



Survey of Community Planning Partnership structures and arrangements 2012

Summary Report

David Barr

Bob Christie

May 2012

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
 - 2. Key findings**
 - 3. Membership and operation of the CPP Board**
 - 4. Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP**
 - 5. Membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships**
 - 6. Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements**
 - 7. The SOA and Community Plan**
 - 8. Comments on Community Planning arrangements**
- Annex A – the full survey and responses**

Survey of Community Planning Partnership structures and arrangements 2012

1. Introduction

In April 2012 the Improvement Service undertook a baseline survey of Community Planning arrangements in Scotland, to inform the joint Scottish

2. Key findings

Membership and operation of the CPP Board

- While all CPP boards contain councillors from the ruling administration, 21 CPP boards (70%) also contain councillors from other parties.
- The representation on CPP boards of other statutory Community Planning partners is varied. While Scottish Enterprise or HIE sit on 27 CPP boards, members of health boards sit on 25, members of police and fire boards each sit on 18, and regional transport partnerships sit on 17.
- In addition, FE/HE institutions sit on 23 CPP boards and Skills Development Scotland sits on 18 CPP boards. Scottish Government sits on 3 CPP boards.
- All CPP boards include representatives of the voluntary sector, but only 50% of CPP boards include representatives of the private sector
- Whilst all CPP boards regularly receive performance management information, only 7 boards (23%) were reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of partners.

Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP

- Only 5 CPP executive groups (17%) include representatives of the private sector.
- Only 9 CPP executive groups (30%) were reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of Community Planning partner organisations, and while 24 CPP executive groups (80%) report to the CPP board, 6 (20%) do not.

Membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships

- Community Health Partnerships, Alcohol and Drugs Partnerships, and Community Safety Partnerships often appear not to be regarded as within the scope of Community Planning.
- While 28 CPPs (90%) have thematic groups which receive performance information on partners' contributions to the SOA, only 7 CPPs (23%) reported that they have thematic groups which significantly influence partners' resource allocation decisions

Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements

- 20 CPPs (63%) now have localised Community Planning arrangements, although there is considerable variation in the criteria used to define these sub-areas.
- 90% of localised arrangements include community councillors and representatives of the voluntary sector. 42% include representatives of the private sector.

The SOA and Community Plan

- 20 CPPs (63%) have now integrated their SOA and Community Plan or are doing so.
- 15 CPPs (47%) are currently revising their SOA and 10 (31%) did so in 2011.
- 17 CPPs (54%) have 9 or more priority outcomes, or have unprioritised outcomes.
- 30 CPPs (94%) believe that the SOA has significantly influenced the integrated working of partner organisations
- But only 14 CPPs (44%) believe that the SOA has significantly influenced partners' resource decisions.

Community Planning arrangements

The majority of CPPs are actively reviewing their structures and arrangements alongside their SOA. There is considerable variety in their local approaches, but also considerable consistency in their focus on outcomes, on integrated working, on the localisation of Community Planning and on working more closely with communities. However,

prioritisation and resource management remain as significant challenges.

Summary of Findings

3. Membership and operation of the CPP Board

The survey asked about the strategic body or board of the CPP, including its composition and its roles in relation to resource and performance management.

- 30 CPPs have a strategic board.
- 27 CPPs have both a strategic board and an executive group.
- 1 CPP has a body which is both its strategic board and its executive group.
- 2 CPPs have a strategic board but no executive group.
- 2 CPPs have an executive group but no strategic board.

The survey asked about the composition of the CPP board, both from the statutory Community Planning partners (councils, health boards, police boards, fire boards, Scottish Enterprise, Highland and Islands Enterprise, regional transport partnerships) and others.

- All 30 CPP boards contain councillors from the ruling administration.
- 21 boards (70%) also contain councillors from other parties.
- 29 boards (97%) contain chief executives (or partners' equivalent).
- Members of health boards sit on 25 CPP boards (83%)
- Members of police and fire boards each sit on 18 CPP boards (60%).
- Scottish Enterprise or HIE sit on 27 boards (90%)
- FE/HE institutions sit on 23 boards (77%)
- Skills Development Scotland sits on 18 boards (60%)
- Regional transport partnerships sit on 17 boards (57%)

In addition SNH, Scottish Government, SEPA, Scottish Water and Community Justice Authorities each sit on 4 or fewer CPP boards (<13%).

