

**Title**                            **Report on Community Improvement Partnerships (CIPs) consultation**

**By:**                                **Andrew Olive, Head of Community Learning**

**Date:**                            **3 July 2007**

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The consultation period regarding the future direction of CIPs concluded on 18 May 2007. Responses were received from a wide range of organisations and stakeholders including CIP partnerships, schools (including governors), voluntary groups, community groups, faith groups, police, PCT representatives and many representatives and groups across supporting LA teams.
2. The consultation considered some of the ongoing issues and challenges surrounding the work of the Community Improvement Partnerships, focusing particularly on:
  - Where CIPs fit into the city-wide strategic and accountability framework, i.e. Children's Trust arrangements
  - The role and purpose of CIPS
  - Measuring the impact of CIPs in achieving better outcomes for children and young people
  - Exploring opportunities to support the long term sustainability and appropriate forms of governance.
3. Specific feedback was requested on:
  - The formation of a new strategic group to ensure long-term direction, sustainability of CIPs and ensure their place in the city's consultative, communication and accountability framework (to replace the Extended Schools Steering Group
  - The membership of this group
  - Whether the role and purpose of CIPs should be more clearly defined
  - The formation of a working group to co-ordinate the work on indicators to demonstrate the impact of CIPs
  - The membership of this group
  - The preparation of a 3 year indicative budgets by each CIP by September 2007 as a starting point to the discussion on how to sustain long term financial stability.

### **Part A – A summary of the consultation**

A commentary on the consultation is provided below under each of the above statements.

- 4. The formation of a new strategic group to ensure long-term direction, sustainability of CIPs and ensure their place in the city's consultative, communication and accountability framework (to replace the Extended Schools Steering Group) and the membership of this group**

The formation of this group was widely supported by all sectors. It was felt it would enable issues that affect all partnerships to be considered more efficiently and facilitate agencies and voluntary / community groups with limited capacity to be represented at a strategic as well as operational level in the individual CIP groups. The group's place in the Children's Trust arrangements was also supported, securing the CIPs place in the accountability structure.

With overwhelming support for this group, there however, as with all groups of this nature, a tension between the wide range of partners that wish to be members and the optimum size of group.

Suggested membership from the consultation included:

- Limited to those partners that contributed financially
- Senior manager from health
- All 5 CIP managers and chairs
- A representative from each CIP but not necessarily the chairs
- CIP managers to rotate membership
- Representative from LA
- Senior manager from Police
- Community based representation, both city wide and neighbourhood based
- A representative from the voluntary sector, e.g. Portsmouth Alliance
- Councillors
- Children, young people and families as service users
- Neighbourhood forum reps.

A range of other comments gave a helpful steer to the way forward:

- Not too many – a maximum of 12
- A core group with others invited as appropriate
- Each representative must have a fully briefed person to deputise for them if necessary
- An annual conference could report on progress and act as a consultative group to key issues
- Some representatives could 'wear 2 hats'; e.g. represent CIP and agency
- The role of members in being proactive at feeding back to CIP must be clear
- Clear links to the JCG were recognised as useful, though one group suggested, 'a non-local authority representative to attend JCG on behalf of the CIPs'.

## **5. Whether the role and purpose of CIPs should be defined**

The notion of an agreed role and purpose of CIPs was supported. Many groups suggested that 'CIPs feel owned by schools and not partner agencies.' The community groups were particularly concerned that they were not involved in the setting up of the partnerships.

It was felt there needed to be greater clarity that, 'these partnerships exist essentially for children and young people'. Some respondents suggested a change of name to

reinforce this would be helpful. Some respondents referred to the Best Value Review (BVR) on community involvement and to ensure CIPs and take note of the outcomes of the review.

## **6. If so, the definition of the role and purpose of CIPs**

A draft definition was included in the consultation paper as a starting point. This will be refined when the proposed overarching group meets in September.

There were a number of specific suggestions on what should be edited out, though less on suggested definitions. For example, the mention of school improvement plans removed as they are not necessarily CIP business and may put an over emphasis on schools rather than wider partnerships and put other agencies off; greater clarity on the issues of sustainability, accountability and whether CIPs are commissioners and a suggestion that the definition should have a city wide general paragraph and then one for each CIP that lays out in no more than 3 bullet points the CIP priorities for that year.

