BUDGET & PERFORMANCE PANEL

Partnership Mapping & Evaluation
14 July 2009
Corporate Director (Finance & Performance)

PURPOSE OF REPORT
To inform Members of the main outcomes arising from the completed evaluations of the Community Safety and Museums Partnerships and to provide an update on progress on the agreed work programme for the evaluation of eight partnerships during 2009/10

This report is public

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the outcomes arising from the evaluations of the Community Safety and Museums Partnerships be considered and any further actions identified

2. That progress on the work programme for evaluating eight partnerships during 2009/10 be noted

1   Introduction

1.1   In February 2009, Members considered the work programme for 2009/10 for the evaluation of eight major partnerships and the completion of the evaluations of the Community Safety and Museums Partnership who had been undertaking a 'pilot' study of the effectiveness of the adopted *Partnership Development and Evaluation toolkit.*

1.2   This report sets out the main outcomes arising from the completed evaluations and the progress made to date in preparation for the evaluation of the eight major partnerships selected for 2009/10.

2   Overview of completed Partnership Evaluations

2.1   A conscious decision was made to choose two very different partnerships in terms of their purpose and overall significance to the Council to pilot the effectiveness of the *Partnership Development and Evaluation Toolkit* in practice.

2.2   Representatives and officers from both partnerships have said that they were able to effectively apply the toolkit to their circumstances and areas of activity/responsibility. Positive feedback has been received that the toolkit has been valuable not only as a means of assessing partnerships and the Council's involvement in them but also as a means of generating discussion in a structured way on key aspects of partnership working, including some that had not been previously considered.

2.3   It was reported that the toolkit had provided an opportunity for the partnership to identify what it does well and where there are areas for further improvement, and that it has '*…helped to build relationships and enabled partners to gain a greater understanding and appreciation of their contribution to the partnership and has raised the potential for this to be used more effectively in the future'.*

2.4   The Museums Partnership toolkit was initially completed by a representative from Lancashire County Council's Museums Service before being considered by senior County Council and City Council officers including the Head of Cultural Services. Part 2 of the toolkit, considering the Council's role and contribution to the partnership was completed by the Head of Cultural Services and the Cultural Services Manager.

2.5   The Community Safety Partnership took a different approach with the Community Safety Officer initially visiting several Service Heads within the Council to discuss their contributions within the partnership, before having a series of workshops with key officers from partner organisations, including representatives from the Health, Fire and Police authorities.

2.6   The manner in which individual partnerships undertook the evaluation was left to their discretion as it is recognised that no one approach 'fits all', but both have been successful in terms of providing information on essential aspects of partnership working including their main functions/purpose and funding, risk management, governance and value for money arrangements. The toolkit has also enabled each partnership to take stock of their overall effectiveness against a set of criteria covering the following key questions:

- **Focus** – '*Is the purpose of the partnership clear and does it make a positive contribution to the needs of the community?*'

- **Membership** – '*Is the membership of the partnership appropriate to meet its stated aims & objectives?*'

- **Efficiency and effectiveness** – *'Is the partnership effective and does it measure its inputs, outputs and efficiency?*'

- **Accountability & Transparency** – '*Does the partnership demonstrate accountability and does it follow democratic principles?*'

- **Learning & Sharing** – '*Does the partnership learn from others and share experience and expertise?*'

- **Evaluation and Monitoring** – '*Does the partnership evaluate and monitor its progress and outputs?*'

2.7   Outcomes and actions arising from each evaluation are set out in Appendices A – Community Safety Partnership and B – Museums Partnership for consideration and comment. It should be noted, however, that these have yet to be considered by the full membership of each partnership, when arrangements will be made to assign responsibility and set target dates for the implementation of agreed actions and to monitor and report on progress.

2.8   Standing information relating to each partnership, together with details of agreed development and improvement actions will be entered in a database which will provide a central point of reference of partnership activity and enable the Partnership Mapping & Evaluation team to monitor progress in implementing the actions agreed by each partnership. This database will also be used to ensure that partnerships report annually on their activities and provide assurance on their governance arrangements and overall effectiveness.

3   Partnership Evaluation Work Programme 2009/10

3.1   At this relatively early stage good progress has been made against the approved work programme for 2009/10. Initial meetings have been held with lead Council officers and partner representatives from each of the eight partnerships to plan the arrangements for conducting the evaluations, five of which are now underway.

3.2   These meetings have been extremely positive with officers and partners seeing real benefits/opportunities in undertaking the evaluations. All have agreed to the timescales set out within the work programme and progress will be monitored by the Partnership Mapping and Evaluation Team, with any exceptions from planned activity initially being reported to the Performance Management Group for consideration. Service Heads are incorporating the resources needed to undertake the evaluations within their Service Business Plans for 2009/10.

