



## Partnership working in Haringey

16 March 2010

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1 Executive Summary	1
2 The Haringey Strategic Partnership	2
3 The LSP's Long-Term Goals	14
4 Leading the LSP and Creating a Culture of Working Together	16
5 Meetings and Messages	19
6 The Benefits of Collaboration	22
7 Getting Things Done	24
8 Common Frameworks	26
9 Shared Systems	28
10 Looking Forward	30

## **Appendices**

A Action Plan

B Methodology

# 1 Executive Summary

## 1.1 Context

As part of the 2009/10 audit plans for Haringey Council ('the Council') and Haringey Teaching Primary Care Trust ('the tPCT') we agreed to undertake a review of Partnership working to inform our Use of Resources assessment.

Our approach was to build on our understanding from the 2008/09 Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) and Use of Resources (UoR) processes by reviewing relevant documents and interviewing key members of the Haringey Strategic Partnership (HSP) and the chairs of each theme board. We also sent a survey out to 90 HSP and theme board members, receiving responses from 34 people. We considered this to be a statistically relevant response rate. Finally, we attended an HSP Board meeting as observers. Please see Appendix B for more details on our methodology.

Whilst undertaking our review we learnt that the Leader of the Council had commissioned a similar piece of work from the Interim Deputy Chief Executive. We refer to this as the 'Performance Management Group (PMG) review' within this report. As soon as we became aware of the PMG review we utilised the findings to steer the direction of our work. The focus became for us to provide additional challenge to the HSP and to focus on the function of the theme boards and the utilisation of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) by the HSP.

## 1.2 Key messages

- Setting "red flag" issues to one side, CAA identifies positive outcomes delivered in partnership. There are good examples of working together to solve problems, mostly where a problem is "bigger" than single organisations (swine flu, teen pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases for example). The challenge, therefore, is around finessing structures, addressing known weaknesses and developing a bolder shared vision.
- The partnership is resilient; it has coped with significant external stress and scrutiny, changes to personnel and challenging discussions. This has been achieved through a combination of generally effective structures and good interpersonal relationships. The adversity faced in the past 18 months has led to renewed focus regarding partnership working and this was reflected on positively in the recent joint inspectorates' report on safeguarding.
- However, performance management systems have risked becoming stymied, as there has been little differential in the reports received by the theme boards and the board / PMG. There has been a sense of disconnect between HSP leadership and local / front-line service delivery. Joint resource management is rudimentary in terms of tangible outcomes outside the Area Based Grant (ABG) / Performance Reward Grant (PRG) debate, and the scope for achieving significant efficiencies through collaboration between HSP partners is only now starting to be explored seriously. This is vital as it is one of the pivotal ways of addressing the stresses of the 2011/12 and beyond funding reduction. The Partnership is self-aware in this respect and recognises the need to shift up a gear. Partners are setting a clear agenda for development and improvement.

- The theme boards are operating at differing levels of maturity and effectiveness, with performance against LAA targets varying widely across the boards. The latest data available shows that overall across the LAA targets 24.3% are rated as 'red', with the Enterprise Board for example having 57% rated as 'red' and data awaited for all its other targets (see section 2.5.7 below). This performance should, however, be set in the context of an 18 month recession. In addition, in our view the number of members on the theme boards is too high in some cases. Further monitoring and review of the theme boards is needed as part of the continuing PMG review.
- The JNSA has to date had inconsistent impact across the partnership. Partners are aware of it, but have not all been able to make effective use of it, particularly at the Better Places and Integrated Housing theme boards. There is scope for Phase 2 to more directly influence and inform all the theme boards' work, and for it to continue to feed into specific commissioning activity.

### **1.3 High-priority actions**

Please see Appendix A for our Action Plan with management responses to the action points below:

- The HSP Board needs to be free to focus on strategic issues. The theme boards should be managing the more operational matters, for example, recycling targets.
- The HSP is data-rich, and there are specific examples of information being shared effectively, but the volume and distribution of data makes it difficult to access efficiently. Interviewees have spoken of needing a "helicopter view", which the PMG has recognised.
- It is agreed that the proposed secretariat to address this issue needs to be more outward-looking, helping to ensure that the ABG continues to be invested wisely.
- The PMG's proposal to form an HSP Business Group should be implemented. This group should be tasked with monitoring financial information and influencing mainstream resource allocation across the partnership. The starting point for steering is knowledge about the resources available. That said, any resource mapping undertaken must be proportional and cost-effective
- Senior managers' events across the partnership should be maintained as they provide the opportunity to build a culture of partnership working below the PMG level.
- The Council currently demonstrates community leadership in line with it being democratically accountable. The impression given by some is that more leadership is needed from non-Council other partners, as all need to be 'Leaders of place.' The HSP should continue to work to ensure balanced input from all parties. For example, the police have recently started to work with the Council to better ensure that CCTV provides value for money. Activity data is available but historically this has not been analysed to link with outcomes. We understand that five or six outcomes are being agreed so that data can be coded accordingly.
- There is scope for phase 2 of the JSNA to better inform the work of all the theme boards. The biggest three theme boards (Wellbeing, Children's Trust and Safer Communities) have utilised phase 1 effectively, along with their own strategic needs assessments. The Enterprise board utilises its own recession dashboard. However the JSNA could more effectively feed into the work of the Better Places and Integrated Housing boards. Overall responsibility should be agreed for the effective dissemination of the JSNA data to all the theme boards.

- The recent PMG review did not look at the theme boards in detail. Their link to the newly proposed Executive Board will need to be considered. The PMG has recognised that once in place the Executive Board may wish to carry out a piece of work reviewing the structure of the theme boards and whether they are appropriate to the needs of Haringey. We would agree this review needs to be completed, with an emphasis on both LAA targets and other demonstrable outcomes being achieved by each board.
- In our view chairs of theme boards should not also chair any of the board's sub-groups, as this could represent a conflict and result in a lack of appropriate scrutiny of chairs' performance.
- The development of a commissioning framework was agreed and adopted in April 2009 and the practical application has been tested by the Compact toolkit. This will continue to help align Voluntary & Community Services (VCS) activity to commissioning opportunities. However, the Haringey Association of Community and Voluntary Organisations (HAVCO) perceives that the interests of third sector representatives are best reflected around health and wellbeing, but that there is room for improvement in the other theme areas.
- Six individuals from the Community Link Forum (CLF) are voted to represent the CLF on the HSP Board. We would recommend that the HSP build 'community empowerment' into the HCLF project to ensure that the community representatives receive the capacity building support that some of them require. Also, the fact that individuals are voted for rather than organisations means that some major VCS delivery partners could not be actively involved. There is a perception from some quarters that CLF attendees are not able to fully represent the relevant delivery agencies. Where the board perceives there is a deficit of expertise, we would recommend that it consider using the allowed option to co-opt members who are not elected through the CLF. In addition, the CLF is perhaps being under-utilised. For example, the tPCT would find it useful to utilise the CLF more to make contact with excluded groups.
- It is recognised that engagement from the private sector needs to improve, and that perhaps looking outside the borough is an option. The issue is partly due to a lack of large private sector employers in area, although there is some involvement from Shopping City in Wood Green. Engagement is being sought through other media e.g. business breakfasts. Networks with smaller businesses are needed too.

#### **1.4 Use of this report**

This report has been prepared for the Council and the tPCT, and should not be relied upon by any third parties.

#### **1.5 Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the HSP Performance Management Group, the theme board chairs, the Council's Interim Deputy Chief Executive, the Council's Assistant Chief Executive, Policy, Performance & Communications, the PCT's Associate Director of Communications, Stakeholder and Engagement and the other Council and tPCT officers who contributed to this report.

**Grant Thornton UK LLP**  
**16 March 2010**

## 2 The Haringey Strategic Partnership

### 2.1 National context

In April 2009 The Audit Commission issued its report 'Working Better Together? Managing local strategic partnerships' (LSPs). In summary, this report stated that:

- LSPs must bring a complex network of local agencies together to achieve common goals
- LSPs work through leadership, culture, and relationship management
- Standards and systems must support LSPs' layered roles
- CAA will assess whether local public bodies and their partnerships are contributing to outcomes

The report concludes that most LSPs are evolving and maturing, but that there is a wide variation in the quality of partnerships, and their ability to deliver intended outcomes. In some cases local and national partners still need to recognise the key dynamics that support partnership working. Too few LSPs take an area-wide approach to performance and resource management. Some LSPs have well developed performance arrangements, but less developed resource management.

