



NOTTINGHAMSHIRE PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT GROUP

Thursday 4 September 2008

Richard Herrod Leisure Centre, Gedling Borough Council

MINUTES

Present

Steve Barnett	Senior Manager, Audit Commission
Jacqui Bell	Chief Executive, Networking Action for Voluntary Organisations (NAVO)
Stephen Bray	Assistant Director, Gedling Borough Council
John Buckley	Assistant Chief Fire Officer and Strategic Director, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
Steve Calvert	Strategic Director for Communities, Nottinghamshire County Council
Les Cowling	Programme Manager: Children achieving their full potential (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Kirsty Cole	Strategic Director of Corporate Services, Newark and Sherwood District Council
Chris Common	Policy and Performance Officer, Nottinghamshire County Council
Rob Crowder	Chief Executive, Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN)
Nina Dauban	Health and Wellbeing Partnership Chair (NAVO)
Kate Davies	Strategic Director, Nottinghamshire Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT)
Steve Derbyshire	Nottinghamshire Partnership Support Officer – Sustainability and Economic Development
Peter Elderton	Head, Policy and Performance, Nottinghamshire County Council
Gill Francis	Assistant Director - External Relations, Nottinghamshire Probation
Ged Greaves	Strategic Manager, Policy and Performance, Newark and Sherwood District Council
Sue Griffiths	Deputy Chief Executive, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Cathy Harvey	Programme Manager: Health and Wellbeing for All (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Marie-Laure Huke	Lead negotiator, Government Office for East Midlands
Geoff Hulse	Nottinghamshire County Council Business Improvement Board (Independent observer)
Chris Kenny	Director of Public Health, Nottinghamshire County Teaching and Bassetlaw PCTs
Tamara Khosla	Nottinghamshire Partnership Secretariat
Liz Lesquereux	Programme Manager: Strong Sense of Place (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Susan Lewis-Roberts	Nottinghamshire Partnership Manager



<i>Phil Lyons</i>	<i>Chair, Nottinghamshire Partnership Management Group</i>
Ruth Marlow	Managing Director, Mansfield District Council
Anthony May	Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services, Nottinghamshire County Council
Alan Mellor	Chief Executive, Ashfield District Council
Kate Miller	Nottinghamshire Partnership Secretariat
Jean Pardoe	Chief Executive, Connexions Nottinghamshire
Sarah Pearson	Bassetlaw District Council
Joe Pidgeon	Programme Manager: Vulnerable People (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Diane Pollard	Nottinghamshire Partnership Finance Support (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Paul Randle	Assistant Chief Executive, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Sharon Squires	Director of Change (Communities), Nottinghamshire County Council
Simon Starr	Director, Sport Nottinghamshire
Marcie Taylor	Services Director, Strategic Services, Children and Young People, Nottinghamshire County Council
Steve Turner	Broxtowe Borough Council
Chris Walker	Programme Manager: A Safe Place To Live (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Richard Wilding	Scrutiny and Policy Manager, Ashfield District Council
Pam Wisher	Gedling CVS

Total present: 40 people

Apologies

Peter Baguley	Programme Manager: Environmental Sustainability (Gedling Borough Council)
Mick Burrows	Chief Executive, Nottinghamshire County Council
Celia Morris	Programme Manager: A Thriving Economy (Nottinghamshire County Council)
Heather Stokes	Head of Service for Strategic Planning (Communities), Nottinghamshire County Council
Lili Tabiner	East Midlands Development Agency (EMDA)