- All 30 CPP boards contain representatives of the voluntary sector
- 16 boards (53%) contain representatives of community groups
- 15 boards (50%) contain representatives of the private sector
- 8 boards (27%) contain representatives of localised CPPs

Comment - *The board hWol"xL(9LGWal"xL(9LxL(9LGWCIJHx"G)9)W.I"xL("Lx"G()WTIJHx"G)9)Wkcl"xL*

On performance management:

- All CPP boards regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their executive group and/or thematic groups and/or partners.
- 22 CPP boards (73%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their executive group
- 21 boards (70%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their thematic groups or partnerships
- 17 boards (57%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their individual CP partners on their contributions to the SOA.

Comment - the intention is to work towards discussion on resource allocation.

Comment - The Board has yet to reach the point of challenging/calling to account, each other or the theme groups, regarding performance / delivery of outcomes.

Comment - Elected Members within the Council's Corporate and Community Planning Standing Scrutiny Panel provide a scrutiny function for the CPP Board by scrutinising performance reports provided against the SOA.

From the supplementary information provided by CPPs it is clear that many CPP boards are reviewing their current arrangements.

Comment - We undertake a formal review of our structures and arrangements every two years to ensure that they are fit for purpose

Comment – the Board has recently completed a PSIF self evaluation which has identified improvement actions which will be taken forward during 2012/2013. A series of Board Development days are being held from June both to improve the effectiveness of the Board and feed into the development of the next phase of the SOA.

Comment - Following a self-assessment exercise using PSIF the Leadership Board has agreed an Improvement Plan. This has already changed the CPP's structure including combining our former Leadership and Management Groups into a new Leadership Board.

4. Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP

The survey asked about the executive / working / senior officer group of the CPP, including its composition and its roles in relation to resource and performance management.

- 30 CPPs have an executive group
- Chief executives (or partners' equivalents) sit on 22 executive groups (73%)
- FE/HE institutions sit on 13 executive groups (43%)
- Members of health, police or fire boards each sit on 8 executive groups (27%)
- Councillors sit on 6 executive groups (20%)

18 CPPs identified the other partner organisations which sit on their executive groups, with the most frequently identified being Scottish Enterprise/HIE and Skills Development Scotland.

- Representatives of the voluntary sector sit on 19 executive groups (63%)
- Leaders of thematic groups sit on 15 executive groups (50%)
- Representatives of the private sector, localised CPPs and community groups each sit on 5 executive groups (17%).

The survey asked about the roles of the CPP executive group in relation to resource and performance management. On resource management:

- 4 executive groups (13%) have a budget allocated to them by partners and 26 (87%) do not.
- 9 executive groups (30%) are reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of partners.
- 10 executive groups (33%) are reported as advising partners on their resource allocation decisions.
- 11 executive groups (37%) are reported as neither significantly influencing nor advising on partners' resource allocation decisions.

On performance management:

- 24 executive groups (80%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, thematic groups or partnerships
- 22 executive groups (73%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, individual partners on their contributions to the SOA.
- 24 executive groups (80%) report to the CPP board and 6 (20%) do not.

Comment - further work is required to ensure that resources and service delivery support the delivery of key outcomes.

Comment - the partnership recently used the PSIF to develop an improvement plan, which includes a number of key actions aimed at improving outcome based approaches, and reviewing partnership structures and performance reporting arrangements. A key aim is to align partner/partnership budgets more closely to support the delivery of community plan outcomes.

Comment - The Executive Body acts to coordinate reporting by thematic groups to the Board and receives requests from the Board to carry out specific pieces of work.

erships

- 18 CPPs (58%) have thematic groups or partnerships which have budgets allocated to them by CP partners, and 13 (42%) say that they do not.
- 7 CPPs (23%) reported that they have thematic groups which typically significantly influence partners' resource allocation decisions
- 13 CPPs (42%) reported that they have thematic groups which typically advise on those decisions
- 11 CPPs (35%) reported that they have thematic groups which typically neither significantly influence nor advise on resource allocation decisions.

