

## **Minutes from the Be Birmingham Programme Board 17<sup>th</sup> January 2008**

**Present:** David Cragg (LSC, chair); Elaine Elkington (BCC); (WMP); Ian Smith and Philippa Holland (GOWM); CSUPT Tom Coughlan (for CSUPT Paul Scarrott, WMPS) Paul Tilsley (BCC), ACC Anil Patani (WMPS), Asif Afridi (for Joy Warmington, BRAP, Lyndley Jenks and Jon Wright (JobCentre plus); Sean Connolly and Angela Saganowska (for Sophia Christie, PCT); and Jerry Blackett (Chamber of Commerce).

**Supporting officers, observers and guests:** Dr Naomi Rees (BSP, Partnership Manager, notes); Jayne Bench (BSP); Richard Kenny (BSP); Jason Lowther (BCC); Malcolm Green (NRA); and Jackie Mould (BSP Director).

### **Item 1, 2, 3 and 4: Apologies, declarations of interest, notes and matter arising**

Member apologies were received from Brian Carr (BVSC); Les Lawrence (BCC); and Stephen Hughes (BCC). JobCentre plus were welcomed to the meeting. The notes were agreed as accurate and there were no matters arising or declared conflicts of interest.

The group congratulated David Cragg on his OBE. Jackie tabled hard copies of the NRF evaluation report to PB members for comment. She would also send an electronic copy after the meeting. She told the group that an event on 7<sup>th</sup> February is being planned to disseminate the findings. Jackie also informed the group that the community engagement projects agreed at the last meeting were underway and a taskgroup meeting would be scheduled shortly. Anil Patani expressed his view that the preventing extremism agenda overlapped with the community engagement developments and this needed further consideration.

The group agreed that Paul Tilsley would chair the meeting after David Cragg had to leave.

### **Item 5: BeBirmingham Stocktake**

The main discussion points are captured below, rather than taking one recommendation at a time, as the paper would be amended for the BeBirmingham board.

Malcolm Green took the group through the stocktake report. He said that the general consensus was that in order for the partnership to move forward it would need restructuring. Appendix 1 of the paper diagrammatically showed what was being suggested. The main recommendation was that BeBirmingham would have a broader strategic group with a smaller executive and each thematic partnership area would have a similar structure.

David Cragg accepted that the report broadly reflected the discussions held at the PB but he felt it might not address the issues raised at the board meeting at the end of November 2007. The proposals needed to articulate better the BeBirmingham roles and responsibilities. It was his view that the wider board cannot really delegate or hold partners to account as it doesn't have the power to direct or sanction, it is more of a standing conference. Others suggested that a great deal depended on how far

the executive group were prepared to be held accountable and against what. Several supported a cultural/behavioural shift where progress was assessed and/or measured against the community strategy and local area agreement targets, as this was already the common agenda for all the partner agencies in the executive.

An issue remained around potential conflicts between duty-to-cooperate statements, mutual accountability for specific work streams and BCC accountability obligations. Several felt this needed further thought and articulation, particularly where obligations/commitments made at one point in the governance arrangement influences partnership activity somewhere else in the delivery chain. David Cragg suggested that each major area/programme of work should develop a formal protocol which considered the current/developing duty-to-cooperate and articulated mutual accountability, lead agency and lead accountability.

The group discussed the role of the proposed neighbourhood board. David Cragg expressed some concern about how the proposed neighbourhood board would serve those partner agencies with a more planning/strategic role and fewer operational and/or neighbourhood functions. He also felt that while the city strategy enacted at the wards level through neighbourhood plans there was still a need to join-up other partner agency work (whether commissioners, providers or advisors) at the neighbourhood level. Paul Tilsley felt that the neighbourhood board needed to be empowered to make decisions and had an important role to improve the profile of the constituency partnerships. The neighbourhood board should be recognised as a mechanism for improving communication and helping to remove barriers/blockages to delivery. Anil Patani saw parallels with the way community safety is delivered; the thematic partnership board agreed the 'how' and this was delivered at a neighbourhood level through the police function and its supporting local delivery groups and neighbourhood policing activities. Elaine Elkington saw the neighbourhood board playing an important role in pulling the constituency chairs into the partnership governance arrangements. Malcolm confirmed that the proposal was that the neighbourhood board would be strategic and allow a two-way flow. It could usefully explore the implications of strategic decisions of key partners/partnerships and/or LAA activities issues at the neighbourhood level, to inform subsequent decision-making. The group agreed to a time-limited task and finish group, with Elaine Elkington taking the lead, to articulate how partners will interact with and benefit from this new neighbourhood board arrangement.

The group also discussed the proposals around chairing arrangements for the thematic partnerships. The group felt there were a number of reasons why they couldn't agree to the proposal that each thematic partnership board would automatically be chaired by a BCC cabinet member however they also agreed that cabinet members had an important role to play across the partnership. The group agreed that a time limited task and finish group should be established to agree how each partner could 'buy-in' to the new partnership proposals. The group agreed that each thematic partnership should consider its arrangements particularly to validate the strategic/delivery chain and the wider engagement. The PB supported the principle that BCC cabinet members should chair, co-chair or vice-chair as appropriate.

A number of specific points were made for the consultants to consider;

- The sport, leisure and culture aspects needed further thought as it appeared to span several interests. Jackie was asked to consider in a time limited task and finish group to develop this further.
- The community cohesion aspects needed a higher profile and probably placed as a key strand of the single neighbourhood programme.

