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1. **Public services reform and local government: strand 1 – partnerships and outcomes**: The Committee will take evidence from—

   Ken Dunbar, Chief Executive, Aberlour Childcare Trust;

   Duncan Thorp, Parliamentary, Policy and Communications Officer, Social Enterprise Scotland;
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**Agenda Item 2**

Submission from the National Community Planning Group
As Scotland’s largest solely Scottish Children’s charity, we warmly welcome the opportunity to respond to this much needed inquiry. We are simultaneously engaging, through our Head of Policy, with the Scottish Government’s review of Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements. We are hopeful that these two parallel reviews will work closely and collaboratively towards a more progressive model of Local Authority Community planning and public service delivery.

Strand 1 – Partnerships and outcomes

- How could councils better integrate their partners into the process? How could the degree of commitment to the process amongst other community planning partners be improved? How can any legislative or administrative barriers that make partnership working more difficult be overcome?

Involvement of the voluntary sector in the SOA drafting process

Since the launch of the Concordat in 2007, government representatives up to cabinet level have attested to the role they expect the third sector to play in the framing of local authority Single Outcome Agreements. They cite community planning partnerships as the route through which voluntary organisations can help shape SOAs. The reality is far different. In the first round of SOAs only 15 local authorities in anyway sought to involve CPPs in the drafting process. A survey conducted by Community Care Providers Scotland after the publication of the first round of SOAs in 2008 identified that 90% of voluntary sector Community Care providers had not been approached or involved in any aspect of the SOA drafting process- this is especially troubling given that the provision of care is a statutory requirement on local authorities. It would seem logical that care providers be at least consulted in the framing of any aspect of the SOA governing the provision of care or related support.

There is great variety within CPPs in Scotland; there is also variety in the way they relate to local authority planning. Coupled with the fact that in most cases voluntary sector representation on CPPs is confined to a representative from the local Council of Voluntary Service, who tend in the main to represent small community organisations rather than a cross section of the sector, and even then not always at board level- this represents a considerable bottle neck for individual third sector organisations to have a meaningful engagement with the drafting process. This problem is compounded when cost cutting means

that voluntary organisations do not have the capacity to engage in planning and networking.

As such we would like to see more opportunities for the voluntary sector to engage meaningfully in the process of drafting SOAs and a replication of good practice in terms of co-production. Some local authorities demonstrated some good practice in terms of co-production in the run up to the most recent round of SOAs which could be replicated by others in subsequent years: Aberdeen City Council conducted an open conference where representatives from all sectors with an interest in the SOA could have a meaningful involvement in the drafting process.

- How can local authorities and their partners move further towards real, integrated working?

**Best practice case study: Dundee Early intervention team**

The Dundee Early intervention team represents a unique collaboration between Aberlour, Action for Children, Children 1st and Barnardos in partnership with Dundee City Council and NHS Tayside working to deliver a flexible range of interventions and support to families who, whilst not currently accessing acute social service provision, are possibly on the edge of a crisis and in need of support. This ties directly into the government’s focus on prevention as by giving these families the help they need before the situation becomes more acute we can offset the need for statutory intervention.

The four organisations have drawn upon our combined wealth of experience, working within Dundee’s communities and have designed a service model that from April will offer these families a single point of access to a range of support programmes. That could be support with relationships, parenting or positive mental health as well as access to a 24 hour helpline. We aim to be as flexible as possible and what’s special about this is that families can access this at times of the day when problems are more likely to arise, as such it will be staffed and open out with normal working hours, so that we can be their for these families when they really need us.

- How can the community planning arrangements be adapted and developed to promote outcomes-based and preventative approaches?

**Measuring prevention will require a new approach to outcomes and indicators**

The focus on prevention engendered by Christie is a welcome shift in policy direction. However with this shift must come a nuanced approach to the collection and performance measurement of local outcomes and indicators. By definition, the preventative agenda seeks to prevent an outcome rather than attain it. In puts and interventions towards such an end may very well take over a decade to see a return on investment.
There is an opportunity for CPPs to have a stronger role in overseeing the totality of public resources in their area in line with 'localist' thinking and government ambitions. The government should draw on lessons from the UK Government’s previous initiative on Total Place, but with a view to greater transparency and inclusion of all public spend resources in the area, not just those that are identified with the administrative boundary or government department. This will enable more creative solutions to prevention and outcomes to emerge.

A move to shared measurement systems and better sharing of data between all public sector bodies and the voluntary sector will go some way to enabling better measurement of long term outcomes and will encourage and enhance collaboration. A way to do this would be to incentivize ongoing data input and collection from volunteer partners. Opportunities for sharing knowledge and improving interpretation of data and research outcomes would enable improved learning and understanding about what works and what needs to be improved to deliver sustainable outcomes.

- How is the work of delivery on SOA outcomes managed, coordinated and driven through the various community partnership structures and agreements? How could Single Outcome Agreements be improved to deliver on community planning targets?
- What is the purpose of a Single Outcome Agreement in assisting the delivery of improved outcomes? How are local Single Outcome Agreements developed, and how do they relate to national priorities?

Implementation of the Concordat and the role out of single outcome agreements

In collaboration with other organisations in the children and young peoples sector, Aberlour undertook an analysis of the thirty two single outcome agreements published in the summer of 2008 and then subsequently on the publication of the 09-10 round of outcomes. We looked at each Local Authorities SOA against a range of issues connected to the work and interests of our organisations and our service users. Understandably the first round of SOAs was characterised by a significant amount of inconsistency and a considerable lack of clarity as to the strategic importance or pre-eminence of these documents. It was hoped that with the introduction of sixteen Strategic directors from the Scottish Government and through the publication of guidance from the improvement service, to guide Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) and local authorities through the drafting process of the second round that things would be considerably better this time around.

We have just concluded our qualitative analysis of second round of the 32 local authority SOAs and whilst there is marked improvement on the year previous. A considerable amount of inconsistency remains and the process by which voluntary sector organisations can actively influence the process of
framing the Single Outcome Agreements of each local authority remains inconsistent, vague and in many cases non-existent.

**Consistency:** Those unfamiliar with the Concordat would be forgiven for looking at the first round of 32 Single outcome agreements and fail to see any consistency and in some cases would not recognise that these documents were created to serve the same purpose- this significantly improved with the drafting of the second round thanks in part to 16 government directors and the improvement service guidance. However even now, inconsistency remains.

**Timescales:** Different local authorities continue to attach different life spans to their SOA. Indeed since the signing of concordat there has been uncertainty as to whether the SOA should be refreshed every year or whether, once in place the SOA should cover the term of the local authority administration. This is important to clarify as these will affect the way in which organisations can contribute to the drafting of future plans and will affect how the authority can adapt to changing circumstances. This is critically linked furthermore to the pre-eminence of the Single Outcome Agreement in relation to other plans and strategies laid out by the local authority.

‘Above’ or ‘below the waterline’: In conferences and seminars that accompanied the publication of the first round of SOAs, there was much use by Government and COSLA representatives alike of the term ‘Above the waterline’. The use of this term suggested that the SOA should represent a strategic overview for the local authority and that it should lay out broad brush aims whilst pointing to lower level documents which in turn lay out the detail of local targets and goals. The Concordat states:

> The SOA will cover all local government services in each local authority area as well as a significant range of the responsibilities of Community Planning Partnerships where local authorities have a significant part to play².

This definition is arguably the cause of the ensuing confusion notable in the tremendous differences in the first round, in the SOAs of differing local authorities. Dundee city council’s 08/09 SOA was short and written in very broad brush terms and made reference to a range of local strategies and plans whereas Scottish Borders Council was tremendously detailed and laid out in minutiae all of its local targets and indicators for that year. Whilst a greater consistency has now been fostered, there is still a lack of clarity as to where some local authorities hold their Single outcome Agreement in terms of importance as a driver for policy and expenditure. In reality, the SOA in most cases sits both ‘Above the waterline’ in terms of the defined local outcomes and ‘below the waterline in terms of the local indicators.

- How could local authorities and other public bodies contribute more to influencing and improving outcomes in their area?

² Concordat between COSLA and the Scottish Government 2007
Being more ambitious in SOA targets and indicators

One of the chief criticisms levelled at Scottish Local Authorities after the first iterations of the SOA drafting process were complete was the lack of ambition manifest in many of the outcomes and indicators set down by local authorities. For example one local authority set the following target on homelessness resettlement:

*Increase percentage of people assessed as homeless who are permanently re-housed (baseline 68%; target 70%).*

With targets such as these it can be argued that Local Authorities were not prepared to see the SOA as a vehicle for transformational change, opting instead to set targets that they were already on course to achieve or which, in failing, could be explained away as a statistical anomaly.

If, as with the 2009 SOA iteration, the agreement is set to last 3-4 years then Local authorities should seek to be far bolder in the indicators and targets that they set themselves. At the same time it must be recognised that some targets are far more easily achieved than others and there is only so much that a Local authority has in its power to affect demonstrable change. As such, outcomes measurement can rarely be compared on a like for like.

- How can arrangements, processes and accountability be improved?

Accountability in the concordat:

It has never been clear to what standard or level of accountability the Local authorities will be held in the execution of their SOAs. As the Concordat has defined an entirely new mechanism for the expenditure of public funds and the deployment of services it would seem odd that there was no mechanism to ensure monitoring, evaluation, quality control or accountability for progress towards those ends. There are few examples of local authorities examining the commitments they made in 2008/09 but one such Authority that did make such an analysis of its own progress between SOA iterations stated in the preamble to its 2009/12 SOA that:

"the target to increase the number [of people with disabilities] in work by 200 during 2008/09 has not been met with an increase of only 12 achieved."

Whilst it is laudable that a Local authority should be willing to publish this missed target, and should be seen as an example for others to follow, it serves to pose the question- ‘so what?’ Ultimately without any clear line of accountability threat of sanction- or adequate self monitoring mechanisms the process of setting praiseworthy local indicators as targets in SOAs in the first place comes into danger of being rendered meaningless. Whilst the above shortfall is likely to be a direct result of the recession and covers an area of expenditure which (apart from More Choices More Chances money) was not
otherwise ring-fenced, similar targets for previously ring fenced expenditure may very well likely fall short of aspiration in the future.

If a local authority is shown to persistently under-perform in achieving the targets indicators and outcomes it has set itself in pursuit of its commitment to the 15 national outcomes (the agreement which ultimately underpins the concordat), there must come a point at which the government withholds sign off on its single outcome agreement as being unrealistic or too ambitious- yet such a process is not clearly defined.

The premium attached to Single Outcome Agreements will be further devalued, particularly if it can be shown that neither the single outcome agreement nor the process by which it was arrived has led to any actual or meaningful change in the direction of funds spent by the local authority. If such a devaluation were to occur then it is likely that Single Outcome Agreements would very quickly become irrelevant to local authorities in terms intent or expenditure and would in turn become obsolete. Greater clarity is therefore needed to demonstrate the link between the setting of targets and indicators and the movement of funds. SOAs need to reflect the 15 National Outcomes and associated Indicators, which arguably should also comprehensively reflect overarching policy and practice drivers. In Social Care and Education these are programmes such as GIRFEC, Better Health, Better Care, Equally Well and The Early Years Framework. It appears challenging to make that link at local level within SOAs, particularly when health boards etc. have different boundaries, which can lead to duplication and lack of clarity in resourcing and delivering public services. Similarly cross cutting developments such as “parenting strategies” get lost through fragmentation, and individual local authority interest can overshadow better return on national investment.

We hope that partnerships such as the Dundee model mentioned above following an initial review, may attract sufficient confidence from local government and other funders to grant long term funding which will enable evidence-based activity that may demonstrate how changes in processes can impact on child outcomes.. We can evidence results from existing services and developments, often qualitative ones using soft indicators supported by output information, and are keen to evidence longitudinal change supported by measurable and quantifiable outcomes which can lead to real impact within the communities our service users and services are part of.

More transparent and publicly accessible reporting on outcomes is urgently needed.

Strand 2 – Benchmarking and performance measurement

- What are the main challenges (cultural, technical, geographical or other) in developing performance measurement and benchmarking systems for local authorities across Scotland?

The main challenges in measuring performance leading to benchmarking are that there is a significant diversity in how baselines are set or identified, and
subsequently how information and/or data is gathered. Local authorities vary in size and in structure, and have very different priorities related to geography, rural versus urban environments, demographics, and indicators and how they are set. Even “national” indicators such as “the index of multiple deprivation” are used in different ways depending on the driver within the local authority, initiative or service it is used to inform.

For Aberlour we know that there are many ways to “improve the lives of Scotland’s children and young people” as our strap line suggests. Addressing basic need may well deliver a short term positive outcome, but will not necessarily lead to longer term impact. For that we have to be bold and not only sustain service delivery beyond a what is for us now “standard” maximum three year or so term of commissioning; but also allow services to become part of a local system which can facilitate longer term impact as partners grow together and consider systems change. As we know less than 15% of health outcomes can be attributed to health services (Stephen Woolf, 2007) Engineers in the 19th century who built the means to deliver clean water arguably had the greatest influence in our well-being (Michael Little- 2011)

Within “Changing Lives” it was recognised that “change is required not only for financial reasons, but because people want and expect choice over the type of support they access; they want flexibility, independence and control. Our systems and services need to reflect these aspirations” The voluntary sector has a solid track record in engaging with service users, and organisations such as Aberlour can support the Local Authority and CPP agenda in accessing information and collaboration from service users on challenges and how to overcome them. Using innovative techniques looking at service design (IRISS conference 2011) can include development of performance measurement at various levels.

There are evidence based programmes such as the Nurse-Family Partnership which have produced good results. There are many initiatives within children and young people’s services which have shown promise, (e.g. Youth Crime Prevention Intervention Fund, Sure Start partnerships) but few of these have succeeded in becoming part of a “system”, as there has been more emphasis on looking at outputs of the associated expenditure than at outcomes and impact. The Violence Reduction Unit has shown to make a difference within a Glasgow context; yet the approach and its outcomes are not replicated as part of a young people’s system anywhere else. Wheels are frequently reinvented, yet Scotland because of its size and relatively positive partnerships should have the potential to agree a set of standard datasets to support the 15 National Outcomes.

We would argue that the case for this needs to be debated and agreed by representatives of COSLA, ADSW, CCPS, SCVO and representation from the “bigger” charities such as Aberlour and its 4 “big 5” colleagues as well as a similar structure within adult charities.

**Strand 3 – Developing new ways of delivering services**
How can cultural and organisational change be promoted to ensure that local authorities and community planning partners are able to work together to develop the kind of integrated services that are aspired to by local communities?

Changes to Tendering and procurement may be required

The forthcoming ‘Sustainable Procurement Bill’, presents an opportunity to address a number of issues in the commissioning environment which currently can act as a barrier to working together in a fully integrated capacity.

Aberlour would question whether tendering is the best way for service purchasers to ensure that they achieve Best Value. While we can understand and accept the need to ensure that services are procured in an objective and effective manner, we question whether tendering is the most effective means of achieving this. The points below highlight whether this resource-intensive process is the right way of procuring social care services and the information given below demonstrates that the way that the process is applied by some purchasers exacerbates inherent inefficiencies.

Different purchasers have different thresholds for procurement requiring a tendering process. There are examples of purchasers using exactly the same process and requiring the same information for tenders of widely varying values. We believe that procurement processes should always be proportionate to the value and strategic importance of service being purchased.

Tendering remains a very inconsistent and at times frustrating task with organisations like our own regularly encountering a range of problems and barriers. European Procurement Regulations require. The “application of objective criteria in tendering and award procedures”3 . In many cases, local authorities will prefer to provide services in house where possible and will accept tender bids from internal departments that do not accurately reflect the fact that management costs are carried by the centre - thereby making it possible for them to undercut other providers without accurately reflecting the true cost of their provision to the authority.

Commissioning teams frequently take major decisions pertaining to services and tender design. This often appears to be without any consultation with operational staff. In many cases, tendering is seen as a means of saving money rather than achieving Best Value with cost appearing to be the paramount factor and continuity or quality of service coming well behind. Aberlour provides services for some of Scotland’s’ most vulnerable children and their families. For them, the prospect of a new provider coming in and taking over the services they have relied upon for many years purely on the basis of cost can be hugely destabilising.

Voluntary organisations such as Aberlour are encouraged to form partnerships or even consortiums when bidding for targeted funds with other

---

3 Guide to the Community Rules on Public Procurement of Services - Directive 92/50/EEC
voluntary organisations. Tendering processes directly encourage market place competition. It is not unlikely that organisations may be considering a pooling of resources to deliver in one service area, whilst working in direct competition to that same partner for another piece of work.

