HARROW STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

SUMMIT OUTCOMES

22ND November 2010

CONTENTS

Harrow Strategic Partnership Summit Outcomes
22nd November 2010

Introduction

What is the Harrow Strategic Partnership

The Harrow Strategic Partnership was launched in 2003 to lead and influence the delivery of services and ambitions in Harrow, and bring together new ideas and analysis to help Harrow address challenges of the future. The vision and ambitions of the Partnership are reflected in the Sustainable Community Strategy, which sets out the agreed long term vision for the borough. As the umbrella partnership for organisations and partnerships, the Harrow Strategic Partnership is the senior partnership in the borough.

Purpose of HSP Summits

HSP Summits are used as a way of engaging organisations that represent and deliver services to Harrow residents. Discussions in the past have revolved around identifying priority areas for improvement that could benefit from a partnership approach, developing a long term vision for the borough and providing expert advice on the way services should be developed to become more efficient.

November 22nd 2010 HSP Summit

This report provides a summary of the outcomes of the Harrow Strategic Partnership Summit, which took place on the 22nd November 2010.

The Summit was set against a backdrop where expected cuts in public sector funding will mean that the sector will need to consider changing the way it works, moving towards a more engaged model of delivery - working with people, rather than the traditional delivery model.

The Comprehensive Spending Review will have an impact on all Harrow Strategic Partners. This includes the need for the Council to generate savings of approximately 30% of its controllable cost base, a cut of approximately 18% in funding for the Police and significant savings to be made by the Primary Care Trust. These funding challenges will also have a follow on impact on the private sector and the capacity of the voluntary and community sector.

The purpose of the summit was to:

- Highlight and raise awareness of the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review announcements for Harrow and its partners
- Provide an opportunity for attendees to review and comment on the proposed Council vision and priorities in the context of the future funding challenges and importance of the role of partners; and
- Shape the types of consultation and involvement that will be used in the future to inform and engage residents and stakeholders on upcoming decisions.

The summit is only one component of the work that is being undertaken to consult on the Council's proposed vision and priorities. Activities that have taken place in November to provide residents with the opportunity to be involved in the 'Lets Talk' campaign on the proposed vision and priorities include:

- Online survey
- Online blog
- Five roadshows
- Open Days
- Member Packs
- Harrow People
- Residents Panel, and

A conversation on a dedicated facebook page

Who Attended

The Harrow Strategic Partnership Summit was attended by over 90 people who represented a range of public, private and voluntary and community sector organisations in Harrow. The Summit provided a significant opportunity for Harrow partners to debate challenges and identify opportunities to improve partnership working. Representatives included senior officers from Harrow Primary Care Trust, Harrow Council, Harrow Police, London Fire Brigade, Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust, Job Centre Plus, Stanmore College, Northwick Park Hospital and the University of Westminster as well as community leaders from Harrow Association of Somali Voluntary Organisations, Harrow Interfaith Council, Age Concern Harrow, Harrow Mencap, Ashiana Charitable Trust, Harrow Citizens Advice Bureau, Kodak Limited and Panel for Older People. A detailed list of attendees is listed in Appendix 1.

Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) Headlines

A presentation on the headlines of CSR and the implications for the Council, Police, Primary Care Trust and Harrow's economy was given.

Whilst the scale of the cuts to government grants was not unexpected, they are still significant. What this will mean for Harrow will not be known until the Local Government Settlement is released later in December.

Other changes announced as part of the CSR include the removal of ring fencing, which will give greater flexibility on how to spend the money that is provided.

A big theme in the CSR was about transferring the decisions and financial control to the local level, and also the realisation that to be able to continue delivering services at the current level in light of the large cuts, partnerships and cross borough working are going to be crucial.

The settlement increases overall NHS funding by 0.1% every year. But the NHS is required to make efficiencies to deal with the rising demand of an ageing population and the increased costs of technology. The NHS has already committed to make up to £20 billion efficiency savings each year until the end of the spending review.

An increased £1bn by 2014-15 for social care will also be merged into the local government grant. Primary Care Trusts will be abolished by 2013 with the aim of saving money and

improving patient choice by giving GP's the power to form consortia and commission care for their patients. This will mean that public health will move to local authorities but, unlike most grants, will be ring fenced.

