

### HARROW PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING

### **MONDAY 18 APRIL 2011 AT 6.00 PM**

# **COMMITTEE ROOM 5, HARROW CIVIC CENTRE**

#### **AGENDA**

#### **Members:**

**Councillor Bill Stephenson** Leader of the Council. Portfolio Harrow Council

(Chairman) Holder for Finance and Business **Transformation** 

**Councillor Phillip O'Dell** Deputy Leader of the Council,

**Environment and Community** 

Safety Portfolio Holder

**Councillor Graham Henson** Performance. Customer Services

and Corporate Services Portfolio

Holder

**Councillor Susan Hall** Leader of the Conservative Harrow Council

Group

Councillor Barry Macleod-Deputy Leader of the **Conservative Group** 

Cullinane

**Howard Bluston** Representative North West London Chamber of

Commerce

Harrow Council

Harrow Council

Harrow Council

**David Cheesman** North West London Hospital Representative

**NHS Trust** 

Job Centre Plus

**Malcolm Parr** Harrow in Business Representative

**Brian McGowan** Representative Large Employers' Network **Dr Mohamed Aden** Voluntary and Community Sector Representative Voluntary and Community Sector Hassan Khalief Representative Avani Modasia Representative Voluntary and Community Sector **Deven Pillav** Representative Voluntary and Community Sector

Jacqui Mace Further Education Sector Representative **Amar Chandarana** Representative Harrow Youth Parliament Sally Feldman Dean of Media, Arts and Design University of Westminster

School

**Ann Groves** Harrow Senior People's Older People's Reference Group

Assembly

Sue Moran Representative **Nick O'Reilly** Harrow Borough Commander

London Fire Brigade Harrow Equalities Centre **Shelly Choudhury** Interim Director Central and North West London **Robyn Doran** Representative

Mental Health Trust

**Marcia Saunders** Chairman **NHS Harrow** 

Reshard Alaudin Representative Metropolitan Police Authority

#### **Guests:**

Julie BrowneRepresentativeVoluntary and Community SectorJohn EdwardsDivisional Director,Sustainable Development andEnvironmental ServicesEnterprise Management Group

Andrew Howe Director of Public Health Adult and Social Care

Management Group

Chief Superintendent Dal Babu Borough Commander, Harrow Safer Harrow Management

lice Grou

Management Group

Catherine Doran Corporate Director, Children's Chair, The Children's Trust

Services

Marianne Locke Divisional Director, Community & Chair, Community Cohesion

Culture

Michael LockwoodChief ExecutiveHarrow CouncilMark EastonChief ExecutiveNHS HarrowAllen PluckChief ExecutiveHarrow in Business

Fiona Wise Chief Executive North West London Hospital

NHS Trust

Junior Johnson District Manager JobCentre Plus

#### **Officers:**

Alex Dewsnap Divisional Director, Partnership, Harrow Council

**Development and Performance** 

Mike Howes Service Manager, Policy and Harrow Council

Partnership Service

Trina Thompson Senior Policy Officer, Policy and Harrow Council

Partnership Service

Tom Whiting Assistant Chief Executive Harrow Council

**Contact:** Vishal Seegoolam, Senior Democratic Services Officer Tel: 020 8424 1883 E-mail: vishal.seegoolam@harrow.gov.uk

#### **AGENDA - PUBLIC**

# 1. Attendance by Substitute Members:

To note the attendance at this meeting of any Substitute Members, in accordance with paragraph 4.12 of the Harrow Partnership Governance Handbook.

#### 2. Declarations of Interest:

(if any).

# 3. **Minutes:** (Pages 1 - 8)

That the minutes of the Board Meeting held on 14 December 2010, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

# 4. Appointment of Vice-Chairman:

To appoint a Vice-Chairman of the Board.

# 5. **Update on Health:**

Verbal Update by the Corporate Director Adults and Housing, Harrow Council.

# 6. **Children's Services Transformation:** (Pages 9 - 12)

Report of the Corporate Director Children's Services, Harrow Council.

# 7. Harrow Chief Executives Update:

Verbal Update by the Chief Executive, Harrow Council.

# 8. **Partnership Priorities:** (Pages 13 - 18)

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive, Harrow Council.

# 9. **Partnership Structure - Consultation Document:** (Pages 19 - 24)

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive, Harrow Council.

# 10. Local Area Agreement Reward Grant: (Pages 25 - 28)

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive, Harrow Council.

# 11. Any Other Urgent Business:

# 12. **Date of Next Meeting:**

The next Board Meeting is scheduled for 12 July 2011.

**AGENDA - PRIVATE - NIL** 



Harrow Equalities Centre



#### **HARROW PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

# Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 14 December 2010

# (1) Present:

# **Harrow Strategic Partnership Board Members:**

Councillor Bill Stephenson Leader of the Council, Harrow Council Portfolio Holder for Finance (Chairman) and Business Transformation Councillor Graham Henson Performance, Customer Harrow Council Services and Corporate Services Portfolio Holder Councillor Susan Hall Leader of the Conservative Harrow Council Group Councillor Barry Macleod-Deputy Leader of the Harrow Council Cullinane Conservative Group Dr Gillian Schiller (Vice-Chairman Harrow Primary Care Trust Chairman) David Cheesman Representative North West London Hospital **NHS Trust** Voluntary and Community Sector Dr Mohamed Aden Representative Julie Browne Representative Voluntary and Community Sector Hassan Khalief Voluntary and Community Sector Representative Voluntary and Community Sector Avani Modasia Representative Deven Pillay Representative Voluntary and Community Sector Further Education Sector Jacqui Mace Representative Ann Groves Older People's Reference Older People's Reference Group Group Representative Job Centre Plus Sue Moran

