

**Minutes from the Birmingham Strategic Partnership Programme Board
13th June 2007**

Present: David Cragg (LSC, Chair); Jon Bright (BCC, Vice-chair); Sophia Christie (PCT); CSupt Paul Scarrott (WMP) Joy Warmington (BRAP); Jerry Blackett (Chamber of Commerce); Ifor Jones (for Elaine Elkington, BCC); Paul Tilsley (BCC).
Supporting officers, observers and guests: Dr Naomi Rees (BSP Partnership Manager, notes); (GOWM); Richard Kenny (BSP Performance Manager); Tony Bunker (BSP); Richard Browne (BSP); Denise Thompson (BSP); Natalie Markham (BSP) and Jackie Mould (BSP Director).

Item 1, 2 and 3: Apologies, minutes and action points

Member apologies were received from Anil Patani, Les Lawrence/Tony Howell, Brian Carr, Philippa Holland, Peter Woodall and Stephen Hughes. The notes were agreed as accurate.

A few observations were made on the list of action points. Paul Scarrott informed the group that he and Ifor Jones had met the 4 Constituency Directors (Ladywood, Northfield, Northfield and Perry Barr) to discuss high crime rates and had a meeting organised for 22nd June to consider the performance of the Local Delivery Groups. The PB agreed that it was worthwhile to also explore how the constituencies/blocks could contribute to 'closing the gap'. Jackie Mould informed the group that bilateral meetings were now scheduled in and she would be able to report on the community engagement and neighbourhood approach at the July meeting. David Cragg asked that Elaine Elkington's offer to make greater links with the remaining blocks (EE and SSC) be encouraged. The NEET agenda, particularly the individual support program, should be tied in. He suggested workshops with the relevant agencies.

The group agreed to hold off item 8 (performance group, role and remit) for a later meeting.

Action : Jackie Mould and Paul Scarrott to update the programme board at the next meeting, accordingly.

Item 4: Preventing extremism pathfinder

Jackie Mould gave a brief update since the last meeting and sought approval from the PB regarding governance arrangements for the pathfinder. The group agreed that the SSC block was responsible for performance management aspects and that the BCC Equality and Diversity division would operationally manage the work. Paul Scarrott said he was a member of the service board and his impression was that things were progressing well. He was happy to keep the PB informed.

Several constructive points were made; the importance of colleges as places where very diverse people come together, possible link with DFeS faith training activities/experience, the chamber of commerce's experience with capacity building of business leaders, BRAP's current work with Joseph Chamberlain College and the urgent need to explore new ways to collect/collate intelligence across the partnership as the agenda can move very quickly. The group agreed that Paul Scarrott should, with others as appropriate, debate how this project driven activity might develop into

a strategy worthy of future funding. Any proposal needed to have a strong challenge component, be plausible and operate across functional responsibilities.

Action : Paul Scarrott to take all the points back to the SSC and service board and to present an update report and first thoughts on the strategy challenges to the PB within 6 months.

Item 5: LAA Annual Assessment

Richard updated the group on LAA performance since the last 6 month assessment. To date there are 80 indicators within the LAA that can be assessed and 60% are performing well. The detailed presentation would be circulated so only the headline general observations and associated actions are listed here.

Throughout the discussion there were many examples where the LAA process doesn't allow the relative success, compared to comparable areas, to be acknowledged. Looking at past performance next to a target doesn't acknowledge speed of process, increased future potential to succeed, the development of big/innovative interventions or the level of investment in improving systems. There were examples where improvements in one area eg the formal alert by police on domestic violence to social care and health, led to demand pressures elsewhere eg initial and core assessments for potentially vulnerable children. The measurement criteria can hide a wide range of personal circumstance (for example the NEET measurement doesn't distinguish between people about to start an apprenticeship/job from those that are not) and sometimes it is the ratio between processes that is a better indication of progress. In other cases the target seemed to measure/monitor 'service standards' rather than provide an indication of a persons employability for example.

Action : The group agreed that a simply mechanical approach was not helpful and more time would be spent to develop a story for each key indicator.