Central government police funding will reduce by 20 per cent in real terms by 2014-15. On average this will mean approximately an 18% reduction for the Metropolitan Police. This is expected to have an impact on the visibility of police on our streets.

There are currently a number of ring fenced grants that are provided to the council for the purpose of developing the Voluntary and Community Sector, The removal of ring fencing and the combining of these grants will increase uncertainty about the availability of funds.

As anticipated, the spending review confirmed the Government's commitment to some form of shared budgets across the public sector. The initial programme of 16 pilots for Community Budgets will focus on families with complex needs, with ministers saying that this approach may be available from 2013-14.

A transition fund was announced as part of the spending review to provide short term support to those delivering public services. However, the cuts to public sector funding and welfare reforms will be challenging for many in the voluntary sector.

The direction of the Spending Review sets out the primary strategy of rebalancing local economic development towards private sector led growth. The Government will be looking at setting proportions of appropriate services across the public sector that should be delivered by independent providers. The Government also says that it will pay and tender for more services by results and this approach will be explored first in social care, early years, community health, pathology, youth, court and tribunal services, and early interventions for the neediest families.

A copy of the CSR headline slides and the slides on Harrow's economy will be published on the Council's website.

Facilitated Sessions Methodology

The following pages provide information about the outcome of the two facilitated sessions, the general conclusions of the summit and a summary of the detailed comments made by participants.

Summit attendees selected one of nine working groups, each comprising approximately 7-10 people. The facilitated sessions consisted of two activities. The first reviewed the Council's draft vision and priorities and the second activity looked at a pre selected number of consultation methods.

Each group was asked to consider the following questions:

Session 1

1. What are the three most important services provided for Harrow residents?
2. How important is quality of service, efficiency and targeting services to those most in need?
3. How well do the corporate priorities reflect your concerns or hopes for the Borough?

4. How well do the corporate priorities align to your identified "important" services?

Session 2

1. What are the pros and cons of each consultation method?
2. Who would the consultation method be suitable for?
3. When could this consultation method be used?
4. Is this a method that you would want to be involved with?

Each group was supported by a facilitator/scribe who noted the entirety of the discussions and an aggregation of these discussions is given in the following pages.

General Conclusions

Session 1

There was a general consensus that the way services are delivered in the future must change to be able to adapt to the reduced resources that the Comprehensive Spending Review has presented. Currently residents have high expectations for services provided and this should be challenged in the current economic climate. It was suggested that there could be learning opportunities from commercial organisations on how to manage these expectations.

The importance of taking a longer term view and not just concentrating on quick wins was reflected in discussions. Examples of this included the need to continue providing health promotion in order to avoid longer term health problems and also investing in areas where there may be the ability to change the way services are delivered in the future, for example using wardens to work with people to stop dropping litter. At the same time, it is important that those who are unable to change their behaviour due to health reasons continue to receive the services they require. This supported the view that services did not need to be provided in their current traditional form and by changing some services, such as libraries, these could actually become more accessible.

The issue of relying on the voluntary sector to deliver services that the public sector can no longer afford to do was raised across the groups. Whilst the sector is looking to improve its efficiency, services still cost money and no additional resources are being provided. The reduction in public spending will also have an impact upon the private sector. This will impact on the private sector's ability to source resources to fill the gap left by the public sector.

A consistent message across the groups was the need to strengthen the emphasis on formal partnerships, including joint priorities and partnership working. There will be difficult decisions that need to be made, but there are also opportunities to do things differently through working in partnership. In the past there has been tension between central and local agendas, which possibly prevented this approach. This has now been reduced due to Central Government relinquishing some of their controls.

Attendees spoke about the artificial nature of geographical boundaries. There is a need to work across boundaries to achieve efficiencies. This could be through procurement and the shared use of buildings and also exploring whether we could have less than the current three

Councillors per ward. The slight negative to this approach is the potential conflict with Central Government's localism agenda.