# (2) Also Present:

Shelly Choudhury

Andrew Howe Director of Public Health Adult and Social Care
Management Group
Michael Lockwood Chief Executive Harrow Council
Mark Easton Chief Executive Harrow Primary Care Trust
Richard Coe Interim Chief Executive Harrow Association of Voluntary
Services

Interim Director

# (3) The following Harrow Council Officers attended:

Alex Dewsnap Divisional Director, Harrow Council

Partnership, Development and Performance

Mike Howes Service Manager, Policy Harrow Council

and Partnership Service

Trina Thompson Senior Policy Officer, Harrow Council

Policy and Partnership

Service

Tom Whiting Assistant Chief Executive Harrow Council

# **Apologies were received from:**

Howard Bluston (Representative) (North West London Chamber of Commerce), Brian McGowan (Representative) (Large Employers' Network), Sally Feldman (Dean of Media, Arts and Design School) (University of Westminster), John Edwards (Divisional Director, Environmental Services) (Sustainable Development and Enterprise Management Group) and Fiona Wise (Chief Executive) (North West London Hospital NHS Trust)

**ACTION** 

# 35. Attendance by Substitute Members:

AGREED: To

(1) note the attendance at this meeting of the following substitute Members:-

<u>Ordinary Member</u> <u>Reserve Member</u> <u>Organisation</u>

Councillor Phillip O'Dell Councillor Rekha Shah Harrow Council

John Vaughan Shaun Hare Central and North West

London Mental Health

Trust

Dal Babu Nick Davies Safer Harrow

**Management Group** 

(2) note the apologies received.

All to note

#### 36. Declarations of Interest:

**AGREED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made.

All to note

# 37. Minutes:

**AGREED:** 

That (1) the minutes of the Board meetings held on 15 June 2010 and the special meeting on 22 July be taken and read as a correct record;

(2) That the minutes of the special Board meeting held on Monday 18 October 2010 be taken and read as a correct record subject to the following amendment - The final sentence in Minute Item 32 be amended to read:

Turnover and reduction in staff was expected as PCTs would to be abolished by 2013.

All to note

# 38. Harrow Local Economic Assessment:

The Regeneration Project Manager, Harrow Council, introduced a report on the draft Local Economic Assessment (LEA). The officer explained that an assessment of the economic conditions of the local area had been undertaken. This sought to ensure that local economic development and related strategies would contribute to the borough's plans for regeneration and development. The officer requested that the Board comment on the LEA.

Members discussed and commented on the key issues arising from the assessment which, the officer responded to as follows:

- The statutory requirement to complete an assessment had not been removed by the new Government. However, the guidance provided in March 2010 had been withdrawn. Councils were now free to determine the breadth and scope of their assessment reflecting local priorities. The LEA consolidated information relating to the local economy held by the Council and external agencies. The LEA would be used to form a robust evidence based economic strategy and would contribute to the West London LEA;
- Nationally available statistics had been used to compile the LEA. Any additional and relevant information held by local organisations or groups would be welcomed;
- Harrow Association of Voluntary Services (HAVS) had been consulted as the umbrella organisation for local voluntary and community groups within the borough. Officers would consider comments and information provided by other members of the voluntary sector;
- Additional information relating to the results of the consultation and the final strategy would be published on the Council's website. Hard copies of the final strategy would also be available at community organisations and libraries.

The Chairman advised that officers within the Economic Development Unit had worked intensively to devise the assessment. He added that the Council was committed to working in partnership with all members of the Board.

AGREED: That the presentation be noted.

All to note

#### 39. Comprehensive Spending Review:

The board received a report by that outlined the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) was presented to the Board.

Officers advised that the Council would receive a reduction in formula grant

funding over the next four years. There would be a 1.9% net reduction in spending power in cash terms in the 2011/12 financial year. The Chief Executive of Harrow Council reported that the abolition of national indicators and ring-fencing of funding for certain services provided greater flexibility in how funds could be spent. He added that Harrow had fared relatively well compared to other London Councils and that the CSR provided opportunities to consider how the provision of certain services would be delivered in the future.

The Chairman reported that this was a difficult economic time with a degree of uncertainty. The Council would be required to make in-year cuts of £5 million and would need to consider the impact of a reduction in police funding. He advised that protecting front-line services was a key consideration for the Board alongside the importance of working with partnership organisations to ensure residents' needs were being met. He added that the 'Better Deal for Residents' programme would seek to make the delivery of services to residents more cost-effective and make further savings in future years.

**AGREED:** That the report be noted.

All to note

#### 40. HSP Summit Feedback:

The Board received a report that provided feedback on the HSP Summit meeting where the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review and the impact on local partnerships were also discussed.

The Chairman advised that as part of the consultation on the Council's proposed vision and priorities, the views of partnership organisations would be considered alongside results of the extensive consultation with residents. He added that the findings of the summit would be circulated to attendees of the summit and published on the Harrow Council website.

A Member of the Board added that the summit had been useful in identifying how the implications of the CSR would influence the provision of services in the future.

**AGREED:** That the report be noted.

All to note

# 41. NHS Update:

The Chief Executive of NHS Harrow and Brent provided a verbal update on the progress made in restructuring North West London Hospitals NHS and NHS Harrow and NHS Brent. The Board were advised that:

- Following the reduction in NHS funding, management teams within North West London would be reduced from eight to three. Harrow and Brent would merge in order to draw on the experience of existing professionals within both boroughs and minimise management costs. The Director of Strategic Commissioning in NHS Brent had recently been appointed as Borough Director for Harrow;
- The financial position of the Trust had been adjusted to account for changes in services and funding. Unexpected expenditure for acute services and community contracts had contributed to the projected overspend of NHS Harrow. This had been forecasted to be between

£12.9 million and £19.8 million. In order to achieve the estimated outturn of a £15.9 million deficit, it was anticipated that some services and primary care contracts would be suspended or reconsidered. Board members were confident that NHS Harrow would break even at the end of the next financial year if plans to out-source work to other hospitals and increase the number of GP referrals to hospitals outside of the borough came to fruition;

The Board had recently identified a projected savings target of £50 million (14% saving) for the next financial year.

