		Agenda Item	5.
Highland Community Planning Partnership		Report No	CPB 11/16
Community Planning Board – 7.10.16			

Redesign of Highland Council

Report by the Head of Policy and Reform

Summary
This report advises the CPP Board of the Council's approach to redesign, the helpful engagement with the CPP to date and the scope for future engagement at the strategic and functional levels.

1. Background

1.1 Given the financial and demand pressures facing the Council, the Council is undertaking redesign. A Redesign Board of elected members and Trade Union representatives is established to lead the work. Its remit is attached at Appendix 1 and timeline at Appendix 2.

1.2 To date all of the Board's recommendations to the Council have been agreed. This includes:

- A statement of Council purpose, values and outcomes (see Appendix 3);
- The long list of Council functions to review (around 120 out of 270);
- That reviews will include appraising a range of options for service delivery (see Appendix 4);
- That reviews will be conducted in-house by challenge and review teams, supplemented by external support where required (this could include support from the CPP);
- New ways of engaging staff in the redesign process;
- That the approach will be inclusive of public and partner engagement.

2. Engagement with the CPP

2.1 The Chair and Vice Chair of the Redesign Board met with the CPP Chief Officers Group on 19th May 2016. The output from that session helped to develop the Council purpose, values and outcomes. It is attached at Appendix 5.

2.2 The Chair and Vice Chair of the Redesign Board met with the CPP Chief Officers Group at their next meeting on 11th August 2016. The output from that session showed a keen interest in engagement of partners in the process and identified areas of mutual interest and other issues to address, including engagement with and support for the third sector. The feedback is attached at Appendix 6.

2.3 The feedback from both COGs was reported back to the Board and to the Council. Further opportunities for engagement with the CPP exist at both

strategic and functional levels, as described below.

2.4 <u>Strategic engagement</u>
The Board and Council are aware of Government reviews of some partner organisations and will feed views into these in order to achieve the best outcomes for the region.

2.5 Among the options for service delivery listed in Appendix 4 are options for shared services, partnership and integrated services and opportunities for new place-based approaches with partners arising from the new local Community Partnerships. These offer scope for working together even closer, focusing on outcomes and efficiency. They will be identified from the reviews of functions and from other opportunities identified across partners.

2.6 An opportunity exists at a strategic level to follow up on a key issue raised by the COG in August around the expectations of the role of communities in public services. Council redesign has ambition for communities to be more involved in matters that affect them and in doing more in their communities. This is aligned to the new duties of the CPP. The key issues identified by the COG were around:

- How best to support the move to more community run services and the infrastructure for that;
- the need to provide reassurance for communities that public bodies will be there to support them to do it – and that they won't have to do it on their own;
- for support infrastructure to be able to help when things run into trouble. Issues of governance and volunteer fatigue were raised;
- how public sector staff with skills to support community bodies could be released to help with such issues, e.g. volunteering schemes as part of employee development and with potential as a benefit for the private sector too (payback as staff skills development, business development and organisational learning).
- concerns about different capacity in communities to be involved and how this could widen inequalities if support was not targeted and coordinated better in the CPP;
- the need to involve communities of experience and not just of place.

2.7 For Redesign Board members to gather more information about this topic they invited a diverse selection of 15 community bodies across the region to share their experience and ideas on how the Council could become more enabling. 14 were able to contribute. Appendix 7 lists those involved and Appendix 8 provides a summary of the output. The key ideas to pursue are listed below and they have some alignment with the issues identified by the COG.

1. Creating a support or brokerage service for community bodies – a 'Community Gateway' operating like Business Gateway for community bodies. This would connect volunteers with volunteering opportunities,

coordinate volunteering, provide a single point of contact, help to access funding and deal with its associated bureaucracy, support for asset transfer, sharing physical assets across community bodies and with public bodies. It would also provide business advice and training and development.