## **7. The formation of a working group to co-ordinate the work on demonstrating the impact of CIPs and the group's membership**

The formation of this group was supported as long as it did not involve another meeting for similar groups of people. One response suggested the relationship between the CIPs and the group needs to be one of help and support and not one that dictates priorities just because there is available data.

## **8. The preparation of a 3 year indicative budgets by each CIP by September 2007 as a starting point to the discussion of long term financial stability.**

It was this issue that was the most controversial, particularly the matter of ongoing funding. Virtually every respondent whether representing an individual or group view, considered CIPs to be important and CIP managers essential in ensuring their success and all were concerned that agreement on funding was vital to long-term sustainability.

There was support for an indicative 3-year budget as a starting point for a discussion on funding. However, there was no consensus on where funding should come from; generally, the LA officers outlined the council's financial situation, which may be too severe to maintain the funding of the managers should there be no additional standards funds from April 2008, whereas schools considered the LA or other partners should resource the managers as CIPs are a key player in delivering their priorities.

Whether any school contribution should be locally agreed within CIPs or top-sliced by schools forum was contentious; for example the different number of schools within each of CIPs would lead to a lack of equity in contribution, although the level of 'individual service' a manager is able to give to a school also varies. One CIP has memoranda of understanding with schools and some voluntary bodies that financially contribute to the partnership.

There was support for funds being sought from a range of agencies not just schools, although it was appreciated that agencies have contributed to projects and through time though not to the core running costs of the partnerships. Responses from other

agencies considered that funding would be difficult to identify and /or allocate without a clear business case for making clear how the work of the CIPs are helping to achieve the agencies priorities.

## **9. In conclusion**

CIPs have enabled many constructive, effective, multi-agency projects to take place with positive outcomes for children, young people and their families. In particular, they have been a successful catalyst for enhancing collaboration between education and other agencies. Appendix 1 gives some examples of these projects.

A comment from the police illustrates the impact CIPs have made in 2 years and the potential they have to improve the lives of children and young people in the city:

*'I feel that it is vital that the CIP's become an integral part of the areas strategic framework and that they are allowed to play a full role within the decision making processes of the LA, CDRP and such like. I believe that CIPs that are funded and managed to very high standards will play a key role in crime reduction, anti-social behaviour reduction and enhancing the quality of life for local residents.'*

## **Part B – Next Steps**

### **10. Strategic Group**

The strategic group's terms of reference, including the membership are being developed in draft. The terms of reference suggest the group, through the Joint Commissioning Group (JCG), is accountable to the Children and Young People Strategic Partnership (CYPSP) and thus to the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), reinforcing that CIPs are an integral part in the delivery of the Children and Young People Plan (CYPP) and the wider Children's Trust arrangements for the city.

Representatives from other organisations will be invited to these meetings as the agenda suggests and at the discretion of the group.

### **11. Impact and Operational groups**

The draft terms of reference and lists of members for these groups are detailed as Appendices 1 and 2 respectively. The first meeting for the impact group will be before the summer break. The operational group will continue to meet weekly in its current form; representatives from other organisations are invited to these meetings as appropriate.

### **12. Role and purpose**

Defining the role and purpose of CIPs will be one of first tasks of the strategic group and should have regard to:

- Improving outcomes for children and young people across the 5 ECM outcomes, including meeting the Extended Services 'core offer', being the central work of the partnerships
- The interface between CIPs and other community groups; e.g. neighbourhood forums
- Lines of accountability
- Input from individual CIPs

- The importance of partnership working in adding value to all agencies in achieving their own business objectives
- The outcomes from the Community Involvement Best Value Review.

### **13. Long term financial sustainability**

It is accepted that the funding of CIPs both in the short term and to ensure sustainability in the longer term is a key issue. There is a concern that without a defined source, the short term funding issues for next financial year may jeopardise the already good progress made during the first 2 years of the partnerships' work.