Two of the tables discussed whether there was a need to have a Council for Harrow. This led to the discussion of merging Councils, such as Harrow and Brent. This also linked to comments raised about residents who live on the border of different boroughs, who don't get consistent services. When faced with problems these residents are often told they should contact their neighbouring borough. It was felt that more should be done to work closer with neighbouring boroughs.

The groups were asked to explore willingness, interest or commitment to delivering current services differently. The area of outsourcing was raised as a possible way of saving money and it was also suggested that services should be reviewed to remove any possible overlaps such as dial a ride and special needs transport. There was a willingness for the Council to investigate the option of handing over the management of Council owned community assets to Trusts and developing social enterprises.

There was recognition and acceptance of the potential need to increase charges. These issues need to be communicated with residents, the public needs to be convinced of the reasons behind the increase and it needs to be clear that the increase is not just about raising additional income.

A future challenge is changing people's attitudes, in particular those residents who feel that they pay for services through their Council Tax and therefore expect services to be provided. To be able to alter this relationship there needs to be an open discussion regarding quality and not just cost.

Session 1 – Vision and Priorities

Three Most Important Services

The following list outlines the services that were identified by participants as the three most important services for Harrow residents. The number indicates the number of times this service was identified.

Adult Social care = 30
Community Safety = 27
Health = 22
Environment, refuse and clean streets = 21
Children's services = 14
Education = 13
Housing = 7
Youth Services = 5
Traffic, Concessionary travel and parking = 3
Jobs and business = 2
Access to services = 2
Listening Council = 2
Community Development = 1
Sport = 1
Community facilities = 1

Culture = 1
Equalities = 1
Affordable warmth = 1
Finance = 1
Strategic Planning = 1

Comparing these most-important-to-summit-attendees services with the Council's draft corporate priorities, there is a reasonably good fit between people's aspirations and the Council's proposals. Leaving out Health, most of the other service areas mentioned are covered to by the draft priorities as shown below:

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe;

Community Safety
Environment, refuse and clean streets

- United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads;

Listening Council
Community Development
Equalities

- Supporting and protecting people who are most in need; and

Adult Social care
Children's services
Concessionary travel
Housing
Affordable warmth

- A Town Centre to be proud of: changing Harrow for the better.

Community facilities
Jobs and business
Traffic and parking

The gaps identified include:

Education
Youth Services
Culture
Sport
Access to services
Finance
Strategic Planning

Each attendee was asked to score the importance of quality, efficiency and targeting of services. The average scores show that all three are important for residents and partners with quality of services scoring the highest.

Quality of services = average score 8.3
Efficiency = average score of 7.1
Targeting = average score of 7.4

Vision

There was some concern that the vision wasn't ambitious enough. This was due to the feeling that the vision described something that was or at the very least should be done already.

There was also concern about how the Council was going to achieve the vision bearing in mind the current financial challenges. This was linked to the higher costs associated with reaching hard to reach groups.

A number of groups felt that the Council should become more of an enabler and that this should be reflected in the vision. However it was recognised that for residents to be enabled, they needed to feel part of the community.

Priorities

It is important to not have too many priorities and therefore the Council should resist the temptation to add more. The Council should communicate the timeframe of the priorities and also when the priorities will be re-visited.

There was a general discussion across the groups around the proposed priorities being quite broad and therefore all encompassing. This means that they don't currently provide a real sense of what the Council's priorities are which causes some uncertainty on how scarce resources would be distributed.

Some groups indicated their disappointment that 'health and wellbeing' did not feature in the priorities. It was felt that health would address some of the longer term issues and it is important to help people to help themselves. It was recognised that this is largely the responsibility of NHS but there will be a greater role for the local authority once public health is transferred to the Council. Bearing in mind the upcoming changes for health it was important that the transition of responsibility is well managed to ensure minimum impact on residents.

Areas that groups felt were missing from the priorities included climate change and its implications, however a separate group felt this was an area that could be reduced. Some groups felt that the priorities lacked mention of social care, safeguarding children and supporting adults.

Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe

This priority provides a "feel good factor" for residents and communities and therefore it was felt to be an important point. The achievement of this priority will also provide a good example for others. However to achieve this priority it was felt that there was a need for investment from the Council and the Voluntary Sector.

