South East Locality Community Planning Partnership

Friday, 4 October 2019, 14.00
Conference room, St Leonards Police Station

Agenda

1. Welcome/Apologies

2. Terms of Reference - circulated

3. Nomination of Chair/Vice Chair

4. Locality Improvement Plan Stocktake – report circulated

5. Locality Improvement Plan Review – paper circulated

6. AOB

7. Date of next meeting

TERMS OF REFERENCE

LOCALITY COMMUNITY PLANNING PARTNERSHIPS

1   Introduction

1.1   This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the four Locality Community Planning Partnerships in the city in the South East, South West, North West and North East.

2   Background

2.1   The Locality Community Planning Partnerships form part of the community planning governance arrangements for the city agreed by the Edinburgh Partnership Board in April 2019.

2.2   The Edinburgh Partnership's vision for the city, agreed in 2018, is that:

> *"Edinburgh is a thriving, connected, inspired and fair city, where all forms of poverty and inequality are reduced."*

2.3   The Edinburgh Partnership is committed to combining its resources, thinking beyond organisational boundaries, to work meaningfully with communities to deliver this ambition for change.

2.4   The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 requires the Edinburgh Partnership to put in place structures and arrangements which support effective and efficient community planning and provides a clear role for community bodies in its organisation and decision-making process. These arrangements are set out below.

3   Role of Members

3.1   All members will be committed to working together to improve outcomes for individuals and communities in the city and in doing so will:

- uphold and promote the aims and objectives of the Edinburgh Partnership and act in the best interests of the public at all times;
- comply with the Seven Principles of Public Life and the Good Governance Standard for Public Services (Appendices a and b);
- be committed to the National Standards for Community Engagement (Appendix c);
- champion more effective partnership working;
- work collaboratively to find shared solutions to issues; and
- uphold equality of opportunity principles to ensure no one is treated less favourably and promote good relations for all.

4   Remit

4.1   The Locality Community Planning Partnerships will be accountable to the Edinburgh Partnership Board in respect of leading, delivering and progress on the locality improvement plan to improve outcomes for those individuals and communities in their area experiencing the greatest inequality.

4.2   The remit is to:

- Plan, oversee and be accountable for the development and delivery of the locality improvement plan reflecting the changing priorities and needs of the community.

- Establish and maintain effective relationships with all relevant bodies and partnerships, ensuring appropriate involvement and contribution to the locality community planning process.

- Ensure the effective engagement and participation of all bodies in the development and delivery of locality community planning.

- Ensure communities are engaged in the identification of priorities, planning and delivery of the locality improvement plan.

- Maintain a strong understanding of the emerging needs, circumstances and opportunities relevant to the locality, building a robust evidence base of data, information and community intelligence to inform decisions and actions.

- Advise on, and be accountable for, how resources are aligned and allocated to support the delivery of the actions in the locality improvement plan.

- Ensure the effective management of performance and risk in relation to the delivery of the locality improvement plan and reporting progress to the Edinburgh Partnership Board.

- Put in place working group arrangements to support the delivery of the role and remit as appropriate whilst minimising the additional resource requirements placed on partners.

5 Membership

5.1 The core membership will comprise the following:

City of Edinburgh Council (One elected member for each ward in the locality and officer representation)
Scottish Fire and Rescue Service
Police Scotland
NHS Lothian
Health and Social Care Partnership
Skills Development Scotland
Third sector
Neighbourhood Network (one representative for each Network)

5.2 The constituent bodies will be asked to nominate members with the appropriate authority to deliver the Partnerships priorities based on their ability to contribute at a locality level. Each Neighbourhood Network will nominate a community member to sit on the Partnership. The Council will appoint one elected member for each of the wards as part of its annual appointment report in May.

5.3 Each Partnership may co-opt as additional members a representative of an organisation with knowledge of, or interests in the area, provided the partnership ensures that the overall number of the members is manageable. For example, this could be on a thematic basis such as education.

6 Chair and Vice Chair

6.1 The roles of Chair and Vice Chair will be appointed from within the membership of the Partnership from different bodies on an annual basis.

7   Meetings

7.1   The frequency and scheduling of meetings will be subject to the agreement of the Partnership.

7.2   Papers for meetings will be circulated in advance of the meeting and be posted on the Edinburgh Partnership webpage.

7.3   The quorum for the meetings is not less than one third of the Partnership membership and provided at least 3 partner organisations are present.