Following the update, the Chairman added that work had begun to establish a Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board for Harrow. It was felt that this would support the work of NHS Harrow and NHS Brent and strengthen the partnership with NHS Harrow and the Harrow Partnership Board.

A discussion on the financial position of NHS Harrow took place where representatives of NHS Harrow responded to questions as follows:

- Following proposals in the Central Government white paper 'Equity and Excellence' GP consortiums would make budgetary decisions from 2013. NHS Harrow would continue to make budgetary decisions on spending until 2013 and support consortiums until then. Members of the Board would strive to take strategic decisions in order to balance the books
- Members of the NHS Harrow Board were aware of the implications of addressing the financial difficulties which had arisen from the significant unplanned rise in spending and reduction in growth funding. A number of measures, such as, joining up health and social care arrangements could be taken to deliver more long-term cost-effective services in the future;

The Chairman added that Central government would be providing ring-fenced funding for certain NHS services. Officers and Portfolio Holders for Harrow Council had been kept updated on the decisions made by NHS Harrow. Members of the Council attended shadow board meetings to represent the interests of the Board and the wider community.

**AGREED:** That the update be noted.

All to note

# 42. Abolition of Local Area Agreements:

The Board received a report that provided an update on the abolition of Local Area Agreements (LAA). As a result, the partnership would have greater flexibility to amend targets without prior approval or performance monitoring from Central Government. Officers added that the potential grant of approximately £1.2 million for achieving targets in the 2008-11 LAA would not now be payable.

The Board were advised that LAA would be monitored until the end of March 2011.

In light of these policy changes and reforms, the direction and priorities of the

partnership would be reviewed at the beginning of 2011. Harrow Chief Executives would conduct a further review of the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) and its impact on the direction of the Partnership. An action plan on the key outcomes of both of these reviews would be developed in order to inform the partnership of its priorities and how achievements would be set against these priorities.

**AGREED:** That the report be noted.

All to note

# 43. Update From Harrow Chief Executives:

The Chief Executive of Harrow Council presented a report that provided an update of the issues considered by the Harrow Chief Executives' (HCE) meeting on 29 November 2010. He advised that part of the discussion at the meeting related to the capacity for safeguarding children and young people by organisations throughout the borough. The HCE had identified that in order to maximise the effectiveness of existing partnerships and make cost-savings, certain areas within the partnership could be strengthened. He added that any advice or suggestions provided by representatives on the Board would be fed back to HCE.

A Council Officer also presented the quarterly performance report of the partnership that was considered by the HCE meeting. This outlined the HCE responses to a number of recommendations outlined in the performance report, which included:

- Identifying further efficiencies within the Special Needs Transport teams of the Council and NHS Harrow that would deliver additional savings;
- Reviewing existing contracts with strategic agencies to identify areas where savings could be made;
- Considering opportunities for the training and development of young people within the borough;
- Exploring the possibility of developing a work programme charter that supported local businesses and provided skills training opportunities for young people in Harrow;
- Identifying vulnerable communities within the borough and considering the benefits of encouraging residents to sign up to SmartWater;
- Identifying a leader from the West London Alliance (WLA) and a business representative from West London business delegate to represent the views and interests of all West London Boroughs on the London Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board.

In response to a question relating to the work programme charter, the Member of the Board advised that the Council's responsibilities for the work programme had been outlined in the worklessness agenda. He added the comments on this subject matter would be considered in all follow up reports to the HCE.

**AGREED:** That the report be noted.

All to note

# 44. Date of Next Meeting:

**AGREED:** To note that the date of the next meeting of the Board would be held on 8 March 2011.

All to note

[Note: The Meeting, having commenced at 6.02 pm, closed at 7.48 pm]

This page is intentionally left blank



#### HARROW STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD

Children's Services Transformation

Catherine Doran – Corporate Director for Children's Services, Harrow Council

Jo Hawley – Children's Services Transformation Project Lead

18<sup>th</sup> April 2011

#### Introduction

As part of the LAA reward grant money in 2010, the HSP supported the new operating model project by funding the project lead for one year (June 2010-June 2011).

The new operating model for Children's Services is now proposed to come into effect on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2011.

Proposals on the detailed model are currently out for consultation with Council staff and unions and we continue to gather feedback from partners on our plans. The Partnership Board's comments would be welcome.

# **Proposed Action**

The new operating model for Children's Services has been designed based on what our users, our staff, and our partners have told us during the Integrated Targeted Service Review, which ran from June 2010 and consulted with over 750 people.

The key components of this new model of assessing and providing support and services for children, young people and their families are:

- A single point of contact with a multi-agency access team
- Integrated Support Teams
- Special Needs Services
- Targeted Services
- A Quality Assurance and Commissioning function
- A new Education Strategy and School Organisation model
- A Business Support model aligned with the Council's corporate model

Our ambition is for practitioners to be co-located in "Teams Around the Family". This would see more staff located together as part of plans to relocate staff to the Civic Centre. The Council's Children's Services therefore need to carry out a reorganisation and relocation of our staff and change some of the ways in which we work with partners to ensure seamless packages of care for our vulnerable young people.

# What are you asking the Partnership Board to do

This is an update for the Partnership Board. Comments are invited.