The recent growth in crime in Harrow was felt to be a reason to further strengthen the crime element of the priority.

There was also some discrepancy across attendees on the understanding of what 'safe' means. Rather than community safety, one attendee interpreted safe as meaning pavements and roads free of potholes to avoid people falling over.

Having a united and involved community and being a Council that listens and leads

It was felt that the wording of this priority was too generalist and therefore confusing. It also lacked the punchiness of the other priorities. One table however commented that "United and Involved Communities" is the basis for all other priorities and without it all other priorities would fail.

It was questioned whether everyone wanted to be listened to and therefore whether this should be a priority. It was also questioned that, if the Council moves more towards being a Council that empowers and enables its residents, is it enough to only listen and lead?

Whilst public views are important to enable residents to feed into decision making, they need to have knowledge of the budget. It was felt that residents and partners do not currently have this information and therefore cannot contribute effectively. On another angle, one group felt that communities should be empowered with their own budgets and be able to make decisions on how that money is spent.

It was reiterated that there was a need for the Council to work <u>with</u> communities and not <u>for</u> them. To be able to achieve this, there is a need to go to the places where people are to consult, rather than expect them to come to the Council.

There is some work to be done in dispelling urban myths around what can be and can't be carried out by residents due to health and safety reasons. An example highlighted was the clearing of snow and leaves from the individual's area.

Supporting and protecting people who are in most need

Supporting and protecting people in the community was felt to be an important area that could be better delivered in partnership, however there was a need to further explain what "people in most need" means.

Wealdstone is a hub for the community through its Healthy Living Centre. One group felt that the Council should follow this model for more community resources in one community hub such as utilising libraries as a way of providing council information.

The ability to prevent and provide intervention is vital to reducing the intensive resources required to support and protect people in most need. Three of the groups at the summit felt that intervention should be reflected in the priority as well as empowering communities to look after themselves and others.

Two tables discussed the need to address disabled access at tube stations, with both citing Harrow on the Hill Station as being a concern.

Town Centre

This priority received the least support from the summit attendees. It was felt that this priority, whilst benefiting the community, should not be a main priority and is not meaningful for people who do not live in Harrow. There was also concern that other areas of Harrow require development and not just the central town centre.

It was felt that people should get a good impression of Harrow when they come into the town centre, and this could be a role that local shops could take on. To help achieve a centre where people want to go there should also be more events to draw people in such as markets, big bands and parades.

One group mentioned the need to provide strategic planning and therefore develop the borough so it has a visual impact.

Session 2 - Consultation

Across the groups, the importance of tailoring consultation methods to the targeted individuals was essential. It was also important to not just use one method to gain the information required. Consultation methods should also link into existing community activities and should not be standalone. However there needs to be a balance between knowing when to consult and when to just take action.

There is a need to ensure information is presented appropriately and this requires factors such as age, language, location and accessibility to be taken into account.

It was expected that as cuts become more visual, more people will become interested in discussions about what councils and other partners can and can't afford to deliver.

There was a general consensus that consultation needed to be joined up, not just within an individual organisation but also across the different partners. This was particularly important for ward meetings, as there is a limit to how many meetings individuals can or want to attend.

Based on the list of consultation methods that were consulted on at the summit, social media was highlighted across the majority of the groups as missing. Social media examples discussed included the use of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube. It was felt that these avenues should be explored more fully by partner organisations to inform and involve residents in discussions.

Councillors should be utilised more to harness the wealth of information within communities. For Councillors to be effective it is important that they are visible in the community and undertake consultation outside of the town hall. Attendees were relatively supportive of the approach of road shows where Councillors and officers came to talk to residents out in their localities.

A general theme that was raised by all tables was the importance of following through on what information had been gathered and feeding this back to individuals. There was an acceptance that not all suggestions can be undertaken but it is important to reflect the messages and then explain why or why not action had been taken. Feedback helps increase the transparency of decisions and also encourages those who were involved in consultation to take part in future opportunities.