Total apologies: 5 people



MINUTES

Meeting opened: 9.35am

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>Chair</p>	
2.	<p>Corrections and amendments to the minutes of 070808:</p> <p>Page 4 – <u>Update on current year spend</u>: should read ‘The current year funding allocation is approximately <i>£50 million</i>’ (rather than £60 million).</p> <p>Page 5 – <u>Pump priming</u>: should read ‘Exact spend will be known by October and the forecasts will be validated by Christmas, so there will be time to reallocate any <i>aligned</i> funds if necessary.’</p>	<p>Secretariat to amend as required (TK, KM, SLR)</p>
3.	<p>Setting the medium to long term agenda</p> <p>Tamara Khosla</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the last meeting of Management Group, officers had the opportunity to lodge strategic issues regarding the first versions of the delivery plans. ▪ The issues raised do not portray the ‘full story’; however they do provide a first effort at collating all the issues on one day. Officers were asked to review the list and provide feedback about issues raised, and what might be missing. ▪ The Secretariat collated the issues arising under key sub-headings. While there are some interesting outcomes, the list needs to be rationalised and prioritised. Issues were raised most frequently in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Joined up and cross-cutting service delivery ➢ Funding ➢ Communications ➢ Performance management and accountability ➢ District LSPs ➢ Data reliability and validity ▪ The issues provide an opportunity for Management Group to set out a longer term programme of work and ‘future-proof’ the Partnership. In particular, the implications of the issues raised need to be understood and addressed, not only for Management 	<p>Officers to provide feedback on the list of issues raised at the last meeting – via email to Susan Lewis-Roberts or Kate Miller.</p>



NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>Group, but also in how this links into the work of the Strategic Partnership Board and the theme partnerships.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The key steps include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Prioritising the issues and identifying those that are missing ➢ Determining how Management Group wants to tackle these ➢ Understanding the implications for chief officers ➢ Translating these into tangible action plans ▪ To progress this work, the Chair suggested that officers provide initial thoughts on the issues, in particular the implications for the Management Group. The Secretariat will draft a template and send out to officers. Feedback is due by 22 September 2008. 	<p>Secretariat to send out template to officers (TK, KM) on implications. Responses due on 22 Sept 08.</p>
4.	<p>Money – is it important for the LAA? Workshop Alan Mellor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A presentation was provided by the Chair of Finance Working Group, highlighting the key resourcing issues faced by the Partnership. ▪ Officers deliberated these issues in a workshop format. Please note that detailed feedback from the workshops will be provided separately. ▪ It was noted that the Partnership needs to think about resourcing as wider than the £50 million LAA funding allocation through Area Based Grants. Resourcing should focus on the £1 billion public sector expenditure in Nottinghamshire and how this can be aligned and used better. ▪ Officers provided a summary of workshop deliberations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ LAA priorities are often the priorities of individual partner organisations. ➢ Delivery plans are not mature enough to influence budget allocations for next year. ➢ Money is a distraction from LAA and the emphasis should be on partnership activities and redistributing our own resources collectively. Some felt that the £50 million should be distributed according to named funding streams – as has been done in the past. ➢ Guidance is needed to provide direction on pooling and aligning funds; and a clear process needs to be agreed for allocation and commissioning. 	





NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Individual partner organisations must integrate LAA priorities and the need for joint planning and commissioning into business plans. ➤ There are significant political difficulties in pooling funds, particularly from the district perspective. 	
5.	<p>Partnership Communication - Workshop</p> <p>Liz Lesquereux</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An overview of the key communications issues faced by the Partnership was presented. ▪ Officers deliberated these issues in a workshop format. Please note that detailed feedback from the workshops will be provided separately. ▪ Officers provided a summary of workshop deliberations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a lack of clarity about the roles and responsibilities of individual organisations regarding partnership-wide communications. ➤ There is a tension about how to badge partnership working. A repeated theme was that officers were unconvinced about the need for a single Partnership ‘brand’ and felt that outcomes were more important than branding. While most agreed with this point of view, some officers still felt the need to explore a common strap-line which can be overlaid with the branding of individual organisations. ➤ The Partnership should use existing networks, including the Communications Officers Group. ➤ The Nottinghamshire Partnership website is important but needs to be used better. ➤ Understanding Partnership work is complex and there is a sharp decrease in understanding as you move further away from the Partnership’s centre. Induction packs would be useful. ▪ Following the feedback, a proposal was put forward for a senior and more strategic Communications Group to oversee Partnership Communications. Some officers felt that the existing Communication Officers Group should be sufficient. If officers at that group are not senior enough, then this needs to be addressed. 	





NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Officers agreed to form a time-limited task and finish working group to push the communications protocol forward. 	<p>LL to convene short term task group to action the Communications protocol for the Partnership.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Nottinghamshire Compact + Jacqui Bell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Nottinghamshire Compact has been drafted to establish protocols on how the public sector and the voluntary and community sectors (VCS) work together. ▪ The key principles of the Compact were outlined, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Improving communication and engagement ➢ Improving financial and support arrangements for the VCS ➢ Improving the capacity of the VCS ➢ Establishing Compact monitoring and dispute resolution arrangements ▪ Management Group formally endorsed the principles and the Chair noted that these would now be taken to Strategic Partnership Board. ▪ The lead for the Nottinghamshire Compact noted that while this piece of work does not need further funding, it does require people resourcing. ▪ Officers were asked to ‘loan’ staff from each partner organisation that not only have good knowledge of their organisation’s work, but also have good relations with the voluntary sector, particularly around funding, capacity building, communications and engagement. ▪ The Chair noted this request and asked officers to nominate staff from their organisations to assist with the development of the Nottinghamshire Compact. This work will be coordinated by the Secretariat. Responses are due by 15 September 2008. 	<p>Nottinghamshire Compact to be taken to Strategic Partnership Board for endorsement.</p> <p>Officers to nominate staff to assist with the development of Compact by 15 September 2008.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>The role of GOEM and the Audit Commission in Partnership working</p> <p>Marie-Laure Huke and Steve Barnett</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A presentation was provided by GOEM and the Audit Commission, providing an overview of the respective roles of 	





NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>Government, Councils, LSPs, Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships (RIEPs), and Inspectorates in partnership working and area-based performance management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government Office, Inspectorates and RIEPs have committed to aligning their work so that local areas (and the effectiveness of their LAAs) are inspected in a systematic and coordinated way. ▪ Information about the outcomes of the Nottinghamshire Partnership will be reported through the Data Interchange Hub. ▪ Officers reiterated the lack of clarity about how RIEPs fit in with the LAA and the Nottinghamshire Partnership. ▪ Some officers remained unclear about the role of the Hub. ▪ The Chair noted that the roles need to be more simply communicated in order to be better understood, and tasked the Secretariat with pulling this piece of work together. ▪ The slides from the presentation will be sent out to officers. 	<p>Secretariat to clearly summarise the roles in the local performance framework (TK, KM, SLR) Secretariat to send out the slides presented by MLH and SB (KM, TK)</p>
8.	<p>Performance Information Update Pete Elderton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The details of the performance of indicators for the 1st quarter of 2008-09 were outlined. ▪ There are a number of indicators for which there is no available data (yet). In some cases, this is because of timeframes around data collection. In other cases, this is because the data has not yet been provided. ▪ Some officers felt that district level data should not be brought to Management Group, rather the high level County data, as this is what was signed off with Government. ▪ Managing the data is a key issue that needs to be sorted out as this will form the basis of the CAA judgement across the 198 indicators. ▪ It was noted that the outcomes of the governance review will have an impact on performance is managed and monitored. ▪ There was some confusion over the Data Hub. Officers were told that the Hub is a centralised data base which draws from existing data sources. In reality, the Nottinghamshire Partnership will probably not need to refer to the Hub as officers can obtain data directly from source (through partner organisations). There are also issues about how long it will take for complete data to be 	





NO.	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>available on the Hub. Therefore, the Hub is a useful place for data collation, but not so much for performance management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Officers felt that while the Hub is good in theory, it isn't so good in practice and some work is needed to improve it.▪ The Chair noted the concerns and reiterated the need to be clear about data we collect as well as the roles and limitations of the Data Hub.▪ The Chair suggested that these issues be progressed by the Performance Officers Group. Their next meeting is on 30 September 2008.	<p>Issues around data collection and monitoring to be addressed by the Performance Officers Group on 30 September 2008 (CC, JP)</p>
9.	Any Other Business <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. DAAT noted that NI 8 is underperforming, particularly in relation to sport.2. Query about timeframes: next meeting of Management Group is on 9 October 2008, while the Nottinghamshire Partnership Forum is meeting on 10 October 2008. These are not the same meetings.	<p>Simon Starr (Sports Nottinghamshire) and Kate Davies (DAAT) to discuss NI 8.</p>
10.	Next Meeting <p>9 October 2008, 9.30am – 12.00 noon To be hosted by Ashfield District Council Venue details to be confirmed.</p>	

Meeting closed: 12.35pm

Please direct any queries to the Secretariat Team for the Nottinghamshire Partnership Management Group:

kate.miller@nottsc.gov.uk

susan.lewis.roberts@nottsc.gov.uk