#### **Summary of the Issue**

#### **Proposed Children's Services Reorganisation**

### Background and Context

Comparisons with other London authorities show Harrow's total spend on Children's Services to be low. Education, social care and youth service budgets are well below average. Despite this and thanks to the commitment and hard work of staff, children and young people's outcomes are good, looked after children numbers are low and services are regularly judged as good or better in inspections.

But this is not sustainable. Central Government is altering fundamentally the Local Authority's role and relationship with schools and several of Harrow's high schools are exploring moving to Academy status. Savings targets for 2011-12 have begun to have an impact on all services. We need to redesign our systems and bring our resources together to deal with these changing times and in order to keep children safe and improve outcomes for vulnerable children, young people and families.

Our vision is to build on this foundation of strong Children's Services in Harrow to create a fully integrated Children's Services Directorate that will offer a seamless multi-agency service to vulnerable children, young people and their families. The core principles underpinning this vision are:

- Strong partnerships with police, health and the third sector building on Total Place principles, delivering services together
- A seamless multi-agency service with one point of contact that meets the needs of vulnerable children, young people and their families
- An early intervention approach to ensure that needs are met at the earliest opportunity and avoiding later expense once problems are entrenched
- A Team Around the Family/Child model to meet need in a co-ordinated way
- Reduced bureaucracy and improved integrated systems to maximise time that key professionals are able to work with families and share information effectively
- A new relationship between the Council and schools, acknowledging their increasing autonomy but recognising and building on their understanding of children and family circumstances
- Maximising the efficient use of resources through robust strategic planning, commissioning and procurement of services to meet local need
- Improving outcomes through rigorous quality assurance closely linked to performance management and workforce development

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CIPFA Benchmarking local authority report 2010

Benefits of a new approach will include:

Benefits to Children,	Benefits to Staff	Benefits to the System
young people and families		
<ul> <li>Fast track most vulnerable for targeted services</li> <li>Families only having to tell their story only once</li> <li>Fewer, more appropriate professionals working with family</li> <li>Access to a rich source of information about services</li> <li>Clearer system</li> <li>Speed of access</li> <li>Improved understanding of need</li> <li>Greater co-ordination of services and expertise to meet need</li> <li>Whole family, whole child services</li> <li>A more personalised approach</li> <li>Not being repeatedly referred between agencies</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Better job satisfaction</li> <li>Maximising time using professional skills and reducing bureaucratic form-filling</li> <li>Putting key staff in control of decision-making</li> <li>Developing a wider range of skills</li> <li>Clarity about our remit and purpose</li> <li>Multi-agency context supports staff to build new skills</li> <li>Close and effective working relationships with partners</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Improved information sharing</li> <li>Swift access to advice and guidance, collation of relevant information from partners and onward referral to the right source of help</li> <li>Central point with key skills and knowledge</li> <li>Easier more efficient multi-agency working</li> <li>Reduce pressure on targeted services over time</li> <li>Reduce costs and the opportunity to invest savings elsewhere</li> <li>A single, clear system for referral</li> <li>Transparency of provision and accountability</li> <li>Cut out unnecessary processes and time wasted on referral and disjointed information gathering</li> <li>Reduce duplication of provision and functions</li> </ul>

# **Key Aspects of the New Operating Model**

The proposed model groups similar functions together to produce more efficient systems. Services aligned in this way will make the needs of vulnerable children, young people and families the focus of our work, rather than dividing resource up into traditional service silos.

The model introduces a single referral point for all services to reduce bureaucracy and improve efficiency. It also proposes a more effective multi-agency safeguarding information sharing system.

Services focused on intervening early with vulnerable children, young people and families will be brought together into multi-disciplinary teams. The teams will work as part of a Team Around the Family model.

A more effective and robust commissioning, procurement and quality assurance model is proposed. Interventions will have a strong evidence base. We will work more closely with the third sector to deliver services more effectively for families.

We intend to relocate of the majority of Children's Services teams to one site within the Civic Centre with a delivery model focused on communities for example through Children's Centres.



#### HARROW STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD

Partnership Priorities April 18<sup>th</sup> 2011

#### Introduction

On the 10<sup>th</sup> February, Harrow Chief Executives met to discuss and identify future priorities for the Partnership. They met again on the 28<sup>th</sup> March to confirm these priorities for the Board's approval.

Four priorities have been proposed by HCE to the Board for approval. These are:

- Public Service Integration and Joint Service Delivery
- Building Community Capacity
- Health
- Worklessness/Welfare

On approval of the priorities a work plan will be finalised in partnership with the identified HCE leads. The work plan will include the key projects that need to be undertaken to help achieve the Partnership priorities over the next two years.

Given the significant changes in the external environment since 2009, it is widely accepted that there is a need to refresh the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The priorities identified by HCE are not intended to replace the existing SCS but rather provide a short term framework for areas where the Partnership can influence and where there is added value by taking a partnership approach.

#### **Proposed Action**

A draft set of outcomes have been put forward in this paper under each priority. These are a starter for ten, and we recognise that they need further shaping.

It is proposed to undertake a workshop style session on the priorities and to help shape the draft outcomes for each priority in this paper at the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> April. This will provide an opportunity for Board members to comment on HCE's recommended priorities.

It is proposed that the priorities are adopted on the 18<sup>th</sup> April to enable a work plan to be drafted. The workplan will outline the potential projects that could help meet the draft priorities. This workplan will be coordinated by members of HCE and will provide timescales, milestones, gaps and resource requirements.

A summary of the comments and feedback from the Board meeting on the outcomes from the 18<sup>th</sup> April will be circulated separately to all members within 1 week of the meeting. HSP members will then be invited to feed any further comments on the draft outcomes to the Policy and Partnership Team by the **4**<sup>th</sup> **May 2011**.

