



To: Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee  
Report by: Leader of Council - Cllr Sian Reid  
Relevant scrutiny committee: Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee  
Wards affected: All Wards

## **LAA Performance Report 2009/10: CAMBRIDGESHIRE TOGETHER AND CAMBRIDGE AND SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP**

### **Not a Key Decision**

#### **1. Executive summary**

- 1.1 There are four linked reports on this agenda that concern the Council's strategic partnership work.

#### **Performance**

- 1.2 In addition to this report there are Local Area Agreement (LAA) performance reports covering:

- The 'Managing Growth' theme (Cambridgeshire Horizons)
- The 'Economic Prosperity' theme (Greater Cambridge Partnership)

These two reports look back at performance against the relevant Local Area Agreement targets for 2009/10. Similar performance reports covering the other LAA themes have been considered during this cycle by the relevant City Council scrutiny committee. This is in accordance with the Council's 'Principles of Partnership Working'.

- 1.2 This report gives an overview of county-wide LAA performance to March 2010. Scrutiny members should consider the two performance reports above alongside this report.

#### **Future of the Local Area Agreement**

- 1.3 The LAA concludes at the end of March 2011. The opportunity for partners to claim 'reward grant' from government had provided an incentive to achieve targets within the LAA and to invest in services to

enable them to stretch their performance. However, it now seems very unlikely that this money will be available when the present agreement concludes at the end of March 2011.

- 1.4 The report highlights a significant change in direction by the new coalition government which means the existing thematic strategic partnership structures, built to support and oversee delivery of the LAA, are no longer practical and need to be fundamentally reviewed. This has been recognised by partners who have commissioned a 'task and finish' group of officers to carry out the review and recommend radical changes which will reduce bureaucracy and focus work on local priorities.
- 1.5 In parallel, government has invited Councils and business leaders to submit proposals for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). An outline submission was submitted by partners on September 6<sup>th</sup>. Lots of further work is required with partners to agree such things as the detailed role of the LEP, governance arrangements and what the implications might be for other partnerships such as Cambridgeshire Horizons and the Greater Cambridge Partnership. The proposals are set out in the fourth linked report on this agenda.
- 1.6 On 22 July 2010 Council agreed to review the Council's criteria for partnership working. The criteria (Principles for Partnership Working) are included in this report at Appendix B and the Scrutiny Committee is asked to give its views as to whether they are still fit for purpose.
- 1.7 City Council officers have asked a selection of City Council members and officers who attend the existing thematic strategic partnerships for their perceptions about the effectiveness of the meetings. Appendix C summarises their views. This work, together with the 'Principles of Partnership Working' will inform our input into 1.4 above.

### **Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership & Reward Grant funding.**

- 1.8 The report also includes an update of the work of the newly formed Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership and gives the current position regarding in year cuts to Local Public Service Agreement 'reward grant'.

## **2. Recommendations**

The Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

- 2.1 Consider the 2009/10 end of year performance against LAA indicators shown in Table 1, under section 4.
- 2.2 Advise the Leader of the Council of any issues that she should feed back to Cambridgeshire Together or the Local Strategic Partnership.
- 2.3 Advise the Leader of any changes that should be made to the Council's Principles for Partnership Working set out in Appendix B

### 3. Background

- 3.1 An approach to our involvement in, and reporting on, county-wide thematic strategic partnerships was agreed by the Leader at Strategy and Resources scrutiny committee on 19 January 2009. Executive Councillors, nominated by the Council, now sit on the Cambridgeshire Together Board alongside other key public service stakeholders in the county and are involved in each of its six thematic strategic partnerships, which presently cover the priority areas shown in the Vision for Cambridgeshire.
- 3.2 The thematic strategic partnerships are:
  - **Cambridgeshire Horizons**, covering the Managing Growth theme
  - **Greater Cambridge Partnership**, covering the Economic Prosperity theme
  - **Community Wellbeing Partnership**, covering parts of the Equality and Inclusion theme
  - **Children's Trust Board for Cambridgeshire**, covering parts of the Equality and Inclusion theme
  - **Environmental Sustainability Partnership**, covering the Environmental Sustainability theme
  - **Safer and Stronger Strategic Board**, covering the Safer and Stronger Communities theme.
- 3.3 Cambridgeshire Together is responsible for negotiating and delivering the improvements required by Cambridgeshire's Local Area Agreement (LAA), now in its third and final year. The LAA was shaped by the 'Vision for Cambridgeshire 2007-2021'. Targets are delegated through the relevant thematic strategic partnerships.
- 3.4 Annual reports from the Executive Councillors showing performance of their partnership up to March 2010 are being reported to the relevant City Council Scrutiny Committee during this cycle. The 'Managing Growth' and 'Economic Prosperity' themed partnership reports are included on this agenda and should be read in conjunction