Most LSPs have progress to make on their improvement journey if they are to deliver sustainable community strategy and Local Area Agreement (LAA) outcomes. LSPs that have good, shared systems for performance management (with performance reporting, resource allocation, and risk management) will find it easier to show that they are on track to achieve agreed outcomes than those that do not.

We have based the methodology of our review on the Audit Commission's report and resultant self-assessment questions for improving partnership working.

### 2.2 Context for the area

'Haringey is a densely populated borough in north London with a population of over 225,000 people. It is also one of the most diverse with a significant proportion of people from ethnic minority backgrounds and over 160 different languages are spoken in the borough.

Haringey is the eighteenth most deprived borough in the country; although it is also has areas of greater affluence making Haringey one of the most unequal boroughs in terms of wealth. Crime levels are reducing but remain high. There is also a high level of people moving in and out of the borough and shortages in affordable housing. There are large numbers of people living in temporary accommodation and a lower than average number of owner occupiers. Unemployment is high in Haringey and average wages are lower than elsewhere in London, but above those nationally. There is also a higher than average number of people with no qualifications. There are large differences in the health of people between the west and east of the borough. There are high levels of alcohol misuse, teenage pregnancy and infant mortality. Life expectancy is improving and is on track to meet the 2010 target but is still below the national average.'

(Haringey CAA, December 2009)

### **2.3 External assessment of the area**

The 2008/09 Comprehensive Area Assessment gave Haringey a red flag for Safeguarding Children, indicating significant concerns and that action is needed in this area. Having said that, the CAA was positive with regards partnership working in general across the borough.

The CAA reported progress against the HSP's agreed priorities as follows:

#### **People at the Heart of Change**

- Local partners work well to help build a community where local people get on well together
- Local partners are making Haringey cleaner and greener
- Local partners have a lot more to do to make sure there is enough housing for local people

#### **An environmentally sustainable future**

- Local partners are making good progress in meeting current environmental needs without damaging the ability of future generations to meet theirs
- Local partners are raising awareness and involvement of local people in these issues
- Some good progress is being made in limiting the impact of public services on the environment
- Recycling is being improved with 25 per cent of household waste recycled and composted but the target of 28 per cent was not met

#### **Economic vitality and prosperity is shared by all**

- Regeneration schemes are being targeted to reduce the gap between the east and the west of the borough
- Local partners understand their challenges in relation to worklessness and are working to tackle these
- Local partners are working well to support young people who are out of work and to increase their levels of skills
- Local partners are working to tackle poverty in Haringey and have agreed a plan to do this

#### **Safer for all**

- The safeguarding of children is a key risk for local partners and has been red flagged
- The fostering agency and private fostering arrangements are good, but looked after children continue to experience too many changes of placement
- An independent inspection of adult social care services in January 2009 found that the safeguarding of vulnerable adults was adequate
- Overall crime in Haringey is reducing. However local people are still concerned about the levels of crime

#### **Healthier people with a better quality of life**

- Local partners are making some progress in improving the health of local people. However there are still some key challenges
- Local partners are working with local people to help them manage their own health
- More needs to be done to improve the health of children. Local partners have a good understanding of the challenges and are taking action to address these
- The number of teenage pregnancies remains a key concern. Local partners are prioritising this issue and taking action to address it
- Local partners put extra money into sexual health services last year and met its target for local people aged 15 – 24 accepting a test/screen for Chlamydia

- Significant challenges remain in reducing alcohol harm. Local partners have a good understanding of these challenges and have agreed an action plan

#### **People and customer focused**

- Local partners have made some progress in meeting their aim for local people to have high quality, customer focused services
- Greater opportunities are being provided for local people to get involved in decision making
- Local partners are working well with voluntary and community organisations overall

### **2.4 Structure of the partnership**

The HSP Board represents the strategic layer of the partnership structure. There are 35 representatives on the HSP Board from organisations across the borough. The HSP Board is chaired effectively by the Leader of the Council.

Below the HSP Board at an executive level there is a Performance Management Group (PMG) consisting of 8 members from the Council, tPCT, Fire, Police, College of North East London (CONEL), Job Centre and Haringey Association of Community and Voluntary Organisations (HAVCO). As the PMG evolves into an Executive, it is being considered that the current chair be rotated in order that the Leader of the Council can contribute fully rather than managing both meetings.

Below the PMG at an operational level there are six Theme Boards, responsible for service management and delivery.

At the January 2010 HSP Board the PMG presented some of its findings from the recent PMG away day. Changes to the structure of the partnership were proposed as follows:

#### **Standing Conference**

It was proposed that this should become the new format for HSP meetings. In addition to the existing core membership the Area Assembly Chairs would become members of the HSP and other 'topic specific' participants would be invited to attend where appropriate.

#### **Executive Board**

It was proposed that this should replace the existing PMG and would have increased delegated authority to drive delivery and to shape, prioritise and direct resources.

In addition to formal meetings the Executive Board's Work Programme would include problem solving sessions and 'time out' to explore/commission new pieces of work and ideas.

The PMG has agreed that the existing membership should be extended once the Executive Board is formed by inviting a representative from the private sector to sit on the Board. It was agreed that London First should be approached with a view to identifying a suitable candidate for this position.

The theme boards have not yet been reviewed by the PMG and their link to the Executive Board will need to be considered. The PMG has recognised that once in place the Executive Board may wish to carry out a piece of work reviewing the structure of the theme boards and whether they were appropriate to the needs of Haringey.

### **HSP Business Group**

The PMG has also discussed the need for a Partnership Business Manager to manage governance issues and Chair a new HSP Business Group that would support the Executive. This proposal has not yet been taken to the HSP Board. However, the HSP Board accepted proposals for the PMG to submit a further report to the HSP in March setting out finalised proposals, which come into effect as of April 2010. It is expected that the HSP Business Group idea will be included at this time.

The Business Group would consist of the Lead Officers from each of the theme boards and would develop new practice and policy on behalf of the Executive Board. It would also be responsible for taking an overview of the resources available across the Partnership, which will be essential in the current economic climate.

### **2.5 Story of the theme boards**

There are six theme boards under the HSP, each being responsible for its corresponding LAA targets. These boards have been in place since 2002 / 2003 and are all at different stages of development.

Each theme board has a nominated scrutiny lead at member level, with activity aligned to theme boards. In 2009/10 specific scrutiny reviews are being undertaken in each of the theme board areas with the exception of the Integrated Housing Board, which already has a report going direct to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee (OSC). Examples include 'What can be done to improve the support given to carers?' (Wellbeing) and 'What actions are being taken / considered to encourage sustainable travel and to reduce traffic congestion?' (Better Places).

Each theme board has CLF representatives. This mechanism is beneficial to HSP partners as well as the VCS as it provides consistency and accountability across the Boards and ensures community engagement.

#### **2.5.1 Enterprise**

The Enterprise Board is Chaired by the Chief Executive of the Council, with the Vice Chair being the Cabinet Member for Environment & Conservation. It has approximately 18 members from across the Council, the tPCT, CONEL, HAVCO, the LSC, Jobcentre Plus, Business Link, the North London Chamber of Commerce, economic development bodies and local VCS groups amongst others.

The atmosphere of meetings is perceived to be very professional. It is generally agreed that getting private sector involvement on the Board is problematic, partly due to there being few large local employers who would have a vested interest. The HSP has started holding Business Breakfasts in order to better gather the views of the private sector. It has been suggested that forums could be formed that would better interact with the local business community to identify milestones for business development and enterprise. There is also scope for having the meeting Chaired by a different partner, moving the Council from its current 'driving' role to that of an enabler. There is an opportunity here for improved involvement and engagement of local businesses, both small and large within and outside of the borough.