The collated comments will be developed into a paper and presented to HCE on the 9<sup>th</sup> **May** for agreement in consultation with the Board's decision making group. The outcomes will be used to guide the discussion on allocation of partnership funds. (See paper on Local Area Agreement Reward Grant)

# What are you asking the Partnership Board to do

- Agree the four Partnership Priorities
- Comment on the draft outcomes
- Provide further comments to the Policy and Partnership Team on the draft outcomes by the 4<sup>th</sup> May 2011.

# **Summary of the Issue**

#### **Public Service Integration and Joint Service Delivery**

There is a widely held belief that if done well, service integration has the potential to create a virtuous cycle of effective public service delivery, maximise the use of public resources and increase user and customer satisfaction. There is willingness by partners to develop and deliver approaches to the integration of services, planning and delivery.

As an example the creation of the Children's Integrated Model will put in place a portal for targeted children's services leading to improved outcomes, and a reduction in cost. Other areas that could benefit from integration and joint delivery include the way we work with at risk families (e.g. top 100 families), the reporting of anti social behaviour, the alignment of mental health provision, alcohol substance misuse and their impact on crime and better commissioning of services between agencies.

# Suggested Outcomes we are trying to achieve through this priority

- 1. Reduce failure demand<sup>1</sup>
- 2. Better value services
- 3. Reduced (residents) vulnerability (for example through joined up reporting of ASB)
- 4. Better understanding of customer needs
- 5. Joint commissioning

6. Rationalised activity across agencies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Failure Demand – reducing duplication across a process e.g. reducing the amount of times a customer needs to make contact on the one issue

# **Building Community Capacity**

Given the financial challenges facing partners, we cannot continue to provide services in the way we do currently. If we are to meet these challenges, we need to engage people in debates about the future and enable them to make a positive difference, in their lives and their communities. This will require looking beyond conventional solutions and recognising the value of a thriving third sector. For example social enterprises and mutuals can be an important element to reforming public service delivery.

To enable citizens to become more active there needs to be the provision of information, support and opportunities to contribute to the decision making process so they can take a greater part in Harrow services. For example it will be important that structures and processes are in place for engaging the pubic and patients under the new GP Commissioning role. The Partnership has an opportunity to support this engagement process.

In 2007 the Quirk Review investigated how to optimise the community benefit of publicly owned assets through considering options for greater transfer of asset ownership and management to community groups. Community management provides residents with the opportunity to get more involved in how their services are delivered.

Harrow already has a high proportion of residents who volunteer in their communities. It is important to build on this foundation as volunteering can help individuals gain new skills and friends while helping others. This is particularly relevant for young people who can use volunteering to build their work experience and increase their chances for employment.

# Suggested Outcomes we are trying to achieve through this priority

- 1. Increased citizen and civic capacity/activity
- 2. Improved skills and confidence of the voluntary and community sector
- 3. Empowered communities (who make their own choices and help themselves)
- 4. Greater independence of community organisations
- 5. Improved public services
- 6. Organisational and financial sustainability
- 7. Restoration of unused buildings
- 8. Increased volunteers
- 9. Increased sense that citizens have greater involvement
- 10. Residents influence decisions affecting local area
- 11. Residents are well informed

### Health

The Government White Paper on the reform of the health services makes a series of radical proposals about how different parts of English health and health care services are

commissioned. This includes abolishing Primary Care Trusts and passing the remit of commissioning services to GP's. Statutory Health and Wellbeing Boards will take on the function of joining up commissioning of local NHS services, social care and health improvement and will allow local authorities to take a strategic approach and promote integration across health and adult social care, children's services, including safeguarding and the wider local authority agenda.

The public health functions that are currently held by Primary Care Trusts will be transferred to local authorities by 2013.

For the National Health Service and local authorities to cope with increasing demands on services, there has to be a shift in policy to enable elderly and/or vulnerable people to stay at home longer, rather than being admitted to hospital or residential care because they feel unsafe or vulnerable in their own homes. The UK has an ageing population and statistics show that people over 65 in the UK consume nearly 70% of Healthcare resources. In order to cope with this increasing demand we need to find ways of enabling people to be cared for in their own homes for longer, rather than being admitted to hospital or residential care. The reablement programme is one method of achieving this.

To ensure partners effectively adapt to the future delivery of health services and harness the opportunities that these changes may bring it is important that the Partnership has a focus on this area.

#### Suggested Outcomes we are trying to achieve through this priority

- 1. Maintain independence of older people
- 2. Strong leadership and direction for health and wellbeing
- 3. Health structures enable clear and robust decisions on those services most needed in Harrow

# Worklessness/Welfare

On the 16<sup>th</sup> February the Welfare Reform Bill was introduced to Parliament. It introduced a wide range of reforms, which will have significant implications for Harrow residents and partners. These range from direct impacts on housing provision, the economy, health and social care, community cohesion, safeguarding, homelessness, demand for schools and policing.

As a result to the proposed changes to the amount of grant funded for new affordable homes, these homes will now have rents at up to 80% market rents. In addition the maximum benefit available to cover rent will decrease from the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile to the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile. In 2013 the introduction of the Universal Credit will also cap the benefit available. These changes will result in fewer properties available for benefit recipients.

The proposed change from life term tenancies to two year minimum tenancies will potentially cause greater anxiety as a result of a lack of security and reduced community cohesion as a result of increased movement across neighbourhoods.

The unemployment figures for Harrow for the past year have demonstrated a slight decrease in the number of people unemployed, which directly contradicts the national unemployment figures. However, for the first time in 12 months the February unemployment figures have shown an increase.