with this report. This report gives a high level summary of overall performance in section 4 below.

- 3.5 Government had included the incentive of 'reward grant' within the LAA if partners achieved the LAA targets. It now seems very unlikely that this grant will be honoured. The statutory Place and Status Surveys, due to be carried out this autumn and used to collect data to measure some of the LAA target indicators, have already been scrapped and a number of the wider National Indicator Set have been abolished.
- 3.6 The existing strategic partnership structures were developed in order to deliver the Local Area Agreement. They have become complex and overly bureaucratic and will clearly not be appropriate going forward in the context of the coalition government's localism agenda, the abolition of the regional government offices, the significant financial challenges facing public sector organisations and the end of the LAA.
- 3.7 The Cambridgeshire Public Service Board (comprising public sector Chief Executives) has initiated a review which is taking a radical look at partnership working across the county. The focus will be on reducing bureaucracy and enabling officers to come together only when they need to do so in order to deliver local priorities.
- 3.8 This work is being taken forward alongside a joint submission to government for a Local Enterprise Partnership. The submission was made by the government's deadline of 6<sup>th</sup> September and is included in a separate report to this committee.
- 3.9 Proposed changes to partnership working will be taken through the Public Service Board and Cambridgeshire Together and reported back to this committee at a later date.
- 3.10 The Council will need to make sure that any future structures will deliver the Council's objectives. To inform this work:
  - i) On 22 July 2010 Council agreed to review the Council's criteria for partnership working. The 'Principles for Partnership Working' agreed in January 2009 are included in this report at Appendix B. The Scrutiny Committee is asked to give its views as to whether they are still fit for purpose and to recommend any changes to the Leader.
  - ii) Officers asked a selection of members and officers who attend the existing thematic strategic partnerships for their perceptions

about the effectiveness of the meetings. Appendix C summarises their views.

#### 4. Performance against LAA targets

- 4.1 The LAA End of Year Performance Report 2009/10 provides a summary of present performance across Cambridgeshire in each of the thematic blocks and sets out the risk of the targets not being met by 31 March 2011.
- 4.2 Each indicator within each thematic block is weighted equally and has been given a Red-Amber-Green (RAG) status on the basis of either the data given or an assessment of performance drawn from other performance information or results. This is coloured coded using the RAG system as follows:

On target / Low risk of not achieving outcome	<b>Green</b>
Target narrowly missed / Moderate risk of not achieving outcome	<b>Amber</b>
Target missed significantly / Serious risk of not achieving outcome	<b>Red</b>

- 4.3 Overall the assessment of LAA performance by the County Council's Performance Team is given as "Amber".

**Table 1: Summary of performance across LAA thematic areas at end of year 2009/10.**

Thematic Block	Performance	Risks	DoT 2008/09 to 2009/10
Economic Prosperity	<b>Red</b>	<b>Red</b>	↓
Environmental Sustainability	<b>Amber</b>	<b>Amber</b>	↔
Equality & Inclusion	<b>Amber</b>	<b>Amber</b>	↔
Managing Growth	<b>Amber</b>	<b>Amber</b>	↓
Safer & Stronger Communities	<b>Amber</b>	<b>Amber</b>	↔

- 4.4 The block that is causing most concern is Economic Prosperity, which is directly affected by the economic conditions in the country. The LAA was "refreshed" at the end of its second year, following negotiations with GO East, and some targets were negotiated downwards to reflect the changes in the economic environment.