There is good engagement from community representatives who are active and ask questions. The community representatives on the Enterprise Board have also led presentations at the meetings and played an active role in the finalisation of the Enterprise Prospectus, the Board's commissioning document. At the end of each session there is half an hour to discuss a particular topic so that the Board is not just papers led. This allows everybody to contribute.

### **2.5.2 Wellbeing**

The Wellbeing Board is Chaired by the Chair of the tPCT, with the Vice Chair being the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Wellbeing. There is an agreed approach that these two roles are rotated on an annual basis (i.e. next year the Chair will be the Cabinet Member). It has approximately 23 members from across the Council, the tPCT, local NHS Trusts, the Mental Health Trust, local VCS groups, CONEL, Middlesex University, HAVCO and the Probation service amongst others. The Wellbeing Board receives the second highest level of ABG (approximately £5m).

Our perception is that the Board has become more effective but is still evolving. It is quite mature as it heavily involves health and social care who historically have always worked together. The current chair had been the Vice Chair for many years then put himself forward as the chair as he had concerns over how the Board was progressing. The atmosphere of meetings is now felt to be positive and discussions relevant.

The rotating chair agreement shows a level of maturity. However, we have also been told that the chair can rotate quite regularly throughout the year (due to unavailability) which does not help progress / the exercise of control. Some feedback received implies the agendas have been too heavy and that there is too much information to disseminate, although the atmosphere does remain good. The current chair is keen to introduce exception reporting to avoid receiving too much data. An impression has been given that the Community Link Forum (CLF) representatives can be dominated over by the bigger agencies and are therefore prevented from making as much of an impression as they could.

There are protocols in place for data sharing with regards adults and more recently children. Partners recognise that health is a shared responsibility. There is good engagement with the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) and successful, open commissioning. 63 wellbeing projects have been commissioned with VCS organisations. This is approximately a quarter of the theme board's commissioning. The theme board had significant input into the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and as a result this includes significant health targets.

The issue of taking responsibility for costs between the Council and the tPCT does not appear to be a problem in Haringey. In addition to the Wellbeing board there is a quarterly meeting between the Leader and top team members from Children & Young People's Services (CYPS), Adult Social Services (ASS) and the tPCT, and the Leader meets with the tPCT chair on a monthly basis.

Last year there were good results around older people and delayed discharges as a result of close partnership working.

### **2.5.3 Safer Communities**

The Safer Communities Executive Board (SCEB) is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Safer Communities and Enforcement, with the Vice Chair being the police Chief Superintendent. In the past this board was chaired by the Council's Chief Executive as she had experience of this from elsewhere. There is an intention for the chair to rotate to being the Chief Superintendent in the coming year, depending on events after the local elections in May. It has approximately 19 members from across the Council, Homes for Haringey, the tPCT, the Fire Service, the Mental Health Trust, the Probation service and local community groups amongst others.

The SCEB has evolved from the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP). Since then the police, probation, fire and voluntary sector have all come to the table to avoid duplication of work and to add value to the board. Our perception is that the SCEB is strong and that the police presence contributes towards this. There is real commitment and passion from the chair. However, the perception is that meetings can tend to be too long and there is sometimes a parochial bias. It is felt that the pace of meetings needs to be faster, as members are committed and tend to have already read the papers. They therefore want to use the meeting to move the discussion forward.

Attendance is good, with agencies encouraged to send a mandated substitute when a member cannot attend. Representatives from Health are becoming more involved, and have made a positive contribution to the anti-social behaviour sub-group. The chair tries to get each partner to contribute to agendas, and there is a different topic on the agenda at each meeting. There are local area meetings which feed into zonal groups which feed into the SCEB. The chair and the police superintendent are both very keen to avoid duplication, and for example are looking at the 'Diamond district theory' which places focus on issues in particular local areas. To increase the effectiveness of this and all theme boards it is suggested that theme board chairs should not also chair any of the sub-groups as this could represent a conflict.

There is an information sharing protocol in place - this was achieved before other boards and the Council as a whole. This is particularly useful for the police and the Council working together. The Head of Community Safety commissioned somebody to come and look at how the board functions which we are told led to limited recommendations that are being implemented. There are examples of joint commissioning by the SCEB and it is our understanding that the SCEB is good at actively commissioning what it feels is needed, rather than just seeing what programmes are already being offered by the VCS for example.

#### **2.5.4 Children's Trust**

The Children's Trust is chaired by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, with the Vice Chair being the police Chief Superintendent. It is the biggest theme board with approximately 29 members across the Council, the tPCT, local NHS Trusts, Great Ormond Street hospital, local schools, the local Safeguarding Children Board, the Mental Health Trust, the Probation service, HAVCO and local community groups amongst others. The Children's Trust receives the highest level of ABG funding (approximately £11m).

The Children's Trust was established in March 2009, as the new Cabinet Member wanted a fresh approach after Baby Peter, and DCSF guidance recommended an expanded board, for example including a local GP with responsibility for child safety. The evolving board is mature and established as it is a statutory function. Due to the context of the past 18 months, the Trust has had to face major challenges. Our impression is that it has met the challenges robustly, and that there is improving dialogue between partners. The atmosphere of meetings is understood to be improving, although there may be room for further progress as some described the mood of meetings as 'defensive'.

It is unusual for a police representative to hold the Vice Chair position, but our understanding is that this has worked well for Haringey. The more linear style can be appropriate and effective for safeguarding issues.

The chair recognises the increased need for partnership working. In the past she feels that members hadn't felt very involved, and that the approach was too top down with no feedback being given to members when they raised an issue. Attendance was not good in the past. This was the rationale behind forming the Trust as members would have more buy-in. There is now diverse voluntary sector representation and the impression given is that the Trust is more effective than its previous incarnation. The Chair also invited an opposition councillor to join the Trust. This is the only theme board where this is the case.

The board is still evolving, with its own executive performance group, JAR action plan being implemented and a specific safeguarding working group. The performance management group meets between Trust meetings and filters the reports / creates exception reports to go to the Trust meeting. In past below the board there was a plethora of meetings happening with no coherent reporting mechanism. There are now three area partnerships in line with the Children's networks. These are very focussed on delivery and the priorities within each area. The chair of each of these area partnerships sits on the main Trust board and reports upwards. There are some other borough wide forums, including one for workforce development which encourages people to view themselves as working for the children of Haringey, regardless of who their employer is.

The Trust reviewed itself after 6 months to measure whether people are finding it effective. It has started holding the meetings at different locations, for example at a children's centre or at the sixth form college. A protocol for data sharing has recently been adopted. The chair identified that joint commissioning is the under-developed area in the Trust.

### **2.5.5 Better places**

The Better Places Board is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Environment & Conservation, with the Vice Chair being from the Community Local Forum. It is the smallest theme board with approximately 15 members across the Council, the tPCT, the Lee Valley Regional Authority, London Remade, the Environment Agency, the Fire Service, Transport for London, HAVCO and local community groups amongst others.

The current chair has been in post for 3-4 years. Attendance is ad hoc, with statutory bodies having a relatively poor attendance record in comparison to the local community groups. The perceived weakness of this board is that some bodies do not send representatives with any mandate to make decisions or contribute. The chair tries to keep meetings informal to encourage everybody to participate. He feels that attendance is improving, with more involvement now from local faith groups for example. He also feels that the atmosphere is improving and that members do not come along with separate agendas anymore. However, there are still problems with engagement and getting partners to realise they are all jointly responsible for meeting the LAA targets.

The impression given is that this board is not as mature as others. Haringey feels it is needed but the governance in this area is not so strong, and its general direction is perceived to be a bit "woolly". Having said that, it has a clear action plan in place to meet its LAA targets. The chair ensures that a traffic light system is applied, and only 'red' targets are discussed. Because it is focussed on long term targets it feels quite established. The chair meets with the officer team at the Council prior to meetings to filter the information presented, enabling the agenda to remain topical and interesting. The chair wants the board to become less Council-led. He would like to see the NHS / colleges / faith groups 'owning' individual LAA targets and for them to tell the Council how they should be working to meet them.