There was some concern around the potential for misalignment between the LAA target developments and the separate PSA discussions between central departments and BSP partner agencies. Several LAA targets are influenced by national market short fall issues. The funding allocation of stretch targets needed to be resolved. The city/region developments also needed to be factored in.

Action : The group agreed that were possible early discussions would be had with the functional leads within GOWM, to help avoid confusion.

There was good support to further develop the alcohol strategy into the mainstream. A draft alcohol safety was expected in July and would include an analysis of hotspots and the contribution that partners could make. Related to this the PB requested a description of what needs to be done to achieve PSA 1 particularly in the 4 constituencies with the highest crime rates.

Action : Paul Scarrott would discuss with his community safety colleagues about what specifically the partners can do to make a contribution to PSA1.

The group briefly discussed their thoughts on community cohesion, in the LAA context. The view was that community cohesion was the 'sum total outcome' of a whole set of activities. The group agreed that an audit/analysis of what takes us in the right direction versus things that take us away from improved cohesion, should be considered.

The group questioned the process by which the newly identified underperforming areas (length of stay in temporary accommodation, number of adult drug users in treatment, key stage 2 standard for swimming) would/should be considered.

Action: Richard Kenny to consider the points raised as he further develops the LAA.

Item 6: Preparing the ground for the new LAA 2008/11

The group agreed that the PB would make up the nucleus of the LAA negotiation team and include at least the Chief Executive of BCC, Block leads and senior officers with oversight of major programmes. The full PB would be invited to a ½ day awayday in September/October. The group felt the background paper usefully set out a starting position for the new LAA 2008/11. The group restated previous points; the importance of city/region developments and joint investment plans, mapping PSAs coming out of the CSR process to ensure the LAA is up-to-date and wanting clarity about how the performance reward grant would be allocated.

Action: David Cragg and Paul Tilsley would have a discussion about the performance reward grant outside of the meeting. Jackie Mould to organise the PB awayday.

There was also a brief discussion about the interface between the LAA process and the community strategy 2026 developments. The following points were made;

- Don't reinvent the discussions held during the Prospectus development.
- The Community Strategy 2026 needs to acknowledge the developments in science and the challenges of climate change. This will help emphasis the distinction between the LAA and the longer term Community Strategy 2026.
- The Community Strategy 2026 should describe the 'big traps' and be more of a risk assessment than a 'war and peace' collation of every partner agencies strategies.
- The Community Strategy 2026 should show the collective impact from cross-cutting, cross-functional activity that can only be achieved through partnership working.

Action : Richard Kenny would consider how the £300K would be allocated to support the LPSAs.

Item 7: Reshaping the planning process

Richard said the paper was to give assurances about the planning process and gain approval for a re-design that is outcome driven and fit-for-purpose beyond 2008. The strengthened BSP team meant an increased opportunity to make closer links to blocks and constituencies.

The group agreed the proposal and made a few observations;

- Details could be explored at the planning PB awayday.
- It was critical that the planning process focussed on 'closing the gap'.
- Clarity on staffing/funding should be sought from GOWM as the early indications of the CSR process were not positive. This will influence behaviour/attitude and scope of the partnership agenda.
- A great deal had been possible with NRF and the long term planning post-NRF is very important to all partners.

AOB

There were three items raised under AOB. Each is summarised below with its associated action point.

Sophia Christie asked how the learning from the BCC partnership review work would be shared. Jackie Mould said that the individual reports would go to the relevant partnership and would contribute to the BSP stocktake that was underway.

Action: Jackie Mould to bring a report to the PB at the next suitable meeting.

Paul Scarrott asked how the CSPs would get feedback from the PB meetings.

Action: Jackie Mould to develop a mechanism to inform CSPs.

Jerry Blackett asked for a view about funding the better together project. This project had useful links with about 300 businesses and he could make a progress report available. David Cragg reflected that this project had come ad hoc to the PB over several years and his impression was that it didn't fit.

Action: Jackie Mould to receive the progress report from Jerry Blackett and consider against the innovation and development fund criteria. This and the other IDF project would be presented at the July meeting.

Next meeting

Thursday 12th July 2007, 9:00-11:00am at LSC, 15 Bartholomew Row, Conference room 1