7.4   The Partnership will work towards achieving a consensus in making decisions, whilst respecting the right of individual members to disagree. If this cannot be reached a vote of members in attendance will be taken. If there is an equal number of votes the Chair will have the casting vote. In the event of the Chair not using their casting vote, the decision will be reached by lot.

7.5   Every meeting of the Group will be minuted and the minutes presented to the following meeting for approval.

7.6   The Group will provide reports to the Edinburgh Partnership Board on the delivery of the Locality Improvement Plan in accordance with the approved performance framework.

8   Declaration of Interest

8.1   Board members will declare an interest in items of business where appropriate and in accordance with the provisions set out in Appendix (d). Declarations will be noted in the minutes of meetings.

The Seven Principles of Public Life

Selflessness

Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family or their friends.

Integrity

Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity

In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

Openness

Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

Honesty

Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

Leadership

Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

Committee on Standards in Public Life

The Good Governance Standard for Public Services

The Good Governance Standard for Public Services is intended for use by all organisations and partnerships that work for the public, using public money. It sets out six core principles of good governance for public service organisations.

1 Good governance means focusing on the organisation's purpose and on outcomes for citizens and service users

    1.1 Being clear about the organisation's purpose and its intended outcomes for citizens and service users

    1.2 Making sure that users receive a high quality service

    1.3 Making sure that taxpayers receive value for money

2 Good governance means performing effectively in clearly defined functions and roles

    2.1 Being clear about the functions of the governing body

    2.2 Being clear about the responsibilities of non-executives and the executive, and making sure that those responsibilities are carried out

    2.3 Being clear about relationships between governors and the public

3 Good governance means promoting values for the whole organisation and demonstrating the values of good governance through behaviour

    3.1 Putting organisational values into practice

    3.2 Individual governors behaving in ways that uphold and exemplify effective governance

4 Good governance means taking informed, transparent decisions and managing risk

    4.1 Being rigorous and transparent about how decisions are taken

    4.2 Having and using good quality information, advice and support

    4.3 Making sure that an effective risk management system is in operation

5 Good governance means developing the capacity and capability of the governing body to be effective

5.1 Making sure that appointed and elected governors have the skills, knowledge and experience they need to perform well

5.2 Developing the capability of people with governance responsibilities and evaluating their performance, as individuals and as a group

5.3 Striking a balance, in the membership of the governing body, between continuity and renewal

6   Good governance means engaging stakeholders and making accountability real

6.1 Understanding formal and informal accountability relationships

6.2 Taking an active and planned approach to dialogue with and accountability to the public

6.3 Taking an active and planned approach to responsibility to staff

6.4 Engaging effectively with institutional stakeholders

The Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services

National Standards of Community Engagement

Inclusion
We will identify and involve the people and organisations that are affected by the focus of the engagement.

Support
We will identify and overcome any barriers to participation.

Communication
We will communicate clearly and regularly with the people, organisations and communities affected by the engagement.

Impact
We will assess the impact of the engagement and use what has been learned to improve our future community engagement.

Planning
There is a clear purpose for the engagement, which is based on a shared understanding of community needs and ambitions.

Methods
We will use methods of engagement that are fit for purpose.

Working Together
We will work effectively together to achieve the aims of the engagement.

Social Community Development Centre (SCDC)

D E C L A R A T I O N   O F   I N T E R E S T

1. Your interests

1.1 Interests which should be declared may be <u>financial</u> or <u>non-financial</u>. They may or may not be interests covered under the categories of a Register of Interests.

1.2 Interests which are registered should be declared.

1.3 Where a <u>private or personal</u> interest might be seen by a member of the public to be in a different light to that of an ordinary member of the public because of your standing in the Edinburgh Partnership the interest should be declared.

2. Interests of other persons

2.1 Where financial interests and non-financial interests are known to you of your spouse or your cohabiter, you will need to consider if these should be declared, where a member of the public might reasonably regard the interests as effectively your interests.

2.2 The interests, both financial and non-financial, known to you of relatives and close friends may have to be declared under the principle of transparency, where the interest might objectively be regarded by a member of the public acting reasonably, to be affecting your responsibilities in the EP.

3. Making a Declaration

3.1 Your declaration of interest must be made as soon as practicable, when a particular item is being discussed you must declare the interest as soon as you realise it is necessary.

3.2 an oral declaration should identify the item or items of business to which it relates and give sufficient information to enable those at the meeting to understand the nature of your interest. You do not need to give a detailed description.