Harrow largely consists of small and medium enterprises. To help build employment in the borough the importance of a strong and vibrant economy is necessary. This will be supported by the regeneration of the town centre and its neighbouring areas, which is critical to attracting inward investment and employment growth.

# Suggested Outcomes we are trying to achieve through this priority

- 1. SME growth
- 2. Business retention
- 3. Prevent vulnerable people becoming more vulnerable
- 4. Improved social outcomes for residents
- 5. Economic well being
- 6. Reduced dependency on welfare and public sector support by families
- 7. Consistent employment/redundancy advice across agencies

This page is intentionally left blank



#### HARROW STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD

Partnership Structure – Consultation Document 18<sup>th</sup> April 2011

#### Introduction

The Partnership Structure has been reviewed to develop a proposal that reflects the new priorities which are described in a paper elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting and reduce duplication across the partnership structure. In summary, the changes involve:

- Creating an Assembly, with a membership largely the same as the current Board, that
  would meet in a more informal manner, twice a year, to discuss issues such as what to
  include in a refreshed Sustainable Community Strategy, the best ways of extending
  community involvement in Harrow or the needs of the diverse communities of the
  borough.
- Reducing the size of the Board, which would deal with business items such as receiving monitoring reports on progress in implementing both the Sustainable Community Strategy as well as receiving advice from the assembly on issues such as developing strategic direction for the Harrow Strategic Partnership and examining from a community perspective initiatives explored by Harrow Chief Executives;
- Streamlining the management groups and bodies that make up the partnership family.

In proposing changes, it is recognised both the value of the work undertaken by existing parts of the Partnership and the contribution made by groups and individuals. The change proposals should not be seen as rendering any part of the current agenda unimportant but are designed to sharpen the partnership's focus on the most pressing priorities for Harrow and Harrow's public services, including groups support by public services. Where it is suggested that partnership groups are disbanded, it is intended that work in these areas continue with the support of people from a range of agencies but not within the formal partnership structure which needs to be attuned more closely to the new priorities.

#### **Proposed Action**

In order to develop a proposal that is fit for purpose for all Partnership members, it is suggested that the Policy and Partnerships team lead a consultation with as many of the Board members as possible over the next four weeks to explain the thinking behind the initial ideas outlined above and gather ideas about these or other changes. The results of this work would be written up and circulated for comments as early as possible to give Board Members time to consider the ideas before the next meeting of the Board on the 12<sup>th</sup> July, where the new structures would be agreed.

# What are you asking the Partnership Board to do

The Partnership Board is recommended to consider and approve the suggestions made for the future of partnership structure;

# **Summary of the Issue**

The current constitution defines the Harrow Strategic Partnership as a conduit for change to address the social, economic, environmental, health, education, and community safety needs of the communities of Harrow as reflected in the Sustainable Community Strategy and is the senior partnership in the borough. Its functions include:

- Monitoring the progress and evaluating the success of the Sustainable Community Strategy, through a Partnership Performance Monitoring Framework, ensuring that its kept up to date;
- Encouraging members of the Harrow Strategic Partnership to contribute to the co-ordination of plans, partnerships and initiatives that are delivered in Harrow;
- Jointly developing cross agency proposals and bids for local, regional, national and international funding in consultation with the relevant Accountable Body
- Working together to develop an integrated network of public and other services, focusing on outcomes, minimising bureaucracy and working towards aligning budgets for appropriate projects and areas of work; and
- Assessing the effectiveness of the work of the Harrow Strategic Partnership annually to ensure it delivers the above items

# **Partnership Board**

The most significant change that has occurred since the constitution was agreed in 2010 is that Local Area Agreements will not be renewed and so when the most recent agreement ended last month, there will be no new programme of work that is capable of generating reward grant funding.

In reviewing the constitution relating to the Partnership Board, the function of debating issues of strategic importance to Harrow has been little used and that no such items have been initiated by community representatives. To this extent, the Partnership Board is not fulfilling its remit of providing a forum for exploring the implications of significant change.

A possible future pattern of working could involve a smaller Board, which meets up to four times a year to transact business, hold Harrow Chief Executives to account for progress and set strategic direction.

A key role of the Harrow Strategic Partnership is the engagement opportunities it provides to a wide range of partners/agencies; however one of the key weaknesses of the existing Board is the lack of debate around strategic issues. To build on the existing Summits and develop opportunities for innovative and creative thinking it is proposed to hold up to twice a year, a café style debate around the big questions (i.e. those issues of importance to Harrow), to gather opinions from all sectors and groups within Harrow, which will be named an Assembly. The Assembly will prove an opportunity for partners to bring an issue to the table

and undertake an action learning style event to debate the issues and drawn together recommendations. These will then be captured and developed outside of the meeting.

In tandem with these Assembly meetings, the wider Summit meetings would continue. Partners would be invited to select topics and lead sessions rather than allowing the Council to continue to set the agenda for these and Assembly events. There would continue to be up to two Summits a year.

#### The revised Board could include:

- The Leader of the Council:
- one other majority party Councillor;
- one minority party Councillor
- two representatives of the voluntary and community sector; (via an election process)
- one representative of the business community
- one representative of the PCT
- one GP representative
- one representative of the North West London Hospital NHS Trust
- one representative of the Further Education Sector
- one representative of the Metropolitan Police
- one representative of the London Fire Brigade
- one representative of Job Centre Plus
- Chair of Harrow Chief Executives

The wider assembly would include all of the current membership of the Partnership Board and, possibly, several others.

# **Harrow Chief Executives (HCE)**

There are no significant changes to the functionality of HCE proposed but some related to membership. Specifically, it is proposed to invite a representative from the Clinical Commissioning Board, to identify, invite a new representative of the business community, and resolve the voluntary and community sector representation by having an agreed and permanent presence.