**Tendering Timescales:** Aberlour is concerned at the lack of advance notice of Invitations to tender and the short timescales allowed to complete and return tender applications, even during holiday periods and a general failure to understand the complex activity that is being specified. Typically, this will be between two and four weeks, but has been even less than two weeks. Six weeks would be an exception. Such little time is afforded in the tender process that very little can be done by potential bidders to properly consider service design or to explore partnership opportunities with other service providers. The advantage of this would be that the skills and experience of various organisations could be brought together to the benefit of service users. It is our strong view that these very short timescales militate against the provision of Best Value services by failing to allow the necessary time to adequately assure or demonstrate value for money.

At the other end of the process, once the tenders are submitted there are often significant delays before purchasers proceed with the selection process. There is a feeling that purchasers do not apply the same timescales to their parts of the process that they require of potential providers.

- **How can the tensions between shared services creating savings through potential reductions in the number of staff involved and the economic impact brought about by any resulting job losses be resolved?**

**Shared services beyond staff reduction:**

Sharing services don’t always have to entail a reduction in staff and there are many aspects of a shared service approach that can be undertaken without the tension of reducing staff numbers such as collocation or building collaboration into any new project or framework.

Adequately embracing the shared service agenda and optimising the impact of technology and new ways of working can yield significant recurrent annual savings (Some Local authorities have reported savings of between 35-40% in back office costs from sharing services) primarily achieved through:

- Reduced management costs
- Greater transactional efficiency
- Better deployment of high cost expertise
- Channel shift (from paper processes to on-line self-service)
- Automated processes
- Improved knowledge management

There can be considerable benefit to more collaborative approaches in business development projects by bringing teams from across the public, private and voluntary sectors, particularly in new experimental work.
• How can any legislative or institutional barriers to developing shared and innovative service delivery models to their full potential be overcome?

Market tensions preventing the sharing of services between providers

Local Authority’s are increasingly being called upon to look to a shared service model for the delivery of services, as such; they are not unreasonably looking to service providers and asking questions as to the lack of shared services amongst providers. A dichotomy exists in the commissioning landscape which creates a natural barrier to the sharing of services between service providers. At once collaboration is encouraged but at the same time new contracts are put out to tender, or existing services are put out for re-tender and depending on the contract on offer, we can be asked to submit a collaborative or competitive bid with/against another third sector provider. In a competitive market, this means an adequate sharing of back room services between providers exceptionally difficult.

• Is there scope for further national shared services along the lines of the shared recruitment portal for local authorities, ‘myjobscotland’?

A common information requirements portal for purchasing local authorities:

Most tender applications require applicants to provide a huge range of background information about their organisation. In most cases, the purchaser already has this information from the purchaser, in the form of other tenders or information supplied to achieve Approved Provider status or for Contract Monitoring purposes. Often, the Care Inspectorate will also have this information. The repeated provision of the same information is wasteful of scarce resources.

We believe that it would be sensible that providers had only to provide this information once and that there should be a central point or portal of contact in Scotland responsible for approving the provider. All agencies could be assured that this had been done to the appropriate standards (and was being regularly reviewed). This would result in a significant saving of resources for all parties.

• What can be learned from elsewhere, for example from initiatives such as the Nottingham Early Intervention City or the Birmingham total place pilot?

The argument was that the prevailing paradigm for public service improvement had been a top-down model. National targets had been set, delivery chains established, and large amounts of money had been pushed down the resulting command and control structures to achieve change at ground level. This linear model was recognised as coming to an end, and within the Nottingham, Birmingham and Croydon Total Place models the joining up of
multi-agency teams around the service user(s), co-designing services with citizens and their own support networks have had significant success.

As argued before: Aberlour has a good track record in designing services around the user(s), needs-led as opposed to service-led, and believe the model of “place based” leadership which supersedes individual organisations and functions such as our Dundee work and recent D&G service, using strengths from the partners, including users, and positively recognising each other’s contribution is a worthwhile aim. This cannot be achieved overnight, nor can this be done without resourcing local authority partnerships or CPP’s to enable the model to be investigated, made fit for purpose to our Scottish context, and most importantly ensuring appropriate representation at all levels. No animals should be deemed more equal than others within this ambition; and investment must be guaranteed to support the process.

Within Total Place, a “systems change” model, there is a clear recognition of the importance of the Early Years preventative agenda; we are not far removed in Scotland with our strategy; however preventative must also apply in other areas, e.g. leaving care.

- **What scope is there for developing ways of delivering services, such as the personalisation of care, in order to mitigate the effects of shrinking resources while also promoting improved standards of care?**

**Self directed support and service delivery**

Though Self Directed Support will bring many benefits, and enable independent living, choice and dignity to many, we must be cautious of putting to much store in the personalisation of care agenda as a potential panacea to reducing care costs. Whilst the personalisation agenda empowers service users, it can also reduce their access to choice as they potentially lose access to economies of scale brought about by group commissioning. With the inevitable rise in self-directed support, the key to meeting the needs of customers and service users is to engage them early on in the service design and personalisation process. Similarly, uptake of Self Directed Support is more prevalent in certain groups of care recipients such as older people and those in receipt of adult services. In some cases the most vulnerable of families, particularly where parents are providing round the clock care to a profoundly disabled child, find the prospect of managing their own care budget a daunting prospect. Local Authorities must be mindful that in these cases, mainstream commissioning will need to continue.
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Social enterprises are businesses that trade for social and/or environmental purposes. They operate in all markets, selling goods and services to local authorities, central government, private businesses and individual consumers.

Social Enterprises exist to make a profit just like any private sector business. However instead of paying dividends to shareholders any profits or surpluses they make are reinvested into social and environmental purposes; for example providing employment opportunities to the long term unemployed. Without making a profit social enterprises cannot meet their social and environmental objectives; they must trade, to be sustainable.

The scope of social enterprise across Scotland is significant. They work across many sectors, in particular those areas that are of most interest to the public sector, such as childcare, regeneration, culture, employability, environmental management, healthcare, housing, social care, sport, tourism, transport, waste and recycling and welfare services.

The more-than-profit approach is used by a hugely diverse range of organisations. Below are some of common types of social enterprise.

Cooperatives and mutuals - Cooperatives and mutuals are democratically-owned businesses which give employees, customers or members a stake in the business.

Credit Unions - Credit unions are a distinct type of co-operative which provides financial services to members, often in areas of social and financial exclusion but offering financial products to everyone.

Housing Associations - Housing Associations are voluntarily-managed companies providing affordable housing for rent and for sale. They give priority to those in greatest need and reinvest any surplus income in maintaining or adding to their housing stock. Many Housing Associations also support other forms of social enterprise through ‘Wider Role’ community regeneration activity.

Social Firms - Social Firms are commercial businesses that provide integrated employment for people with disabilities or other disadvantages in the work place.

Development Trusts - Development trusts are community run organisations that are concerned with the economic, social, environmental and cultural needs of their community. They are owned and managed by the local community and aim to generate income through trading activity that enables them to move away from dependency on grant support.
Community Interest Companies - CIC's are limited companies created for the use of people who want to conduct a business or other activity for community benefit, and not purely for private advantage.

2.0 Why social enterprise and public services?

Social Enterprise Scotland welcomes this call for written evidence. Our organisation is member-led and we are consistently engaged with our membership in order to respond to consultations and to directly inform research. Within the context of public sector reform, we believe that a complementary and fundamental review of public services reform is timely and necessary, in light of the ambitions set out in the Christie Commission report. None of us needs reminding that because of financial constraints there is a real urgency to the reform agenda.

In terms of the 'public service ethos' social enterprises are natural partners to the public sector. The value placed on a culture of equality and fairness and a commitment to social responsibility is something we both hold in common. Social enterprises often support the most vulnerable and those with multiple and complex needs and they work on supporting and empowering individuals and communities. We believe that prevention is better than cure when it comes to the role of public services in supporting the needs of the most excluded people. Social enterprises are the best example of what we mean by 'localism', being locally run and locally accountable.

As explained above, the sector works with a variety of different models and range of delivery vehicles. This approach of diverse solutions and rejecting a one-size-fits-all approach to services is, we believe, of great value in terms of public service solutions. We believe that public services need this innovation and that services should be local and directly involve the community.

We believe in - and practice - a preventative approach, when it comes to the delivery of services and improving lives across Scotland. There needs to be a shift in culture in order to implement and measure preventative spending in councils. This also needs to include a shift in what we mean by ‘public service’.

The social enterprise sector is well used to working in partnership with others in the public and private sectors and in delivering services in new and innovative ways. In order for the public sector to reform, remain sustainable and develop capacity, then working in collaboration with social enterprises is essential. We believe that the current public sector financial constraints and wider economic issues are a unique opportunity for radical reform.
According to Social Enterprise Scotland / Ipsos Mori research, the evidence is that the public place a high value on community benefits when it comes to the public sector procuring goods and services, the very ethos of social enterprise. Awareness of social enterprise continues to rise.

### 1 Knowledge and awareness of social enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness of social enterprises among people in Scotland has increased. Over seven in ten (71%) people now say they know at least something about social enterprise (compared to 65% in February 2010). There has been a slight increase in the proportion of people in Scotland who say they know at least a fair amount about social enterprises.

### 2 When Government and public sector organisations buy goods and services from suppliers, which should be most important in their decision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aug 2010</th>
<th>Feb 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting the job done at the lowest price</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that the supplier passes on some additional benefits to the local community</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Though this figure is still high there has been a reduction from 71% to 69% which we believe is due to the impact of recession.
4.0 Strand 1 - Partnerships and Outcomes

Social Enterprise Scotland is best placed to answer Strand 1 of the call for written evidence. Please also see Appendix 1 for the new local government manifesto from Social Enterprise Scotland, of direct relevance to many of the issues raised in this consultation. The manifesto contains seven specific policies that councils could implement to improve outcomes for their communities.

Social enterprises are already delivering services on the ground across Scotland’s communities and working in partnership with local authorities and the wider public sector. However, we know from the direct experience of our members that public services could be transformed if social enterprises had the right environment to deliver more and better services.

The Christie Commission Report and the report from the Scottish Parliament Finance Committee Inquiry into preventative spending examined how public services should focus more on preventing social problems arising rather than reacting to crises once they have occurred. We ask that you use these reports to promote preventative spending and local, community-based social enterprises as the foundation for all future public service delivery.

A lot of strategic policy is determined at a local level, alongside Third Sector bodies, and it is vital that there are strong connections and positive working relationships.

Strand 1 - To examine the ongoing development of community planning partnerships and the community planning process and assess how these could be built upon to support outcome-based approaches to service planning and delivery in local areas.

How could councils better integrate their partners into the process? How could the degree of commitment to the process amongst other community planning partners be improved? How can any legislative or administrative barriers that make partnership working more difficult be overcome? How can the partners further improve on the progress that has been made and overcome the remaining challenges on engaging communities and voluntary sector organisations in the process?

There is much good work and partnership good practice across Scotland’s local authority areas. However, there needs to be a shift in the culture and working practices of many local authorities, to a point where innovation in service delivery and exploring new ideas and new partnerships i.e. with social enterprises is the norm. There also needs to be recognition that social enterprise is distinct from other parts of the third sector due to their enterprise orientation in delivering their social purpose. There is, in some parts of Scotland, an issue with regards to social enterprises being excluded from Third Sector Interface forums. If council officers could pro-actively ensure that their local social enterprises are included in all local forums, including Community Planning...
Partnerships, and actively question any lack of inclusion of social enterprise in TSIs, then this would be welcome. If social enterprises could be regularly consulted and listened to in relevant areas e.g. housing, economic development, employment creation for those with barriers to the mainstream labour market and regeneration, then this would mean better inclusion and enhanced engagement from the sector. A performance review of the CPP structures and what is and is not working would be welcomed.

**How can local authorities and their partners move further towards real, integrated working? What steps would facilitate the sharing of budgets in pursuit of shared outcomes?**

If councils could procure more often from - and commission public services in partnership with - social enterprises this would directly involve closer and better working relationships and benefit both sides. Social enterprises do not expect preferential treatment; rather, we are working with government at all levels within the procurement reform programme to support a level playing field for social enterprises. This area is something that is developing as the public sector seeks to embrace preventative spending and reform and we urge councils to take this agenda forward. This can be done by prioritising community benefit and Community Benefit clauses in contracts, in turn leading to the wider social impacts that social enterprise can bring - a positive reduction in the use of local public services, better outcomes for service users and much closer partnership working. CBCs could cover targeted recruitment and training (TR&T), equal opportunities, training existing workforces, supply chain initiatives and community consultation. We would urge every local authority, if not already in place, to identify a community benefit champion within their authority to ensure the council promote and implement obligations under the Sustainable Procurement Action Plan and more precisely, in preparation for the Scottish Government’s introduction of a Sustainable Procurement Bill.

The function of social enterprises in designing and commissioning services through Public Social Partnerships should be rolled out. Social and environmental outcomes can be achieved alongside financial efficiency this way, where Third Sector organisations work with public sector purchasers. We call on councils to look at reforming public service design to involve end users and providers, as improved quality can be built around the needs of people and communities. We need a continuous programme of Public Social Partnerships to deliver a radical new approach to quality service design. In relation to this we must also identify solutions to the barriers presented by TUPE arrangements in relation to public sector pension fund deficits.

In addition to this is the issue of community ownership of public assets. Sustainable communities can be created through social enterprise and community-owned and run development trusts. We believe the promotion of community ownership of public sector assets through social enterprise delivery can underpin the economic and social cohesion of communities, delivering local skills and local jobs. Social enterprise plays an important role in regeneration and this should be recognised. Public asset transfer.
delays must be addressed and we need to restore momentum in the land reform agenda.

**How can the community planning arrangements be adapted and developed to promote outcomes-based and preventative approaches?**

Local strategies should be developed and implemented around preventative spend approaches reflecting local need and communities of place and interest. A commitment to taking an ‘invest to save’ approach should be reflected in CPP structures and strategies, in consultation with local third sector interfaces, including local social enterprises.

**How is the work of delivery on SOA outcomes managed, coordinated and driven through the various community partnership structures and agreements? How could Single Outcome Agreements be improved to deliver on community planning targets?**

SOAs should be developed after effective and inclusive consultation with Third Sector Interfaces, but TSIs must all include social enterprise networks and based on hard evidence of need locally.

**What is the purpose of a Single Outcome Agreement in assisting the delivery of improved outcomes? How are local Single Outcome Agreements developed, and how do they relate to national priorities?**

National priorities e.g. youth unemployment and the impact of welfare reform on the most vulnerable individuals and communities should be reflected in local SOAs. This should be with key performance indicators and cross-sector partnerships to improve outcomes through planned interventions. This will require flexibility and potentially the reform of budgets and budget allocations.

**How could local authorities and other public bodies contribute more to influencing and improving outcomes in their area?**

Adopt outcomes based commissioning and ‘invest to save’ approaches, thereby encouraging third sector and social enterprise communities into the debate. Testing new delivery options through social enterprises and public social partnerships could provide opportunities for service users to be at the heart of the service design process and through the evaluation process, in measuring results. In addition, increased adoption of community benefit clauses into tenders, including generic spend allocations will result in improved outcomes, impacts and efficiencies.

**How can arrangements, processes and accountability be improved?**

Greater transparency around how local priorities/SOAs and spend allocations are arrived at would be welcome.
5.0 How social enterprises are already adding value to public services

Examples of projects, services, innovations or improvement work.

Social enterprises across Scotland have direct experience in the operation of public services and public services can be transformed through these businesses. The added value that social enterprises deliver in providing quality public services can be significant. There is also the possibility of making savings in public finances. There are many ways in which public agencies and local authorities can work with social enterprises to achieve social and environmental benefits for the communities they serve. The impact of growing and trading with local social enterprises can bring significant gains for local economic growth and help boost jobs. There are also many opportunities that can be gained from more informal ways of working together. With a better public sector framework social enterprise can deliver even more.

Case studies of success from across Scotland

Community benefit...Commonwealth Games 2014 - The use of Community Benefit clauses for the building of the Velodrome for the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow provided an opportunity to submit a tender to operate an on-site catering facility serving 500 workers. Unity Enterprise was invited to set up the operation after a tender process exclusively involving social enterprises. While the main building contractor assisted with setting up the accommodation, Unity Enterprise had to make a considerable investment in equipment and infrastructure. To date the operation has enabled Unity Enterprise to employ 10 people, some of whom have been unemployed for some time, while the opportunity also allowed Unity to provide employment and training opportunities for some of their current service users. The agreement is to last over the next few years until the site is completed and this experience and good track record of delivery has enabled Unity Enterprise to bid for and win other tenders for similar work.