The board has devised a Commissioning prospectus initiative. The CLF helped to promote the 'greenest borough' funding programme, requesting project ideas from the VCS to help the Board meet its objectives. Bodies are encouraged to come up with an initiative that tackles one of the National Indicators. The board has to date provided £120k to support four bids. In order to be successful the bids needed to show how they were sustainable i.e. how they will continue once the first year's funding ceases. Partners lead this process, especially the CLF bodies who vet the bids they receive and then monitor progress. The chair has secured the same level of funding for the initiative for the coming year.

### **2.5.6 Integrated housing**

The Integrated Housing Board (IHB) is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, with the Vice Chair being from a Housing Association. It has approximately 17 members across the Council, Homes for Haringey, Housing Associations, the tPCT, HAVCO and local community groups amongst others.

The current chair has been in place for 19 months. It is our impression that this board is at an earlier stage of development, and that partners are still "working through the relationship". There is a good general understanding that housing is crucial for all areas of concern - health, economic wellbeing, homelessness etc. The board is getting better but there has been a cultural issue because the Council has historically been the housing provider. The homelessness strategy has been effective and has helped encourage partners to work together. The chair does feel that attendees co-operate well.

Agendas are manageable because the remit of this board is quite specific. The performance data provided for the board's LAA targets used to be poor, but now the IHB targets are reported separately allowing for much better monitoring (the chair instigated this change).

The chair believes that the arrival of a new Assistant Director of Housing at the Council has been a great benefit, and that prior to that the board was ineffective. He expressed disappointment at the commitment of external partners, in particular the Housing Associations (HAs). Attendance of the three HAs on the board is erratic, and when members cannot attend they do not generally send a replacement. The chair has also seen no evidence that the three HAs feed back to the other 57 HAs in the borough. It is our impression that the chair could consider exerting his influence over members to encourage them to attend, as this would increase engagement.

There are some interesting topics coming up that the chair hopes will better engage members - NFI work in housing which has been going on for past 6 months; Homes for Haringey have completed a door knocking exercise and will be presenting on the outcomes of this; all HfH staff were recently brought together for the first time at a conference held at Alexandra Palace to motivate them. The Chair plans to invite all 60 HAs to these upcoming meetings in an attempt to improve engagement. They will be able to participate even if they can't vote.

### **2.5.7 Performance of the theme boards against their LAA targets**

There are a total of 77 targets to be considered: 35 'designated' improvement targets encompassing Haringey's key priority areas for 2008/09 - 2010/11; 10 mandatory education attainment targets; 29 local indicators for areas where local priorities were not reflected among the 198 national indicator options, including 16 stretch targets; and 5 safeguarding indicators which were added in the refresh from April 2009 (these are therefore not included in the analysis below).

The relative performance of each theme board is shown below, as per the latest data available to us. For designated and stretch targets this data is from the performance update to November 2009 presented to the HSP Board on 21st January 2010. For other targets it is from the LAA outturn report for 2008/09.

**Table 1 - Performance by number**

Theme Board	Number of targets	Red	Amber	Green	Data awaited
Enterprise	7	4	0	0	3
Wellbeing	14	1	2	8	3
Safer Communities	10	2	1	4	3
Children's Trust	26	9	3	10	4
Better Places	7	1	0	2	4
Integrated Housing	6	0	1	1	4
PMG	4	1	0	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>

**Table 2 - Performance by %**

Theme Board	Total	Red %	Amber %	Green %	Data awaited %
Enterprise	100.0%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Wellbeing	100.0%	7.1%	14.3%	57.1%	21.4%
Safer Communities	100.0%	20.0%	10.0%	40.0%	30.0%
Children's Trust	100.0%	34.6%	11.5%	38.5%	15.4%
Better Places	100.0%	14.3%	0.0%	28.6%	57.1%
Integrated Housing	100.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%
PMG	100.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>32.4%</b>

The tables above shows that according to the data available, the theme boards' effectiveness in achieving their targets can be ranked as follows. This is based on the % of targets rated as either green or amber.

1. Wellbeing
2. Safer Communities
3. Children's Trust
4. Integrated Housing
5. Better Places
6. PMG
7. Enterprise

## **2.6 Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)**

The JSNA was completed ahead of schedule in Autumn 2008. It has been used as part of the partnership's overall strategic assessment which informs priority setting and commissioning. In particular it had a significant impact on the tPCT's strategic plan, and it contributed directly to development of the 10 priority outcomes for the tPCT. It has also fed into world class commissioning activity. The JSNA naturally fed into the work of the Wellbeing theme board.

The JSNA, alongside other needs assessments, underpins the Children's Strategic Plan launched in September 2009. The chair of the Children's Trust informed us that the Plan used the same data set as the JSNA. Then the Children's Trust broke the data down into the three children's areas of the borough so that it could be discussed at the first area meetings. This led to a more local needs assessment in order to identify where best to locate projects and therefore how best to use limited resources.

The SCEB received a JSNA presentation. This raised the awareness of the board regarding the Health Inequalities agenda and crime patterns. The chair of the SCEB informed us that it had led to useful discussions around the drivers of crime.

The JSNA Phase 2 is nearly complete and this year's needs assessments have influenced strategic direction and developments. For example:

- The mental health needs assessment was presented to the Well Being Partnership Board and will influence the development of NHS Haringey's polysystems;
- The sexual health needs assessment will enable a review and update of the sexual health strategy;
- NHS Haringey's Neighbourhood Development Plans facilitated the development of the Locality Commissioning plans; and
- The Safer Communities Strategic Audit was presented to the Safer Communities Executive Board

The JSNA is also being reviewed within the LSP strategic commissioning framework. Needs assessment is the first part of the commissioning cycle, and so the JSNA is being considered alongside other subject-specific needs assessments, feeding into the development of commissioning intentions for each thematic board. Commissioners sit on both the JSNA steering group and the HSP commissioning group which will aid dissemination of the JSNA data.

Our impression is that the JSNA has been influential at the HSP level, but not always further down at the theme board level. We are unaware of it having any impact within the Enterprise, Integrated Housing or Better Places theme boards, but there should be scope for it to do so. For example, green spaces and parks have an impact on obesity, and housing has an impact on mental health. The next stages of the JSNA will be crucial i.e. the four key themes of mental health, sexual health, vulnerable children & young people, and population change and growth and its impact on services should feed into all the theme boards' work more directly.

## 3 The LSP's Long-Term Goals

'Effective collaboration requires common goals, agreement on how to achieve them, and shared information about success and failure. It is usually voluntary and takes time to mature. Successful longer-term partnerships have used an overarching vision (now expressed as the SCS) to underpin partners' commitment to joint working that delivers benefits to local people and leads to action.

A strong evidence base should support the links between the SCS and the LAA. Over two-thirds (70 per cent) of the LAA targets agreed in 2008 were consistent with local SCS priorities. The remaining 30 per cent were evidence of the tensions between locally and nationally driven priorities.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **3.1 How well does the sustainable community strategy (SCS) reflect LSP members' ambition and priorities? How well is the long-term SCS embodied in the shorter-term local area agreement (LAA)?**

The prioritisation process has been rigorous, based on a good understanding of local need (per the CAA). Our survey results show general agreement that priorities reflect an even balance of the interests of all participants in the HSP.

The main benefit to participation in the HSP (excepting corporate social responsibility) for the fire service, the police, Job Centre Plus etc. is the opportunity to contribute to the tackling of the root causes of bigger issues. For example: the fire service contributed to the alcohol harm reduction strategy, and have worked with the Youth Offending Team; the police have been engaged in actions to address mental health problems.

The SCS and LAA are effectively aligned. Clear links have been developed between LAA local and national indicators, and SCS priorities. The LAA is an effective expression of the SCS.

### **3.2 How well do partners share performance and other information to enable the LSP to track need and progress across all SCS priorities?**

The area is data-rich, and there are specific examples of information being shared effectively, but the volume and distribution of data makes it difficult to access efficiently. Interviewees have spoken of needing a "helicopter view".

The focus on delivery of outcomes may have become stifled by the performance management process. The value of exception reporting is diminished by the volume of accompanying information. The ability to deliver is affected by the maturity of the corresponding theme board.

Historically the same reports have appeared at theme boards and at PMG / HSP level with little added value or additional debate. The PMG support the concept of a secretariat to address this, increasing the focus of performance reporting and shared information. This would be consistent with the majority of LSPs and would be funded from the ABG.