However, almost all CPPs have CHPs, ADPs and Community Safety Partnerships, which have budgets provided by one or more partners, and so there have clearly been different interpretations of whether or not these partnerships

6. Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements

The survey asked about localised Community Planning Arrangements for Sub-Areas of the (EhTKB'4)'HE sub-areas for Cm

7. The SOA and Community Plan

The survey asked about the relationship between the SOA and the Community Plan, including their levels of prioritisation and influence.

On the relationship between the SOA and the Community Plan:

- 18 CPPs have integrated their SOA and Community Plan and 2 are doing so (63%).

On the timescales for the SOA and the Community Plan:

- Most SOAs currently run to 2012-13 or 2013-14
- Many Community Plans run to 2015 or 2020
- The timescales for integrated SOAs/Community Plans are highly variable.

On the prioritisation of the SOA:

- 15 CPPs (47%) are currently revising their SOA and 10 (31%) did so in 2011.
- 4 CPPs (13%) have up to 4 priority outcomes
- 11 CPPs (34%) have 5-8 priority outcomes
- 13 CPPs (41%) have 9 or more priority outcomes.
- 4 CPPs (13%) have not prioritised their outcomes.

On the influence of the SOA:

- 30 CPPs (94%) believe that the SOA has significantly influenced the integrated working of partner organisations
- 22 CPPs (69%) believe that it has significantly influenced partners' policy decisions
- 21 CPPs (66%) believe that it has significantly influenced partners' business plans
- 14 CPPs (44%) believe that it has significantly influenced partners' resource decisions.

Comment - The Community Plan will remain as the overall direction - running from 2008 to 18. The SOA will act as the delivery plan for the Community Plan.

Comment - Our 'community plan' is the SOA and its Delivery Plan. The SOA sets out the outcomes and targets and the Delivery Plan includes the actions to achieve them.

Comment - The current SOA is easier to understand and digest than SOA 2009 and the, now discontinued, Community Plan which had no long term targets and was not performance managed.

Comment - SOA is the key document, community plan is no longer relevant

Comment - Currently producing integrated SOA/Community Plan for 2012 onwards.

Comment - The PSIF self evaluation has identified improvement actions which will impact on the development and implementation of the SOA/ Community Plan including:

- *Rationalise and improve how evidence is used to inform decision making*
- *Review the scrutiny role of the Board in relation to performance management*
- *Review the SOA outcomes and targets and develop a process to allow prioritisation*

Comment - The current version of the SOA was developed through the partnership and with an outcomes focus, compared to previous iterations, consequently there seems to be more commitment from partners to ensuring delivery on the priority areas and integrated working, though there is still improvement in this approach to be made.

Comment –

(cont.)

Survey of Community Planning Partnership structures and arrangements 2012

SECTION A: Questions about the membership and operation of the CPP Board

1. **Name of Community Planning Partnership**
2. **Name of respondent**
3. **Job title**

4. **The CPP has a strategic body or board (if not, please continue to section B)**

Yes	30
No	2
Total	32

5. **The CPP also has a separate executive body (e.g. executive group / working group / senior officer group)**

Yes	27
No	3
Total	30

6. **Members of the CPP board include:**

Councillors from the ruling administration party / parties	30
Councillors who are <u>not</u> from the ruling administration party / parties	21
Any members of health boards	25
Any members of police boards (or joint committees)	18
Any members of fire boards (or joint committees)	18
Chief executive officers (or equivalent)	29
Executive Directors (or equivalent)	17
Heads of Service (or equivalent)	8
Leaders of all thematic groups / partnerships	12
Representatives of localised Community Planning partnerships	8
Representatives of community groups	16
Representatives of the private sector	15
Representatives of the voluntary sector	30
Representatives of FE / HE	23

7. **The CPP board is chaired, co-chaired or chaired in rotation by:**

Council leader	25
Other councillor	3
Member of a CP partner board	2
Council chief executive	1
Other CP partner chief executive	0
Other chair - please provide details	2
Total of responding CPPs	30