4. Effect of Declaration

4.1 Declaring a financial or non-financial interest will have the effect of prohibiting participation in discussion or voting on the item. You may be asked by the Chair to leave the room until the business item is concluded.

4.2 A conclusive test of whether you should declare an interest is whether knowing all the relevant facts, a member of the public would reasonably regard your interest as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your discussion or decision making in your role in the Edinburgh Partnership.

4.3 If in doubt you should take no part in the discussion of the business item and leave the room until the item is concluded.

STOCKTAKE REPORT

This report provides a summary of the findings of the Locality Improvement Plan stocktake that was carried out during August and September 2019.

Background

1.1.   The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 requires Community Planning Partnerships to identify and improve outcomes for local areas which experience the greatest inequality. The locality improvement plans show how the public bodies, with communities, aim to deliver better outcomes on agreed priorities for each local area.

1.2.   The four Locality Improvement Plans (LIPs) were approved in October 2017 by the Edinburgh Partnership Board. The LIP priorities were developed through consultation with local communities, and all have a similar structure:

- five locality wide themes:
    o   Economy/Employability
    o   Children and Young People
    o   Health and Wellbeing
    o   Team around the Place
    o   Community Safety
- small areas plans – areas where the community experience higher levels of inequalities and a poorer quality of life.

1.3.   Alongside the LIPs sits the new citywide Community Plan 2018-28 (or Local Outcome Improvement Plan). This was developed through a focused approach where priorities were considered against three test questions:

- can only be addressed through joint working
- are thorny
- address poverty and inequality

1.4.   An annual report on the LIPs was reported to the Edinburgh Partnership Board in December 2018. At this meeting, the good progress with actions

across the themes was noted. The report also highlighted the challenges to progressing actions. The Edinburgh Partnership agreed that the Locality Community Planning Partnerships, once established, should carry out a review of the LIPs, together with the operational working arrangements, to address the challenges raised and ensure a greater focus on poverty and inequality, in line with the Community Plan.

1.5.   As an initial phase of this review, a stocktake of the LIPs was undertaken. During August and September, a series of interviews were carried out with partners leading the LIP workstreams in each locality.

1.6.   These interviews covered the following topics:

- what had been the successes/areas of progress?
- what have been the barriers/challenges?
- are there any gaps?
- suggestions for improvements going forward.

Key topics raised

2.1.   The **scope and detail in the LIPs** was a topic raised across partners and localities. The aspiration to focus on prevention around poverty and inequality and partnership working was seen as positive and worth retaining.

2.2.   However, the LIPs and the accompanying action plans are very large and unwieldy documents. They encompass a broad range of work currently underway (both single agency's action and existing partnership working) within the localities. The size of these documents and the inclusion of 'business as usual' actions have made it difficult to focus on the specific areas where joint working locally could have additionality and help reduce inequalities.

2.3.   The **development of good working relationships** was seen as a key element of the working groups. People reported that having the right people in the room at the right time was a positive factor in making action happen. Where possible, existing partnership groups were asked to expand their remit to include the appropriate LIP theme. Where there were gaps, new partnership groups were set up. These working relationships also gave rise to opportunities to work together in ways that were not expected initially.

2.4.   **Changes to individuals within working groups** was a challenge to the pace of progress. New individuals had to be brought up to speed with the LIP priorities and workstreams and progress to date which resulted in delays to progressing LIP actions. It was acknowledged that people moving on is a challenge that will remain going forward.

2.5.   The **lack of links between working groups** was raised as a barrier. The current operational structure, with working groups based on themes/small areas, has led to silo working with few links between the groups. Discussions at Locality Leadership Team meetings were too high level and did not always involve theme leads. When theme leads did meet regularly, there were improved links between individuals but opportunities to address cross cutting

issues were not always identified and progressed. People did not feel that attending all the groups would be a viable solution due to their time constraints. Improving communication about work underway would allow them to identify additional opportunities for them to contribute to specific actions and attend relevant meetings.

2.6.   **Clearer links to other plans/groups** could be improved going forward. When LIP priorities were closely aligned to partner priorities, actions were progressed as each action addressed multiple priorities. Where there was less alignment, dealing with internal pressures generally had to be prioritised resulting in less progress on joint objectives.