## 4 Leading the LSP and Creating a Culture of Working Together

'Local authority chief executives play a crucial role in the strategic and executive levels of management and governance. They must develop partnership culture and negotiate commitment from others.

LSPs cannot make an impact across their objectives without partners' senior level commitment to joint decision-making and action.

Another potential balancing mechanism is in the choice of members and chairs of executive and theme groups. Councils in some LSPs share leadership by appointing cabinet members to theme groups, but not necessarily to chair them.

An important message to local stakeholders is that LSPs are democratically accountable to local people through councillors' roles.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **4.1 How well are elected members engaged at board and theme group levels?**

Partners tell a story of improving engagement with elected members. The HSP and PMG are chaired by the Leader, Councillor Kober.

All theme groups are either chaired or vice chaired by Councillors. There is a general recognition that this makes a positive contribution to proceedings, but chairmanship skills have proved to be variable. Further details of this are included in section 2.5 Story of the Theme Boards above.

There is potential for separation of duties to be enhanced. If an elected member chairs a theme board, he or she should not also chair any sub-groups, as this represents a conflict. It is unlikely that he or she will effectively challenge their own performance as chair of the theme board or vice versa. It should be clear that members are accountable for the performance of the theme boards on which they sit.

Survey results show narrow agreement that members play a positive role within HSP structure.

### **4.2 How well do elected members on overview and scrutiny challenge your LSP and partners' performance?**

The chair of the OSC is an observer of the HSP. The OSC has regular discussions around outcomes that are either at risk or where there is good practice and there are lessons to be learned. Examples include actions to reduce teenage pregnancy.

Each theme board has a nominated scrutiny lead at member level, with activity aligned to theme boards. In 2009/10 specific scrutiny reviews are being undertaken in each of the theme board areas with the exception of the Integrated Housing Board, which already has a report going direct to the OSC. Examples include 'What can be done to improve the support given to carers?' (Wellbeing) and 'What actions are being taken / considered to encourage sustainable travel and to reduce traffic congestion?' (Better Places).

Overview and scrutiny of LSPs can demonstrate accountability and improve performance. The Audit Commission 'Working better together?' report includes a guide called 'Messages for councils' overview and scrutiny functions', which has examples of best practice and questions to improve the role of overview and scrutiny in LSPs. We would recommend the nominated scrutiny leads explore these questions, if they have not done so already.

#### **4.3 How well do chief executives and other senior managers work together to achieve the LSP's vision?**

The PMG is the main forum for collaboration. It is characterised as collegiate, occasionally "robust", but constructive. The partnership is resilient in that it has coped with changes in key personnel, and has had difficult discussions (e.g. allocation of ABG) without disagreements preventing progress. The survey results show strong agreement that strategic leadership is effective.

The capacity of the PMG is restricted by the volume of paperwork, but a clear approach to addressing this is in place.

Below the PMG there is an opportunity for more networking of senior managers and a need for departmental silos to be broken down and collaboration encouraged at all levels of the partnership organisations. Senior managers' events are the opportunity to nurture these contacts with the objective of building a culture of partnership working.

#### **4.4 How well does your LSP board provide strategic leadership? How well does the board work to develop effective joint working and trust at all levels between LSP partners?**

Feedback suggests that there is limited strategic leadership from the HSP board. It is seen more as a "rubber-stamp", being the main opportunity for partners to meet and share information to inform future partnership activity and priorities and to test out ideas.

The PMG represents the main decision-making body, providing effective leadership. The PMG acts as an Executive Board with the power to make strategic decisions. The recent PMG away-day highlighted the need to develop this role.

As with the PMG, there is a "collegiate" atmosphere at the HSP Board, with all partners being given the opportunity to speak. At the meeting we witnessed a healthy number of questions raised or comments made by a wide variety of attendees from different sectors.

#### **4.5 How well does the LSP core team support LAA delivery?**

There are clear arrangements in place for monitoring performance against LAA targets, involving a quarterly performance review, a six-monthly review of the wider action plan and annual evaluation of the strategy. The HSP core team is currently an administrative function, however plans are in place to develop a more flexible secretariat approach.

There is a recognition that the proposed secretariat needs to be more outward-looking, as this will ensure that the ABG is invested wisely.

## 5 Meetings and Messages

LSPs should consider the right meeting style for each forum or board. Strategic forums nationally commonly have between 30 and 100 members. This makes them too large for detailed executive decision-making but not for developing the strategic vision, encouraging joint working, and reviewing progress.

LSPs should consider the following:

- private and voluntary sector organisations proposing vice chairs, to avoid the dominance of local authority and health representatives;
- agendas that ensure balance between different strategic activities;
- forum meetings being organised as consultative conferences; and
- a strategic board that can link the inclusive community forum and the performance-focused executive.

LSPs need to avoid performance reports appropriate for the executive layer crowding-out wider discussion.

LSPs should review the extent to which the style of meetings and other arrangements support or hinder joint working. They should also be clear about the extent to which money spent on partnership branding and websites adds value.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **5.1 How well do your LSP meetings reflect a culture of partnership and mutual respect?**

The atmosphere at meetings is generally characterised as positive and collaborative. The HSP is perceived to be less council-centric than other LSPs, and there is a willingness to devolve key positions and accountabilities to other partners e.g. Paul Head (CONEL) is currently vice-chair and the rotation of the chair of the PMG is under consideration. The Borough Commander of the fire service chaired the group responsible for developing the HSP's CAA submission. These are characteristic of a balanced, flexible, collegiate partnership.

The Council currently demonstrates community leadership in line with it being democratically accountable. The impression given by some is that more leadership is needed from other partners, as all need to be 'Leaders of place' without the Council dominating. The HSP should continue to work to ensure balanced input from all parties. For example, the police have recently started to work with the Council to better ensure that CCTV provides value for money. Activity data is available but historically this has not been analysed to link with outcomes. We understand that five or six outcomes are being agreed so that data can be coded accordingly.

The HSP code of corporate governance underlines the need for HSP leadership to set the tone by creating a "climate of openness, support and respect". The HSP Terms of Reference set out clear expectations of participants.

Our survey results show clear agreement that a culture of partnership and respect is in place.

## **5.2 How was the chair of your LSP chosen?**

The chair (the Leader of the Council) was chosen by mutual consent, and there is agreement that this role is undertaken effectively. The chair is considered to be 'a partner of equals'. The Leader has also chaired the PMG. The PMG are currently considering the rotation of the chair, demonstrating balance and objectivity within the partnership. There is a consensus within the PMG that they should hold themselves to account to the HSP Board.

## **5.3 How well does strategic/board membership reflect local diversity? How well does the strategic board agenda reflect the different interests of public sector, private sector and third sector representatives?**

The ethnic/gender mix across the HSP is perceived to be broadly representative of the wider workforce and community. The gender mix at a senior level is good, but at this level there is less ethnic diversity. However, it is not clear that this presents significant issues in the context of a good understanding of / responsiveness to local needs & demographics.

Dialogue with the VCS is improving supported by the compact and third sector mapping exercise. The development of a commissioning framework was agreed and adopted in April 2009 and the practical application has been tested by the Compact toolkit. This will continue to help align VCS activity to commissioning opportunities. However, HAVCO perceives that the interests of third sector representatives are best reflected around health and wellbeing, but that there is room for improvement in the other theme areas.

There is now a delivery plan in place to monitor the principles of the Community Engagement Framework. There is a desire for partners to pool their engagement processes, as realistically partners are all asking the same questions of community representatives. This is at an embryonic stage but the end aim does have value.

It is recognised that private sector engagement needs to be encouraged, and that perhaps looking outside the borough is an option. The issue is partly due to a lack of large private sector employers in area, although there is some involvement from Shopping City in Wood Green, and it is understood that networks with smaller businesses are also important. Engagement is being sought through other media e.g. business breakfasts.

## **5.4 How well is LSP activity and LAA performance communicated to partners and to the wider community?**

There is a recognised need to improve links between the HSP leadership and area assemblies, and develop connections with front-line service delivery.