Further thought is to be given to including a representative of the Integrated Care Organisation and Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust on an as and when needed basis. Health representative on HCE needs to be considered alongside the Health and Wellbeing Board discussion to prevent duplication of membership.

It is, however, suggested that HCE should formally endorse the terms of reference and the size of all management groups, sub-groups and task and finish groups. Proposals for groups should set out their purpose, duration and the organisations that would be represented and at what level. Proposals would be measured by the value that would be added.

# Management, sub and task and finish groups

Partnership working is essential and should continue across all fields of activity irrespective of whether there was a relevant management group or any other group established. Partnership working across organisations should be seen as business as usual but partnership groups themselves should only be established when there is demonstrable value in doing so. Similarly, groups should report to the appropriate part of the structure only when there is a clear purpose in doing so. This paper does not specifically look into delivery groups which sit underneath Management Groups. However, as part of the discussion on management group's role and purpose it is important to reflect on the remit of the delivery groups.

The prospective Health and Well Being Board and the current Safer Harrow Management Group both have statutory basis and are therefore both necessary. A Health and Wellbeing working group, however, have agreed not to establish a shadow Heath and Well Being Board for the time being but are exploring creating a more informal umbrella/pathfinder group.

A decision now needs to be taken on when the existing Adults Health and Well Being Board should be dissolved. The existing Board oversees a number of sub-groups not all of which are currently functioning effectively. If the Board were to be dissolved now, the sub-groups that would support the priorities for the coming year should be retained and report progress through the HCE performance report while the others would report to the organisation responsible for the function (such as the PCT for smoking cessation). If the current Board was maintained, there could be a confusion of roles with the umbrella/pathfinder group.

It is proposed to hold a workshop in June with members of the Children's Trust, the Adult Health and Wellbeing Group and the sub groups. An intended outcome of the workshop is to engage partners in the development of more defined and smaller bodies, which are aligned to the proposed priorities.

The Community Cohesion Management Group comprises representatives of voluntary and community organisations that have an interest in establishing and maintaining good community relations. In this, it has interests in common with the Safer Harrow Management Group and the Better Together Group.

The Sustainable Development and Enterprise Management Group cover housing, planning, economic development and the environment and include partnership links with the Rayners Lane regeneration programme. It is important that the Rayners Lane link is maintained and there is a place for discussion on strategic housing to be undertaken. Advice from the Council's Place Shaping department and the Home Group will be sort during the consultation period to identify a possible solution to this gap.

Neither the Community Cohesion Management Group nor the Sustainable Development and Enterprise Management Group in their current form contribute specifically or uniquely to the new priorities. It is suggested that the Sustainable Development and Enterprise Management Group and Community Cohesion Management Group are disbanded in their current form and discussions commence with the Chairs to review how these groups can be transformed to support the new Partnership priorities, once agreed. This will include the addition to the Better Together Group of the relationship with the voluntary and community sector

If the above was taken into account this would provide the following Management Groups

- The new Umbrella Health and Wellbeing Pathfinder Group (and disband the existing group)
- Safer Harrow

# Task and Finish Groups

There is already a number of task and finish groups in place. Once the new Partnership priorities are approved there will be a need to establish task and finish groups to take forward the priorities for 2011/12. The list of groups identified at present comprises:

- Implications of welfare changes
- Reablement Group
- Integrated Children's Working Group
- Commissioning model for Children's Services
- Better Together
- A series of Practitioner Groups looking at processes and how different organisations can best support agreed outcomes

The proposed list of Task and Finish Groups are indicative and will be confirmed once the priorities and the associated workplan are finalised.

#### **Other Partnership Functions**

The following groups are also part of the Partnership:

- Greener Harrow
- Harrow Senior Residents People's Assembly (the name for the successor to OPRG and POP)
- The Voluntary and Community Sector Forum
- The Recession Busting Group
- Local Safeguarding Children's Board

Greener Harrow, HSRA, and the VCSF are all reference groups that bring an expertise or special interest perspective to the Partnership's deliberations. They are self governing bodies that have the ability to contribute to partnership discussions and to give advice. It is recommended that the Partnership continues to offer them this facility and that a representative(s) of each of these groups attend the Assembly.

Currently the Local Safeguarding Children's Board does not formally feed into the governance structure of the Partnership. It is therefore proposed that the Board reports quarterly to Harrow Chief Executives and if required any strategic issues are forwarded to the Board for discussion.

The Recession Busting Group was established as a specialist response to the economic downturn and is, effectively, a Task and Finish Group although one whose duration is beyond local influence. It is recommended that this should continue, at least in the short term, until the worklessness priority has been scoped.

Finally although the rationalisation of the partnership structure may appear to reduce opportunities for individuals and groups to contribute to debate, represent points of view and shape the strategic direction of the Partnership. The proposed pattern of Assembly and Summit meetings allows for considerable public and interest group input. However it is felt to be needed, additional engagement activity can be considered, although on the whole maintaining groups primarily to enable engagement opportunities does not represent good governance or use of resources.



#### HARROW STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD

Local Area Agreement Reward Grant 18<sup>th</sup> April 2011

#### Introduction

The Reward Grant Determination letter for the outstanding LAA Reward Grant was received by the Council on the 15<sup>th</sup> March 2011 in respect of the targets where data was not available to support the claim when the first submission was made.

Harrow has received a sum of £635,396.88, which is 50% of the initial claim. As a result of pressure from London Councils and other representative bodies, Government has also relaxed the split of revenue and capital to 70% revenue and 30% capital.