Partnerships with the public sector...Kibble - Scotland’s national specialist provider of services for high-risk and high-dependency young people. Working closely with Scottish and local government, Kibble’s model of care has been designed and developed to focus on the long-term outcomes for looked-after children. Given the complexity of needs of the young people, and the requirement for high levels of appropriately-qualified staff, they actively recognise the importance of engaging with councils and other public bodies to help them plan how they use specialist provision.

SROI...Impact Arts Fab Pad Project, North Ayrshire - Impact Arts is a national community arts organisation. It has pioneered “the Fab Pad concept” across Scotland, using art as a catalyst for positive change in people’s lives. Fab Pad was developed to work with vulnerable people when they took on a tenancy. The project has been funded by Communities Scotland, North Ayrshire Council and North Ayrshire Community Planning Partnership, and actively supported by Cunninghame Housing Association.
The report identified reductions in repeat homelessness for participants in the project, including reduced tenancy support costs, improved health and well-being of participants and greater family stability, reduced agency support and increased training and employment. The report also demonstrated a strong business case for landlords to involve Fab Pad in supporting tenants at the start of their tenancy, to reduce tenancy turnover and anti-social behaviour, and an increased ability to meet rental obligations. The analysis estimates social added value in 2006/07 was £711,788. The results suggest that for every £1 that has been invested in the North Ayrshire Fab Pad project, a social return on investment of £8.38 has been realised.

**Growth in recession...Dundee International Women' Centre (DIWC)** - employed the equivalent of four and a half full time staff and had a turnover of £144,845 just over four years ago; to date they now employ nine full time and 28 part-time staff with a turnover of £463,591. This increase happened during a period of recession. A combination of vision, innovation and drive, mixed with DIWC’s long standing values and need for financial sustainability resulted in the launch of two social enterprises. Rise & Shine Childcare and Wooden Spoon Catering were launched. Both businesses are heralded in Dundee and its environs as two of the most successful thriving social enterprise businesses that reflect good practice.

**Case studies to demonstrate the need for reform**

**Tackling wrong perceptions of social enterprise** - an agency could have chosen a social firm (under Article 19 of EU rules) to deliver a service, which would have had much greater long-term benefits and resulted in work for about a dozen people who were otherwise hard to employ. Instead they decided to put the contract out to commercial tender because they saw the social enterprise approach as riskier and probably more expensive in the short term.

**Resistance to improving services** - a council could have given a contract to a social enterprise, or even put the currently in-house service out to competition using community benefit clauses, achieving better outcomes over and above delivery of the service itself. However, inertia and a desire to protect the jobs of the current workforce, regardless of efficiency and public value, meant that the council has shelved plans to do this. This saves some jobs in the council, and safeguards the manager's position, but is not in the interests of the public, the service delivery and the wider society.

**6.0 Conclusion**

Social Enterprise Scotland believes that social enterprise should be firmly placed at the heart of public sector reform in Scotland, occupying a new space between the public and private sectors and with grassroots participation. Social enterprises should be a non-negotiable feature of public service design and delivery.
These social businesses should remain independent from local authorities but be given the support to achieve sustainable growth. The economic situation now provides a real opportunity for an imaginative transformation of public services. There remains considerable suspicion in the public sector about the social enterprise model, however, as engagement increases, we believe this will change.

Scotland needs to take a longer term view of public sector reform and consider what our services will look like in five, ten and even thirty years time. Will the services we get continue to be led by the suppliers or will consumers and purchasers get increased power through choice of provision/supplier?

In an age of outcomes the time for social enterprise has arrived. We very much look forward to engaging with local authorities and the wider public sector in delivering good value and high quality public services.

Finally, we need the levers to achieve real culture change for long term reform and to tackle the entrenched views of how the state should deliver public services to its citizens - putting service users and communities at the heart of it.

Appendix 1 - Social Enterprise Manifesto for Local Government

Below are the key sections from our local government election manifesto for the May 2012 elections. These key policies were formulated after direct consultation with the members of Social Enterprise Scotland.

Introduction - Councils and social enterprises in partnership

We have a vision of partnership. Local authorities hold power over many key areas of activity that affect our innovative social enterprises, other businesses and third sector organisations. Social enterprises offer positive social impact and huge economic potential and already work well with many local authorities across Scotland. Working in partnership with our councils is the aim of the social enterprise community and we fully understand our responsibilities to positively engage and promote our work. By implementing real preventative spending - procuring from and contracting with community-based social enterprises, a council can see wide-ranging social impacts, local economic growth and positive reductions in use of public services. We don’t need to spend more - we need to innovate and transform. If political parties and councils adopt the policies in this manifesto they will begin to see a radical transformation in their communities - and better lives for everyone in tough times.

Policies

1 A full social enterprise strategy in every council - Each local authority to adopt a strong, comprehensive growth and support strategy that directly involves social
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 enterprises in the process and supports preventative spending - guaranteeing a partnership approach. Good practice case study: The City of Glasgow.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Procurement and Community Benefit clauses - Incentivise council departments to prioritise community benefit in all contracts and radically simplify the procurement process, ensuring that everyone gains from public services - boosting the huge social impact of the sector and increasing the potential for local economic growth. Good practice case study: Unity Enterprise, catering and the 2014 Commonwealth Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Business Rates Relief and social investment - For all councils to offer and widely publicise rates relief for social enterprises and other third sector organisations - allowing them more financial freedom to boost the added value they bring to the community. To also explore new ways in which to boost local social investment. Good practice case study: The Melting Pot, Edinburgh and City of Edinburgh Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Asset transfer, buildings and land - To utilise the full, underused resources of councils for community benefit, by transferring all types of properties and land to social enterprises for free or nominal rates - and have a strategy to support easy, straightforward asset transfer. Good practice case study: Wooden Spoon Catering and Dundee City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A central role in public service reform and preventative spending - All social enterprises to have a direct voice in council decision making, where appropriate, over preventative spend and reform, reducing bureaucracy and duplication in service delivery - as well as in regeneration, economic development and housing. Good practice case study: Social Enterprise Alliance Midlothian - partnership with and support from Communities and Wellbeing division in Midlothian Council, including regeneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A real voice in local decision making - To guarantee that social enterprises can fully participate in effective Community Planning Partnerships and other local forums. That there is full engagement with Third Sector Interfaces and that barriers to participation are pro-actively broken down by council officials. Good practice case study: Clackmannanshire Third Sector Interface is central to the local Single Outcome Agreement and Change Plans, in partnership with the Council and NHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Promoting the social enterprise model - That councils promote their local social enterprises as part of the formal communications strategy. To include the benefits of the social enterprise model in service delivery, the innovative nature of social enterprise, quality of goods and services and volunteering and work experience in social enterprises - both within the local authority and to the wider community, schools and media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further details on anything contained within this document please contact:
Duncan Thorp, Parliamentary, Policy & Communications Officer
duncan.thorp@socialenterprisescotland.org.uk or 0131 243 2654
February 2012

In partnership with: Senscot
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE
PUBLIC SERVICES REFORM & LOCAL GOVERNMENT INQUIRY
STRAND 1 – PARTNERSHIPS & OUTCOMES

SUBMISSION FROM SCOTTISH MENTAL HEALTH CO-OPERATIVE (SMHC) AND LANARKSHIRE ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH (LAMH)

INTRODUCTION
The SMHC were formed in 2010 to represent the voice of smaller, more local mental health service providers throughout Scotland. Currently our membership represents nine organisations who employ over 750 staff and over 700 volunteers, supporting over 12,000 people per year with an amalgamated turnover in excess of £17m. The vast majority of our turnover is public money in the form of contracts and service level agreements.

This response is therefore reflective of our work that is in the field of adult community mental health services.

Our experiences are varied throughout the country, however the following highlights the most common and relevant themes relating to such experiences and our suggestions on improving same.

A reflection on the local Lanarkshire situation will then conclude.

BACKGROUND
Generally speaking and in keeping with Christie Commission’s recommendations we’re in favour of a move towards greater integration of health and social care services, a move towards greater choice and control for people who use public services and also a greater focus on outcomes.

In order to realise the aforementioned however, we believe the third sector needs to be recognised much more as a full and equal partner in public sector reform, certainly much greater than it has been with regards to Community Planning.

Experience
Delivering services that not necessarily involved in designing.

Suggestion
Future services are designed utilising experience, knowledge and local expertise of local third sector organisations. Community planning, SOA’s and strategic commission by public bodies affords an opportunity to better link up to improve the current situation and facilitate a more integrated and balanced approach utilising the public sector and third sector as more equal partners.

Experience
Ability to influence formation of original SOA’s and contribute to ongoing reporting, monitoring and reviewing of same have been not that successful. Likewise, we haven’t been able to readily access clear, transparent and timeous data in relation to SOA updates.
Suggestion
Local authorities need to be more transparent about the various structures that exist to promote planning, partnerships and decision making within localities. SOA reviews should involve all partners who can contribute towards their achievements. Annual reviews/reports should involve partners including the third sector.

Experience
SOA outcomes tend to focus on systems indicators that are mostly quantitative e.g. reduced hospital admissions in mental health usually mean more people are being supported in the community (possibly due to reduced beds), however what is the quality of support people receive in the community and does it meet their expressed needs?

Suggestion
A stronger emphasis on individual outcomes that are more qualitative would be beneficial. It would also be beneficial to look at wider measures such as social audit, SROI and social capital.

Experience
SOA’s and CCP’s are not always seen as something that everyone has to buy into or be ultimately involved in. Different targets for public agencies e.g. HEAT can contribute to insular based approaches to outcomes.

Suggestion
Aligning and/or sharing budgets would assist with necessary cultural change between organisations, also resulting in a more equal share of resources and ultimately power. This would also result in improved joint working, better use of resources and improved achievement of outcomes. What cross cutting themes exist that overlap between targets such as HEAT and SOA’s that could be combined to produce common outcomes and purposes.

Experience
Competitive tendering and re-tendering of services that are already delivering quality and are providing value and desirable outcomes leads to a reduction in costs to a point where quality compromised, including terms and conditions of employees. Short term funding inhibits the ability to work strategically and plan for the long term as meaningful partners.

Suggestion
Existing Health and Social Care services should only be subject to procurement where they are not meeting contractual obligations.

LANARKSHIRE
Background
As everyone will be aware we work across 2 local authority areas, North and South Lanarkshire. The following will outline our specific experiences in both areas.

Experience
3rd sector interface and supporting structures are well established as focal points for engaging relevant 3rd sector involvement in key issues within North Lanarkshire, however South Lanarkshire interface is not as mature or evolved. Recently this has been typified with information provided and subsequent opportunities to engage with
Change Fund for Older People.
Our other experiences relate to the aforementioned general experiences and I will be happy to discuss these in more detail on the day.

Hugh Cairns,
Senior Manager, LAMH
Chairperson, SMHC.
Background to BEMIS

BEMIS is the national Ethnic Minorities led umbrella body supporting the development of the Ethnic Minorities Voluntary Sector in Scotland. BEMIS was established in 2002 to promote the interest of minority ethnic voluntary organisations, to develop capacity and support inclusion and integration of ethnic minorities’ communities. It is a member-led and managed organisation with an elected board of directors.

As a strategic national infrastructure organisation, BEMIS aims to empower the diverse range of Ethnic Minority communities in Scotland by promoting inclusion, equality, human rights education and democratic active citizenship.

As such, Bemis works to ensure that ethnic minority communities are fully recognised and supported as a valued part of the Scottish multicultural civic society.

BEMIS welcomes this opportunity to respond to the ongoing development of public sector and local government reforms.

Strand 1 – Partnerships and outcomes

- How could councils better integrate their partners into the process? How could the degree of commitment to the process amongst other community planning partners be improved? How can any legislative or administrative barriers that make partnership working more difficult be overcome?

Despite the emphasis that both the Scottish Government and the Scottish Parliament have placed on consultation and engagement with civic society, there still appears to be a lack of both consultation and engagement by the public sector of members of diverse ethnic minorities.

Effective partnership working requires an equitable approach to both consultation and planning. Evidence from BEMIS\(^1\) 2009 Report on Poverty and Community Planning Survey for Ethnic Minority Communities clearly shows that race discrimination is still an issue in service delivery and may not be adequately addressed by CPPs

\(^1\) www.bemis.org.uk/publications
through their Single Outcome Agreements with the Scottish Government e.g. in terms of support for women and young people, within education and training or employment services, within work with employers or service providers, in supporting entitlements to welfare benefits, health services, and the procedures around support for asylum seekers.

The experience of respondents to this particular survey was that within diverse ethnic minority communities this discrimination is being manifested particularly within access to employment - lack of support in getting into employment, discrimination within the workplace, and low wages. Therefore the initiatives which were felt would be most effective among members of diverse ethnic minority communities were: training for people to get into employment; child care; and tackling discrimination. One way to improve this would be through an analysis of evidence collected through Equality Impact Assessments.

In addition to discrimination lack of information on rights may be one contributing factor – lack of awareness of rights as laid down in EU directives which the UK Government and Scottish Parliament have signed up to e.g. United Nations World Programme for Human Rights Education (UNWPHRE)

BEMIS recommends that:

- Councils ensure that all staff and partners that they work with are fully informed of their duties under the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) and the Equality Act (2010). This will require regular training and update sessions.
- Councils should establish standards of behaviour and an ethos of respect, reflecting shared values and promoting racial equality among staff and make provisions for any cultural needs staff or community members might have.
- Councils should make public their commitment to combat and eliminate racism (and other forms of discrimination), and put this commitment into practice.
- They should improve their responses to racism and racial harassment and provide advice and support for victims.
- Councils should organize and support events that promote diversity and understanding between communities.
- How can local authorities and their partners move further towards real, integrated working?

If the SOA, between a CPP and the Scottish Government, sets out how each will work towards improving outcomes for their local communities then these local communities should be consulted with in a variety of ways to ensure inclusivity and at each stage of the process from consultation, planning and implementation right through to the evaluation and review stages.
All partners in the CP process should have access to good quality training. We would suggest that training around cultural awareness, while useful, will not address equality issues and would recommend that training around the Equality Act 2010 should be delivered.

Councils should conduct research (Equality Impact Assessments could contribute to this) to ascertain the level of engagement from ethnic minority communities, identify the reasons and barriers around lack of engagement and make recommendations that will instigate change.

Integrated working can be further developed through joint training sessions for all involved in the CPP process - using expertise within and outwith the partnerships; use of World Café style for inter-agency training and informal learning sessions; develop shared visions and objectives; job shadowing and secondment opportunities between sectors and agencies; information sharing

- How can the partners further improve on the progress that has been made and overcome the remaining challenges on engaging communities and voluntary sector organisations in the process?

With regards to community planning there is still much work to be done to further improve the engagement of the diverse range of BME communities.

BEMIS recommends that the diversity of BME communities is recognised and that particular groups are not homogenized e.g. there will be a huge range of skills and experiences and beliefs within the A8 migrant community or within the Scottish/Asian community. Assumptions should not be made based on stereotyping and inaccurate media reporting.

Attempts should be made to ensure community engagement and representation. In doing so, you may wish to consider the following questions. Are the same people being selected over and over again? Are these people in touch with and able to represent the local community? Does each group have the necessary, up to date skills and knowledge within it to act as gatekeepers? Does this group have a clear and distinct remit?

- How can the community planning arrangements be adapted and developed to promote outcomes-based and preventative approaches?

It is unclear what is meant by ‘preventative approaches’. Will these approaches involve interventions and positive action strategies? The role of CPP requires to be further explored in order to ensure that it is outcome focused. BEMIS has found that communities tend to disengage and under invest their commitment to civic participation roles when:

- They feel excluded
- Their issues and voices are not addressed according to their needs, or
• When their voice is replaced by proclaimed representatives and detached consultations.

BEMIS recommends that in order to promote outcomes – based community planning arrangements consideration should be given to:

• Investing and enhancing inter – agency working and training on outcome focused planning
• Investing in similar training for ethnic minority communities and for community groups in general
• The role of CPP should be explored in relation to issues of poverty and discrimination amongst the ethnic minority communities
• Raise awareness of Human Rights Education and Democratic Active Citizenship and utilize this as a core component in community cohesion and engagement

Strand 2 – Benchmarking and performance measurement

Given BEMIS’ unique position within the BEM and cultural community sector our focus in replying to the various aspects of this consultation will inevitably focus on those communities’ experiences in relation to engagement by, and with, public local authorities. Whilst recognising that there is a genuine commitment on the part of public bodies to the concept of Equality BEMIS is of the opinion that it is clear from the experiences of the minorities’ community that this is not always reflected in either the monitoring or practice in a consistent way.

What are the main challenges (cultural, technical, geographical or other) in developing performance measurement and benchmarking systems for local authorities across Scotland?