## **5. Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Local Strategic Partnership**

- 5.1 In April 2010 Cambridge Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) merged with South Cambridgeshire LSP to form a new single LSP. Two meetings of the new LSP have now taken place. This merger is an acknowledgement of the common problems faced by both districts and a desire for closer working between the agencies covering the areas to help resolve them. It has resulted in fewer meetings taking place and simplified reporting arrangements for the existing partnerships covering the City and South Cambridgeshire.
- 5.2 The LSP is developing a new Sustainable Community Strategy to set out priorities for the two areas (at present it is a statutory duty for local authorities to produce Sustainable Community Strategies). The Strategy will replace the two existing strategies and will run from April 2011 for three years. The LSP is consulting local stakeholders, members and residents about its content.
- 5.3 The LSP has been monitoring the performance of the LAA locally and was looking to ensure that local partnerships and lead partners are contributing effectively to its achievement. The LSP presently uses the performance management reports generated by Cambridgeshire Together and asks lead officers for partnerships, in underperforming areas, to give account for their work.

## **6. Local Public Service Agreement Reward Grant**

- 6.1 Cambridgeshire's Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) preceded the current LAA. The LPSA contained 'stretch targets' that partners in the county negotiated with government across 12 topic areas. These targets had to be delivered by March 2007. Partners needed to achieve at least 60% of each 'stretch target' in order to be awarded reward grant. Across the County we achieved a total of £9m 'one-off' reward grant.
- 6.2 Cambridgeshire Together used £915,000 of the grant to help support the concessionary fares bus scheme and £525,000 for 'capacity building' to support the county's partnerships. LSPs were asked to decide how the remaining reward grant (approximately £1.5m per LSP) should be used to deliver projects over the period January 2009 to April 2012. Collectively, partners agreed to spend some of the grant on countywide projects that will help achieve the targets in the LAA. The rest is being spent on local projects, commissioned by each of the 5 District LSPs.

- 6.3 These projects are being co-ordinated on behalf of the LSPs by the County Council and the 5 District Councils. Here, they are being co-ordinated by officers in Strategy and Partnerships who are monitoring delivery and managing the budget. Many of the projects are now underway. Some are completed or nearing completion. All projects have to be completed by April 2012.
- 6.4 The government paid half of the reward grant (£4.5m) to the County Council 'up front'. The City Council was drawing down funding from the County Council as the projects progressed through quarterly returns.
- 6.5 In June 2010 government announced that it was making cuts to reward grant. The County Council did not receive the remaining £4.5m and so have been unable to make any further payments to District Councils including the City Council.
- 6.6 City Council officers had negotiated a £250,000 "float" at the outset as part of a Conditions of Grant with the County Council. This was to mitigate the financial risk to the City Council. This is enabling us to honour most of our commitments to projects that were underway. However, a number of projects where agreements had not yet been signed have had to be cancelled and we have negotiated funding reductions to some projects. Government has now confirmed that no further grant payment will be made.
- 6.7 Appendix A lists the projects and their current position.

## **7. Implications**

### **Financial**

- 7.1 The loss of the £4.5m of LPSA reward grant will have an impact on the voluntary sector across the county who are more likely to turn to local authorities for more support.

### **Staff**

- 7.2 A considerable number of City Council staff from all departments are working with partners to deliver the LAA. The partnership review will look to reduce bureaucracy and re-focus efforts on local priorities.

### **Equal Opportunities**

- 7.4 Equality and Inclusion is a key strand of the Cambridgeshire Vision and LAA.