8. **Does the CPP board have a budget allocated to it by CP partners?**

Yes	12
No	18
Total	30

9. **The CPP board (please select the answer which applies):**

Advises partner organisations on their resource allocation decisions	10
Significantly influences the resource allocation decisions of partner organisations	7
Neither advises nor significantly influences partner organisations resource allocation decisions	13
Total	30

10. **The CPP board regularly receives performance management information from, and discusses that information with:**

An executive / working / senior officer group on the performance of the CPP overall	22
Thematic groups or partnerships on their performance	21
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the SOA	17

Other councillor	1
Member of a CP partner board	1
Council chief executive	17
Other CP partner chief executive	2
Other chair - please provide details	8
Total of responding CPPs	30

17. Does the executive body have a budget allocated to it by CP partners?

Yes	4
No	26
Total	30

18. The executive body (please select the answer which applies):

Advises partner organisations on their resource allocation decisions	10
Significantly influences the resource allocation decisions of partner organisations	9
Neither advises nor significantly influences partner organisations resource allocation decisions	11
Total	30

19. The executive body regularly receives performance management information from, and discusses that information with:

Thematic groups or partnerships	24
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the SOA	22
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the community plan	9
The Executive body does not receive and discuss performance management information	4
Total of responding CPPs	30

20. The executive body meets:

Monthly or bi-monthly	17
Every three or four months	12
Bi-annually	1
Annually	0
Total	30

21. The executive body reports to the CPP board:

Monthly or bi-monthly	4
Every three or four months	16
Bi-annually	4

Annually	0
The executive body does not report to the board	6
Total	30

executive body	
Total	31

31. Thematic groups or partnerships typically report to the CPP board with performance information:

Monthly or bi-monthly	0
Every 3 or 4 months	12
Bi-annually	10
Annually	6
Thematic groups or partnerships do not report to the CPP Board	3
Total	31

32. Do you have comments on the membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships?

Councillors representing the sub-area	17
Other councillors	2
Executive Directors (or equivalent)	1
Heads of Service (or equivalent)	6
Service managers (or equivalent)	12
Area-based staff	15
Community councillors	17
Representatives of residents' / tenants' associations	15
Representatives of other community groups	15
Representatives of housing associations	7
Representatives of local schools	8
Representatives of the private sector	8
Representatives of the voluntary sector	17
Other members - please identify these members	5
Total of responding CPPs	19

37. Please indicate the typical frequency of localised Community Planning partnership meetings:

Monthly or bi-monthly	3
Every 3 or 4 months	13
Bi-annually	0
There is significant variation between localised Community Planning partnerships	4

organisations	
Total of responding CPPs	16

39. Do sub-areas have budgets allocated to them by CPP partner organisations?

Yes	8
No	12
Total	20

40. Do localised Community Planning partnerships award grants to local organisations?

Yes	8
No	11
Total	19

41. Do you have comments on localised Community Planning arrangements?

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

42. Is there any further information on your CPP structure or arrangements that is relevant but has not been covered so far?

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

Section E: Questions about the SOA and Community Plan

43. The CPP has an integrated SOA and community plan

Yes	18
No	14
Total	32

44. Please identify the timescale for J),7fTQFJ,:Q,7yT-FE,N(7PT-QFF,ar)/7nT--:FQ,7yT-EF,,(/Q/7mT(FNEJcomui pl

Section E: i5as an integratededEF,w)/7 T(FNE,N(7PT-QFF,ar)/7nT--:FQ,7yT-EF,,(/Q/7mT(FNEJcomui pl

47. If there is a separate community plan does it identify clear outcomes which set out what will change for the area and its people?

Yes	13
No	1
Total	14

48. The most recent substantial revision of the SOA was in:

2010	7
2011	10
Under revision	15
Never revised	0
Total	32

49. Please indicate how many priority outcomes the CPP has identified in the SOA:

Under 4	4
5 – 8	11
9 or more	13
Not prioritised	4
Total	32

50. Please indicate whether the SOA has significantly influenced the following:

Resource decisions of partner organisations	14
---	----