Recent research work by BEMIS has resulted in the gathering of evidence that there is good practice by upwards of a third of public sector agencies across Scotland in terms of strategic planning frameworks geared to meeting the duty “to eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote equality of opportunity and good race relations between people of different racial groups.” An assessment of evidence given of good practice across all indicators of engagement identified seven local authorities and three police forces in particular.

To what extent has the work undertaken over the last two years by the Improvement Service, SOLACE and others contributed to developing a common approach to benchmarking across Scotland’s local authorities?

In general, the police forces across Scotland provided evidence of consistency in terms of established and transparent frameworks with clear systems for monitoring, evaluating and review. There was a broader variation among Local Authorities, and within different departments within local authorities and the level of informed knowledge and quality of engagement varied considerably. There
was in some cases evidence that, where one service department was leading effectively on this area of work, staff in other departments or at a corporate level might be less informed because they were less involved.

Unfortunately given that only two health boards responded it is difficult to make any assessment of standards of engagement by health boards across Scotland. Both these health boards serve primarily rural populations and both provide evidence of partnership working across public sector agencies in rural communities.

Community Profiling Indicator: Area profile of ethnic minority population; list of voluntary sector organisations; list of ethnic minority community venues; workforce profile; profile of service users

10 local authorities and 3 police forces had access to all five types of community profile data. Current profiles of service users by ethnicity are good indicators of use of profile data for monitoring engagement of service users. 20 reported collecting data on service users by ethnicity - 15 local authorities of which 4 are rural authorities.

BEMIS believes that having access to this type of information however does not necessarily result in a broader range of engagement with ethnic minority communities than agencies with access to less detailed profile data. However it does suggest that access to good quality information can contribute to targeting of initiatives. Agencies in rural Scotland are disadvantaged by restrictions on release of census data at a local level, but there may also be a reluctance to collect such information for reasons of confidentiality. A current concern, particularly in rural areas, is the need to accurately estimate the size and trends in the migrant worker population from Eastern Europe and how that may influence CPPs and SOAs.

What technical or other resources are needed to continue and complete the development of recent work on benchmarking? How can the development of benchmarking help improve the performance of local authorities in Scotland?

BEMIS acknowledges that there may well be a dichotomy between the NPF and SOAs in terms of measurement and benchmarking, if not in objectives and outcomes but in methodology, because of the National/Local differences in approach and this may well extend to the ways in which the partner organisations in any given CPP work. BEMIS believes that there is considerable potential in exploring the development of a national “Impact Assessment tool kit”, similar in purpose to the EQIA tool(s) as a universally useable ‘benchmarking assessment’. The model used in developing the EQIAs, involving relevant partner organisations would perhaps be the best way forward in relation to benchmarking.
Should the Scottish Government have a role in providing national impetus to the development of benchmarking and performance measurement?

BEMIS believes that if some uniformity is to be introduced to CPPs in terms of benchmarking there has to be a nationally driven impetus to developing a benchmarking impact assessment toolkit. Perhaps, following on from the EQIA partnership model, Government could take the lead, working in partnership with SOLAS, CoSLA, business and the Third Sector.

To what extent can the developing work on benchmarking be extended across community planning partnerships?

BEMIS is supportive of the localism agenda in relation to CPPs but believes that if their success is to be assessed effectively there has to be a nationally agreed tool used to measure progress. Using one nationally agreed toolkit could provide that uniform measurement tool.

How can data derived from benchmarking influence the future direction of community planning and the contents of future SOAs?

BEMIS believes that, as with most datasets, it could be used to inform and improve practice at both local and national levels.

**Strand 3 – Developing new ways of delivering services**

To examine progress in relation to the development of shared services and other innovative ways of achieving economies of scale and harnessing the strengths and skills of key public sector partners to deliver the best possible quality services in local areas.

Key questions for this strand of the inquiry:

- How can cultural and organisational change be promoted to ensure that local authorities and community planning partners are able to work together to develop the kind of integrated services that are aspired to by local communities?

All aspects of Community Planning should be collaborative- consultation, planning, implementation, evaluation, review….etc. and this should be done in an equitable and respectful way ensuring that there is no hierarchy and all partners have an equal stake in the planned work. This may require a cultural shift in the way that Local Authorities and CP partners work. If the balance of power is seen to lie with one partner then this will affect the partnership – it will not be equal.

Partnership goals through the SOA are likely to have a positive impact for all communities.
Opportunities should be created for Inter Agency working where LA staff and other agencies share knowledge and practice. True collaborative working will work best when those involved have built good working relationships and have a respect for each other’s organisation.

- How can the tensions between shared services creating savings through potential reductions in the number of staff involved and the economic impact brought about by any resulting job losses be resolved?

It is unfortunate that this model of working is being introduced at this time of austerity measures and within a general climate of fear. The model of working is likely to be associated with rationalization rather than with delivering the best outcomes for the community. All stakeholders have a responsibility to work together to change the culture, eliminate the ‘fear’ culture and ensure adequate measures of the impact of their work are in place and used to inform the process.

- How can any legislative or institutional barriers to developing shared and innovative service delivery models to their full potential be overcome?

Firstly you should investigate whether the barriers are actual or perceived. The main barriers are likely to be around issues of discrimination, child protection, confidentiality and work roles and remits. All staff will have to comply with the law and with policies. That’s a good starting point – is everyone aware of their duties and responsibilities? Is there a shared vision of where the CPP is going and of the SOA?

- What can be learned from elsewhere, for example from initiatives such as the Nottingham Early Intervention City or the Birmingham total place pilot?

In 2009 BEMIS wrote a report on their ²Poverty and Community Planning Survey for Ethnic Minority Communities. In order to explore engagement with the community planning process and with community planning partners, respondents were asked a number of questions around their awareness, level of engagement and support for tackling locally some of the root causes of poverty and inequalities. Almost three quarters said that the main barrier to engagement by diverse ethnic minority communities was “not knowing enough about community planning.” Examples of barriers were lack of dedicated support for engagement of ethnic minorities, lack of openness to new views and lack of time amongst those employed.

BEMIS would like to suggest that the recommendations in this report be taken forward in order to enhance the CPP experience for ethnic minority communities.

² www.bemis.org.uk/publications
The problem of the invisible “for-what”

- **Engender** is a 20+ year old feminist information, research and training organisation that works to make Scotland a fairer, safer place where women can flourish and contribute to both the social and market economies with dignity, freedom, and justice. To this end we seek to increase women’s power and influence; make visible the impact of sexism on women and on Scotland’s social, economic and political development; and support people, organisations and our government to make equality a reality.

The following outlines the overarching issues that Engender invites the Committee to consider in its enquiry.

- **Reform for what?** Engender supports the objective of community planning partnerships and in particular the principle of subsidiarity. We are alarmed at the current shrinking of the public sector at a time when it is needed most, and we lament the quantities of women (who make up 70% of public sector employees) losing jobs as we speak.

We see public sector reform as one of the key drivers of the systemic changes needed to address the ever-growing inequalities in the Scottish nation and in its communities, and we see community planning as the local mechanism. We are convinced that our communities will support a change process with social and economic justice as its agenda, but we fear that community planning has made little progress toward that system change.

- **Problems with outcomes.** The failure to ground community planning partnerships (CPPs) in outcomes for change has led to a process focus that replicates existing systemic inequities in “new” processes. The outcome of healthier, more equal (“fairer”) communities has never been embedded, and the processes have become the outcomes.

Perfectly worthy ambitions, such as a closer match between resources and need, local participation bringing local ownership and community cohesion, joined-up services, have been laid over a ground of inequality of opportunity and of outcome for women, for people living in poverty, for people living with disability, and so on. The failure to identify the drivers of poverty and inequality as central
to community change and community planning has reproduced local process rife with inequality.

- **Problems with processes.** As mentioned, the current lack of progress reflects the confusion between better processes (joined-up work, devolved responsibility, ‘community’ participation) and better outcomes. The implementation of community planning and the leaders of CPPs consistently fail to ask the right questions about those processes (e.g., who *needs* to participate to change the outcomes?; who needs to benefit from services to reduce unequal access?, how do we re-design community leadership so that the previously disenfranchised can and *want* to participate?) New area-based approaches suffer from the same theoretical and practical failure.

- **Budget mismatches.** Outcome-focused planning requires budgets that are linked to outcomes and budget processes that are transparent, gendered, and devolved. The real policies of a CPP are revealed by where and how it spends its money. Currently CPPs are for the most part re-named clusters of statutory agencies whose budgets remain firmly silo-ed and untouched by serious quality-assured equality impact assessment. Pooled budgets spent according to a logic model that drives investment in real change are needed.

- **Areas for central government intervention.** Some ideas for what the government can fix:
  
  a. Make explicit the “for-what” by setting outcomes for the process that address the growing divisions and inequality among our communities.
  
  b. No CPPs have incorporated, despite the option in the Act. CPPs thus have all the responsibility for community shifts without the authority to make them happen. The government needs to resolve this problem before CPPs can be held accountable for real change.
  
  c. Address the gulf between (in)equality work and community planning processes. Link public service equality outcomes with community planning, perhaps by requiring CPPs to abide by the same specific equality duties as the public sector entities.
  
  d. Scrutinise the work of scrutiny bodies such as Audit Scotland to ensure that equality outcomes are core business in audit of CPPs and their public sector partners.
  
  e. Embed improved equality outcomes in measures of best value.
  
  f. Implement budgeting processes (including gender-sensitive budgeting) that directly link revenue and spend to outcomes, make strategic finance decisions transparent to who-benefits analysis, require sign-off by equalities bodies at community or regional level.
1. PARTNERSHIPS AND OUTCOMES

1. How could councils better integrate their partners into the process? How could the degree of commitment to the process amongst other community planning partners be improved? How can any legislative or administrative barriers that make partnership working more difficult be overcome?

- PLACE CPPS ON A STATUTORY FOOTING – while the various individual partner agencies are statutorily obliged to participate in community planning through their duties under the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003, community planning partnerships have no separate legal standing. As corporate entities they are therefore not accountable to anyone in terms of delivering on their SOA commitments.

- STRAND LEADS – where each partner agency has to take a strand lead.

- CREATE “EFFECTIVE MECHANISMS FOR JOINT ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SOA COMMITMENT” – in its guidance to community planning partnerships the multi-agency Concordat Oversight Group (COG) stressed that as all statutory public sector partners to the partnerships are ultimately accountable for public spending and policy performance, they are also accountable politically and publicly for the content of the SOAs. Therefore a crucial step for partnerships is to create effective mechanisms for joint accountability for SOA commitment that will run alongside their individual accountabilities for their own resources and services.

- GOVERNANCE – moreover, the above will need clarity around governance.

- JOINT INSPECTIONS OF SHARED OUTCOMES – these too would support the above.

2. How can local authorities and their partners move further towards real, integrated working?

- SEE RESPONSES TO 1. ABOVE – at the present time the commitment to SOAs of individual partner agencies varies, with some recognised as playing very active parts, others less so. Placing CPPS on a statutory footing should help to alleviate this kind of problem.
• FOCUS FIRST ON IDENTIFYING COMMONALITIES AND OVERLAPS, THEN LOOK TO INTEGRATED WORKING - the point here is surely moving towards effective integrated working. Evidence submitted by the National Community Planning Group to the Christie Commission highlighted the tension between community planning objectives and the day-to-day business, resources and myriad existing organisational priorities and pressures on partner agencies – where these are rarely sufficiently convergent to focus on joint CPP activities and tangible outcomes to the extent required or beyond short term impact only. Funding cuts are likely to exacerbate this situation further. Success is more likely where common services (e.g. procurement) or goals (e.g. reducing substance misuse) are identified first, followed then by what resource and activities would be required to achieve them, thereby allowing intelligently informed/directed integrated working practices to be implemented.

• CO-LOCATION OR AT LEAST PHYSICAL PROXIMITY OF SERVICES – there is evidence that this can help to break down the sometimes significant cultural differences, barriers and agenda of the various partner agencies and which can often stifle progress otherwise.

• JOINT BUDGETS AND JOINT TARGETS.

• MULTI-AGENCY TASKING AND CO-ORDINATION – another successful practice has been the use of multi-agency fora for jointly tasking shared resources in partnership activities.

3. What steps would facilitate the sharing of budgets in pursuit of shared outcomes?

• AGAIN, SEE RESPONSE TO 1 ABOVE – this would require proper, robust joint governance and a clear articulation of tangible outcomes that are assessed through joint inspections. It is arguable that the community planning process has not yet matured into the sophisticated and binding delivery platform necessary to achieve this.

• BUT DIFFERING OPERATING MODELS AND PRIORITIES – even were the above to be resolved sharing budgets across an entire CPP is still likely to be problematic. For example, while it may seem logical for Health and Social Work to share budgets around common themes such as services for the elderly, it is hard to see how the same could be applied to agencies such as the police whose response ethos, multiple disciplines and functions do not lend themselves to such a model.

4. How can partners further improve on the progress that has been made and overcome the remaining challenges on engaging communities and voluntary sector organisations in the process?

• COMMUNICATION AND INVOLVEMENT – sustaining local community interest derives at least in part from a sense that people are actively involved in identifying
local concerns and are able to see that something has been done. There are various ways in which this could be achieved, including local area committees, key information networks, surveys, social media and so on.

- UNDERSTANDING WHAT WORKS – following on from the above, a better appreciation and sharing of what does and does not work can obviously help to build on success in an efficient and effective way, and can provide additional leverage in negotiations around participation.

- SUSTAINABLE FUNDING, RESOURCES AND OUTCOMES – the voluntary sector relies heavily on local authority funding and many voluntary agencies that support CPPs have already become casualties of council budget cuts. In this context, the need for capacity building and long-term sustainable outcomes becomes more acute.

- ADOPTING A WIDER PERSPECTIVE – for understandable reasons councils and community planning partnerships tend to adopt a geographic view of communities. This can be to the detriment of e.g. minority groups.

5. How is the work of delivering SOA outcomes managed, co-ordinated and driven through the various community partnership structures and agreements?

- AGAIN, SEE RESPONSE TO 1 ABOVE – the lack of statutory framework and accountability mechanism means that how this is done varies and to variable degrees of success. There are, however, some common themes: the emphasis remains very much on end-product outputs rather than outcomes (perhaps justifiably so given the long-term nature of the SG’s national outcomes they are supposed to contribute to, and SG guidance on local indicators) or process milestones; and given their lack of legal standing, organisational priorities will tend to take precedence over SOAs where these diverge. There needs to be greater clarity as to the intent of SOAs and more effort made to achieve the strategic convergence of priority areas.

- THE RIGHT LEADERS – where it works can be down to having the right people leading the right bits and very strong leadership from the Chief Executive.

6. What is the purpose of a single outcome agreement in helping to achieve better outcomes? How are local single outcome agreements developed, and how do they relate to national priorities?

- ACCORDING TO THE SG WEBSITE – SOAs are agreements between Government and CPPs setting out how each, and within that each partner agency, will work towards improving agreed outcomes for local people in a way that reflects local circumstances and priorities, within the context of the Government’s national outcomes and purpose.
- DEVELOPMENT IN PRACTICE – again it is likely that the exact process by which SOAs are developed will differ in each CPP but initial guidance advocated, among other things, involving local communities to inform them.

- SOAS V NATIONAL PRIORITIES – from a police point of view there can be differences between SOAs and national priorities which can in turn cause tensions around resources. Conversely, some SOAs simply encompass a selection of policing priorities that have already been identified as force or national police service priorities, e.g. reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.

7. How could local authorities and other public bodies contribute more to influencing and improving outcomes in their area?

- LEGISLATION – activities and structures related to community planning really ought to be established and governed through legislation.

- BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF EACH OTHER/INTERDEPENDENCIES – understand better what each partner agency can and cannot do and the limitations each has in terms of resources, remits and scope.

- JOINT PLANNING AND COMMITMENTS

- CONTINUITY AND DRIVE – of leadership in particular to forge good working relationships that are the foundation for successful partnerships; and a shared drive to integrate, share and make efficiencies and strive for public value.

- SPECIFIED OWNERS – have dedicated owners responsible for specific themes.

- EVALUATING ACTIVITIES AND IMPACT – the current system of performance measurement is predicated on the view that performance is to be measured rather than understood. This is an unhelpful and quite possibly highly inefficient way of working. Evaluating what is done within, between and across all 32 councils and CPPs to learn what activities and inputs have what effect (or not) would provide a robust base of evidence through which to influence and improve future working and subsequent outcomes.