## **Community Safety**

7.5 Strong Communities is a key strand of the Cambridgeshire Vision and LAA.

## **Environmental Implications**

7.6 Environmental sustainability is a key strand of the Cambridgeshire Vision and LAA.

## **8. Background papers**

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Local Area Agreement, Year End Performance Report - May 2010

<http://www2.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/db/council2.nsf/3a8c0d82ef2ec52b80256b14003ef045/13749c6b74676efc802577230037d6b8?OpenDocument>

Proposals for a New Model of Partnership Working – May 2010

Cambridge LSP, Performance Management Report – January 2010

## **9. Inspection of papers**

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: **Trevor Woollams**  
Author's Phone Number: **01223 457061**  
Author's Email: **Trevor.woollams@cambridge.gov.uk**

Appendix A LPSA Reward Grant – Current Position

LPSA Reward Grant		Planned Project Costs			Actual Spend
Project Details for Cambridge City					
Status	Theme	Revenue	Capital	Total	Totals to 31.3. 2010
County-wide projects paid directly by County	Domestic Violence	£62,000	£18,000	£80,000	£66,487
	Childhood Obesity	£32,000		£32,000	
	Smoking Cessation	£39,534		£39,534	
	Community Speed Watch		£5,600	£5,600	
	Older People	£21,360	£26,640	£48,000	
	Alcohol Related Harm	£40,000		£40,000	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> Sector Strategy for Cambridgeshire	£8,393		£8,393	
	Community Planning / Engagement			£0	
Local projects paid directly by County	Pupil Performance – CC Education	£60,000		£60,000	£53,800
	Work with at Risk Young Men - OCYPS	£60,791		£60,791	£28,966
	The Streets ASB awareness schools programme - OCYPS	£14,446	£9,700	£24,146	£14,010
	Improving exclusion through learning	£90,000	£89,500	£179,500*	£13,188*
	<b>Subtotal projects administered by County Council</b>	<b>£428,524</b>	<b>£149,440</b>	<b>£577,964</b>	<b>£176,451</b>
Local projects paid directly by SCDC	Connections Youth Bus	£88,558	£70,000	£158,558 <sup>#</sup>	£79,908
	Health & wellbeing of Travellers	£25,000		£25,000 <sup>#</sup>	£1,830
	<b>Subtotal of projects administered by South Cambs. DC</b>	<b>£113,558</b>	<b>£70,000</b>	<b>£183,558</b>	<b>£81,738</b>
Local projects paid directly by City Council	Delivery of Climate Change Charter	£60,000		£60,000*	£25,801*
	Handyperson Service	£70,000		£70,000*	£26,200*
	Specialist Alcohol Community Psychiatric Nurse to reduce levels of street drinking in the City	£118,468		£118,468	£75,095
	Management of Cambridge Wildlife Sites - Wildlife Trust	£14,000	£6,000	£20,000	£10,000
	Income maximisation - CAB	£28,000		£28,000	£28,000
	Community Fund for City - CCDF	£7,500	£150,000	£157,500	£0
	Empowering Communities - CVS capacity building	£60,890		£60,890	£36,588
	LSP Support Officer	£41,355		£41,355	£27,568
	Improving Community Cohesion	£105,000		£105,000	£30,072
	Health Improvement Officer	£45,000	£2,000	£47,000	£0
	Community Recycling Champions	£44,000		£44,000	£14,671
	Street Cleaning	£38,000	£38,000	£76,000	£56,500
	Cambridge Business Against Crime - programme of City Centre initiatives	£29,000	£15,000	£44,000	£38,195
Supporting vulnerable people during economic downturn	£31,500		£31,500	£23,500	
	Contingency	£3,102		£3,102	
	<b>Subtotal of projects administered by the City Council on behalf of the LSP</b>	<b>£695,815</b>	<b>£211,000</b>	<b>£906,815</b>	<b>£392,190</b>
	<b>Total of LPSA Reward Grant allocated/actual spend</b>	<b>£1,126,897</b>	<b>£386,440</b>	<b>£1,513,337</b>	<b>£617,784</b>

<sup>#</sup> Excludes 50% contribution from South Cambridgeshire allocation.

\* Includes approx. 50% of funding from South Cambridgeshire's allocation

1.2 Cambridge City Council, in its Conditions of Grant with the County Council, was administering £906,935 of LPSA reward grant on behalf of the LSP.