The CLF is maintained by HAVCO. It includes 250 bodies, with six individuals being voted to represent the CLF on the HSP Board. The fact that individuals are voted for rather than organisations means that some major delivery partners could not be actively involved. There is a perception from some quarters that this is tokenistic and that CLF attendees are not able to fully represent the relevant delivery agencies. The CLF is perhaps being under-utilised. For example, the tPCT would find it useful to utilise the CLF to make contact with excluded groups.

Some LSPs have developed a distinct brand, or identity, to reinforce and make a public statement about local joint working. The Audit Commission found that although some of the LSPs they looked at had websites, none of them (by December 2008) had evaluated whether the resources spent on communications and branding supported a sense of place or created further confusion about local public services.

There have been some attempts by the HSP to communicate with the public (e.g. LAA leaflet), but overall communication with the public / public awareness of the HSP and partnership successes is not strong. This may be compounded by a lack of branding, although the HSP has a clear rationale for this and the lack of a separate website for example is a conscious decision.

## 6 The Benefits of Collaboration

'Partnerships create synergies: the LSP's contribution to local outcomes should be greater than members' separate activity. Many synergies are soft because they rely on the intangible elements of partnership working. They develop from the trust that comes from commitment to common goals and mutual respect..

LSPs can:

- act as the catalyst to encourage partners to co-locate frontline and back office activities;
- encourage partners to develop information systems to support decision-making across a service network; and
- help partners manage resources to secure performance improvement.

The opportunity for joint commissioning is one of the synergies that should arise from local joint working. Statutory partners involved in established theme groups (children and young people, community safety, health, supporting people), are likely to have experience of two-way or three-way joint commissioning arrangements.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **6.1 How does your LSP board ensure that the contributions of different partners build towards the agreed common goals in the SCS and the LAA?**

The HSP board has done this through developing a governance & performance management infrastructure, ensuring appropriate level of representation at meetings.

Strategic planning within individual member organisations does take place in the context of SCS/LAA targets, although there is no single mechanism for imprinting this on organisational plans. There is evidence that this happens for the Council Plan and business planning process, and the NHS Haringey Strategic Plan makes reference to the SCS/LAA targets. Similarly the police are focused on delivering LAA outcomes.

Our survey shows general agreement that the right people attend meetings, although there are some concerns around accountability at different levels.

### **6.2 How well does your LSP facilitate networking between partners?**

We are not aware of any specific networking activity outside the HSP structure. Our survey does not show agreement that this happens.

Relationships between partners currently develop organically through participation in the PMG/HSP board/theme boards.

There is potential for a partnership development programme, in particular focussing on the middle-tier who it is crucial to reach.

### **6.3 How well do partners work together to exploit the potential efficiency gains from joint working?**

There is a sense that the scope for efficiency is limited or would have low value in some areas due to sector specialism of, for example, HR / Payroll systems and needs. In this context not all members are 'partners of equals'. In reality, the feeling is that it would make more practical sense for the Council to look at efficiency gains from working with other London Boroughs, for example Enfield or Camden.

The most significant opportunities are around asset management / co-location but current examples of co-location, whilst improving outcomes, do not always appear to be saving any money. In practice terms it has, however, worked well for Jobcentre Plus as there is less stigma attached to going into a children's centre than a Jobcentre, whilst also providing much needed desk space to a core service. Another positive example is the criminal justice function within Shopping City. Significant savings could be possible if the tPCT is able to utilise some of the Council's buildings, as for example this would lead to energy costs being reduced.

Strategic commissioning between the Council, the Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health Trust and the tPCT is a potential burgeoning area. Discussions have already been held regarding joint commissioning with the VCS for mental health services. The development of a commissioning framework was agreed and adopted in April 2009 and the practical application has been tested by the Compact toolkit. This will continue to help align VCS activity to commissioning opportunities.

The Council has been in discussions with the tPCT regarding potential shared services. The recent PWC work on support services at the Council has provided a useful quantum for this. For example, at the tPCT the HR function has followed the provider arm, but there may be scope for the Council providing payroll services.

## 7 Getting Things Done

'Steering mechanisms influence partners' allocation of resources for achieving objectives. These mechanisms have developed unevenly across LSPs. The LAA focus on performance has encouraged executive-level performance sub-groups to coordinate partners' activity. Finance sub-groups, to monitor financial information and influence resource allocation, however, are less common.

LSPs without performance or finance sub-groups should review whether they have effective arrangements to steer performance and allocate resources across the partnership. Finance groups can develop rules to cover the use of area based grant (ABG) and performance reward grant (PRG). But this is a small part (commonly less than 2 per cent) of mainstream public service revenue spending.

One of the biggest challenges for LSPs is how they influence and steer the use of partners' mainstream resources. The starting point for steering is knowledge about the resources available. Only 14 per cent of the single-tier and county LSPs have mapped resources in their areas. But resource mapping must be proportional and cost-effective. One case study LSP abandoned its first mapping exercise, as it was too ambitious: another decided not to repeat the exercise.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **7.1 How well is performance management steered by your LSP?**

Performance management processes are clear, but there are questions around current effectiveness and a lack of accountability. There are clear plans to address this, through the establishment of a secretariat and differentiation of internal performance reports to meet needs of different groups / increase the capacity for strategic management within the PMG.

Historically there has been limited tailoring of performance reporting, with the same reports circulated to the board, executive and operational levels. There is a recognised need to introduce more focus at different levels. This will be a role of the new secretariat.

There is an apparent lack of accountability of thematic boards to the PMG / HSP and there is scope for the HSP to further challenge the performance of the theme boards and to hold them more to account.

### **7.2 How well is financial management steered by your LSP? How well does the LSP board and its executive groups influence mainstream resources to achieve local outcomes?**

There is a clear and effective process for allocation of ABG to theme boards which was first adopted for 2008/09. The debate around allocation of resource has matured and developed through this process. There is a clear overview of PRG achievement.

There is a good understanding between the Council and the tPCT of total budgets and areas of discretionary spend. There is a pragmatic, if rudimentary understanding of wider availability of resources across the partnership, for example to the fire service, Job Centre Plus and the police force.

Partners contribute according to their means.

Our survey results show overall disagreement that joint resource management is effective.

The PMG has discussed plans to set up an HSP Business Group. This would consist of the Lead Officers from each of the Theme Boards and would develop new practice and policy on behalf of the Executive Board. It would also be responsible for taking an overview of the resources available across the Partnership, which will be essential in the current economic climate.

### **7.3 Are partners aligning their internal planning, monitoring and evaluation processes to focus on LAA and SCS priorities?**

The CAA found good alignment between the LAA and SCS. Alignment is also implicit in that (a) shared prioritisation is effective and (b) strategic planning by member organisations takes place with regard to the SCS.

Strategy guidance agreed by the PMG will help partners ensure that their plans are aligned with the SCS and LAA. However, there is no overarching framework for systematic organisational planning. This is partly because, for example, fire and police planning frameworks are mandated by pan-London bodies.

Internal planning and monitoring arrangements are very focused on LAA targets within the Council and tPCT, with the tPCT updating its strategic plan with this in mind. This is less direct for other partners but reference is still made. The Council has an overview of the tPCT's planning in general and the two bodies try to align their target setting so that there is consistency, for example through the LAA refresh and by the Council having input to the NHS strategic planning process. There is sharing of outcomes data as part of the NHS Strategic Plan and scorecards that have been developed jointly, for example on infant mortality.

All partners have a very clear view of the resources they are responsible for within the LAA framework e.g. ABG and PRG.

## 8 Common Frameworks

'The layered approach to partnership governance and management recognises that partners have their own governance arrangements and stakeholders. The original LSP guidance was clear that partners remain accountable to their own stakeholders.

Performance information frameworks provide a focus for standardisation across LSP partners. Shared data and common approaches to performance help to join-up theme group activity.

LSPs that know their support costs can make informed decisions about value for money. They are also in a stronger position to agree about different partners' contributions, in cash or kind, to the LSP support team's work.

Pooled budgets allow partners to bring funds together to achieve economies of scale (particularly administration costs) from resources that would be too small to make a difference by themselves. The pooled budget manager can use the combined resources to commission services or goods. But pooled fund arrangements are subject to constraints reflecting different government department's rules.