The funding from April 2008 will be informed by a number of on-going issues. Schools Forum is considering the financial pressures for the local authority and a discussion on the sustainable funding of CIPs will be part of the debate. A recent meeting of Schools Forum received verbal reports from representatives of both primary and secondary head teachers that gave a very strong steer against the School Forum supporting a top slicing at this stage. The debate will be informed by the announcements from national government concerning the future funding arrangements for extended services; the government have suggested strongly that there will be funding, though whether the Extended Services Standards Fund will continue is unclear. It has been indicated that each secondary school and cluster of primary schools is to have an extended services coordinator, though details such as whether the funding will be distributed to local authorities or schools and if all schools will be eligible for similar funding are unknown. The indicative 3 year budgets for the CIPs will helpful background to the debate.

There was support for funds being sought from a range of agencies not just schools, although it was appreciated that some agencies have contributed to projects and through their time though not to the core running costs of the partnerships; e.g. the police contributed to the Youth Café project in Cosham. The LA will pursue contributions from other agencies through the Children's Trust arrangements and discussions at the CYPSP.

Longer term sustainability issues will a priority of the strategic group, in consultation with CIPs, PCC and other interested bodies. This **could** include:

- funding agreements with other organisations,
- alignment with children's centres
- a review of the number and size of partnerships
- development of the commissioning roles of CIPs, as yet undeveloped and leading to consideration of the legal status of the partnerships, particularly with reference to raising funds and employing staff.

## Appendix 1

### SUCCESSSES OF COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIPS

1. Through CIPs many constructive, effective, multi-agency projects have been implemented across the city with positive outcomes for children, young people and their families across the ECM outcomes. In particular, they have been a successful catalyst for enhancing collaboration between education and other agencies. For example:
  - Café Central in Cosham is a collaborative project between police, Motiv8, Youth Services, Community Wardens and was set up directly by young people in Springfield working with the CIP manager. It meets on a Friday evening when 100-150 young people are provided with a safe environment, appropriate activities of their own choice and are able to build relationships with adults. The police report that some of the young people regularly moved on attend the café and the school is looking to credit the work carried out by the young people. In addition, the provision has enabled Motiv8 to target vulnerable young people.
  - In the south-east CIP, the multi-agency meetings have enabled better focus of work to improve punctuality and attendance. Local police know where the young people gather and have supported truancy sweeps. The headteacher of the local secondary school suggests the positive relationships developed through the CIP have facilitated this level of cooperation.
  - Also in the south-east an obesity priority group has recently been established. HIDS chair the group, with schools nurses and other PCT representation on the group. The initial survey has highlighted healthy living issues, rather than physical activity, as the priority, including supporting schools that have not attained Healthy School status.
  - The Heart of Portsmouth (HOP) CIP has built more effective links with other groups; e.g. the Neighbourhood Management Pilot and the CIP organised a well attended 'Party in the Park' event and have jointly funded a summer holiday activity package in the across the CIP. Scary Guy is a joint initiative focused on substance misuse planned for the autumn term. Links with the HOP children's centre have seen a drop in for young people opened in one centre and joining up of provision offered to families. Developing links with the resident groups have led to PAD funding holiday activities in Portsea, Patch funding an Easter fun day and the Heartlands Community Voice printing t-shirts for children representing the area in a musical competition.
  - A Credit Union has been established in each school in one of the CIPs, encouraging pupils and parents to save to achieve financial independence. Parents have saved more money and have been able to pay more bills on time.
  - In partnership with the Health Improvement Team, smoking cessation classes have run in 2 of the CIPs, with over 80 teenagers and adults attending. 35 participants gave up smoking altogether.
  - King Richard Secondary School supply the community with low-cost PCs as a business enterprise with pupils occupying different positions within the 'Company'. Over 100 computers have now been upgraded and supplied to families and having support offered as part of family learning.

- The CIP manager in the north-east has organised a comprehensive package of holiday activities for the summer. Traditionally, very little has been offered in this area whereas this year up to 1200 children will be able to access suitable activities over four weeks of the summer break.
  - Profitable interagency work in the south-east has focused on alcohol misuse. The priority group, including police and youth services identified outlets that sold alcohol to underage young people and served notices on these establishments to cut off supply.
  - Relate has set up webcam counselling in 10 schools through the CIP. This is innovative and groundbreaking practice as is the first of its type in the country.
2. A comment received from the police as part of the consultation outlined below, illustrates the impact CIPs have made in 2 years and the potential they have to improve the lives of children and young people in the city:
 