1.3 The table above shows a breakdown of how the total grant was allocated by the former Cambridge LSP.

1.3.1 **County-wide projects paid directly by County**

LSPs agreed to support these projects. The projects are being administered directly by the County Council.

1.3.2 **Local projects paid directly by County**

Cambridge City LSP commissioned the County Council to deliver these projects. They are being administered directly by the County Council.

1.3.3 **Local projects paid directly by SCDC**

Cambridge City LSP and South Cambridgeshire LSP jointly commissioned these projects. They are being administered by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

1.3.4 **Local projects paid directly by City Council**

The first two projects were commissioned jointly by Cambridge City LSP and South Cambridgeshire LSP. The rest were commissioned by Cambridge City LSP. They are being administered by Cambridge City Council and have a total value of £906,815 (the slight difference from the Conditions of Grant form is due to amended project costs). By the end of March 2010 the City Council had paid out £392,190.

1.4 Government suspended payment of LPSA grant in June 2010. Officers immediately stopped work on any projects where formal agreements or contracts had not been signed. These projects were:

**i) Community Fund for Cambridge City** **£157,500**

*This will affect the level of future grant that is distributed in the City to support community and voluntary sector organisations.*

**ii) Health Improvement** **£47,000**

*This will affect the ability of the local Health Improvement Partnership to reduce health inequalities in the City*

**iii) Community Roots Arts (part of the Improving Community Cohesion project)** **£15,000**

*This will reduce the range of activities and the extent of involvement in local community centres in the City*

1.5 Officers also negotiated a reduction in the scale of some of the projects (where agreements were already in place) with the lead organisations. These projects were:

**i) Bling Ya Thing (part of the Improving Community Cohesion project)**  
**£10,000**

*This will reduce the number of developmental workshops and qualifying local talent show heats in local community centres but the second talent show will still be run.*

**ii) Handyperson Service**  
**£15,000**

*This will reduce the re-investment that was planned, to enable additional stair rails, etc. to be purchased to support older people to live independently, but the main project will still run.*

**iii) Diversity in Public Life (part of the empowering communities project)**  
**£10,000**

*This may reduce the number of people from different sections of the community who engage in the governance of public agencies. The project is now smaller in scale.*

**iv) Workshops exploring Islam (part of the Improving Community Cohesion project)**  
**£3,000**

*The remaining workshop will still run but will have lower costs.*

**v) Recycling Champions**  
**£5,000**

*The project will continue as originally intended. The reduction represents an under-spend in the first year.*

**vi) Contingency sum**  
**£3,000**

1.6 Given the above the City Council's commitments, as of 1 April 2010, were:

Total amount of Reward Grant administered by the City Council	£906,935
Less: amount already paid	£392,190
Less: amount not yet committed	£219,500
Less: negotiated reductions	£46,000
<b>Remaining commitment</b>	<b>£249,245</b>

1.7 The City Council negotiated a float of £250,000 as part of the Conditions of Grant with the County Council to mitigate financial risk. This sum will allow the remaining commitments to be honoured.

1.8 Cambridge City and South Cambridge LSP endorsed this approach when it met on 21 July 2010.

1.9 The City Council paid out a further £87,836.79 to LPSA projects for the period April – June 2010, leaving £161,140.

## Appendix B

### The Council's Principles for Partnership Working

Extract from a report to Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 19 January 2009.

#### 5 When should we work in Partnership?

5.1 Working in partnership can bring significant additional benefits to the people who live, work and study in our area, especially when partners pool resources and skills to achieve a common aim. Examples of where this is working well in Cambridge include tackling anti-social behaviour and reducing obesity.

5.2 However, partnership working can sometimes be complicated, over bureaucratic and resource intensive in relation to the outcomes achieved. Therefore, we need to be clear when we will and when we won't join a partnership.

5.3 The criteria in Principle 1 should be used to 'test' whether the Council should enter (or remain) in any partnership.