Next Steps and Feedback

Feedback

Thirty two feedback forms were completed out of a total of 93 attendees. Participants were asked to score the usefulness of the information on the Comprehensive Spending Review, their understanding as a result of the presentation and the ability to participate effectively in the event. Overwhelmingly the scores were positive with only three individuals scoring either Poor or No for the one or more of the questions.

Under the free text section just over half of the comments included suggestions for improvements with a few outright criticisms of the event including "A complete waste of time and Council Tax Payer's money; disgraceful". There were comments about the cost of the event, the size and content of the slides, which were difficult to read from a distance and the short time allowed for asking questions at the end of the plenary session.

Other comments praised the organisation of the event, the location, its timing and the variety of organisations represented. In relation to the format of the facilitated sessions, some people felt that further information about current services and their costs would have been useful and the questions around which the discussion was focussed were ambiguous.

The positive comments recognised the value of being able to contribute views to the process for developing priorities.

There were several comments that went beyond the arrangements and management of the event and instead touched on the substantive issues. One questioned the continuing role of local authorities if the localism agenda was pursued to the extent of different services and service standards being adopted for localities.

Other comments questioned the value that had been achieved from the previous dramatic increase in NHS funding as services still included substantial waiting times and, similarly, asked why violent crime has increased recently despite increased Police resources.

Finally, there were several requests for feedback.

Next Steps

The Harrow Strategic Partnership Summit has provided a rich and valuable source of evidence and views on the future priorities from organisations that provide a service to, or represent Harrow communities. It is also important that the Council has a direct conversation with residents. Therefore the feedback received from the summit will be used to build on the Let's Talk campaign outcomes and help inform the final vision and priorities.

The analysis of the various consultations on the draft vision and priorities will be considered by members in December. In January stakeholders will be invited to a 'finale' event that brings together the results of the borough wide consultation, Lets Talk and hear how the Council plans to take the priorities forward. Finally the Corporate Plan for the Council will be presented to Cabinet in February, which will include the final vision and priorities.

The views of the various consultation methods gained from the summit will also be used to inform how Harrow Strategic Partnership members choose to involve and engage with communities and residents in the future.

This report will also be circulated to all summit participants and will be made available on the council's website.

Further information on the Lets Talk – new conversation can be found on www.harrow.gov.uk/letstalk

Appendix 1 - Attendees

1	John Allwright	Harrow Federation of Tenants and Residents
2	Cllr Sue Anderson	Harrow Council
3	Bernard Archer	Harrow Pensioners Forum
4	Dal Babu	Harrow Police
5	Andrew Baker	Harrow Council
6	Myfanwy Barrett	Harrow Council
7	Michelle Bauernfreund	Harrow Council
8	Wendy Beeton	Harrow Council
9	Mark Billington	Harrow Council
10	Scott Black	Home Group
11	Mark Bloomfield	London Fire Brigade
12	Audrey Brightwell	Harrow Partnership with Older People
13	Carmel Brown	Relate London North West
14	Bernard Burns	Friends of the Earth
15	Sarah Carthew	University of Westminster
16	David Cheeseman	Northwick Park Hospital Trust
17	Heather Clements	Harrow Council
18	Alex Dewsnap	Harrow Council
19	Mark Easton	NHS Harrow
20	Mark Piper	Harrow Association for the Disabled
21	John Edwards	Harrow Council
22	Adil Farooqi	The Furqan Academy
23	Cllr Keith Ferry	Harrow Council
24	Carole Furlong	NHS Harrow
25	Phiroza Gan	Harrow Interfaith Council
26	Therese Glynn	ADHD
27	Sydney Golding	Harrow Partnership with Older People
28	Cllr Susan Hall	Harrow Council
29	Bernie Becker	Harrow Council
30	Dr Rahim	Harrow Bengali Association
31	Mr Thacker	Harrow Elders Group
32	Ann Groves	Older Peoples Reference Group
33	Anita Blair	Willow Housing and Care
34	Mrs Nichols	Little Stanmore Tenants Residents Association
35	Jan Harris	Support for Living
36	Jill Harrison	Harrow CAB
37	Cllr Graham Henson	Harrow Council
38	Brendon Hills	Harrow Council
39	Andrew Howe	NHS Harrow
40	Cllr Thaya Idaikkadar	Harrow Council
41	Mohammed Ilyas	Harrow Council
42	Fola Irikefe	Harrow Council
43	Yasmin Ismail	Office for National Statistics
44	Arvind Joshi	Ashiana Charitable Trust
45	Sue Kaminska	Harrow Council