*'I feel that it is vital that the CIPs become an integral part of the areas strategic framework and that they are allowed to play a full role within the decision making processes of the local authority, crime detection reduction partnership (CDRP) and such like. I believe that CIPs that are funded and managed to very high standards will play a key role in crime reduction, anti-social behaviour reduction and enhancing the quality of life for local residents.'*
  3. The partnerships have also enabled Portsmouth to be the only authority in the south that deliver the extended services 'core offer' to all its pupils. The CIP managers liaise with schools and other partners to complete an area audit of activities identifying gaps and supporting schools in ensuring that local needs are met; the improvements in childcare provision in term and holidays demonstrate the difference this work has made.
  4. National recognition of the work has led to visits from Beverly Hughes MP and Naomi Eisenstadt DCSF, who recognised the significance of the Community Improvement Partnerships and the impact they were beginning to have on children and young people.

They both commented on real progress on the ground and the range of integrated ways of working adopted. Portsmouth is regularly used as an example of good practice in extended services national publications, as our charging guidelines and audit tools for extended services have been used, adapted and applied all over the country.

## Appendix 2

# Community Improvement Partnership Impact Group

Terms of Reference – June 2007

## DRAFT

### Role

1. To develop processes and systems to effectively evaluate the impact of Community Improvement Partnerships
2. To link and add value to other related projects on evaluating impact on outcomes for children

### Functions

1. To establish a set of measurable performance measures for CIPs – linked to children's dataset
2. To implement a coherent evaluation methodology for CIPs and Extended Services using local and national models and toolkits
3. To work with schools and other agencies to establish effective systems of data and information collection to measure impact
4. To develop and implement good practice in qualitative and case study evaluation
5. To link effectively with related projects – e.g. Child Level Commissioning, LARC research, Citystats etc
6. To link effectively with the strategic Inter-Agency Information Group and CYPP Priority 11

### Reporting

This group reports on at least a quarterly basis to the CIPs Strategic Group

### Membership

<b>Name</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Andrew Olive (chair)	Head of Community Learning	PCC - CFL
Mark Scarborough	Extended Services Manager	PCC - CFL
Hayden Ginns	Partnerships and Commissioning Manager	PCC – CFL
Katie Riches	KTP Associate Researcher	PCC/Uni of Portsmouth
Ande Merel	Information Officer	PCC - CFL
Julian Wright	CIP Manager	Axcess CIP
Holly Miller	CIP Manager	North Island CIP
Helen Corkery	CIP Manager	HOP CIP
Nigel Harvey-Whitten	CIP Manager	SE CIP
Jo Dernham	CIP Manager	NE CIP

## **Appendix 3**

# **Portsmouth Community Improvement Partnerships' Operational Group**

## **Terms of Reference**

### ***DRAFT***

#### **Role**

1. To ensure the Extended Services 'core offer' is in place across the city
2. To share best practice, information and challenges between CIPs, local authority and national organisations/bodies
3. To liaise with and share information with service providers and other key stakeholders
4. To make final decisions of staged processes for Extended Services provision

#### **Functions**

1. To promote opportunities within each CIP and citywide
2. To ensure that all schools are well informed about current practice, opportunities and priorities
3. To audit provision against CYPP, CIP and national priorities
4. To make effective links with external organisations
5. To support consultation exercises, which help identify future priorities
6. To share relevant data with the Impact Group
7. To ensure clear and effective lines of communication are established within each partnership and citywide

#### **Reporting**

This group reports on at least a quarterly basis to the CIPs Strategic Board and each member will report back directly to their own CIP.

#### **Membership**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Post</b>	<b>Agency</b>
<b>Mark Scarborough</b>	<b>Extended Services Manager</b>	<b>PCC-CFL</b>
<b>Helen Corkery</b>	<b>HOP CIP Manager</b>	<b>HOP CIP</b>
<b>Jo Derham</b>	<b>NE CIP Manager</b>	<b>NE CIP</b>
<b>Nigel Harvey- Whitten</b>	<b>SE CIP Manager</b>	<b>SE CIP</b>
<b>Holly Miller</b>	<b>North Island CIP Manager</b>	<b>North Island CIP</b>
<b>Julian Wright</b>	<b>Access CIP Manager</b>	<b>Access CIP</b>

Other attendees may be invited as necessary, e.g. when making decisions on Extended Service provision.

June 2007