Partnerships on performance in relation to specific projects or programmes of work that relate to priorities. This should also be done using a report card template.

2.2.7 Securing “Buy in”

If the suggested approach is adopted, its success will be dependent on the level of “buy in” across the Partnership. This will require a great deal of awareness raising, support and cascade training where necessary. It is also proposed that the Partnership identified a number of OBA Champions (those who have already been on OBA training) who can provide advice and guidance where needed.

2.3 THEMATIC PARTNERSHIPS

2.3.1 Research with other LSPs has identified that there is a move away from partnerships with large, hierarchical structures, towards a more fluid, task and finish approach.

2.3.2 At present in Redcar and Cleveland Partnership there are five thematic partnerships: Children’sTrust; Health and Wellbeing; Safer Communities; Stronger Communities and Regeneration. It is proposed that with the exception of the Regeneration Partnership, the current Thematic Partnership Structure is retained (see para 2.4.3). If they have not already done so, Thematic Partnerships will need to fundamentally review their terms of reference, including their role, remit and membership to ensure that they are well placed to deliver the Statement of Priorities.

2.3.3 Regeneration Partnership

None of the Partnerships who we spoke to about their new structures are planning to have a “Regeneration” Partnership, but most have a delivery partnership (or similar) that will

focus on the Economy, Jobs and Skills.

2.3.4 The remit of the Regeneration Partnership is extremely wide, covering issues including jobs and skills; transport; housing; and environment. Each of these four policy areas are delivered by sub groups or partnerships. Given that the Partnership is focussing its efforts on delivering the Statement of Priorities, it is recommended that the Regeneration Partnership and the Jobs and Skills Strategic Task Force are amalgamated, to focus primarily on the jobs, skills and enterprise agenda. Accordingly, this partnership should be renamed “Job, Skills and Enterprise.” This should also be our key mechanism for engaging with the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Private Sector.

2.3.5 The other issues that have previously been covered by the Regeneration Partnership (i.e Transport, Housing and Environment) should be picked up by the existing partnerships (see below section on strategic/cross cutting sub-groups)

2.3.6 Action Groups (formerly known as sub-groups)

The sub-structure of the LSP can be divided into three different types of groups:

2.3.7 Strategic/cross cutting groups who focus on strategically significant issues that cut across all of the Thematic Partnerships. These are:

- Culture Forum (currently reports to Board)
- Transport (currently reports to Regeneration Pship)
- Housing (currently reports to Regeneration Pship)
- Environment (currently reports to Regeneration Pship)
- Community Cohesion (currently reports to Stronger Pship)
- Personalisation and Self-Directed Support Partnership (newly formed partnership)

It is recommended that for the purpose of governance and simplicity, these groups continue to report to their existing Thematic Partnership. However other Thematic Partnerships will be able to task them where their expertise would contribute to delivering priorities. Where this is the case, relevant activities will be reported through the relevant Thematic Partnership. The Culture Forum currently reports to the Board and it has recently been proposed that the Personalisation and Self Directed Support (PSDS) Partnership also reports directly to the Board. Although these are clearly cross-cutting groups which will need to link into the work of all Thematics, it is recommended that for governance purposes, the Culture Forum formerly reports to the Jobs, Skills and Enterprise Partnership, and the PSDS Partnership reports to the Health and Wellbeing Board. This will ensure that the only groups that report directly to the Board are the Thematic Partnerships.

2.3.8 Operational Groups focus on very specific issues that are closely aligned with delivery of one or two objectives within the Statement of Priorities. These groups require clear direction/formal links with Thematic Partnerships. Work has been undertaken to map out how these groups link to the Statement of Priorities, and identify any potential duplication or overlap. The Chairs of these groups will be tasked to ensure that opportunities for improved co-ordination or joining up are maximised. Thematic Partnerships, and the groups themselves should also give consideration to whether or not these groups are continuing to add value or could their objectives be better achieved through a task and finish approach. In doing so, they need to be mindful of the absence of financial support through Area Based Grant, and a continuing reduction in the public sector purse for at least the next three years.

2.3.9 Reference/Engagement Groups – these are groups who represent the interests of key stakeholder groups and should influence the work of the entire Partnership:

- Voluntary Sector Forum (currently links to Stronger Pship)
- Engagement Forum – to incorporate Links/Healthwatch (not yet been established)
- Provider Forum (links to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership)

It is recommended that all Thematic Partnerships involve and draw on the expertise of these groups as necessary, and that they have seats on Thematic Partnerships where appropriate. Thematic Partnerships can also request that they contribute to, or lead specific pieces of work as appropriate. These groups should not be accountable to the Partnership and therefore do not need to fit within a formal structure, but should still be part of the Partnership family to ensure effective two way communication.

2.3.10 Task and Finish Groups

It is recommended that thematic partnerships (and the Leadership Forum where appropriate) commission time limited task and finish groups to deliver specific pieces of work that will contribute to achieving our priorities, where there is no existing group to take this forward.

2.4 NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT AND AREA PARTNERSHIPS

2.4.1 Area Governance Structures are currently under discussion, and no formal decisions have been made regarding how they might look. It is possible that there will be three Area Partnerships (Greater Eston; Coastal and Guisborough and East Cleveland) whose role may include:

- Reporting & accountability route for Neighbourhood Plans
- Reporting and communications route into thematic groups/leadership forum/wider partnership
- Opportunity for Partners to address barriers at a local level, Area-strategic issues

It is recommended that two representatives (one of whom should be a local community representative) from of each of the three Area Partnerships are allocated a seat on the Leadership Forum. This will ensure that there are clear links between neighbourhood working and the Partnership, and that the interests of communities within localities are represented. Places on Thematic Partnerships should also be made available for representatives from the Area Partnerships.

2.4.2 As mentioned above, work is taking place to develop a single Outcomes Framework for Partnership Working that meets the performance management requirements of both Neighbourhood/Area Partnerships, and the LSP.

2.5 COMMUNICATION

2.5.1 Partnership Forum (Formerly known as Conferences or Workshops)

It is proposed that all partnership members, including those from the Leadership Forum; Thematic Partnerships, Area Partnerships, Action Groups and task and finish groups, are brought together biannually in a workshop-based "Partnership Forum" where issues of strategic importance are discussed. One of these Forums should incorporate an Annual General Meeting.

2.5.2 Effective communication both internally, with our partner organisations and with the wider community is fundamental to the continued success of the Partnership. To assist in this, the Partnership will maintain an up to date website with direct links to websites of all its partner organisations. Through the website we will develop a mechanism by which Councillors, Partner Organisations and the wider community can comment, challenge and share their ideas for further improvement.

2.6 SAVINGS

2.6.1 It is difficult to quantify cash savings generated by this review. The following have been identified:

- The cost of employing the LSP Co-ordinator who retired in December has been saved, as the lead support officer role for the Partnership is being carried out by another

Council Officer in addition to existing duties.

- Fewer meetings of the Leadership Forum (formerly the Board), and of sub-groups will reduce the time spent attending, administering and travelling to meetings.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Partnership

- Comment on the proposals no later than **Friday 14th October, 2011**

4.0 FURTHER INFORMATION SOURCES

Friedman, M (2009) Trying Hard is not Good Enough, FPSI publishing

Report Author: Jo Waldmeyer, Policy Specialist
Joanne_waldmeyer@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk
01642 444629

Redcar and Cleveland Partnership Proposed Structure