2.7.   There are some issues identified within the LIP that could be partly addressed through local solutions and partly at a citywide level. Closer links between LIPs and other strategic plan working groups (particular the Local Outcome Improvement Plan Delivery Group) are needed to ensure a joined up approach to addressing these issues, reduce duplication of effort and provide a clarity about where specific issues will be addressed through local and citywide actions.

2.8.   The **collection and monitoring of progress and impact of actions** was challenging for several reasons. Firstly, identifying the relevant data to gather was more challenging than expected as impacts were expected to be more qualitative in nature.

2.9.   Secondly, it is difficult to attribute outcomes to specific actions, and that influencing poverty and inequality outcomes is inevitably long term which militates against more frequent performance reporting.

2.10.   Where data was already gathered for other purposes, reporting for LIP actions was less challenging. Although this could lead to reporting on the impact of other actions not related to LIP priorities. Where new datasets were identified, no consistent approach to embedding new collection processes was adopted. This meant that progress updates were gathered retrospectively as reporting deadlines approached.

2.11.   The need to show a balance of impacts (both qualitative and quantitative; and process, impact and outcomes) and the complex nature of the factors influencing poverty and inequality in local areas means that for certain actions no defined measures were agreed at the beginning which led to issues of not being able to report on impact going forward.

2.12.   Although an online tool, Pentana, was set up to hold a single shared version of the LIP action plan and allow the task of updating on progress to be shared across partners, this has not been well embedded. Following initial training, issues with delays in setting up action plans; differences in information required for the different formats (e.g. online version and word document); and the slow development of extractable progress reports made the tool time consuming and difficult to use for many.

2.13.   The effort put into **involving communities in the development of the LIP priorities** was acknowledged and seen as a positive. However, communications around the purpose of the LIP need to continue to evolve so

that communities gain a better understanding of how their issues are represented (within a selection of plans) and the LIP discussions remain focused on joint working and addressing poverty and inequalities on a local basis. The inclusion of community representatives on the locality community planning partnerships is seen as a positive step in this direction.

2.14. A final barrier highlighted was when **other workload pressures impacted** on partners ability to commit time to taking LIP actions forward.

Recommendations

3.1. **Recommendation 1:** strip back the LIP and agree a limited number of joint actions that focus on addressing poverty and inequality, that are not already in place, for implementation over the next 12 to 24 months. This would make the document more dynamic and allow regular opportunities to sense check the impact of actions and ongoing relevance of priorities before further actions are developed.

3.2. **Recommendation 2:** revise the operational working arrangements to consider if there is a more flexible approach which would drive the LIP actions forward in a coordinated manner across the themes. The other partnership working driven by other strategic plans needs to be considered as part of any realignment of groups.

3.3. **Recommendation 3:** ensure meetings have a clear purpose so that those attending understand what they are expected to contribute. This will allow partners, including community representatives who are volunteers, to ensure that the limited time they have available to support LIP development and delivery is targeted by attending the most appropriate meetings.

3.4. **Recommendation 4:** embed a pro-active progress reporting culture so that updates are reported and captured (with relevant data) as actions happen and progress reporting is not ad hoc in nature.

3.5. **Recommendation 5:** define a clear timeline and structure for reporting progress to increase accountability within the LCPP membership. This will include an annual progress report to the Edinburgh Partnership Board as well as responsibility to provide exception reporting to the Board when issues arise that cannot be addressed by the LCPP.

Locality Improvement Plans

Review – September 2019

PURPOSE OF REPORT

At its meeting held on 2nd April 2019, the Edinburgh Partnership agreed to review Locality Improvement Plans (LIPs) with a view to [1]'improve outcomes for those individuals and communities in their area experiencing the greatest inequality'.

To ensure the LIP review process is robust and addresses the scope set by the Edinburgh Partnership, this report proposes an initial stage which will involve an in-depth analysis of each locality to better understand where individuals and communities are experiencing the greatest inequality. In doing so, the LIP review and any proposed changes as a result is taken forward using informed approaches and understanding.

Recommendations:

1. To agree to partners undertaking more in-depth analysis to identify individuals and communities experiencing the greatest inequality - the Edinburgh Partnership scope of review;
2. Partner officers establish a suitable framework in which to undertake the analysis;
3. The findings are to be reported to the Edinburgh Partnership at its December 2019 meeting to inform the full LIP review process thereafter.

INTRODUCTION

The Edinburgh Partnership Governance Framework sets out the remit of the Locality Community Planning Partnership. One of the main functions is to - '*plan, oversee and be accountable for the development and delivery of the locality improvement plan, reflecting the changing priorities and needs of the community*'.