46	Hassan Khalief	HASVO
47	Solakha Lal	Harrow Council
48	Jaswant Lall	Job Centre Plus
49	Marianne Locke	Harrow Council
50	Michael Lockwood	Harrow Council
51	Paddy Lyne	Harrow Federation of Tenants and Residents Association
52	Jacqui Mace	Stanmore College
53	Cllr Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Harrow Council
54	Desiree Mahoney	Harrow Council
55	Samia Malik	Harrow Council
56	Lynne Margetts	Harrow Council
57	Nahreen Matlib	Harrow Council
58	Julian Maw	Harrow LINk
59	Brian McGowan	Kodak Ltd
60	Paul McKeown	Job Centre Plus West London
61	Richard Michalski	Harrow Council
62	Avani Modasia	Age Concern Harrow
63	Sue Moran	Job Centre Plus
64	Jemima Morris	PRO-ACTIVE West London
65	Colin Morris	Pensions Disability and Carers Service
66	Katherine Murray	CNWL
67	Paul Najsarek	Harrow Council
68	Cllr John Nickolay	Harrow Council
69	Cllr Joyce Nickolay	Harrow Council
70	Chris O'Brien	Harrow Youth Parliament
71	Cllr Phil O'Dell	Harrow Council
72	Deven Pillay	Harrow Mencap
73	Linda Robinson	Friends of Bentley Priory Nature Reserve
74	Pravin Shah	Harrow Council for Justice
75	Baldev Sharma	HARA
76	Cllr Victoria Silver	Harrow Council
77	Jim Shutt	Home Group
78	Hazel Simmons	POP
79	Maurice Soffa	Harrow Pensioners Forum
80	Cllr Bill Stephenson	Harrow Council
81	David Summers	H&WIA Community Forum
82	Kashmir Takhar	Harrow Council
83	Trina Thompson	Harrow Council
84	Martin Verden	Harrow Heritage Trust
85	Stuart Ward	Harrow Police
86	Tom Whiting	Harrow Council
87	Dan Wilson	Harrow Teachers Centre
88	Anthony Wood	Harrow Public Transport Users Association
89	Carol Yarde	Harrow Council
90	Nalini Solariki	ADHD and Autism Support Harrow
91	Heather Smith	Harrow Council

Appendix 2 - Pros and Cons from consultation facilitated session.

Pros	Cons
Interest Forums and Panels	
Ready group	Ready group
Jury selection random	Same People
Schools – ethnicity, disability	"Is their opinion that important"?
Reps Sheltered Homes	Polarised view (small group hijack)
Very well informed	Self selecting
Low cost	Information flow needs to be adequate
Specific facilitation to get the information you are after	Need to ensure the panel represents the wider view
Reach hard to reach groups	Doesn't work on things which are very general
Safety in numbers	Building on support for people who require access (language barriers etc)
Stimulates debate	Personal agendas
Get people along to your group e.g. police	Opinion change with age
Members can develop knowledge	
Share information	
Works well around interest and locality	
Networking among other groups and individuals	
Exhibitions, Roadshows, Open Days	
Takes issues to the people	Either very general or very little substance over style
Quick message	Staffing – on day
Freebie, practical	Quality of advice
Popular with different groups	Structured, biased
Clear message	Time consuming
Draws people in	Quality of conversation
Raises awareness	Quality of feedback fairly superficial
More visible	Same people at events
Reaches more people	Not good turnouts (sometimes)
Allows people to ask other questions – able to engage the community	Can exclude people depending on where they live
More accessible	Costly
Better way of dispensing information rather than feedback	
Grabs attention	
Raises profile	
More options for people to provide feedback	
Provide networking opportunities	
Planning for Real	
Options, allows feedback	Direction of travel