8. How can arrangements, processes and accountability be improved?

- SEE ALL THE ABOVE – including greater clarity about who is responsible for what budget; what sort of return is expected on any investment; transparency in what has actually been achieved and how; joint inspection that is based on outcomes; and, better governance structures.
2. **BENCHMARKING AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

1. **What are the main challenges (cultural, technical, geographical or other) in developing performance measurement and benchmarking systems for local authorities across Scotland?**

   • **ASSUMPTION OF TECHNICAL COMPETENCE** – it is assumed, but not necessarily the case, that senior managers’ knowledge extends to a sophisticated understanding of how public finances could be made to work better.

   • **ASSUMPTION OF TECHNICAL COMPETENCE RE DATA**, for example – i) interpreting data – senior managers and even performance analysts do not necessarily understand statistics, and this can lead to incorrect interpretations (often exaggerated) of what performance data can and actually does tell us, for example; ii) contextual information – while there is growing recognition of the relevance of contextual factors to explain data – and with this a growth in the use of, e.g. rates per population – many agencies still feel uneasy not providing misleading or uninformative raw figures; iii) making fair comparisons – the socio-demographic profile of local authority areas will be different and will differentially affect performance. Any system of benchmarking/comparison must be able to understand and take account of this.

   • **CULTURAL BARRIERS RE THE DATA** – i) uniformity of data – unless everyone applies consistent counting conventions and collection methods (e.g. surveys) then it will continue to be impossible to make true comparisons. This has already proved difficult to achieve in national organisations with locally autonomous bodies such as the police service; ii) unpopular measures – similarly, sometimes the reason for the above is that agencies consider preferred measures uninformative or unhelpful, too expensive, irrelevant to their area, and so on and so refuse to adopt them;

   • **COMPARING VS UNDERSTANDING PERFORMANCE** – different approaches are required for assessing and for understanding performance, and yet many organisations persist in using one – usually a series of performance indicators – and wrongly assume that it can do both. The danger is that benchmarking becomes used in this way too, whereas in fact it should be used to help understand how performance might be improved.

   • **EMPHASIS ON GEOGRAPHICAL COMPARISON** – continuing on from the above, the emphasis for performance comparison continues to be geographical area. If its purpose is solely to compare how well one local authority is performing against one or more others, then that is fine – although one local authority is not homogenous in itself but contains various pockets of mixed profiles; nor do populations differ in any logical or consistent way according to which local authority residents come under. If the desire is to derive comparative data that might help to identify how improvements could be made, then more informative comparisons could
be made, e.g. smaller geographical areas, MOSAIC categories, cluster analyses, or for benchmarking purposes, processes and results. Likewise, to realise the full potential of benchmarking comparators should not be limited to other local authorities.

2. To what extent has the work undertaken over the last two years by the Improvement Service, SOLACE and others contributed to developing a common approach to benchmarking across Scotland’s local authorities?

• Both the Improvement Service and SOLACE have clearly helped by, for example, working on a common set of indicators for SOAs. However, this work could be developed further, possibly involving other public bodies. Benchmarking / comparators with the private sector would also be useful, especially for corporate services such as HR and finance.

3. What technical or other resources are needed to continue and complete the development of recent work on benchmarking?

• Where benchmarking is used to look at which, of a range of different approaches, processes or circumstances aiming to achieve the same thing produces the best results, we need agreement on common data and reporting standards, together with common definitions, around what we consider success to be or what it is councils/CPPs should be striving to achieve.

• As above, benchmarking / comparators with the private sector would also be useful.

4. To what extent can the developing work on benchmarking be extended across community planning partnerships? How can data derived from benchmarking influence the future direction of community planning and the contents of future SOAs?

• As with the first comment, there is no reason why it cannot be extended to good effect across all public sector bodies including CPPs, although the definition of success problem raised above may prove more difficult to resolve. The data generated can broaden CPPs’ exposure to alternative, more effective, processes and ways of working with a view to understanding how they might reshape their own processes / activities in order to achieve better results.

5. How can the development of benchmarking help to improve the performance of local authorities in Scotland?

• It is a key method of helping to drive improvement, because it allows sensible comparisons and assists in identifying, developing and extending good/best practice across authorities.
• It is of more practical value than simplistic performance measures because it attempts to learn about the impact of different processes or approaches – not just those used by other Scottish local authorities but in any comparable function, service or organisation – on end results, rather than just making simple comparisons of the end results themselves.

• Nevertheless, it needs to be applied in an appropriate and constructive manner (not just as another statistical performance comparison tool) and should not constrain innovation.

• It also needs to be fed into and used by the governance process.

6. **Should the Scottish Government have a role in providing national impetus to the development of benchmarking and performance measurement?**

• There are arguments for and against this. On one hand is the argument that such things should be apolitical and have cross-party agreement / support to work, otherwise they will change with successive governments. On the other, it might be argued that unless Scottish Government has a role, at least for performance measurement as it is not clear what role it should take in terms of benchmarking, nothing will get done.

• An alternative view might be that such a role might more appropriately sit with scrutiny bodies. This has been the case in the past, pre the Crerar Review, while both performance and benchmarking remain integral elements of common inspection tools such as EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) model.
3. NEW WAYS OF DELIVERING SERVICES

1. How can cultural and organisational change be promoted to ensure that local authorities and community planning partners are able to work together to develop the kind of integrated services that are aspired to by local communities?

Given the current challenging funding context there is a risk that public bodies retreat from partnership working into their own core areas of business, so this is a relevant question.

- Again it goes back to the suggestion that we work from reviewing core functions and objectives of individual organisations in order to identify areas of common priority and convergence amongst partner agencies, and then consider how best to integrate partnership working into these.

- Is there a role for central government to be more prescriptive about what good outcomes might look like, i.e. provide additional national direction without detracting from localised approaches?

- In the meantime, could SG and COSLA do more to share existing effective practice?

- Co-location.

- Developing an understanding of what the outcomes are, what the main drivers are for achieving them, and what each agency, department, team and individual is contributing to that end.

2. How can tensions between shared services creating savings through potential reductions in the number of staff involved and the economic impact brought about by any resulting job losses be resolved?

- The need for pragmatic solutions is not denied, and shared service modelling (SSM) is recognised as a sound business principle for, e.g. business mergers. What is less obvious is that the same approach applied to public sector reform would i) maintain performance and standards, ii) realise anticipated savings, or iii) work across agency boundaries within the broader context of unco-ordinated and single agency public sector reform compounded by an SG directive of no compulsory public sector redundancy.

- Reductions in senior ranks would allow for numbers to be maintained whilst reducing staff costs.
3. How can legislative or institutional barriers to developing shared and innovative service delivery models to their full potential be overcome?

- LEGISLATION – again, this goes back to the argument under SOAs/CPPs for a statutory framework.
- INSTITUTIONAL – again, better understanding of the abilities and limitations of organisations and their resources; and establishing specified owners of specific areas of work.
- SHARED LEARNING – share learning from elsewhere, e.g. the successful Total Place initiatives.

4. Is there any scope for further national shared services along the lines of the shared recruitment portal for local authorities, “myjobscotland”?

- YES – the development of the Tell Me Scotland portal (which came about in part as a result of the success of myjobscotland) opens up possibilities for other national shared services.

5. What can be learned from elsewhere, for example from initiatives such as the Nottingham Early Intervention City or the Birmingham total place pilot?

Although there is much to learn from elsewhere, it is not as straightforward as simply regarding this kind of initiative as good practice:

- It should be about differentiating between short-term fixes and long-term solutions. The questions that should be asked are: how sustainable are these initiatives? Are they still operating now? Is it service personnel simply doing what they should be doing or has it brought about real change?
- It is also about persuading strategic leaders to adopt such practices, implement them jointly and make staff and resources available as necessary. Where this may detract from existing performance/service requirements strong and challenging leadership will be required, as will robust evaluation and governance.

6. How can innovative delivery methods for services and collaborative arrangements (as mentioned, for example, in the Christie Commission report) help to improve outcomes and tackle embedded social problems focused in defined geographical areas?

- There is no reason why they cannot, but any intervention really needs to start with a clear vision of: i) what is desired; ii) what this will actually look like; and iii) what indicators will tell us if we are succeeding or not. Only then should work begin on devising collaborative activities around these. The priority should be, as Christie highlights, the earliest possible interventions. It may also be necessary to take a longer-term view on these – a difficulty with many initiatives is that they are short-lived either because funding is only available for a limited period or because partner
agencies’ interest can wane if there are no immediate successes – but it may also be that the problems they are designed to tackle or the measures by which impact will be assessed simply take longer to resolve or identify (especially anything to do with prevention). For these reasons too, strong and sustained leadership is required.

7. What scope is there for developing ways of delivering services, such as the personalisation of care, in order to mitigate the effects of shrinking resources while promoting improved standards of care?

• Greater use of technology through which to consult, communicate and provide updates on services.
• Identification of effective practice through scrutiny.

HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC)
February 2012
Strand 1 - Partnerships and Outcomes

To examine the on-going development of community planning partnerships and the community planning process and assess, how these could be built upon to support outcome-based approaches to service planning and delivery in local areas.

Key questions for this strand of the inquiry:

How could councils better integrate their partners into the process? How could the degree of commitment to the process amongst other community planning partners be improved? How can any legislative or administrative barriers that make partnership working more difficult be overcome?

Without a shared acceptance of outcomes then there will always be resistance to partnership activities where, no perceived benefit for the partner exists, or there are competing reporting and/or budgetary requirements on that partner. Partner aims and responsibilities should be identified and harmonised with those of the partnership to identify mutual benefit.

Legislation around a duty to participate with some clarification on accountability may be of some benefit.

How can local authorities and their partners move further towards real, integrated working?

There is evidence that this is working in practice within Fife. The integration of key personnel from partner agencies into a cohesive group with shared purposes, visions and resources. At a national level the expectation (possibly a statutory requirement) of a ‘partnership’ approach to shared policy setting and integration of these ‘shared’ objectives into partners strategic plans would assist.

The closer the work of partnership is harmonised with that of each agency involved will assist in absorbing extra workloads and task prioritisation can be rationalised.

What steps would facilitate the sharing of budgets in pursuit of shared outcomes?
The first step is acceptance and implementation of a ‘shared’ purpose, vision and strategic objectives. Each partner must be able to clearly identify the ‘benefits’ to the approach if they are to truly participate. Creation of a ‘ring fenced’ partnership budget, through which joint initiatives can be financed. There should be a pre activity cost/benefit evaluation process for each initiative to identify benefits and identify strategic links to, not only all involved, but also to others who may derive direct benefit whilst not necessarily participating.
How can the partners further improve on the progress that has been made and overcome the remaining challenges on engaging communities and voluntary sector organisations in the process?

It is imperative that at the outset the relevant partnership services and agencies are identified. Where an activity is centrally/partnership funded then a requirement to engage and participate should form part of any funding agreement. Again early identification of benefits, to all partners, in engaging must form part of the initial scoping exercise or agreement and a centrally funded budget should encourage voluntary support.

How can the community planning arrangements be adapted and developed to promote outcomes-based and preventative approaches?

Partners with a shared focus will naturally identify these approaches. Again Fife is a model example of how this process can be, and is, implemented. Development and sharing of ‘best practice’ models is an imperative.

How is the work of delivery on SOA outcomes managed, coordinated and driven through the various community partnership structures and agreements? How could Single Outcome Agreements be improved to deliver on community planning targets?

In Fife all community structures and agreements are linked to the SOA outcome objectives and hence to SG expectations. A strategic Assessment process advises on the priorities for the following 3 year plan and associated objectives. All partners ensure that the partnership/SOA objectives are embedded into their individual Strategic Planning processes.

What is the purpose of a Single Outcome Agreement in assisting the delivery of improved outcomes? How are local Single Outcome Agreements developed, and how do they relate to national priorities?

Local outcomes should be derived from a recognised local need. The need is identified through statistical analysis of the activities or occurrences that are reported. Generally the high end issues are the same throughout the country to a greater or lesser extent but local activity should concentrate and prioritise on the issues most pertinent to their particular areas. The local Single Outcome Agreements should reflect this.

How could local authorities and other public bodies contribute more to influencing and improving outcomes in their area?

Identification of common outcome aims. The duty to ‘actively’ participate in actions which can be directly linked to these aims, would ensure engagement by all. Lead agencies identified with regard to specific area issues should work with partners to improve services.
How can arrangements, processes and 'accountability be improved? 

If partners are embedded into the concept of shared objectives and are embedding these into their Strategic Plans as described above then this would be a natural by product of that process.

Agencies can identify resource commitment and would be accountable through both partnership and individual reporting mechanisms.

Strand 2 - Benchmarking and Performance Measurement

To examine the development of work that has taken place over the last two years in relation to the development of benchmarking and comparative performance data and cost measurement and assess how it can contribute to the performance of local authorities in Scotland.

Key questions for this strand of the inquiry:

What are the main challenges (cultural, technical, geographical or other) in developing performance measurement and benchmarking systems for local authorities across Scotland?

The main cultural challenge is getting 32 local authorities to agree a common framework of indicators against which to benchmark.

Technical differences could be overcome by preparing definition templates that rationalise the method for collection and storage of data. This would be greatly assisted if all authorities were using the same Performance Management Software.

Geographical challenges can be met by including constant factors within the indicators where appropriate, e.g. per head of population. Demographic differences will need to be taken into account in any broad picture, this may for example. be overcome by applying measures as averages over large population indices

To what extent has the work undertaken over the last two years by the Improvement Service, SOLACE and others contributed to developing a common approach to benchmarking across Scotland's local authorities?

I am not sure this is evident within the fire and rescue services in particular. There has been input from Scottish Fire and Rescue Advisory Unit as well as the Chief Fire Officers Association as well as the Scottish Governments Statistician Group which has contributed to developing a common approach; however this could be improved with a more joined up effort.
What technical or other resources are needed to continue and complete the development of recent work on benchmarking?

Fife Council, (including Fife Fire and Rescue Service) in partnership with Stirling and Clackmannan councils have recently procured Covalent Performance Management Software, Which I believe is also being used in 18 or so of the 32 councils in Scotland. The benefits of using this software are already being realised after only about a year, for example a single data collection methodology with readily accessible data sets to monitor and evaluate. If a Scottish approach using common software could be agreed this would improve benchmarking significantly.

To what extent can the developing work on benchmarking be extended across community planning partnerships? How can data derived from benchmarking influence the future direction of community planning and the contents of future SOAs?

The collected data must be compatible and collected in a consistent format. As shown in Fife the understanding of what data sets are available and the benefits of combining data sets to give a broader societal risk profile is a good example of how this can be brought together.

We are already developing indicators for the community planning partnerships to meet their general needs and to feed relevant data to the area groups that work at the practical level under the partnership in Fife. This data is used to demonstrate that outcomes are being achieved and the partnership are meeting their stated goals to improve the wellbeing of the communities of Fife.

How can the development of benchmarking help improve the performance of local authorities in Scotland?

This should create a target for achievement; however it must be relevant and demonstrably related to the individual baselines.

With specific reference to the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, we currently have 8 services that benchmark with each other. Under sector reform we may have up to 32 local units reporting through hubs to the national board and ultimately the Chief Fire Officer for Scotland. Now more than ever it is crucial that we develop benchmarking to ensure these local units understand how their performance is being measure and how it contributes to local community planning partnerships and the service nationally.

Should the Scottish Government have a role in providing national impetus to the development of benchmarking and performance measurement?

Yes there is definitely a role for Scottish Government. In Scotland’s Fire and rescue Services work has already begun through initial meetings with the Scottish Governments Statistician Groups. However this is somewhat disjointed ,and as a result data produced in the Scottish Governments Statistical Bulletin is not necessarily aligned to exiting agreed data sets and indicators, including our Statutory Performance Indicators as reported by Audit Scotland. Any National impetus must therefore deal with data inconsistencies.
Strand 3 - Developing New Ways of Delivering Services

To examine progress in relation to the development of shared services and other innovative ways of achieving, economies of scale and harnessing the strengths and skills of key public sector partners to deliver the best possible quality services in local areas.

Key questions for this strand of the inquiry:

How can cultural and organisational change be promoted to ensure that local authorities and community planning partners are able to work together to develop the kind of integrated services that are aspired to by local communities?

There have to be clearly stated expectations and an understanding of them. There has to be consistent monitoring processes to ensure changes take place with a positive outcome. Excellent leadership is required and there has to be a clear buy in from the top down into what needs to happen to inspire organic change in organisational culture. This new culture has to be promoted with regular feedback on the benefits and achievements of the more collaborative approach.

How can the tensions between shared services creating savings through potential reductions in the number of staff involved and the economic impact brought about by any resulting job losses be resolved?

Potential structural changes required have to be identified and a consistent change management process implemented to ensure minimisation of any impact. If services are designed to meet the needs of communities specific project / service design balance sheets can be maintained with resultant costs or savings accounted for in a partnership budget, to be shared. Or through monitoring of financial impact amongst partners to determine funding models.