3.3 Details of the actual and planned activity to date, and for the remainder of the year are set out in Appendix C. Further reports on overall progress will be submitted to both the Performance Management Group and the Budget and Performance Panel, in line with this work programme.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

Effective partnership working and the Council's responsibility to provide vision and leadership to local partnerships is a key component of the Council's corporate plan. Strengthening performance management of partnerships is a corporate priority for the Council.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT
(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

None identified arising from this report

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None as a direct result of this report, although as work progresses there will be a need to develop effective links with the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and supporting processes to ensure that key financial implications and risks arising from service delivery through working in partnership are reflected and addressed within the Council's existing financial planning arrangements

---

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has highlighted the need to ensure that as the partnership framework becomes established there will be a need to update the Council's Financial Regulations and Procedures and Contract Procedure Rules as appropriate.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications directly arising from this report

---

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and would emphasise the need to monitor and ensure high standards of behaviour when the Council is working in partnership with other organisations

---

BACKGROUND PAPERS	**Contact Officer:** Robert Bailey
Partnership Development and Evaluation Toolkits and project documentation	**Telephone:** 01524 582018 **E-mail:** rbailey@lancaster.gov.uk **Ref:** 07/0735 B&PP report 090714

Issues Identified	Actions Planned	Responsibility	Implementation Target Date
1. Revised structure of the partnership in line with the review of the LDLSP and the requirements of the CDRP Reform Act are not yet fully established	• Review/clarify the structure and responsibilities of the CSP and the LDLSP Safety Thematic Group and consider ways of effectively integrating the statutory responsibilities of the CSP within the LDLSP Safety Thematic Group incorporating: - The Executive - Sub Groups - Constitution - Stakeholders - Capacity - PACTs - MAPS - Officer Working Group		
2. The interests of agencies can override those of the partnership as a whole	• Make it clear that everyone has 'a voice' and clearly identify roles and responsibilities of partners both individually and collectively • Consider ways to improve information sharing arrangements and ensure that priorities of other agencies/organisations are clearly understood • Review the way in which partners report back to their own organisations on the activities of the partnership and strengthen links into each organisations business planning process		
3. Continue to develop effective communications through the establishment of the LDLSP Community Engagement Strategy	• Take advantage of the Community Engagement Framework to provide effective two-way communication and consultation with all stakeholders in order to promote more effectively the value of the partnership within communities • Use stakeholder analysis to consider		

Issues Identified	Actions Planned	Responsibility	Implementation Target Date
3. Continued	development of stronger links with the voluntary, community and faith sector and the criminal justice system		
4. There is a need to review/set objectives in line with the Sustainable Community Strategy and agree priorities with the LDLSP within the resources available to the partnership	• Ensure where possible that objectives and outcomes are **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic, **T**ime-bound, **E**ffective and **R**esourced • Align the priorities of LDLSP and CSP to remove the concept of conflicting and competing priorities		
5. Performance management arrangements are underdeveloped	• Review arrangements resulting from the performance management framework developed by the LDLSP and establish clear KPI's • Monitor/compare performance against agreed SMARTER objectives, targets and KPI's and develop a mechanism for ensuring that performance management information received from all partners is effective, up-to-date, timely and that performance responsibilities amongst partners is understood • Establish effective action planning, monitoring and reporting arrangements for 'failing' targets • Carry out a training and skills audit (as part of the CDRP Reform Act requirements)		
6. Risk management and value for money arrangements are underdeveloped	• Review issues identified in the partnership risk register • Undertake a review of project evaluation procedures to ensure the partnerships resources are providing vfm and are targeted to achieve the partnerships objectives		

Issues Identified	Action Planned	Responsibility	Implementation Target Date
1. No formal review of the Partnership agreement has been undertaken since it was established in 2003 for the management of the Council's three museums by Lancashire County Council	• Carry out a review of the existing partnership agreement (due to end in April 2013) and ensure that any revised agreement incorporates key elements on the running of the partnership and effective partnership working, including shared purpose and values and governance arrangements		
2. The extent and relationship of the partnership to the delivery of Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and corporate/service objectives and priorities should be clear	• Review partnership aims and objectives and (re)determine links to the delivery of SCS and corporate objectives • Ensure that partners agree on strategy, aims/objectives and desired outcomes and consider whether at a strategic level there are opportunities for this partnership to be subsumed within the Key Cultural Partnership or some other • Review Service Business Plans (Cultural Services) and Museum development plans (County Council) in relation to the contribution that the partnership makes to service delivery		
3. There is scope to develop working relationships between City and County Council representatives on the partnership	• Clearly identify roles and responsibilities both individually and collectively and consider ways of improving information sharing arrangements • Review the way in which partners report back to their own organisations on the activities of the partnership and consider benefits of having an officer working group between Cultural Services and the County Museums Service • Develop ways in which partners learn from each other and share best practice, skills and knowledge		

Issues Identified	Action Planned	Responsibility	Implementation Target Date
4. Performance management arrangements are undeveloped	• Review/set objectives ensuring that, where possible, these are **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic, **T**ime-bound, **E**ffective and **R**esourced • Monitor/compare performance against SMARTER objectives, targets and KPI's and develop mechanisms for ensuring that performance management information is up-to-date and timely and that performance responsibilities are understood • Ensure that monitoring procedure effectively links partnership outcomes with strategic objectives and establish effective action planning, monitoring and reporting arrangements within the partnership		
5. Risk management and value for money arrangements are underdeveloped	• Review risk management arrangements and consider risks identified in the partnership risk register • Undertake a review of value for money arrangements linked to performance and procurement opportunities		
6. No exit strategy in place	• Develop and agree an exit strategy		