

# Cheltenham Borough Council

Cabinet – 18<sup>th</sup> October 2011

## Improving Partnership Structures

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Leader of the Council</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnerships Manager</b>
<b>Accountable scrutiny committee</b>	<b>Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>all</b>
<b>Key Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	In 2011 senior officers and practitioners within the public sector and the voluntary and community sector, participated in the Partnership Improvement Programme (PIP) which met three times between March and May 2011. This process resulted in a new structure for partnership working in Cheltenham that has been consulted on over the summer months. The new structure is brought to cabinet for endorsement.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Cabinet endorses the new structures for partnership working in Cheltenham as set out in appendix 2.</b>  <b>Cabinet note the issues raised by the consultees and the responses of the CSP task and finish group in appendix 3.</b>

<b>Financial implications</b>	There are no financial implications of the proposed new structures. Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee have requested additional information on whether the new structures will generate any savings and this will be considered as part of the development of the 2012-13 budget.  <b>Contact officer: Andrew Sherbourne Principal Accounting Technician E-mail: <a href="mailto:andrew.sherbourne@cheltenham.gov.uk">andrew.sherbourne@cheltenham.gov.uk</a> Tel no: 01242 264337</b>
<b>Legal implications</b>	There are no legal implications of the proposed new structures.  <b>Contact officer: Donna Ruck E-mail: <a href="mailto:donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk">donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk</a> Tel no: 01684 272695</b>
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	None

<b>Key risks</b>	<p>Corporate Risk CR 40 says “If Partner organisations are not sufficiently ‘bought into’ the commissioning process then there is a risk that the commissioning work will be done in isolation and potential savings and effective delivery of outcomes will be reduced.”</p> <p>The mitigating action is</p> <p>“£10k pa agreed in budget to extend current grant agreement with Cheltenham VCA. Positive meetings held to take forward the partnership improvement project with Institute for Voluntary Action Research and programme of 3 sessions completed. Action plan and new structures proposed and will be taken forward. CSP endorsed the proposals at their meeting in June and a meeting has been held with officers at GCC to ensure that proposals are discussed at senior level within the organisation.”</p>
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	<p>The proposed structures will enable the council to deliver many of the partnership elements set out in the corporate strategy.</p>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	<p>None identified</p>

## 1. Background

- 1.1 In 2011 senior officers and practitioners within the public sector and the voluntary and community sector, participated in the Partnership Improvement Programme (PIP) which met three times between March and May 2011. In sessions one and two, participants spent time discussing the strengths of partnership working in Cheltenham and areas where they would like to do further work to build on those strengths as part of a commitment to continuous improvement to meet local needs in the light of changing legislation.
- 1.2 During the final PIP session, a draft partnership structure was proposed and was agreed by all participants. It has fewer partnerships and simplified governance arrangements; it appears to be flexible, outcomes focussed and has the potential to engage diverse groups. The group identified three main issues that will need to be resolved:
- Developing a terms of reference for all parts of the new structure setting out outcomes, roles, responsibilities, accountabilities, membership and frequency of meetings.
  - How will the transition be made from the existing partnership structure to the new model?
  - How will the Cheltenham structure relate to county-wide partnership structures?
- 1.3 The CSP met on 23 June to endorse the draft structure and to agree a period of consultation to gain partner views on the proposals. The consultation closed on the 2 September and the 7 responses were discussed by a CSP task and finish group that met on 8 September.
- 1.4 **Appendix 3** sets out the Task and Finish group's responses to the issues raised by the consultees.

## 2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 The task and finish group that met on the 8<sup>th</sup> September reviewed the consultation comments and also reflected on comments about the proposed structures that had been made informally throughout the process. Because of the overall positive nature of the comments, the group was firmly of the view that the proposed structure be endorsed by the CSP at its September meeting.
- 2.2 The structures were duly endorsed by the CSP at its meeting on 29 September. A number of questions were raised at the CSP meeting that will be considered as the structure evolves:
- Where does Arts and Culture representation sit?
  - Ensuring effective representation from businesses?
  - Do we need a place for the University/GlosCol?
- 2.3 The CSP also agreed to review the primary function of the strategic leadership group and this will now concentrate on setting out how quality of life in Cheltenham can be improved through improved partnership working and leading the process of aligning organisational priorities to deliver priority outcomes.

## 3. Implementation plans

### 3.1 Endorsement and organisational buy-in

- 3.2 The CSP made a request to all CSP partner agencies that they take time to endorse the proposals. This paper to Cabinet fulfils the council's part of this commitment. The structures were also endorsed by the VCS forum that met on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2011.

### 3.3 Membership:

- 3.4 The task and finish group has identified who might best sit on the new partnership groups and these are set out in the **appendix 2** for discussion.

- 3.5** In terms of the Positive Participation Partnership, the group would like to see the Stronger Communities Partnership (SCP) take the lead in setting this partnership up and this will be discussed at the next SCP meeting on 3 November. They will be supported to manage this transition by Helen Down.
- 3.6** In terms of the Positive Lives Partnership, It is suggested that a meeting be facilitated of the lead officers who would make up the partnership (where they are in-post). This meeting is being planned and will be held in October. They will be supported to manage the transition by Richard Gibson.
- 3.7** In terms Strategic Leadership Group, it is planned to use the next CSP date on 15 December to formally close the CSP whilst at the same time as inviting new representatives from Probation and Fire and Rescue. The main business of the meeting will be endorse an updated needs analysis, a set of collective priorities for partnership working and an assessment of resources available to meet these priorities. They will be supported to manage the transition by Jane Griffiths.
- 3.8 Future priorities:**
- 3.9** It is anticipated that the Stronger Communities Partnership meeting on 3 November will review the March 2011 needs analysis (and any subsequent updates) in order that an updated needs analysis can be presented to the CSP meeting on 15 December.
- 3.10 Governance arrangements:**
- 3.11 Appendix 2** to this report includes a draft philosophy of partnership working that sets out a range of commitments on partners. The CSP meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December will review this document and sign it off. More detailed terms of references for the constituent partnership groups will need to be developed and signed off.

<b>Report author</b>	Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnerships Manager, 01242 235354, richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Risk assessment</b></li> <li><b>2. Improving partnership structures for Cheltenham</b></li> <li><b>3. Summary of questions / issues raised and responses</b></li> </ol>
<b>Background information</b>	

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk					
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	I	L	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register	
CR 40	If Partner organisations are not sufficiently 'bought into' the commissioning process then there is a risk that the commissioning work will be done in isolation and potential savings and effective delivery of outcomes will be reduced.	Chief Executive Andrew North	28 <sup>th</sup> October 2010	4	3	12	reduce	Effective engagement with the VCS forum, plus other partners through CSP and thematic partnerships. The objective of 'place based' project is to engage partners and create alignment. Ensure that joint funding is subject to use of proper commissioning disciplines.	31-Mar-12	Policy and Partnerships Manager	remains on corporate risk register	