LSPs will have a mixture of pooling and aligning. Whether partners choose pooling or aligning, they should be clear about the standards that govern resource and performance matters, and should be clear why they have chosen a particular financial arrangement.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **8.1 Does your LSP have an agreed performance management framework that recognises and builds on the strategic, executive and operational roles?**

Both the Council and HSP performance reports monitor performance against the Council and Sustainable Community Strategy priorities. Performance is also monitored against agreed targets which for the Council are reviewed and set at year end as part of the business planning process.

The Council and HSP reports focus on outcomes at risk, i.e. of not being achieved. The reports set out action taken to address underperformance.

At the HSP there are focussed discussions around outcomes that are either at risk or where there is good practice and there are lessons to be learned. Examples include actions to reduce teenage pregnancy (this was also discussed at Overview & Scrutiny), action taken to deal with Chlamydia, improving recycling and the Drug & Alcohol strategy.

### **8.2 Is there an agreed data quality policy and action plan with clear ownership?**

The Council has agreed a data quality policy, which refers to risks associated with using and sharing data within partnerships, and sets out a range of mitigating actions. There are also protocols in place to address data sharing for specific areas e.g. crime, health and adults but not yet children's services.

The Council's data quality strategy and policy apply to the partnership data. However, interview and survey responses suggest that the strategy is not well known or understood across the partnership, and there are residual concerns in some areas around, for example, the data protection act and arrangements for sharing personal data between organisations.

### **8.3 How well does your LSP work to keep its evidence base up-to-date?**

There is effective consultation to understand local need. This is feeding into the refresh of CAA.

Partners are aware of the existence of, for example, the JSNA, but have not all been able to make effective use of it. This is possibly a symptom of the weight of the information currently provided to partners, something the PMG is making steps to change. Having said that, the development of the JSNA is now successfully feeding into specific joint commissioning activity, and the PMG have approved the purchase of a shared data platform currently being procured for implementation in the Spring of 2010. This will allow the development of an electronic data observatory for the HSP.

See also section 9.2 below regarding shared performance systems.

### **8.4 How well do your LSP partners understand the costs of maintaining the LSP? How well have LSP partners made decisions about aligning or pooling of budgets?**

The level of understanding of costs of participation varies across the partnership. For the most part, costs of participation are absorbed within salary budgets.

There are limited examples of pooled budgets in place. One example is that CONEL has pooled resources with the Council on the Haringey Plan to tackle redundancy. There is a strategic willingness to explore this, but there is also an awareness that 'tribalism' at an operational level could be a barrier.

## 9 Shared Systems

'Overview and scrutiny enables councils to hold LSPs to account for local action and local public spending. The LGPIH Act 2007 and the Police and Justice Act 2006 give councils power to scrutinise the activities of LAA named partners.

Overview and scrutiny of an LSP can:

- focus on one-off activities or events;
- review systems and risks;
- assess performance in different themes; and
- review performance data from LSPs and partners.

LSPs provide an opportunity for statutory partners to benchmark their performance against one another. Some LSPs use performance information from other areas to help them interpret local performance.'

'Working together? Managing local strategic partnerships' - The Audit Commission, April 2009

### **9.1 How does the LSP ensure there is accountability, through its member organisations, for its actions?**

The HSP Terms of Reference set out arrangements for accountability, but there are some reservations around effectiveness within the current performance management arrangements.

It is generally felt that people who attend meetings have a mandate within their respective organisations. The duty of partners to co-operate is included within their roles and responsibilities, and HSP board meetings generate action points that partners are held to account over.

However, survey results only show narrow agreement that accountability is clear.

### **9.2 How far do the LSP and its partners have a shared performance system that extends across the partnership layers?**

Covalent is the Council's performance management system and the mechanism for collecting and reporting performance data on a timely basis. The tPCT has direct access to input and update the performance data for which it is the lead. Staff at the tPCT can also update action plans as required, and they have viewing access to a number of indicators where they have an interest in performance although permissions are limited in terms of them amending data or changing targets. Health staff have been trained and can also update risks which they own, for example some related to the Joint Area Review action plan.

Other partners do not enter data directly on Covalent but performance leads from the Council's Community Safety team receive weekly scorecards and update the figures on Covalent each month. This enables the corporate team to report on performance across the Council's priorities and to present up to date and relevant performance information including indicators on which other partners lead. The same applies for Homes for Haringey whereby the client team update Covalent monthly and scorecards reflect the status (red, amber or green) of performance against target. The system is also used to report comparative performance by including benchmarking data in performance reports.

The PMG receives quarterly updates on performance and progress against objectives and targets under the SCS and LAA. Progress is regularly reviewed and shared through a number of well-established mechanisms. For example there is a performance manager's forum which meets bi-monthly with both Council and health partners attending. Through these meetings it is possible to address specific performance issues and upgrades / developments with Covalent as well as data quality.

As part of the Council's approach to data quality it carries out audits of the national indicators including some cross-cutting indicators where the Council is not the lead.

### **9.3 How developed is joint commissioning in the LSP?**

There is scope for increasing joint commissioning and procurement, with the joint commissioning framework being piloted within the enterprise board. Some joint commissioning is occurring in health and social care. However, our survey shows strong disagreement that in general this takes place effectively.

In the first year of the LAA there was no strategic joint commissioning framework in place. It was in place by the second year but the majority of spend was already committed. For 2009/10 again many plans and budgets had already been agreed therefore there has been limited scope to apply the framework, unless spending has been de-commissioned or new grants have become available. However, some examples have been noted within the SCEB.

### **9.4 Have the LSP and its partners used benchmarking to assess the effectiveness of the LSP?**

The HSP benchmarked itself against eight other LSPs in September 2009. The benchmarking looked at structures and performance management arrangements, going into detail around how often the top and delivery boards meet, and what they consider. It also looked at the number of theme boards and how often they report upwards.

Prior to undertaking the benchmarking best practice guidance was reviewed, including 'Working better together?' and the Improvement and Development Agency website. The approach was then to review available online documentation, performance reports and Audit Commission case studies.

The main findings of the review were that the frequency of HSP Board, PMG and theme board meetings (currently quarterly) may need to increase to enable more rigorous performance challenge, but also to ensure that performance management does not 'crowd' out the agenda.

## 10 Looking Forward

### 10.1 What are the priorities for improvement following the review?

The PMG has established a clear set of "next steps":

- Haringey - the people, the place, the partnership
- Integration with zonal working - developing a closer connection to communities and front-line services
- Partnership practice and achievement to be showcased around the borough
- Performance management framework to be clarified and simplified - to include development of a secretariat
- PMG to develop role as an executive body

Our survey yielded various responses to the question 'How would you improve the effectiveness of the LSP?' These are listed below for the consideration of the PMG:

- More joint commissioning
- Reducing duplication in the sub groups
- Becoming more strategic at meetings of the Board
- More outward facing
- Setting fewer targets and ensuring delivery of those set
- More joined up working and ownership
- Look at the 'golden thread' issues and revise the SCS with this in mind
- Involve partners in more decisions
- The approach to effectiveness has been one of continuous improvement. As we gel together as partners the better our performance becomes
- There needs to be much more communication between the LSP and staff who are working in front line services
- Its current framework is effective as duly elected VCS reps on the LSP are continuing to inform and enable VCS voice at LSP level
- Would have forums that strongly reflect the key strategic priorities that in my case interact with the business community and identify milestones for business development and enterprise
- Ensure it was not just a sign-off board but involved the community better in the decision making
- Quarterly email newsletter, which any Haringey organisation or resident can sign up to receive - open information as a start!
- Possibly an annual open SCP event, showcasing progress, inviting input of ideas, suggestions - and chance for council and other statutory and voluntary/community sector elected reps to be questioned
- Introduce strategic commissioning across the whole LSP. It is currently being piloted
- We could do with a more targetted use of the ABG to fewer priorities, currently spread too thin on too many initiatives