How can any legislative or institutional barriers to developing shared and innovative service delivery, models to their full potential be overcome?

There must be a legislature provision to allow services to negotiate any barriers to required change. As above re duty to ‘actively’ participate.

Is there scope for further national shared services along the lines of the shared recruitment portal for local authorities, ‘myjobscotland’?

Yes. Nationally negotiated contracts for services are likely to deliver on economies of scale for items such as power and fleet requirements.
How can innovative delivery methods for services and collaborative arrangements (as mentioned, for example, in the Christie Commission report) help to improve outcomes and tackle embedded social problems focused in defined geographical areas?

By identifying alternative delivery mechanisms which can deliver on stated outcomes. This will require a degree of cultural evolution as advised in Stream 1 where the best outcome may be delivered by a partner who sees no, or little apparent benefit.

What scope is there for developing ways of delivering services, such as the personalisation of care, in order to mitigate the effects of shrinking resources while also promoting improved standards of care?

Utilising alternative delivery models, maximising efficiency, removing unnecessary actions and implementing shared delivery models, including new and emerging technologies.

Fife Fire and Rescue Service
February 2012
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE
PUBLIC SERVICES REFORM & LOCAL GOVERNMENT INQUIRY
STRAND 1 – PARTNERSHIPS & OUTCOMES
SUBMISSION FROM JOBCENTRE PLUS – EAST & SOUTH EAST SCOTLAND

Background

Jobcentre Plus is part of the Work Services Directorate of the Department for Work and Pensions. It provides front-line services that support people of working age from welfare into work, and helps employers to fill their vacancies.

Jobcentre Plus at Scottish level, work with CPP partners on various forums including - Scottish Employability Forum, National Delivery Group and SLAED. We are also active members of BASES working groups - developing products which will support the better alignment of our services.

There are 4 Jobcentre Plus Districts in Scotland – Glasgow Lanarkshire & East Dunbartonshire, North, West and East & South East (ESES)

I work within ESES, which serves 9 Local Authority areas – Stirling, Falkirk, Clackmannanshire, City of Edinburgh, West Lothian, East Lothian, Midlothian, Fife and Borders

Jobcentre staff have a long history of partnership working with key partners and employers in their communities. There are many examples of delivering outcomes when working with organisations in the public, private and voluntary sector. Since the introduction of the Workforce Plus Framework, the approach has become more joined-up with Jobcentre Plus working with CPP Partners to deliver shared outcomes

Senior Managers and staff within our 22 Jobcentres are regularly involved in partnership working at strategic and operational level depending on how employability services are delivered at local level. This work varies from referring to an employability programme to chairing an employability group.

I lead a team which includes 5 Employer and Partnership Managers who are dedicated to working in partnership across the following 5 areas: Forth Valley, Fife, West Lothian, City of Edinburgh and Midlothian, Borders and East Lothian

The work of the Employer and Partnership team is varied and includes:

- Working closely with operational colleagues to identify the needs of our customers
- Promoting and developing Get Britain Working opportunities including – Work Clubs, sector based work academies and Work Experience
- Working with Partners to develop employability solutions and source provision
- Working with Employers to meet their needs
- Leading Customer Representative Groups to exchange information and gain customer insight
Membership of Community Planning Partnerships

Following the recommendations of the Workforce Plus Strategy, the setting up of employability forums has provided a platform for Jobcentre Plus staff to participate in Community Planning Partnership activity.

When tackling worklessness and improving employability, it has allowed us to better understand the roles and responsibilities of our partners and move towards a more integrated approach when providing services.

Within our District, representation on CPP groups and delivering related activity by Jobcentre Plus staff varies across Local Authorities.

To date we are not represented at Board level on any CPP although we are active members of strategic employability groups and thematic groups in each Local Authority. Our overarching aim is participate in groups at a level where we can contribute most and deliver shared aims.

Across our District we participate in the following key partnerships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire</td>
<td>Economic Development Partnership</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Jobs Strategy Group</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>Employability Forum</td>
<td>External Relations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Opportunities Fife Strategic Group</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>Learning and Skills Partnership</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Stirling Economic Partnership</td>
<td>External Relations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>Community Benefits and Procurement Group</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>Economic Development Steering Committee</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>Community Planning Steering Group</td>
<td>District Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We participate in a number of other thematic groups which include employer engagement, welfare reform, tackling poverty, Alcohol and Drugs partnerships and advice services.

Internal communications are in place to coordinate activity and ensure that staff are aware of progress which results from partnership working. This takes the form of written partnership updates following key partnership meetings and partnership working being a standing agenda item at internal strategic meetings.

We have used various assessment tools to gauge the effectiveness of CPP activities on an annual basis. The results vary where some partnerships viewed as developing steadily with strong evidence of collaborative working. Others are still considered to be at early stages of development.
Success to Date

In general success when delivering shared objectives has been achieved within partnerships where there is a strong emphasis on employability and strong leadership in place.

Good partnership working takes place when partners understand and communicate how their organisations will contribute to employability and are empowered to take actions forward.

Many successful initiatives are delivered by a few of the key partners working together based on traditional relationships - e.g. Integrated Employment and Skills initiative working with Skills Development Scotland, Health Academy delivered with NHS

To ensure we tap into the expertise and resources that exist within the community and deliver joint strategic aims all of the key partners need to be represented at the table i.e. Local Authorities, Colleges, SDS, NHS, Voluntary Sector, Jobcentre Plus, and Employer Representatives

Within all Local Authorities in our District, Jobcentre Plus has worked with CPP partners to take forward some fundamental tasks which include:

- Mapping local provision
- Upskilling front-line service staff
- Populating skills pipeline
- Contributing to and reviewing Strategic Employability planning process
- Jointly funding some employability provision

Where the partnerships are more mature other examples of joint activity include:

- Joint Employer Offers
- Examples of working together on large scale employer activity
- Better maintenance and use of skills pipeline to improve services
- More cohesive approach to allocation and assessment of funding bids
- Joint commissioning of provision
- Better alignment of services to avoid duplication
- Joint approach to Welfare Reform
- Delivery of joint initiatives

Good Examples of these include:

- The West Lothian Employer Offer –where jobcentre Plus provide the single point of access to services provided by CCP partners which is underpinned by a partnership approach to delivering these services
- Joint approach taken by the Opportunities Fife Employer Engagement group when they offered a full recruitment service to Amazon when they relocated in Fife. This service was replicated in Edinburgh by the Joined Up for Jobs group through the Edinburgh Employer Offer when Amazon set up at Waverly Gate.
- Welfare Reform groups in Fife and Stirling include Jobcentre Plus representation
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- Jobcentre Plus involved in joint-commissioning process for SDS national programmes within all CPPs ensuring that we align our approach to the commissioning of provision
- Joint approach to addressing recruitment shortage within Home Care sector in Edinburgh.

Working Toward Outcome-based approaches

There is much scope for Jobcentre Plus to extend the work we do through the Community Planning Partnership approach. Representation at Board level would allow us to reach a wider audience at local level and further integrate our approach

NHS is a key partner both as an employer and a partner. Based on a number of successful models we can work together to improve the customer journey for those returning to work after a long-term illness and help sustain employment

Jobcentre Plus offers a number of measures to support our customers under the Get Britain Working banner – Work Clubs, Work Experience, Volunteering, and sector based work academies. Already we are working with many partners to deliver these opportunities for our customers and ensure that they dovetail with local provision along the employability pipeline.

There are a number of Employer Offers operating across the District. By adopting this collaborative approach at CPP level when engaging with employers we can understand their needs and improve the employability prospects of our customers

In order to address the levels of Youth Unemployment we can continue to work with our partners to develop provision and promote initiatives and incentives that will prepare young people for world of work and support employers.

Rosaleen Brown
External Relations Manager
Scottish Parliament Local Government and Regeneration Committee
Public Service Reform Inquiry – Skills Development Scotland Submission

Introduction

Skills Development Scotland (SDS) is Scotland’s skills body, focused on contributing to the delivery of the Scottish Government’s Economic and Skills Strategies. Our services are further shaped in response to the Scottish Government’s Career Information, Advice and Guidance Strategy and more recently, the Draft Youth Employment Strategy.

The large majority of our budget is allocated to the National Training Programmes and we are tasked with delivering 25,000 Modern Apprenticeships in 2012-13.

Staff costs form the second largest proportion of our expenditure, with the majority of our employees working in communities delivering our careers information, advice and guidance, and employability support services. We work with partners to deliver our services across Scotland:

- Through 120 public access locations, including our centres, and outreach locations in Scotland’s colleges and other partner sites;
- In nearly 400 secondary schools.

This submission provides an overview of the way we work with Local Authorities and Community Planning Partnerships to ensure our service delivery meets local needs and contributes effectively to local infrastructure.

SDS Approach to Local Engagement

Working with CPPs – Background

We work with CPP partners to ensure that there is a multi-agency approach to assessment and planning for young people. However at the time of the development of the Single Outcome Agreements and the development of the Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs), SDS was in the process of being created¹. One of the impacts of the timing was that the Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs) did not fully capture SDS’s contribution in all Local Authority areas and SDS was not included as a member of CPPs. Nevertheless, in some areas, significant elements of SDS’s work were captured and well documented, demonstrating high-quality, mature, levels of partnership engagement. In other areas it appeared that there was little or no involvement, even where the partnerships were strong.

As a response we developed an extensive programme of engagement with Local Authority Chief Executives which was intended to raise the profile of SDS, explore the potential for representation on the CPPs and develop a Service Delivery Agreement in each Local Authority area.

¹ Created in 2008, SDS is a non-departmental public body (NDPB) which brought together the careers, skills, training and funding services of Careers Scotland, Scottish University for Industry (learndirect scotland) and the Skills Intervention arms of Scottish Enterprise and Highlands & Islands Enterprise.
Subsequently, SDS has worked closely with CPPs to develop a Service Delivery Agreement (SDA) for each Local Authority which is tailored to reflect the needs of the area balanced within the context of available resources. As a national organisation the SDAs enable us to translate our national offerings into a local context. They show how our services and inputs combine with those of our partners to deliver outcomes aligned to the Single Outcome Agreement (SOA). SDAs address the need for a localised response and alignment with other services delivered locally (e.g. social work, justice). They enable us to tailor our services and agree local ways of working whilst ensuring that we also achieve our national objectives. Key to this is the understanding and agreement at a local level that different partners may have the lead role and targeted resources to deliver different services. Using the format of the SOAs and the guidelines provided by the Local Government Improvement Service, we developed a format for the SDA which ties it very closely to both local outcomes and national outcomes.

SDAs are developed through local workshops which include direct representation and input from key Community Planning Partners. The development and delivery of SDAs is an important tool for the way in which SDS strengthens its support for local priorities and improves joint planning and delivery.

Many of the activities in which SDS engages are about supporting young people prior to leaving school. Each secondary school and college has a Partnership Agreement outlining how and what SDS delivers in partnership with the institution. Each SDA shows how we work with partners to support, identify, and work with individuals who have more complex needs, as well as those who are looked after, care leavers, young carers and young offenders to ensure that we provide appropriate support and interventions ahead of their intended school leaving date.

As a result of this engagement approach, SDS is now represented on the majority of CPP Boards and is represented in the relevant CPP working groups in all 32 Local Authority areas.

We remain committed to working nationally and acting locally to ensure greater alignment between national programmes and local priorities. We believe that further intensive partnership working will deliver better services, which is the key driver in the development of our SDA approach.

Case Study of Direct engagement with CPPs: Local Training Opportunities

Service Delivery Agreements / L-Tops

An important outcome of the SDAs was the development of a new process for engaging with Local Authorities and the CPPs, establishing a joint approach for commissioning local training opportunities (L-Tops).

SDS successfully bid for European Social Fund (ESF) support for L-Tops and in 2011-12, for the first time, representatives from all 32 CPPs were directly involved in the re-contracting process for employability programmes Get Ready for Work (GRFW) and Training for Work (TFW). This new approach aims to better meet local training needs and supports the drive towards building a single strategic ‘skills pipeline’ in each Local Authority area. The funds will be used to deliver TFW and GRFW training across Scotland through 2011/12 and 2012/13. We have engaged directly with CPPs to deliver the L-TOPS programme in three ways:
1. The establishment of two advisory groups which include CPP representation, one for the Highlands and Islands (HIPP) where all six CPP areas are represented, and one for Lowlands and Uplands Scotland (LUPS) areas where seven CPPs are represented on that group. The remit for the advisory group is to:
   - Consider and define the allocation process for funding of new starts for GRfW and TfW;
   - Consider and agree how best to provide flexibility in the allocations process;
   - Agree the process for joint decision-making on procurement decisions including a protocol for ensuring no conflict of interest;
   - Moderate the contracting statements to balance the National Budget;
   - Review allocations in-year against performance and make recommendations to the SDS Board.

2. Contract estimation
   
   We worked in partnership with nominees in all 32 Local Authority areas to help identify the potential allocation of places to each CPP area by jointly developing and agreeing the estimated number of places required using clear criteria.

3. Contract allocation
   
   CPP representatives were directly involved in the decision making on the number of places in their area to be allocated to providers.

Sharing Intelligence

School Leaver Destinations Report

SDS is responsible for gathering information, on behalf of the Scottish Government, on the destinations of young people when they leave school. The survey tracks individuals upon leaving school with a six month follow-up survey. We share the data from this report, broken down by Local Authority area, with CPPs and use it to plan our work with local partners. In the most recent return the proportion of pupils who left school during 2010/11 who were in positive initial destinations was 88.9%, up from 86% in September 2010.

16+ Learning Choices Data Hub

An example of our partnership working with Local Authorities in contributing to the youth employment challenge is the development of the 16+ Learning Choices Data Hub. Developed by SDS with Local Authorities and Scotland’s Colleges, the Data Hub provides a mechanism for sharing information on individuals as they move through the skills and learning system. So far, all of Scotland’s Local Authorities have signed data sharing agreements, with 30 colleges signing so far. Early discussions are also in train with Jobcentre Plus to explore how we might capture its data on individuals in this system. The continued development of the Data Hub will help the skills and learning system to better plan for the needs of individuals, and target resources appropriately.

Communicating with Community Planning Partners

SDS has delivered bespoke communications and reports to CPPs to support planning, the development of our partnership activity and to raise the profile of SDS’s
investment and involvement at local level. These communications have both national and customised Local Authority information covering all 32 Councils. These have taken the form of newsletters, e-zines and detailed reports drawing on a range of the data we hold on the National Training Programmes and our careers service delivery, as well as local case studies. We seek to build on this and will continue to work with local partners to ensure they have access to information they need and that this is presented in a way that best meets their needs.

**Moving Forward**

We are in the process of refreshing the Service Delivery Agreements for the next three years, and these will be supported by an annually reviewed action plan. As the agreements mature we aim for these to focus on strategic level joint work that will make a real difference to the skills and employment opportunities of local communities. Each SDA will have as a common action, wording such as "We will develop a Youth Employment Action Plan".

In the coming years the important issue of youth employment will continue to be addressed at a local level, with our commitment emphasised through these agreements and their accompanying action plans. SDS will lead on the development of Youth Employment Action Plans (YEAPs) in each of the 32 local CPP areas and these plans will feed into the SOAs so that they are part of the CPP structure. In order to provide a clear line of sight between the YEAPs and the SOA we will seek to develop local outcomes and indicators within the SOAs.
Dear Joe

I am writing in relation to the Committee’s inquiry into Public Sector Reform and Local Government in Scotland.

I very much welcome the Committee’s decision to conduct this inquiry, and in particular that the clear focus of the first strand of the inquiry is on community planning. The Scottish Government’s response to the Christie Commission’s report underlined the continuing importance of community planning and place-based approaches, and included a commitment to review community planning.

We have now begun that review, which we are undertaking jointly with local government and with contributions from other interests such as Audit Scotland. The review is based on the outcomes-focused and partnership-based approach to the delivery of public services that was agreed between the Scottish Government and COSLA in 2007, and which both remain committed to.

I attach a copy of the Terms of Reference for the review that have been agreed between us and COSLA, and that provide the basis on which work on the review is being taken forward. That work is being overseen by a governing group comprising myself, Cllr Pat Watters as President of COSLA and Cllr Rob Murray one of COSLA’s Vice-presidents. The main work of the review is being taken forward by a group of senior officials from the Scottish Government, COSLA, SOLACE, the Improvement Service, Audit Scotland, NHS, the police and fire services, Scottish Enterprise, Highlands & Islands Enterprise, and the third sector.