#### 5.4 **Principle 1**

*The City Council will only work in partnership with other organisations when 1 or more of the following criteria are met:*

- a) *It helps us achieve our MTOs*
- b) *It helps deliver the LAA*
- c) *It helps deliver the Sustainable Community Strategy*
- d) *We have a legal duty to do so*
- e) *It can help us lever in additional funding*
- f) *It saves us money*
- g) *It reduces risk (e.g. to the Council's reputation)*

5.5 Officers believe that the partnerships in Table 1 above comply with this principle.

#### 6. Effective Partnership Working

6.1 We must also ensure that the partnerships we do join are working effectively, that the Council's role is clear and that the needs of the City are met. In particular, we need to ensure:

- Effective governance arrangements are in place

- There is clear accountability between the partnerships and the City Council
- The partnerships are open and accessible
- Resources are identified and used effectively
- Effective scrutiny arrangements are in place

6.2 The following paragraphs include further Principles that should be followed by the City Council to ensure that the partnerships we join are working effectively.

### 6.3 Effective Governance

6.3.1 Effective governance is important to ensure that each partner:

- is clear about the role and focus of the partnership
- takes ownership of an agreed set of objectives
- is clear about how the objectives will be achieved
- is clear about how progress will be measured
- is clear about key risks and how they will be managed

#### 6.3.2 **Principle 2**

*We will ensure the partnerships we belong to have effective governance arrangements including:*

- a) Clear Terms of Reference*
- b) Clear objectives, targets and performance management arrangements*
- c) Effective systems to manage risk*
- d) Effective systems to manage complaints*

### 6.4 Accountability

6.4.1 Clear accountability is important to ensure that informed and appropriate decisions are made and that, where necessary, 'in principle' decisions are brought back through the City Council's own decision making and scrutiny processes to be confirmed (or otherwise).

#### 6.4.2 **Principle 3**

*We will ensure there is clear accountability between the partnerships and the City Council by:*

- a) Ensuring there is appropriate City Council Member representation*
- b) Ensuring the City Council Member representative is clear about their remit and the type and extent of decisions they can make on behalf of the City Council.*

- c) *Ensuring that the City Council Member representative takes relevant decisions back through the City Council's decision making and scrutiny process.*
- d) *Ensuring the City Council Member representative is fully briefed before each meeting*
- e) *Ensuring nominated opposition Spokes are briefed before each meeting (see paragraph 6.7.3 d)*

## **6.5 Openness and Accessibility**

6.5.1 It is important that the partnerships we belong to are open and accessible so that:

- The public and elected Members can easily find out about the issues that are being discussed and the decisions that are being made
- The public and elected Members can find out who to talk to if they want to try and influence decisions
- The public and elected members can attend a partnership meeting to ask questions and listen to debates
- The public and elected Members can read reports before meetings take place and read the minutes afterwards

### 6.5.2 **Principle 4**

*We will ensure partnerships are open and accessible by:*

- a) *Holding all meetings in public*
- b) *Publicising meetings in advance on the Council's website*
- c) *Ensuring agendas and reports can be accessed from our website at least 5 working days in advance of the meeting.*
- d) *Ensuring minutes can be accessed from our website as soon as possible after the meeting.*
- e) *Ensuring the names and contact details of the City Council's lead Member, opposition Spokes (see paragraph 4.9.3 d) and lead officer for the partnership are published on our website.*
- f) *Ensuring those partnerships have effective systems to engage with the public*

*Note: For partnerships administered by the City Council (e.g. Cambridge Local Strategic Partnership) all details will be hosted on the City Council's website. For partnerships administered by partner organisations, clear links will be maintained from the City Council's website to the relevant place on the partner's website.*

## **6.6 Use of Resources**

- 6.6.1 The term 'resources' can mean staff time, money, buildings, equipment etc.
- 6.6.2 We must ensure that the partnerships we belong to have the resources they need to deliver their objectives. We must also ensure that the resources allocated by the City Council are appropriate and used effectively.