- The LSP should strengthen its partnership with the local voluntary and community sector as is the case with national organisations with more resources to deliver on the LAA outcomes
- Not sure how many actual decisions it makes - guess it sets strategic direction, though
- To create a platform where all partners are equal
- To ensure that LSP resources are given to partners that contribute to LAAs
- All members should take an interest in other members activities

## A Action Plan

No.	Ref.	Recommendation	Management response	Implementation details
1.	3.2	The HSP Board needs to be free to focus on strategic issues. The theme boards should be managing the more operational matters, for example, recycling targets.	Agreed The HSP has a new focus to be implemented from April 2010. HSP Board to become a 'Standing Leadership Conference' focusing on strategic issues. PMG will become an 'Executive Board' supported by a new 'Business Group'.	April 2010 Assistant Chief Executive
2.	3.2	The HSP is data-rich, and there are specific examples of information being shared effectively, but the volume and distribution of data makes it difficult to access efficiently. Interviewees have spoken of needing a "helicopter view", which the PMG has recognised.	The HSP Performance Management Group has agreed a revised performance management framework which will streamline data provided to each partnership group.  A new data platform has been agreed, which will bring all the information together in one 'hub'.	April 2010  October 2010 Assistant Chief Executive
3.	4.5	The PMG has proposed the formation of a secretariat to improve the effectiveness of the HSP. This secretariat needs to be more outward-looking, helping to ensure that the ABG continues to be invested wisely.	The servicing of the HSP and its component parts will be tailored to meet the proposed format of the Standing Leadership Conference and the Executive Board including the introduction of the Business Group, see item 4.	August 2010 Assistant Chief Executive

No.	Ref.	Recommendation	Management response	Implementation details
4.	7.2	The PMG's proposal to form an HSP Business Group should be implemented. This group should be tasked with monitoring financial information and influencing mainstream resource allocation across the partnership. The starting point for steering is knowledge about the resources available. That said, any resource mapping undertaken must be proportional and cost-effective	Agreed	April 2010. Assistant Chief Executive.
5.	4.3	Senior managers' events across the partnership should be maintained as they provide the opportunity to build a culture of partnership working below the PMG level.	Agreed	Ongoing Head of OD&L
6.	5.1	The Council currently demonstrates community leadership in line with it being democratically accountable. The impression given by some is that more leadership is needed from other partners, as all need to be 'Leaders of place' without the Council dominating. The HSP should continue to work to ensure balanced input from all parties. For example, the police have recently started to work with the Council to better ensure that CCTV provides value for money. Activity data is available but historically this has not been analysed to link with outcomes. We understand that five or six outcomes are being agreed so that data can be coded accordingly.	Agreed.	Ongoing All HSP partners
7.	2.6	There is scope for phase 2 of the JSNA to better inform the work of all the theme boards. The biggest three theme boards (Wellbeing, Children's Trust and Safer Communities) have utilised phase 1 effectively, along with their own strategic needs assessments. The Enterprise board utilises its own recession dashboard. However the JSNA could more effectively feed into the work of the Better Places and Integrated Housing boards. Overall responsibility should be agreed for the effective dissemination of the JSNA data to all the theme boards.	The expansion of the JSNA steering group to become a 'Healthier Communities Group' will address this recommendation.	July 2010 JSNA steering group

No.	Ref.	Recommendation	Management response	Implementation details
8.	2.5	The recent PMG review did not look at the theme boards in detail. Their link to the newly proposed Executive Board will need to be considered. The PMG has recognised that once in place the Executive Board may wish to carry out a piece of work reviewing the structure of the theme boards and whether they are appropriate to the needs of Haringey. We would agree this review needs to be completed, with an emphasis on both LAA targets and other demonstrable outcomes being achieved by each board.	Agreed	April – May 2010 Interim Deputy Chief Executive
9.	4.1	In our view chairs of theme boards should not also chair any of the board's sub-groups, as this could represent a conflict and result in a lack of appropriate scrutiny of chairs' performance.	To be considered as part of the review of theme boards.	April – May 2010 Interim Deputy Chief Executive
10	5.3	The development of a commissioning framework was agreed and adopted in April 2009 and the practical application has been tested by the Compact toolkit. This will continue to help align Voluntary & Community Services (VCS) activity to commissioning opportunities. However, the Haringey Association of Community and Voluntary Organisations (HAVCO) perceives that the interests of third sector representatives are best reflected around health and wellbeing, but that there is room for improvement in the other theme areas.	HAVCO has agreed to support third sector organisations to better equip them to participate in commissioning.	Ongoing Chief Executive HAVCO

No.	Ref.	Recommendation	Management response	Implementation details
11	5.4	<p>Six individuals from the Community Link Forum (CLF) are voted to represent the CLF on the HSP Board. We would recommend that the HSP build 'community empowerment' into the HCLF project to ensure that the community representatives receive the capacity building support that some of them require. Also, the fact that individuals are voted for rather than organisations means that some major VCS delivery partners could not be actively involved. There is a perception from some quarters that CLF attendees are not able to fully represent the relevant delivery agencies. Where the board perceives there is a deficit of expertise, we would recommend that it consider using the allowed option to co-opt members who are not elected through the CLF. In addition, the CLF is perhaps being under-utilised. For example, the tPCT would find it useful to utilise the CLF more to make contact with excluded groups.</p>	<p>The HSP supports HAVCO to provide the necessary support.</p>	<p>Ongoing Chief Executive HAVCO</p>
12	5.3	<p>It is recognised that engagement from the private sector needs to improve, and that perhaps looking outside the borough is an option. The issue is partly due to a lack of large private sector employers in area, although there is some involvement from Shopping City in Wood Green. Engagement is being sought through other media e.g. business breakfasts. Networks with smaller businesses are needed too.</p>	<p>London First is currently being approached to advise on best way to engage with private sector. Representative from London First to attend Executive Board from July</p>	<p>From July Assistant Chief Executive</p>

## B Methodology

Our approach as outlined in our October 2009 specification was as follows:

- Consolidate learning from year one of the CAA and UoR processes, as well as our review of arrangements for tackling health inequalities;
- Distribute an anonymous electronic questionnaire to named members of all HSP groups and sub-groups. This was sent out to 90 members and we received responses from 34 people.
- Undertake reviews of key documents. This process began with publicly available documents and those already held as a result of our work in other areas. Where necessary we issued partners with further requests for information;
- Undertake interviews with key personnel, initially with members of the Haringey Strategic Partnership's Performance Management Group (PMG). We undertook further interviews as necessary and by agreement, ultimately speaking to the following people:

### Performance Management Group

Organisation	PMG member
LBH	Dr Ita O'Donovan, Chief Executive
LBH	Cllr. Claire Kober, Leader of the Council
PCT	Tracey Baldwin, Chief Executive
Fire	John Brown, Borough Commander Haringey
Police	Dave Grant, Chief Superintendent
College of NE London	Paul Head, Principal of CONEL (Vice-Chair)
Job Centre	Rose Diamond
HAVCO	Naeem Sheikh

### Theme Board Chairs

Name	Theme Board
Dr Ita O'Donovan, LBH CE	Enterprise
Cllr Canver, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities and Enforcement	Safer Communities Executive
Cllr Reith, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People	Children's Trust
Cllr Haley, Cabinet Member for Environment & Conservation	Better Places
Cllr Bevan, Cabinet Member for Housing Services	Integrated Housing
Richard Sumray, PCT Chair	Wellbeing

**Other**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>
Adrienne Roberts, LBH	Interim Deputy CE
Wayne Longshaw, LBH	Assistant CE, Policy, Performance & Communications
Duncan Stroud, PCT	Associate Director of Communications, Stakeholder and Engagement

- By agreement with partners, we will attend HSP meetings in the capacity of observers. We attended the HSP Board meeting on 21st January 2010.



**[www.grant-thornton.co.uk](http://www.grant-thornton.co.uk)**

© 2010 Grant Thornton UK LLP. All rights reserved.

"Grant Thornton" means Grant Thornton UK LLP, a limited liability partnership.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm within Grant Thornton International Ltd ('Grant Thornton International'). Grant Thornton International and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. Services are delivered by the member firms independently.

This publication has been prepared only as a guide. No responsibility can be accepted by us for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from acting as a result of any material in this publication