	Grant Determination	Revenue	Capital
Harrow	£635,396.88	£444,777.82	£190,619.06

On the 22<sup>nd</sup> July the HSP Board agreed the distribution of the reduced LAA Reward Grants for both a best and worst case scenario based on a 50/50 split between capital and revenue.

• Since July a number of new factors have surfaced which prompts the question on whether the original allocation of additional funds still represents the best use of these resources.

# **Proposed Action**

It is proposed that the distribution of the additional reward grant received from Government is reviewed and aligned against the new priorities for the Partnership, once agreed.

It is proposed that discussion on the priorities and outcomes from a previous paper on the agenda is used to develop a workplan, which outlines gaps and resource requirements. The workplan will be broken into the 4 priorities and co-ordinated by identified HCE leads. Each lead will be accountable for ensuring that all appropriate stakeholders are involved in the discussions.

A workplan, which will include both current and proposed projects, milestones, timeframes and resources will be presented to HCE on the 9<sup>th</sup> May. This workplan will be used to decide where the LAA Reward Grant funding should be distributed, to gain the most value and deliver the agreed outcomes for the Partnership.

The agreed workplan and an outline of where the LAA funding are proposed to be allocated will be presented to the HSP Board on the 12<sup>th</sup> July for endorsement.

# What are you asking the Partnership Board to do

To endorse the proposed action of reviewing the distribution of the reward grant around the agreed priorities for the Partnership

To delegate the power to Harrow Chief Executives to develop a workplan based on the agreed priorities and outcomes.

To advise on the proposed allocation criteria

To advise on what support should be made available to voluntary and community sector organisations who wish to develop proposals for the agreed Partnership priorities and outcomes.

To advise on whether the scope of providers should be widened to include organisations outside of Harrow that may be undertaking similar work?

# **Summary of the Issue**

The initial commitment by the Partnership Board was to provide 50% of the received reward grant to those organisations who successfully reached the targets. However in 2010 Government changed the agreement and announced that only half of the total reward grant will be provided to recipients due to the new financial challenges facing the public sector.

Initially Harrow only received a portion of the 50% reward grant due to a delay in finalising a further two indicators. In July 2010 the Partnership Board agreed a distribution based on both a worst case and a best case scenario. The best case scenario took into account the remaining grant that we hoped to receive by November 2010. In November we received a letter from Government announcing that the remaining grant will not be provided in November as originally anticipated and it would now be considered alongside the Round 3 LAA's, therefore the reward grant would not be received until March 2010. At this time it was still not confirmed how much this grant would be.

Since July a number of new factors have surfaced which prompts the question on whether the original allocation of additional funds still represents the best use of these resources. These factors are:

- The financial outlook for public services has considerably changed.
- Some recipient partner organisations have or are about to encounter governance changes
- One of the projects which as originally awarded an additional amount in the best case scenario is due to be completed by August 2011.
- Due to the considerable delay in receiving confirmation from Government on the additional money most of the projects originally agreed have revised their scopes to the lower amounts and the majority are successfully delivering the stated outcomes.

- The change to the split between capital and revenue will require the grant expenditure to be reviewed
- The Partnership is currently reviewing its priorities and structure

The Partnership is currently reviewing its priorities and structure to ensure its fit for purpose and effective. To help the Partnership deliver its priorities it is recommended that the additional reward grant received is utilised to support this work.

If the Board agrees to this approach it is important to note that this would mean some organisations, who solely contributed to achieving the reward grant and were originally led to believe that they would receive 50% of the reward grant, will not automatically receive any additional reward.

The key principles of investment would be an expectation that there is an evidenced return, either social or financial returns, the project is sustainable and demonstrates achievement of at least one of the outcomes.

#### Allocation Mechanism

To ensure the criterion to allocate funding is as simple and transparent as possible it is proposed that decisions on funding would be based around 4 key points:

- Clear demonstration of the desired outcomes (of one or more of the approved priorities)
- Sustainability of the project
- Ability to use the funding to leverage additional funding (e.g. Awards for All, Trust and Foundations and European Funding)
- Robust evidence, opinions, experiences and needs of service users and citizens

#### We would welcome the Boards advice on these proposed criteria.

Innovative approaches to achieving the outcomes will be encouraged and therefore we would welcome the views of Board members on whether we should widen the scope of providers to include organisations outside of Harrow that may be undertaking similar work?

It is proposed to follow a commissioning process for the allocation of the additional LAA Reward Grant, which will be used to support delivery of the partnership priorities and associated outcomes. This will involve the consideration of the following points:

- Good information and evidence is used to inform the decisions including robust evidence from reputable national research
- Opinions, experiences and needs of service users and citizens are taken into account as well as service providers from all sectors
- The cost and value of the proposal is understood and considered when making decisions

- The focus is on improving outcomes and meeting agreed needs

Members of the Partnership Board are invited to provide their thoughts and comments on the proposed commissioning process and the outcomes framework to ensure the final commissioning process is effective.

It is proposed that members of Harrow Chief Executives lead the commissioning of projects under each priority.

One of the major barriers for the smaller voluntary and community groups is their capacity and confidence to apply for grants/funding.

Members of the Board are invited to advise on what support should be made available to those organisation who wish to develop proposals for the agreed Partnership priorities and outcomes.

The final Partnership priorities, outcomes and workplan will be presented to the HSP Board on the 12<sup>th</sup> July for endorsement. Following this meeting, partners will be encouraged to work together to develop proposals for the agreed outcomes of which the Harrow Chief Executives will oversee.

It is proposed that the Harrow Chief Executive group is delegated the power to distribute the £635,396.88 based on a programme of work that will achieve the agreed Partnership priorities. Financial reports will be presented to the HSP Board quarterly to outline where funding has been spent and for what purpose.