**Principle 5**

*We will ensure partnerships have the resources needed to deliver their objectives and that they use them effectively by:*

- a) Ensuring the City Council commits the resources necessary to meet its obligations to the partnership.*
- b) Ensuring City Council resources are used effectively and not duplicated (e.g. by minimising the number of officers attending meetings, disseminating information effectively etc.)*
- c) Challenging partners to ensure they commit appropriate resources*
- d) Reviewing the City Council's resource commitment annually via service plans*
- e) Ensuring City Council Members have opportunities to scrutinise the City Council's partnership work (see section 4.9 below)*

**6.7 Scrutiny**

- 6.7.1 The existing Joint Accountability Committee (JAC) was set up to scrutinise the performance of Cambridgeshire Together and delivery of the LAA. In future it will also be able to make recommendations to the new thematic strategic partnerships. JAC comprises elected Members from the County Council (5) and the District Councils (1 each) and 1 Local Authority appointed Member from Cambridgeshire Police Authority. Cllr Ward currently represents the City Council on JAC. JAC meets twice a year but this is likely to increase to give the committee more capacity.
- 6.7.2 The JAC is an effective means of scrutinising Cambridgeshire Together at a strategic level. However, our own internal systems need to enable our Members to ensure that the needs of residents are met through scrutiny of City Council engagement in partnership work.

## Appendix C      Review of Strategic Partnerships

During August 2010 Members and officers attending the main strategic partnerships at which the City Council is currently represented were asked for their views on the effectiveness of these partnerships, particularly in respect of their capacity to deliver added value for the citizens of Cambridge.

The table below summarises the feedback through the identification of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each partnership.

This internal review took place in parallel with a County Council led review of these partnerships, from which some initial conclusions have been drawn and proposals made. During the period of this review the Government indicated that it too was reviewing the need for some partnerships or was considering removing some of the duties and responsibilities that underpin the existence of some partnerships e.g. Childrens Trust Board, Local Strategic Partnership

Partnership	Lead Member & Officer	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Cambridge City and South Cambs. Local Strategic Partnership</b>	Cllr Reid  Head of Strategy and Partnerships	a) Brings different partners and sectors together to consider priorities for the local area b) Gives a voice to the 'non-public' sector c) LPSA funding for local projects (now stopped) d) Joint-working with SCDC	a) Lack of buy-in from all partners to the role of an LSP b) Not all partners are equal (resources/influence) c) No resource input other than from City and South Cambs d) Has had little measurable impact on services to the public e) Local Area Agreement's are unlikely to continue beyond March 2011 and a key role of the LSP in monitoring the agreement will cease.

Partnership	Lead Member & Officer	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Children and Young People's Area Partnership</b>	Cllr Kerr Head of Community Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Good representation for key services and 3rd sector</li> <li>b) High profile for 3rd sector (chaired by voluntary sector representative)</li> <li>c) Beginning to firm up role and develop action plan</li> <li>d) Commitment from County. Representation on Children's Trust Board</li> <li>e) Evidence of growing trust and confidence amongst members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Inconsistent attendance</li> <li>b) Confusion (but reducing) about role</li> <li>c) Does not meet often enough to really develop role and team work</li> <li>d) Sustainability. Reductions in resources to support it.</li> <li>e) Impact limited as yet but a forum to address common concerns across the City and South Cambs and make best use of joint resources is valuable.</li> </ul>
<b>Cambridgeshire Children's Trust Board</b>	Cllr Bick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Underpinned by a duty to cooperate in Section 10 of the Children Act 2004</li> <li>b) List of statutory partners</li> <li>c) Clear role and purpose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Under review by Government.</li> <li>b) Fundamental purpose of the Board to be removed - requirement to set up a Children's Trust Board and produce a Children and Young People's Plan in April 2011 is to be revoked, the duty on schools to cooperate with Children's Trusts is to be removed.</li> </ul>