- The partnership arrangements need to 'show' how the LAA targets would be delivered.
- The thematic partnerships also had a role in delivering against the community strategy and this needed to be part of their role and responsibility (para 37).

**Action :** Jackie Mould to arrange three time limited task and finish groups (one to consider the neighbourhood board with Elaine as chair, one on achieving all partner buy-in to the new partnership proposals and one on the positioning of sport, culture and leisure within the structure). Malcolm Green to produce an amended draft for the board meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2008, taking the PB comments into account.

### **Item 6: Working Neighbourhood fund (WNF)**

Jackie Mould updated the group on the developing thinking around the Working Neighbourhood Fund (WNF). She confirmed that while this was different from the NRF, the NRF evaluation would inform the partnership about the best ways to utilise this 3 year funding. The WNF was focussed on improving access to employment and other economic opportunities by targeting individuals, neighbourhoods and barriers to employment. Jackie referred the group to the proposals in the table on pg 3&4. This included a consideration for the transition from the NRF to WNF, development cost related to the neighbourhood agenda, thematic partnerships and infrastructure. The bulk of the funding would be focussed on worklessness through a number of strategic programmes; thematic, social enterprise, funding requirements to improve points of integration of mainstream programmes and/or reduce barriers/blockages to employment. Further work was still required but Jackie was keen to get initial feedback from the PB.

David Cragg mentioned that there were a number of related initiatives that needed to be factored in. The city strategy pathfinder had secured funding to 2009, the single European programme until 2013 and the recent white paper on welfare were all important. There were also a number of local initiatives that meant that Birmingham was ahead of the game; dispensation for the 16hr rule, the good functioning of the employment skills board and the LSC continuum of skills development programme. He agreed that related issues such as social housing (specifically the affordability gap), offender learning and youth offending programmes should also be addressed as BeBirmingham develops a holistic response to worklessness. The group agreed that there was a definite neighbourhood emphasis. Jon Wright agreed that the protocol was a good development but it was also critical to avoid duplication. Jon informed the group that Jobcentreplus had had to respond to 3 main changes to client services in the last year. He also warned the group that national policy changes are likely to influence how unemployment/worklessness is defined and recorded.

Phillipa Holland reminded the group that the Working Neighbourhood Fund was not ring-fenced, it was part of the area based grant, and could support other work of the partnership. She was keen that the PB also considered how to use the funding available to all partners, using the increased flexibilities, to address the priorities in the Community Strategy and LAA. Angela Saganowska welcomed the flexibility as the health and employment steering group was considering the added benefit of delivery opportunities through GPs rather than geographical targeting.

Jackie suggested that BeBirmingham needed to have a better picture of what funds come into Birmingham and how this was allocated against the LAA priorities. This should allow the partnership to determine not only how to align activity but also to develop new ways of working. She had seen some work done in Manchester that looked like it would be helpful particularly as it might also identify areas where

Birmingham is not receiving its 'fair share' from a variety of funders. Phillipa Holland agreed that it was important to determine what each partner was doing against each priority outcome. David Cragg said an example of this was the joint investment plan developed around the city strategy core protocol as it articulated £40 million program and mainstream activity. Angela Saganowska informed the group that Birmingham University was currently undertaking a piece of work to determine the total resources going into health inequalities, in order to inform the joint investment plan. Jackie was asked to establish a task and finish group to consider these approaches further.

Paul Tilsley chaired the meeting as David Cragg had to leave. Paul Tilsley stated that he felt that any 'bigger picture' debate needed to consider the length of time people stayed in work and get more local people into employment. Jon Wright explained that there were a number of things to consider. The shifting nature of benefits would affect the behaviour of clients. Targets are set centrally and there were a number of new local programmes being developed that would positively influence demand and supply of jobs. Barriers still existed eg data sharing and the mobility of people who successfully gain employment.

**Action :** Jackie Mould to arrange a time limited task and finish group to consider the role of the joint investment planning process, calling in outside help as appropriate. Jackie Mould to further develop the WNF proposals taking into account comments made by the PB, considering the role the city strategy core protocol might contribute.

#### **Item 7: Second draft LAA to GOWM**

Richard Kenny reminded the group that this was a critical period in the development of the LAA. He went through the technical aspects of the paper and promised to make the agreed changes before submitting to GOWM the following day. The detail is not recorded here. The group agreed that there were a number of areas of work that are underlying determinants of other priority outcomes (eg the approach to misuse of drugs) and a number of shared and overlapping priorities. Richard said a series of bi-lateral meetings with GOWM and workshops to develop delivery plans was being planned in February. The PB agreed the second draft could, with the changes agreed, be submitted to GOWM.

**Action:** Richard Kenny to make changes to the LAA and submit to GOWM.

#### **Item 8: Financial profiles**

Jayne Bench briefly reviewed the financial profile. 100% had been allocated and the spend was in the region of 43%. This was a slightly better picture than last year. Jayne asked the PB to agree that the emerging underspends in the infrastructure and innovation funds should be redirected to activities related to guns and gangs, LPSA and life education. The group agreed.

**Action :** Jackie Mould to redirect underspends in infrastructure and innovation to activities related to guns and gangs, LPSA and life education.

#### **Item 9: AOB**

Jackie tabled a list of BeBirmingham programme of events for information.

#### **Next meeting**

Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2008 at 9:00-10:30am, Conference Room 1, LSC, 15 Bartholomew Row