Financial constraint	(stops ongoing communication)
Large, visual	Reduced attendance if more than one meeting
'Sells' areas like Rayners Lane	High cost
Allows specific groups to consider police, transport	Limited
	Timing of meeting
	Need to make it more flexible
Video Box	
Popular	Little information
Young people	Technology reduces age span
Big brother	Gimmiky
Requires specific questions for specific responses	Already doing in via email/phone
Allows people to use their own language	Time consuming shifting through responses
	Staff time = high cost
	Analysis filtering – may lose detail
	Translation costs
Local Media	
Cheap	Selective news
Wide local coverage	Editorial agenda
Specific messages with detail	Cost of advertising is high
'Community editorial board' on council publication	Local paper sales declining
Radio – specific groups can get access	Weighting of questions lean towards set results
Facebook/twitter	Quality of responses versus costs
Different media for different sections of the community	
Area Forum	
Informed, vocal participants	Relies on people going somewhere
Local	Needs a "big" issue
Issues about your local area	Not going to work "Civic Responsibility"
Join up the individual local areas	Will people be representative
Regularity	Axes to grind
Could focus on local planning issues	Intimidating unless confident
Use for ongoing consultation like resident association	Not representative
	Can be too large
	Individuals/organisations views
	Isolating in the local area
	Quality of information in consultation document
Service User Group	

Empower people – how demand, use service	Need experienced chair to move on – not dwell on negatives
Find out about poor service	Representative?? – who decided who gets to be on the group
Opinion of person who uses service	
Brings experience	
Facilitate grass roots information	

Citizens Jury

Experts	Very formal
Small group - how representative	Expensive
Focuses on crime and safety, town centre and competitive purchase	Who elects the jury
	Representative sample, will they have expertise
	Already have "challenges" why do more
	Duplication

Events

Additional voices – as long as not invited	If not invited risk of geography, weather
Can be cheap if bolt on to something else	
Can target through choice of venue e.g. youth	
Facilitate feedback	

Face to Face Interviews

Wealth of information	Expensive
Probe to get information	Time consuming
Personal	Not representative
Very suitable for certain groups e.g. older people	Cross sample of people (who you are leaving out)
Reach hard to reach groups	Could restrict sample
All information at one time	
Personal views rather than the groups	
Target people who can't read, write or have internet access	
Informative, knowledge from the interview	

Think Casts

Should be visual and short and sharp	Boring
Should be live and interactive and two way process	Selective
Can be cost efficient if done well	'Think Cast' doesn't sound appealing
Put the priorities on the board	Need to simplify the name – pod casts
Appeal to younger audience	Costly if no take up
Real time engagement	Need wi fi
Accessible but limited audience	People unaware of it – need to publicise
Cf net mums – coffee morning chat online for those who can't necessarily access other	What real value 1-2-1 dialogue but 250,000 residents

means. More comfortable	
Access through libraries? As groups?	
Relate to blogs – used more and more nowadays	

Interactive Budgets

Sharing the tricky decisions	Need publicity and explanation
See the impact of the decisions	To be really useful, need extra contextual information
Fun and interactive	
Useful for community groups	
Feedback of results	

Ward Based Public Meetings

Cover local topics e.g. Kodak meeting	Not well publicised
Stimulate debate	Railroaded by certain people
Access a wide range of opinions	Not appealing
Incorporate into ward surgeries – opportunity to use these more	How access specific groups e.g. hard to reach groups
Capture a different audience to street campaigning	Too expensive to go out to each group separately.
Use with neighbourhood champions to alert to relevant local issues	Motivating members of the public
Do consultation together - collaboration	Time / location is important
People turn up for single issues	Accessibility
People to discuss issues concerning their area	Ensure they are well publicised to get a representative sample of the community
Share views with other residents	People reflect who is around at the time
Take the time to visit people and enable them to ask questions	
Supermarkets – most people go there, great cross section of the population	

Focus Groups

Very good when you want to look in detail at specific issues	Not good for broad issues
Understanding behind who is giving their views	How do you choose the people?
	Not very representative – reflect population
	All voices need to be heard in an equitable way
	Facilitator needs to be skilled and independent
	Need to be clear about what happens next