Partnership	Lead Member & Officer	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Cambridgeshire Horizons</b>	Cllr Reid  Director of Environment/ Urban Growth Project Manager	<p>a) Has generated significant levels of external funding for CCC both revenue and capital</p> <p>b) Have put work and resources into projects that have been important to the council e.g. Quality Charter and Strategic Housing Market Assessment</p> <p>c) Representation to the government on growth has been good</p> <p>d) Has a number of highly respected specialist officers</p> <p>e) The City Council would need to put more resources into generating external funding and lobbying government on growth if Horizons didn't exist.</p>	<p>a) Concerns about effectiveness of governance arrangements e.g. lack of annual business plan</p> <p>b) Fails to assist in resolving some issues important to the Council e.g. Cambridge East, Transport Strategy</p> <p>c) Duplication of some roles with other agencies</p> <p>d) Does not always seem to understand the complexity of the issues facing councils or fully recognise the role of councillors.</p> <p>e) Does not have all the specialist/technical skills needed to support councils in their work</p> <p>f) No remit to get involved in policy but there have been examples of 'mission creep' e.g. Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>

Partnership	Lead Member & Officer	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Cambridgeshire Together</b>	Cllr Reid Chief Executive	<p>a) Concept is right. There is a need for officers and Members to come together in a formal context but work is needed to improve the partnership.</p> <p>b) The dynamic of the partnership is changing. There is now a greater willingness by partners to work together</p> <p>c) Partnership developed with a tangible objective to manage the Local Area Agreement. This purpose will almost certainly cease after March 2011.</p> <p>d) If Place -Based Budgeting becomes a reality then the partnership would be well-placed to take this forward but would need a new constitution and Terms of Reference.</p>	<p>a) Agendas tend to be formulaic and the role of participants not much more than rubber-stamping</p> <p>b) Discussions and decisions are often made in side meetings not at CT</p> <p>c) It can be difficult to get members up to speed on agendas because of the broad range of services covered. This makes member engagement more difficult to achieve</p> <p>d) Turnover of partnership membership is high and this affects development of relationships</p> <p>e) The infrequency of the meetings means that there is little time to build the partnership and develop its effectiveness.</p> <p>f) It is not always clear what needs to be progressed by district LSPs and what by the partnership.</p>
<b>Community Well-being Partnership</b>	Cllr Bick Head of Refuse and Environment	<p>a) Information sharing is good</p> <p>b) Reports such as Joint Strategic Needs Assessments or the Annual Public Health report</p> <p>c) Member interest and engagement on services delivered is good</p> <p>d) Reporting on performance for outcome focused targets</p>	<p>a) Lack of budgets</p> <p>b) Variability in resources committed by partners</p> <p>c) Differing partner needs</p> <p>d) Not all Members are engaged</p> <p>e) Too many priorities</p>

Partnership	Lead Member & Officer	Strengths	Weaknesses
		e) Knowledge of health topics good	
<b>Environmental Sustainability Partnership</b>	Cllr Blair Head of Policy and Projects	a) Partnership has good oversight of environmental issues and indicators.	a) Partnership lacks a clear purpose. Unlikely to have been set up without a clear external driver in the Comprehensive Area Assessment/LAA agenda b) Has not been perceived to have added value to its constituent partnerships.
<b>Greater Cambridge Partnership</b>	Cllr Reid Chief Executive	a) Historically has done good work around targeting skills b) Effective distribution of Investing in Communities money c) Work on Clean Tech market work d) Well-regarded by business and has business involvement e) Provides information about inward investment the City Council would otherwise have to provide f) The City Council's membership provides an important voice because of the city's role in driving the local economy and as the only urban centre in an otherwise largely rural area.	a) The partnership seems to have lost its way a bit and become more of a discussion group b) Research is insufficiently focused sometimes to be of practical value to the organizations that might use it c) Uncertainty about the relevance of the partnership's historic role continuing into the future.

Partnership	Lead Member & Officer	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Safer Stronger Partnership Board</b>	Cllr Bick Community Safety Officer	a) Potential to take strategic county-wide view on common issues and services b) Provides a forum for districts to influence Safer and Stronger Communities Funding allocation.	a) Perception that the current composition of the membership of Board (officer and Member) can skew decision-making outcomes. b) Communications can be slow. City officers sometimes don't find out that topics are up for discussion until after decisions have been made.