2. Accessing expertise among Council staff (e.g. legal, governance, HR).
3. Creating modern apprenticeships in community development.
4. Supporting positive attitudes among staff in public bodies about the role of community bodies and how best to support and respond to them. Engage community bodies to provide training in this.
5. Developing the community leadership role of the Council to excite, engage and enable creative thinking in communities.
6. Getting the new local community partnerships off to the right start with local community bodies – from community planning to communities planning.
7. Reviewing funding approaches (and with partners) – easy to access small grants, community investment fund, core funding requirements and commissioning approaches and learning from the community challenge fund approach.
8. Re-inventing / reinvigorating community councils.

2.8   This feedback is of even more use to the CPP given our shared interests i.e.:
- The CPP has partnership roles to support community empowerment, community development and produce community learning and development plans;
- Different partners have funding streams and other supports for community bodies; and
- The CPP is creating new local community partnerships in which community bodies are to participate. The recent CPP event in Strathpeffer on 30.9.16 on Delivering Community Partnerships provided the first opportunity for partners to consider how local community partnerships could be taken forward. Initial views included the importance of utilising a range of mechanisms and building on existing activities, ensuring views of groups across the community are heard, particularly from hard to reach groups and that the success of the partnerships will depend upon the successful engagement and involvement of communities.

2.9   In addition, the COG has identified the need for the CPP to do things differently where that makes sense for the region and for the public purse. Feedback from the COG session in May (Appendix 5) highlighted the need to focus on shared outcomes, see challenge as helpful, be open and clear about how each partner contributes and challenge the status quo (by not being constrained by organisational boundaries, agreeing to shift power and access total resources in partnership). The feedback from these community bodies certainly challenges our current working arrangements. For example the support for community bodies is currently fragmented with Council, regional and national bodies all having roles and this seems to be confusing to community bodies and could well be inefficient.

2.10   To explore these ideas further and agree the action required the Council is hosting an engagement event on 11th November 2016. The HTSI has agreed to run the event on behalf of the Council so that public bodies in attendance can be in listening mode. The Minister for Housing and Local Government is invited. The date selected would enable COG participation as it would largely replace the COG business scheduled for that day, with scope for business to be taken afterwards if required. CPP views on the design of the day are welcome. Attendance is sought from around 70 community bodies and 25 Community Councils, Redesign Board Members, Commissioners from the Commission on Highland Democracy and the COG. Any CPP Board Members keen to attend would be very welcome. Should there be interest from more community bodies then places will be made available as the venue (the Smithton Church, Inverness) can accommodate more people.

2.11   Functional level engagement
At a functional level there will be engagement with individual partners as reviews proceed. There are three types of review underway or to programme. These are:
1. Significant reviews for redesign
2. Reviews underway that may require Redesign Board consideration
3. Mini reviews, largely affecting income, charges and commercial opportunities.

2.12   The reviews are listed by review type in Appendix 9. Most of them will require engagement with partners to a greater or lesser extent and some cannot proceed without them. It is helpful that the Council and particular partners have already identified the potential for shared service arrangements around depots and fleet for example. Services to be reviewed that affect contractual and strategic service arrangements with partners, i.e. with NHSH and HLH will obviously require early engagement with them.

2.13   Review teams are being established and it may be that partners will be invited to help with some aspects of challenge and review. HLH has already contributed to the deliberations of the Board.

---

3. Recommendation

3.1 Board Members are asked to note the redesign work underway in the Council and the pace at which it is working. There has been productive engagement so far with COG members and as reviews begin there will be strategic and functional engagement with partners.

3.2 The event with community bodies planned for 11.11.16 offers potential for learning and new action in the CPP on how best to support community empowerment and more community-run services. CPP participation is sought and it is hoped that the date selection makes this possible at least for COG members with Board Members also welcomed.

Author: Carron McDiarmid, Head of Policy and Reform, Highland Council Tel. (01463) 702852

Background Papers: See full reports on redesign to Highland Council on 29.6.16 and

8.9.16.