Harrow People

Informative	One way not used for consultation
Does get to everybody (but not south harrow)	Distribute with free papers

A good light read	Doesn't include all activities in communities – coverage
Keeps in touch with what's going on	Not informative
Appropriate for target audience - residents	Availability of reporters across the week
Popular	Journalistically very light – need more meat – more challenging
	Doesn't tackle controversial issues
	Too glossy
	Miss out borough events
	Not so efficient – do not know if people read them or bin them
	Not so good for feedback

Street Campaigning	
Good if they can do it	Need more publicity
Councillors and Officers	People don't have time to stop
See councillors working with public	Weather dependent
More comfortable for Councillors	Need to consider whole environment
Immediate response	Doesn't take account of people who work outside the borough
Using the VCS to engage others	Putting the right people on the street – finding people with the right skills
Cross section of people	Skills of the people on the stand
Good as information giving exercise	Reflecting of the population
Effective if linked to another activity	Is it a low cost option?
Works on a neighbourhood level	

Telephone Surveys	
Good to reach groups who are at home, e.g. parents, carers, unemployed	Difficult to ensure representative
Opportunity for discussion	Can't reach ex-directory numbers / fewer landlines
Reach those preferring to talk rather than write	Reliant on people being there
One to one	Language – if English not first language – cost of translation
Quick feedback	Irritating and inconvenient
Good for customer feedback	Can get caught up in a particular issue
Suitable for specific issues	Intrusive
	False responses to get rid of caller
	In opportune timing
	Length of time to complete

E - Participation	
Attract young professionals	Identifying people / publicising – self selecting
Les intrusive	Can't reach non computer users
Easy/efficient to collect/analyse	Relies on reading skills
Good if short and know the length in advance	Not deliberative
Can offer incentives	No access (particularly for older people)

In own time – when it suits	May not access computer every day
Integration gives feedback to participate (e.g. Redbridge)	Access process needs to be simple
Access from libraries	Too adhoc
Suitable for budget consultation, youth involvement, register of interest for participation	Depends on access to internet
Good for young people	Good as a tool but not on its own
Good way for engaging some groups	Could be impacted by poverty, education and diversity
Easy questions essential for good results	Frustrating if get no feedback

Self Completion Questionnaires	
Wide coverage	Need processing unless scanable
Honesty – anonymity	Low response rates, some groups more likely to complete
Consistency of paper form – it stays the same e.g. versus face to face	Time consuming – e.g. reminders, waiting for response
Get responses from people who are interested	Time consuming for consultee
Short questionnaires better	No dialogues; risk of misinterpretation of question
Multiple choice questions easier to analyse	Who actually filled it in??
Accessible to people not on the web (older people)	Low response/high cost would be bad
Can be completed in your own time	Long questionnaires are bad
	Mulitple choice restricts peoples ability to answer fully
	Uses paper

Residents Panel	
Higher response rate	Over time panel needs to be refreshed
Representative	Need processing unless scanable
Informed – interested and have a view	Low response rates, some groups more likely to complete
Opportunity for most people	Time consuming – e.g. reminders, waiting for response
Allows interaction	Time consuming for consultee
Explore issues in greater depth	No dialogues, risk of misinterpretation of question
Meetings should be at different locations	Too many consultations (consultation fatigue)
Suitable for a range of purposes	Has to be linked into decision making process
Good to select people that are representative	Understand what lies behind the issues
	What weighting do you give the results e.g focus groups of the various stakeholders, which are more important?
	Need to be clear about the context – which views are being given and why

Local Surgeries	
Personal	Poor take up
Two way discussion	Needs to be well publicised
Close to the resident	Unrealistic expectations / lack of understanding
Issues driven by the resident	Needs to fit into a wider process
Good for meeting councillors	Not suitable for general issues
Good for individual issues	
Meeting should be local and regular	
Translating general issues into local/specific	
Participation is as and when appropriate	
Social Media	
Can reach large number of people	Too remote
Saves having to travel	Only hit the IT literate
Interactive feedback	Accessibility issues
Quick feedback required	No PC or internet
	Not everyone accesses the website