Prior to moving to the full review stage, it is suggested that in-depth analysis is required to identify those individuals and communities referred to as experiencing the greatest inequality, so that any changes to the LIP, areas of operation and associated outcomes are evidence based.

A framework to support this will be established and the analysis will be undertaken by the end of November 2019.

BACKGROUND

The current LIPs were created using Scottish Government guidance. The guidance specifies that 'each plan would normally focus on areas that will benefit most from improvement'. However, when creating the LIPs, the consultation and subsequent outcomes were developed for the whole locality

---

[1] Edinburgh Partnership Board – 02/04/19 – Governance Implementation & Resourcing

with the intention to support improvements across the 'pockets' of potential poverty. Areas with more pronounced poverty and inequality issues as identified through the SIMD were included with separate outcomes (where applicable). These were identified as "Small Areas" in the LIP and accompanied by "Small Area Plans" which included a range of actions developed to deliver activity aimed at addressing issues of poverty and improving the quality of life for people living in these specific geographic areas. Whilst taking this holistic approach with good intention, it has resulted in significant challenges whereby the LIP has attempted to be 'everything to everybody'.

Partners operating at locality level have indicated that a key challenge with the current LIP is to deliver against outcomes that are more strategic in nature whereby they have no influence over the resources that would be required to support the outcome, for example:

- Tackling inequality issues such as living wage, discrimination, access to transport;
- Increase practitioner capacity to support children's health and wellbeing;
- People of all ages gain skills for employment;
- Services supporting independent living at home for those with additional care needs.

Another challenge is the scale of the LIP itself whereby across all four LIPs there are 150 outcomes and 505 actions.

Alongside the challenges mentioned above, further rationale exists to undertake the LIP review with a view to moving to a different approach.

RATIONALE FOR CHANGE

Communities of Operation

Poverty and inequality exists across the city. However, it is well known that this can be more pronounced in some communities. This supports the Edinburgh Partnership view to review the LIPs to create more targeted approaches. The SIMD is a robust and trusted model for mapping areas of deprivation however, it should be recognised that SIMD is not the sole measure of poverty.

[2]*'Living in poverty is not the same as living in a deprived area' – 'Multiple deprivation is used to describe the situation when individuals, households or collections of people in small geographical areas are deprived of a range of conditions at the same time, for example, they are deprived of adequate housing, education and employment'*

Poverty involves a range of defined factors from low income and access to means tested welfare to fuel poverty and accessing food banks. However, the indicators used to measure SIMD will undoubtedly act as connected drivers to influence greater levels of poverty within those areas identified with high levels of deprivation. Some of these communities are also linked with stigma and intractable issues.

The consequences of deprivation have been studied for several years highlighting significant challenges. Examples include:

---

[2] University of Glasgow – Policy Scotland 'Local Contributions to Tackling Poverty and Inequality in Scotland 2018

- [3]More than a third of children in the most deprived SIMD quintile live in low-income households compared to fewer than one in 20 in the least deprived quintile.
- [3]At the age of five, children from the highest-income families are ahead of children from the lowest-income families by: 13 months in knowledge of vocabulary; 10 months in problem-solving skills.
- [4]Young People - Those who live in more deprived areas are less likely to enter positive destinations than those from less deprived areas, although the gap has been closing in recent years
- [4]Young people living in the most deprived areas are at a higher risk of regular smoking, teenage pregnancy and spending time in custody compared to those in the least deprived areas.
- [5]Children and young people living in deprivation, in poverty or who are of a low socioeconomic status are more likely to be exposed to one or more ACEs (Adverse Childhood Experiences) than their socioeconomically better-off peers

The Edinburgh City Plan and respective partners strategic plans include measures to alleviate these (and many more) issues across the city. Similarly, the work currently underway by the Edinburgh Poverty Commission will also create a series of actions/recommendations aimed at tackling the issue across the city.

With the above in mind, it is important that where any changes are suggested either operationally or in the context of reviewing outcomes, these are based fully on evidence that will ensure appropriate resources are providing the correct service to those experiencing greater levels of inequality.

---

[3] NHS Health Scotland – Child Poverty in Scotland 2018
[4] Scottish Government – The Life Chances of Young People in Scotland 2017
[5] Department of Health /UCL – Impact of Adverse Experiences in the home of Children and Young People 2015