Terms of Reference for the Redesign Board
Agreed by the Board 18.4.16, *amended following Council 29.6.16*

Objectives
The Board will produce proposals for the Highland Council on redesigning the
Council. These proposals will include:
1. A statement of the Council's purpose and values;
2. Clarity on the outcomes the Council seeks to achieve;
3. Reprioritising statutory and non-statutory duties and reviewing the level and
   standards to which services should be delivered to achieve the outcomes and
   meet the reasonable expectations of the public;
4. Recommendations on options for the delivery of public services that are
   affordable and designed with performance in mind, including shared services;
5. Clear links to the Council's localism agenda;
6. Recommendations on increasing public participation in Council services;
7. Recommendations on the structure and management of Council operations;
8. *Recommendations on the review of committee structure and membership;*
9. A draft programme to support organisation change for modern public services
   and for staff and Member development.

The Board will ensure that the process for developing the proposals will be inclusive.
Key stakeholders to involve are:
- Staff;
- Trade Unions;
- Key customer groups;
- Communities of place and of interest;
- Other public bodies; and
- Other service providers.

Scope
The Board will adapt its proposals based on the budget set after the allocations
made by the Scottish Government for 2017/18 onwards and any other external
changes affecting Council operations.

In its proposals the Board will consider the scale for Council operations. However it
is not the purpose of the Board to propose any reorganisation of local government.
While the Council may have a view, this is a matter for Government. The focus of
the Board is the redesign of the Council to meet its statutory requirements.

The terms of reference for the Board will be reviewed as necessary as the work of
the Board progresses.

Timescales for reporting
The Board will report its proposals to Council in two stages:
1. The redesign proposals for the budget for 2017/18 onwards to the Council
   meeting on 15th December 2016.

2. The other aspects of redesign including operational arrangements, public participation approaches and a programme for staff development to the Council meeting in March 2017 (date to be confirmed when the calendar of meetings for 2017 is agreed).

Interim reports on progress including minutes of the meeting will be provided to the Council meetings in May, June, September and October 2016.

Frequency and format of meetings
Board Members will meet fortnightly initially and review the frequency as the Board's work progresses.

Formal Board meetings will be held in public with agendas and reports published in advance on the Council's website. Where items are to be considered in private they will be clearly marked on the agenda with the relevant exemption and their confidentiality will be maintained by Members. Members will receive the agendas and reports for the Board electronically with paper copies made available only on request.

Board Members will also participate in workshops and briefings where appropriate and these will be open to any Council Member to attend and will not be held in public. Members will be notified of workshop and briefing dates by email.

Membership
The Board is made up of 16 Elected Members as per the formula for political balance across the groups within the Council.

The Board will engage with the Chairs and Vice Chairs of Local Committees in making the links between redesign and the localism agenda.

The Board will consider the involvement of other representatives in the Board.

Methods
The Board will draw on a range of evidence from the following sources:
- National requirements;
- In-house knowledge, information, data and views;
- Other local knowledge – e.g. from partners, other providers, those potentially affected;
- Knowledge of what works elsewhere and what has failed elsewhere, e.g. from external input to the Board;
- External challenge, this could be from the engagement with those affected and/or by independent views brought to the Board.

To ensure an inclusive approach the Board will use a range of engagement methods currently in use (e.g. Citizens' Panel, Community Planning Partnership discussions, Management Briefings, focus groups) and develop new methods as required (e.g. Citizens' Juries, new digital platforms). The Board is keen to engage with young people in communities, among the staff and in their representative structures.

In workshops Board Members will use a range of methods to use the evidence and develop proposals, including: identifying what works well in the Council and how to get more of it; defining outcomes; reviewing current functions; generating ideas for change; reviewing options for change; scrutiny of financial analysis, performance and benchmarking; and assessing impacts of proposals on particular groups and places.