As a first step, the review has produced a Statement of Ambition. The Statement, which has been agreed by the Scottish Government and COSLA, sets out our shared understanding that effective community planning arrangements will be at the core of public service reform and in particular will drive the pace of service integration, increase the focus on prevention and secure continuous improvement in public service delivery, in order to achieve better outcomes for communities. It also sets out the key principles that underpin the community planning and Single Outcome Agreement Framework, and so provides the basis on which the work of the review is being taken forward. The Statement of Ambition was published on 15 March, and I attach a copy along with a copy of our covering News Release.
I understand that the Committee is envisages inviting the Scottish Government and COSLA to give oral evidence to the Committee on either 18 or 25 April. Since the review of community planning is being conducted jointly by the Scottish Government and COSLA, I think it would be advantageous if I and Cllr Watters could give our evidence jointly. I would be grateful if the Committee would consider this suggestion, and look forward to hearing further in due course.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Cllr Watters.

DEREK MACKAY

Review of Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements:-

Appendix A - Terms of Reference and working arrangements

Appendix B – News Release - Ambitious vision for public services unveiled

Appendix C – Statement of Ambition
Review of Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements:
Terms of Reference and working arrangements

Introduction

1. This paper, agreed by officials in Scottish Government and COSLA, sets out terms of reference and working arrangements for a review of Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements.

Background and context for the review

2. The Scottish Government and COSLA remain committed to the outcomes focussed and partnership based approach to the delivery of public services agreed in 2007. The findings of the Christie Commission found that this approach had made substantial impact to date and should be built upon to meet the significant cost and demand pressures upon public services.

3. The Scottish Government has restated its commitment to this approach and as part of the 2011 Spending Review has established a programme of Public Service Reform, including taking forward consideration of the Christie recommendations, based on key principles of:

   - a decisive shift towards prevention;
   - greater integration of public services at a local level driven by better partnership, collaboration and effective local delivery;
   - greater investment in the people who deliver services through enhanced workforce development and effective leadership; and
   - a sharp focus on improving performance, through greater transparency, innovation and use of digital technology.

Outputs from the review

4. The Scottish Government and COSLA are agreed that the existing framework of Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs) remain at the heart of this approach. The review will therefore focus upon action required to:

   - develop Community Planning Partnerships to equip them to respond effectively to the conclusions of Christie and the objectives of the Public Service Reform programme, including wider reform initiatives such as the establishment of single police and fire services and the integration of health and social care services for older people;
   - Agree new SOAs between the Scottish Government and local authorities and their Community Planning partners after the local elections in May 2012. These new SOAs will continue to focus on agreed priorities for local communities in the context of national outcomes; and mobilise local authorities, their Community Planning partners and national bodies acting
locally. They will also demonstrate the local response to Christie and the objectives of the public services reform programme, in particular through a focus on integration and prevention; and

- drive pace and consistency of integration and performance improvement within and across CPPs into the future, including through scrutiny reform.

**Key questions**

5. Suggested early areas of focus/questioning for the review are as follows:

- What are the prerequisites for effective Community Planning?
- What are the key changes in the operating context for Community Planning?
- How should Community Planning change to support wider public service reform, both short and longer-term?
- How should SOAs change?
- What are the prerequisites for effective performance management which drives improvement in a Community Planning context?
- How should external scrutiny change?

The Christie Commission gathered important evidence of stakeholder views on Community Planning and the outcomes approach to date; and there are other useful existing evidence sources to support the review considerations.

6. The review is being asked to produce its initial conclusions by the end of February. Those conclusions will identify both immediate actions to be taken and strands of longer-term work to be developed and implemented over the course of the Parliament.

**Working arrangements**

7. The review will be jointly overseen by a small governing group led by the Minister for Local Government and Planning and the President of COSLA. This group will meet fortnightly as described below during the course of the review and will be supported by key officials from COSLA and Scottish Government. The governing group will make recommendations to the Scottish Government and to COSLA Leaders by the end of February, with the aim of these being agreed by mid-March.

8. This governing group will be supported by an officers group, jointly chaired by Scottish Government and COSLA with membership drawn from Scottish Government, COSLA, SOLACE, NHS, police and fire services, 3rd Sector, the LG Improvement Service and Audit Scotland. The officers group will also meet fortnightly during the course of the review, on the same day as and immediately after meetings of the governing group, and will be responsible for the preparation of papers for and ensuring action on the decisions of the governing group.

9. Secretariat and policy support will be drawn from a joint team of officers from Scottish Government, the Improvement Service and Audit Scotland. The team will
meet the week before each governing group meeting, with the first team meeting being on 24 January.

**Dates and times for governing group meetings**

10. The first meeting took place on 24 January. Subsequent meetings are scheduled as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan 2012</td>
<td>16:30-18:00</td>
<td>COSLA, Verity House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb 2012</td>
<td>13:00-14:30</td>
<td>SG, Victoria Quay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 2012</td>
<td>15:00-17:30</td>
<td>COSLA, Verity House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mar 2012</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scottish Government*

*23 January 2012*
APPENDIX B

NEWS RELEASE - AMBITIOUS VISION FOR PUBLIC SERVICES UNVEILED - AGREEMENT MARKS KEY MILESTONE IN SCOTLAND’S PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM 15 March 2012

The Scottish Government and COSLA Leaders have agreed Scotland’s first Statement of Ambition about how to improve the way local services are delivered.

The Statement, covering public services provided to communities by councils, the NHS, emergency services, and other public agencies, is the first step in a major review designed to put Scotland’s ‘community planning partnerships’ at the centre of an outcomes approach to public services in Scotland.

Local Government Minister Derek Mackay said:

“The Scottish Government’s response to the Christie Commission included a commitment to review community planning. We are, in collaboration with local government, delivering on that commitment. As evidence of that, I’m delighted that we have agreed this Statement of Ambition to set out our shared aims for community planning and provide a basis for the work we need to do to make it work more effectively.

“Community planning stands or falls on whether it delivers better outcomes and it must keep up with the pace of financial pressures, changing demography and the growing social needs we face. Effective community planning needs greater integration of services, more focus on prevention and clearer accountability for partners.

“This Statement of Ambition provides a clear framework for how we will achieve that.”

COSLA President Cllr Pat Watters said:

“People want the very best results from their public services. To make that happen, the Christie Commission showed that we need to invest in prevention across the whole of the public sector, and do more to ensure that services work together to focus on what matters most to communities.

“Scotland has set out on that journey, and this Statement of Ambition is a major step forward in agreeing ways to ensure that community planning partnerships truly take centre stage in translating public services into better outcomes. Delivering that ambition will require commitment from across the public sector, but we must all rise to the challenge if we are to grasp this unprecedented opportunity to make a real difference to Scotland’s communities.”

Note to Editors

- The Statement of Ambition can be accessed here: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0038/00389822.doc
- The Statement marks agreement on the key principles that underpin Community Planning Partnerships and the Single Outcome Agreements that set out what partnerships are responsible for delivering. Detailed proposals, including legislative proposals to strengthen the approach where appropriate, are now being developed, and are expected to be implemented quickly after the local government elections in May.
- There are 32 community planning partnerships (CPPs) in Scotland which include a range of public bodies and representatives of the private and third sectors and community groups. The aim of community planning is to make sure that people and communities are genuinely engaged in decisions about public services which affect them, and to ensure that organisations work together, not apart, to provide better public services.
APPENDIX C

STATEMENT OF AMBITION

Effective community planning arrangements will be at the core of public service reform. They will drive the pace of service integration, increase the focus on prevention and secure continuous improvement in public service delivery, in order to achieve better outcomes for communities. Community Planning and SOAs will provide the foundation for effective partnership working within which wider reform initiatives, such as the integration of health and adult social care and the establishment of single police and fire services, will happen.

1. The Scottish Government and COSLA remain fully committed to Community Planning and Single Outcome Agreements. It is these key strategic building blocks, not structural change, that will achieve our overarching purpose of sustainable economic growth, better outcomes and reduced inequalities for local communities in Scotland through delivery of high quality public services.

2. This framework of Community Planning and SOAs, within the broader partnership between national and local government, has already made real impact in improving partnership working between public service agencies and local communities. However, at a time when resources are reducing and demand on public services is escalating, the Christie Commission found that action is needed to build on this success by removing barriers to effective partnership working and to ensure that leadership and cultures, systems and structures, and accountability arrangements across public services fully enable the delivery of better outcomes for communities. The Scottish Government has agreed with these conclusions and has established a broad programme of public service reform. This review is a key element of that programme.

3. The Scottish Government, COSLA and other Community Planning partners recognise that changes, including as necessary legislative change, will be needed to ensure the successful realisation of the ambitions described here. A programme and a timetable for delivering these will be developed by the Review group. This Statement of Ambition provides a clear basis for this programme, supports the work already underway within CPPs, and makes clear the ambitions of Scottish Government, COSLA and other community planning partners to move forward quickly after the local elections in May.

Conditions for Success

4. Public services must improve outcomes, and reduce the outcome gaps within populations and between areas. For Scotland to successfully and fully embrace an outcomes approach, all public services must play a full, active and appropriate role in Community Planning whether acting nationally, regionally or locally. Councils have a lead role in Community Planning and this Review must build their capacity, and that of other partners and of CPPs themselves, to ensure that better outcomes for communities are delivered through a strengthened framework of Community Planning and SOAs.
5. Communities have high expectations of public services and have a key role to play in helping to shape and coproduce better outcomes within their communities. If community planning partnerships are to unlock that potential, their foundations must be built on a strong understanding of their communities, and provide genuine opportunities to consult, engage and involve them. CPPs must be able to engage closely with the needs and aspirations of their communities, within the context of local and national democratic control, with strategic oversight of other specific arrangements and accountabilities for key aspects of public service delivery. CPPs must therefore be able to influence and drive planning and investment decisions by partners towards achieving the outcomes set out in SOAs. This must include ensuring effective involvement not just of the public sector but also of the higher and further education, private, and third sectors and so CPPs must be appropriately empowered to enable them to deliver these requirements effectively, and be able to operate within a national policy, legislative and financial environment that is similarly focussed on improving outcomes.

The SOA

6. At the heart of CPP activity is the development of an SOA that is an explicit and binding ‘plan for place’ to be agreed with the Scottish Government. It must include clear and formally agreed outcomes, indicators and targets, for which all partners are jointly accountable in line with their respective contributions. The SOA must be clear about both the long term outcomes to be achieved over the next decade, and the contributory outcomes, indicators and targets by which progress towards these will be demonstrated over the short and medium terms. The CPP must ensure that the SOA is resourced: partners must contribute appropriately and will be held to account by the CPP through a strong role for local elected members, and by the Scottish Government for those contributions.

What Community Planning Partnerships must do

7. **Understanding place:** CPPs must be effective in mobilising the knowledge and resources of all relevant local and national agencies to develop a clear and evidence-based understanding of local needs and opportunities, underpinned by robust and relevant data, and be capable of monitoring this over time to drive and demonstrating continuous improvement. Responsiveness to local circumstances, but within the context of the National Performance Framework and appropriate national requirements and standards, must be at the heart of Community Planning and SOAs.

8. **Planning for outcomes:** CPPs must translate this understanding into genuine planning for places that recognises the particular needs and circumstances of different communities, and that provides clear and unambiguous joint prioritisation of outcomes and improvement actions.

9. **Delivering outcomes:** the planning process must translate into hard-edged delivery of local priorities and achieve appropriate public service integration in pursuit of local priority outcomes. To achieve that, CPPs must have a clear understanding of respective partner contributions, how total resources will be targeted to deliver the priorities, and how partners will be held to account for delivery. Where changes are required, including through legislation, to ensure that the SOA is effective and binding,
and that it drives integration and a focus on prevention, these will be made. Delivering effectively will also require investment in the people who deliver services through enhanced workforce development, and effective leadership.

How Community Planning Partnerships should operate

10. **Organising for Outcomes:** Each CPP must have structures that reflect its local circumstances. CPPs do not have to take direct responsibility for delivery of outcomes or integration of services where specific fit-for-purpose arrangements are already in place or are being developed. However, CPPs must have a strategic overview of such arrangements, with partners playing their constituent parts in planning and delivery arrangements to ensure that they are robust, appropriately joined-up and genuinely drive performance improvement. The proposals to integrate health and adult social care services are a particular case in point and demonstrate this approach. CPP partners must ensure that these new integrated services are appropriately connected to their wider assessment of the needs of local communities and that the outcomes to be delivered by these new integrated partnerships are reflected in SOAs and wider CPP planning. Community planning and SOAs must in turn be core to the implementation of proposals for integration of health and adult social care services and in the operation of the proposed Health & Social Care Partnerships.

11. **Accountability for Outcomes:** The unique responsibilities of CPPs require strong governance and accountability arrangements, which must complement other arrangements such as the accountability of NHS Boards to Ministers. CPPs must be genuine Boards with all the authority, behaviours and roles that implies for them and constituent partners. That will mean clear joint and collective accountability for delivery, and CPPs will be expected to hold all partners to account for their contribution to local planning and the delivery of those plans. Where this review identifies blockages to the effective participation of some partners, systemic issues or other changes required to ensure that this responsibility is exercised, these changes will be made to ensure that full participation in the CPP happens.

12. Political oversight is key to accountability. Local elected members will exercise oversight and formal accountability through their involvement in CPPs, and will exercise joint oversight and ensure accountability with the Scottish Government through the SOA. The Scottish Government must hold national agencies to account for their contribution to local community planning and SOAs, within the context of their National remit and responsibilities. Where changes, including through legislation, are required in order to ensure effective oversight and accountability arrangements are in place these will be made.

How Community Planning Partnerships should improve outcomes

13. A focus on performance improvement is a fundamental pillar of public service reform and a key element in the development of the Community Planning and SOAs framework. Securing best value is the key driver of performance across public services.
14. While differences in local circumstances may lead to different approaches, CPPs will be accountable for the achievement of improved outcomes, including the delivery of SOAs. CPPs will be committed to outcomes-focused performance improvement and quality standards, including national requirements where appropriate, with robust self-assessment as a starting point. This will drive out inexplicable variations and ensure that CPPs deliver improvement, deploying the totality of partners’ resources to achieve the outcomes for which they are jointly accountable. This process will also help groups of CPPs to work together across wider geographic areas where it is clear that the identification of opportunity and the delivery of activity at a regional or national level would be more effective.

**Reporting Outcomes:**

15. The development of transparent and accessible public reporting, together with an appropriate level of external scrutiny, is key to providing assurance about CPP effectiveness and SOA delivery, and to supporting CPPs in performance improvement. A cohesive approach to capacity building, driven and owned by CPPs themselves, is required, which is supported by co-ordinated activity by the Scottish Government, improvement bodies and others where appropriate. Scrutiny arrangements for CPPs and those for individual partners must complement, not cut across, each other; and take account of the differing governance structures and accountabilities of non-public sector partners.

**Conclusion**

16. This shared Statement of Ambition makes clear the commitment of the Scottish Government, COSLA and representatives of Community Planning Partnerships to retain and develop Community Planning and SOAs as the heart of an outcomes-based approach to public services in Scotland. It also sets out what is required from the Community Planning and SOA framework, and of national government, for these aspirations to be fully and effectively realised.

**ANNEX**

**Key Principles for Community Planning (from ‘Future Shapes’ paper discussed by the Senior Officers Group on 31 Jan)**

The following set of principles will shape the further work of the review. The community planning and single outcome agreement framework is about:

- Delivering **demonstrable** improvements to people’s lives
- Delivering unambiguous **performance** commitments and cost effective service models
- Using an evidence based approach, underpinned by **disaggregated** data, to drive improvement in meeting the differing needs of local populations
- Focusing upon reducing outcome **gaps** within populations and between areas
- Focusing upon delivering **joint** prioritisation of outcomes, interventions and resource use by public services and in so doing strengthening joint working between and the integration of public services
- Promoting early intervention and prevention approaches in reducing outcome inequalities
- Strengthening scrutiny by local democratically elected politicians of how partnerships operate to achieve better outcomes
- Strengthening community engagement and participation in delivering better outcomes
1. The National Community Planning Group welcomes the Committee’s invitation to submit evidence on Strand 1 (partnerships and outcomes) of its inquiry into public services reform and local government. The Group is an initiative of the chief officer associations whose members provide the executive leadership of local public services in Scotland. The Group was formed in 2008 to better co-ordinate responses to the opportunities and challenges of delivering shared outcomes in a difficult financial context. The Group is supported by the Improvement Service and its members represent the:
   - Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (Scotland)
   - Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland
   - Chief Fire Officers Association (Scotland)
   - NHS Chief Executives Forum

2. The Committee’s objective for Strand 1 is “to examine the ongoing development of CPPs and the community planning process and assess how these could be built upon to support outcome-based approaches to service planning and delivery in local areas”. The Committee has asked a number of specific questions on partnerships and outcomes and has invited the NCPG to provide a general response to these.

3. The Group’s evidence is based on an understanding of the original ambition for Community Planning and of the progress made since the introduction of Single Outcome Agreements. Informed by our experience of leading and managing key public services we outline the challenges still facing the partnership and outcomes based approaches, and highlight the opportunities presented by the alignment of the Scottish Government / COSLA review of Community Planning and SOAs with other parts of the reform agenda.

4. Through its evidence the Group wishes to make three key points to the Committee, which we will be happy to expand upon in oral evidence if invited to do so. Our key points are to emphasise that there is:
   1) A need for common duties on public bodies to work in partnership for outcomes;
   2) A need for all parts of the reform agenda to support localism; and
   3) A need for a national parallel to the community planning process.

The ambition for Community Planning
5. The starting point for the Group is the original ambition and legislation for Community Planning in the Local Government Act of 2003. The ambition was clearly expressed in the Statutory Guidance on Community Planning of 2004, which set out the expectations that Community Planning partnerships should:
• Develop and set out a joint vision with agreed objectives for the area, normally in the form of a Community Plan.

• Set out challenging outcomes of performance for the partnership along with the contribution expected from individual partners towards delivering these key outcomes.

• Identify and allocate the resources necessary to achieve the agreed outcomes.

• Monitor, evaluate and report on progress with regard to the agreed outcomes, and what is being done by way of Community Planning.

• In light of monitoring, evaluation and reporting, set out revised actions and outcomes normally as a supplement to the Community Plan.

• Streamline the arrangements for the planning and delivery of services to ensure a connection between strategies and with other partnerships, the removal of any wasteful overlaps and the improvement of efficiency and effectiveness.

6. This statutory guidance expected Community Planning to promote a strong focus on outcomes, on partnership working, on the use of total resources and on the co-ordination of other activity. However, this purpose had not been clearly expressed in the legislation, which established Community Planning as a process “by which the public services provided in the area of the local authority are provided and the planning of that provision takes place”. Such a move toward integrated place-based planning and provision of public services was itself ambitious, but it lacked the necessary legislative expression either of the intended purpose of Community Planning, or of the delivery mechanism by which the purpose should be achieved.

7. The position now is that local authorities have a duty to initiate and facilitate the Community Planning process, while other public bodies (health boards, police boards, fire and rescue boards, chief constables, enterprise agencies and regional transport authorities) have a duty to participate in it. Scottish Ministers have a duty to promote and encourage the use of Community Planning when discharging any function which might affect Community Planning or any body which must or might participate in it.

8. But the Community Planning process remains essentially voluntary, with no legal requirement for public bodies to work together in the delivery of shared outcomes, or even for a partnership to be formed or for a plan to be prepared.

**Progress since 2008**

9. The introduction of Single Outcome Agreements has provided a means by which CPPs can agree with Scottish Government the strategic priorities for their area and express those priorities as outcomes to be delivered by the partners, either individually or jointly, while showing how those local outcomes also contribute to relevant National Outcomes. The Scottish Government’s support for locally determined prioritisation through SOAs has undoubtedly strengthened the partnership and outcomes based approach. However, these SOA arrangements are also voluntary and are reliant on the support and goodwill of Scottish Government and of the local partners.
10. Such joint commitments by a range of public bodies to the shared delivery of outcomes for communities also raise inevitable issues of governance, performance management, accountability, and resourcing. The focus of the Group’s work since 2008 has therefore been on the challenge of retro-fitting the partnerships and outcomes approach to a public service architecture which still prioritises inputs and outputs, often within a silo approach to service planning and provision.

11. On governance, the Group supported the Scottish Government and COSLA in clarifying the implications for public bodies of signing the SOA. Their guidance was that when partners sign the SOA it means:

- That partners are signing up to the whole SOA, not selected parts of it.
- That signing up is equivalent to adopting the SOA as a formal corporate commitment of the Council or Board.
- That such a commitment is to support the delivery of the SOA in all possible ways compatible with their duties and responsibilities.
- That all partners are willing to review their pre-existing structures, processes and resource deployment to optimise delivery of outcomes.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that this is not formal guidance and these arrangements are voluntary; partners will have other priorities, especially those set nationally.

12. On performance management and accountability, the most significant and persistent barrier to partnership working for shared outcomes remains the reality that different local partners face different performance and accountability frameworks, as has been recognised in the evidence provided to the Committee by the Accounts Commission and the Auditor General.

13. National targets and commitments for inputs and outputs make integrated effort around delivery of local outcomes more difficult. SOA commitments, which are agreed by all the local partners with Scottish Government, can still be outweighed by top down requirements on individual partners from separate parts of government. In other words, our systems can still drive us to prioritise our processing of inputs and outputs more highly than the outcomes which they are supposed to achieve.

14. On resourcing, the Group is acutely aware of the pressures facing public services caused by rising demand and falling revenue. The Scottish Government’s commitment to a decisive shift toward a preventative approach is therefore most welcome and must be supported. But as yet the mechanisms for such a shift appear unclear or small-scale. In particular, the three change funds which should be overseen by CPPs amount to just a fraction of one per cent of the spend of Community Planning partners. It is also hard to see how these funds could achieve their intended levering of mainstream funding toward prevention within current public service arrangements. Indeed, the origins of SOAs lay in the inability of ring-fenced funds to lever mainstream resources or a significant integration of services.
15. The situation now is that we will be unable to prevent worsening outcomes for many of our communities, let alone help in achieving improved outcomes, without that decisive shift in our national and local priorities and resources toward prevention and early intervention, hard though that will be. These hard decisions about investment in public services - and about disinvestment, let alone any real shift of resources between partners or to other providers – require an agreed evidence base of what works and what does not work, together with a political will to make the shift to integration and prevention, and a legislative basis for doing so.

The ambition for reform

16. In its submission to the Christie Commission the Group argued that the key to making the shift to a partnership and outcomes based approach lies in accountability. Despite progress since 2008 we are still some way from a system and culture which prioritises – and expects accountability for - local partnering for the delivery of improved outcomes for communities.

17. The Group has therefore strongly argued that our prime concern should be with what public bodies are accountable for, rather than who they are accountable to – and that our accountability should be for the achievement of improved outcomes for communities. Everything else should be secondary to and supportive of that principle.

18. In all sectors, decision makers will prioritise for attention, resources, measurement and scrutiny those matters for which they are held most powerfully accountable. But we are held to account for many things, and so the question is, what matters most? Our experience is that what matters most is what we have a duty to do. It is duties which shape public and political expectations of our performance. It is duties which direct our use of resources. And, as importantly, it is our duties which set the scrutiny and inspection regimes which report on our performance. Our duties should therefore be to achieve improved outcomes for communities.

19. On that basis we developed proposals for the Christie Commission for the completion of the legislative framework for partnership and outcomes. We therefore now welcome and support the Scottish Government / COSLA review of Community Planning and SOAs, as an opportunity to complete the legislative framework; as an opportunity to align the elements of the reform agenda; and as an opportunity to integrate the partnership and outcomes based approach across and between the national and local levels.

Completing the framework

20. The Statement of Ambition from the Scottish Government and COSLA for the review of Community Planning and SOAs is commendably clear that “CPPs must have a clear understanding of respective partner contributions, how total resources will be targeted to deliver the priorities, and how partners will be held to account for delivery. Where changes are required, including through legislation, to ensure that the SOA is effective and binding, and that it drives integration and a focus on prevention, these will be made.”
21. We believe that this ambition requires two linked duties to be placed on the public bodies which are expected to contribute to Community Planning. The first is a new duty on all those bodies to work together to improve outcomes for communities, whether acting nationally, regionally or locally, through participation in Community Planning. This duty would define Community Planning as being a process for the planning, resourcing and delivery of improved outcomes for communities.

22. This will embed the key principle that public bodies should be accountable for the achievement of improved outcomes for communities, alongside their individual statutory responsibilities for service delivery. This common duty will also help strengthen partnership working and local integration between partners, and will help give effect to the ambition that the SOA should be used to target partners’ total resources and be binding on them. Importantly, it creates the opportunity to realise the original ambition for Community Planning, by defining it in law as being for the purpose of agreeing and delivering improved outcomes for communities.

23. We believe that this common duty to work together to improve outcomes for communities should be the default expectation, and justification, for the planning, resourcing and delivery of services by public bodies. However, this working together can be a challenging process, which cannot continue to be reliant upon the current voluntary partnership arrangements.

24. The Scottish Government / COSLA Statement of Ambition is explicit in this respect – “CPPs must be genuine Boards with all the authority, behaviours and roles that implies for them and constituent partners. That will mean clear joint and collective accountability for delivery, and CPPs will be expected to hold all partners to account for their contribution to local planning and the delivery of those plans. Where this review identifies blockages to the effective participation of some partners, systemic issues or other changes required to ensure that this responsibility is exercised, these changes will be made to ensure that full participation in the CPP happens.”

25. The second linked duty is therefore on the Community Planning partners, to collaborate in the delivery of improved outcomes through a mechanism which is binding upon them individually and which ensures their mutual accountability to each other and to their community. This would require the partners to establish a local partnership arrangement with the characteristics of a ‘board’, which is composed and empowered so as to ensure that SOA priorities are jointly agreed, properly resourced, efficiently delivered and effective for communities.

26. In order to ensure that the ‘board’ is not just accountable to itself, but is accountable to the community, we endorse the Scottish Government / COSLA ambition that “partners must contribute appropriately and will be held to account by the CPP through a strong role for local elected members, and by the Scottish Government for those contributions”.

27. We believe that this common duty of partnership working will also support (and should be supported by) the integrated scrutiny of public bodies’ contributions to partnership working; of their contributions to improved outcomes; and of the
fitness for purpose of the local arrangements for collective accountability. Similarly, this duty of partnership working should inform the guidance and direction which the Scottish Government gives to public bodies in relation to their contributions to Community Planning. The fulfilment of this duty should also be examined and reported in the regular auditing of public bodies.

28. As there have been changes to the public sector landscape since the 2003 legislation it will be necessary to review the public bodies which should be covered by each duty, but with an expectation that they should be covered by these duties unless there is a clear reason why they should not. We also recognise that the strengthening of the Community Planning process for the achievement of improved outcomes is not just a public sector concern, but should further encourage the effective contributions of our business and third/voluntary sector partners.

29. We would also emphasise that these two linked duties are intended to provide a framework within which public bodies’ other duties and responsibilities are discharged. They are not intended to cut across partners’ respective accountabilities to Ministers or to councils.

30. Finally, we recommend that these linked duties should be backed by updated statutory guidance which focuses efforts on integration and prevention, with an emphasis on reducing inequalities between and within communities through profiling, prioritisation, integration and targeting of resources and services. In the same way that many of Scotland’s national outcomes cannot be achieved other than by locally responsive solutions, so the achievement of SOA outcomes across the CPP area will often require us to integrate our services around the needs of those very local communities experiencing the most negative outcomes.

Aligning the reform agenda

31. The review of Community Planning and SOAs is taking place alongside very significant structural changes to public services, as parts of the Scottish Government’s reform agenda. These cannot sensibly be progressed in isolation from each other or from Community Planning and so we welcome the Scottish Government / COSLA Statement of Ambition that “Community Planning and SOAs will provide the foundation for effective partnership working within which wider reform initiatives, such as the integration of health and adult social care and the establishment of single police and fire services, will happen.”

32. The key issue for us is how these developments will support or affect localism, i.e. our ability to locally agree, resource and deliver locally appropriate responses to both national and local priorities.

33. We note the Justice Secretary’s recent assurance to the Justice Committee that the single police and fire services will strengthen the links between those services and local communities by enabling individual councils, not joint boards, to shape services in the local area. Our current understanding of the proposals for the single police service (and of equivalent proposals for fire and rescue) is that local commanders will have a duty to ‘participate’ in Community Planning and to develop and agree local service plans with the council. Local service plans
should demonstrate their contribution to other relevant outcomes identified by the CPP and may, by agreement, cover both police and fire services.

34. However, the duty to ‘participate’ in Community Planning has already been shown to be inadequate for effective partnership working, and the status of the council and CPP appears to be that of a consultee rather than a decision-maker. The local commander will be under the control of the chief constable and working within the requirements and priorities of a national service plan and of a nationally determined distribution of resources for the delivery of that plan. So clarity will be important on how a single national service, led by a chief officer accountable to a national authority appointed by Ministers, will support local prioritisation of outcomes, resource use and service delivery by each of 32 CPPs.

35. Nevertheless, these proposals are still in development and an important point here is that they create opportunities to better integrate national and local priorities, so long as both sets of priorities are expressed as clear outcomes for communities – rather than as commitments to inputs or outputs - and so long as they are deliverable in ways that best suit local circumstances. For example, a CPP may want to reflect some or all of the national policing priorities in its SOA, thus giving practical effect to national policy through the service delivery choices of a wider range of local partners.

36. Indeed all CPPs will, uniquely, be expected to incorporate the nationally agreed health and social care outcomes in their SOAs. As we understand that these outcomes will also become the overarching outcomes for the entire NHS there is a welcome opportunity now emerging to consider how CPPs and health bodies can advance the wider health and wellbeing agenda through the SOA.

37. But the proposals for single police and fire services and for health and social care integration are proceeding at great pace and it is important that there should be an obvious linkage of these and other reform initiatives to each other and to the framework of Community Planning and SOAs within which their intended outcomes will be delivered. We firmly believe that they need to be considered in terms of their effects on that framework and designed so that their implementation will demonstrably support better partnership working through Community Planning and the delivery of improved outcomes through the SOA. We therefore support an integration of national priorities within the Community Planning and SOA framework.

National and local integration

38. The key test of any aspect of public service reform should be how it will enable local partners to work with communities to identify, prioritise, resource and deliver joined-up responses to people’s needs in the round – and no longer treating people as the recipients of disjointed initiatives and interventions driven by divergent organisational agendas at local or national level.

39. We have argued for and strongly support the drive for prevention and local integration which is shaping the review of Community Planning and SOAs. However, the pursuit of prevention and integration within thematic silos will not meet our test, simply because outcomes are complex, are linked to each other, and are rarely within the gift of a single public body. Again, it was the limitations
of thematic outcomes approaches, of which there is extensive evidence, which prompted the shift to the single (i.e. integrated) outcome agreements, by which local partners can view communities’ needs in the round and deliver joined-up responses.

40. The planning and delivery of improved outcomes requires the full range of partners’ services and resources to be considered and, potentially, deployed. So our best chance of success lies in pursuing prevention and integration across all the activities of local partners, in support of agreed national priorities.

41. A very real challenge for Community Planning partners in the current financial environment is the need for hard prioritisation around investment and disinvestment, particularly in order to release resources for reinvestment in prevention. So a further test for any aspect of public service reform should be how it will enable local partners to focus their efforts and resources on those issues which are demonstrably local priorities. We know that all local priorities cannot be afforded equal status, and we do not expect that all national priorities can be equal either.

42. If prevention and integration are to take local effect then there will have to be a comparable prioritisation at national level, so that CPPs are not left to try to resolve and resource competing national priorities at local level. We believe that this will require a national parallel to the Community Planning process.

43. We suggest that this should take the form of a national Community Planning ‘board’ through which the national priorities for SOAs can be jointly agreed and monitored.

44. As with local Community Planning partnerships this national ‘board’ should be led by democratically elected representatives, with relevant Scottish Ministers and national representatives of elected local government. And, as with local partnerships, the national Community Planning ‘board’ should include - and be able to draw on the knowledge and experience of - the accountable officers for the public services delivered through Community Planning, together with representatives of the business and third/voluntary sector partners.

45. We believe that a national Community Planning ‘board’ could add value to the partnership and outcomes based approaches in a number of key ways, for example by:
   • Agreeing the national priorities which should be addressed in SOAs;
   • Ensuring that national policy is fully informed by the experience of CPPs;
   • Agreeing the balance between national and local priorities in SOAs;
   • Aligning other elements of the reform agenda with the Community Planning and SOA framework;
   • Setting the expectations of public bodies in their contributions to Community Planning and SOAs;
   • Monitoring the delivery and updating of SOAs; and
   • Ensuring that CPPs are supported in their capacity to deliver prevention and integration for improved outcomes.
46. We acknowledge that the role and composition of a national Community Planning ‘board’ will require further thought, but we commend it to the Committee as a necessary corollary to the local strengthening of the partnership and outcomes based approach which is signalled by the Scottish Government review of Community Planning and SOAs and further developed in this evidence.

47. Finally, the National Community Planning Group would welcome the opportunity for its representatives of local government, police, fire and health chief officers to give oral evidence to the Committee during the course of its inquiry.