When considering options for change the range of options will include providing the service:

- in-house;
- in partnership with others (and where we lead on shared service or integrated service); and
- by others (out-sourced, commercial service, community-run service (with various levels of council support) , or where others lead on a shared service or integrated service arrangement with us).

The Board will also consider the option of ceasing services.

The Board will also consider the findings and recommendations from the Commission on Highland Democracy.

The report agreed by the Board on the range of methods in scope for each objective is available for further detail.

Redesign Board: Timeline May 2016 to March 2017 **Appendix 2**

ACTIVITY	METHOD	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MARCH
Phase 1 - Purpose, values and outcomes												
Board develops proposed outcomes and draft statement of the Council's purpose and values	Workshops* with Board, staff, Trade Unions and partners		Council 29.6.16									
Phase 2 - Re-prioritising statutory and non-statutory duties												
Board re-prioritises duties against outcomes	Workshops*, and staff presentations					Council 8.9.16						
Phase 3 – Appraising the options for change												
Board develops recommendations for Council on service delivery redesign	Workshops*, options appraisal						Council 27.10.16		**Council 15.12.16**			
Phase 4 – Localism and public participation objectives												
Localism and public participation objectives considered in each phase of Board's work	Workshops, impact assessment, Local Chairs, Commission											
Phase 5 – Organisation change and support programme												
Programme of support evolves during phases and to support redesign from 2017 onwards	Workshops, plus 7 new methods agreed by Board 10.5.16											
Phase 6 – Recommendations on the structure and management of Council operations												
To conclude in recommendations to Council March 2017	Workshops, engagement tbc											**Council TBC**

Statement of Council purpose, Values and Outcomes

The Highland Council's purpose is to improve outcomes for Highland communities, Highland citizens and the region as a whole. It leads, invests in and gives strategic direction for regional development.

We stand up for the Highland region. We represent its interests and the contribution the Highlands make at a national and international level.

The Council is the only public body in the Highlands that improves public services through democratic scrutiny by elected members. This includes a wide range of Council services and police and fire services.   We seek to widen democratic rights so that more people can have a say in what matters to them and local community groups can be supported to do more for their local communities. This will bring people together in new ways to be honest about and openly discuss the funding challenges which face public services and to find local solutions together.

The Council must achieve best value for the public money it spends on services. This means being efficient, open and accountable for our own resources, and also challenging the arrangements for public services provided by other public agencies in the region. We will work with partner agencies to simplify and integrate public services in order to get better value for public money. Responsibilities and ways of working may change and we will adapt, putting the needs of people and communities before the needs of organisational and professional boundaries.

The Council has the interests of Highland citizens at the heart of everything we do. We do our best to respond to people's current needs and demands for service and we also work to prevent poorer outcomes for people and communities which can lead to higher costs arising in the future.

We intend to do more to support disadvantaged people and disadvantaged areas, so that economic growth in the Highlands is shared more evenly. We want more people to contribute to, as well as benefit from, economic success. This will mean changing how services are provided and resources are used.

The quality of our staff is a major asset to the Council. We must be a good employer, as well as one of the major employers in our region. We will encourage our staff to challenge positively and to be innovative, making the most of a 'can do' attitude, and their close connections with communities. We will support them through change.

Elected Members know when to set aside potential differences and work on a constructive basis to support the work of the Council and deliver positive outcomes for the community as a whole. They share a strong public service ethos with staff and will foster good working relations with them.

Draft statement of Council values

We believe everyone can have new ideas for doing things better. We want to hear them, especially when they challenge us. We believe good ideas and good results come from people coming together with different views, being respectful and honest about what we can do together. We will make even more effort to hear voices that are not normally heard. We will have faith in staff to use their initiative and we will have faith in local communities to do more for themselves.

Challenging   Open to ideas   Participating   Empowering

Draft statement of Outcomes for the Council

Highland is an attractive place to do business, with key sectors supported and making the most of our outstanding natural resources. Our economic growth is shared across the region, with opportunities for everyone to contribute and benefit, making the most of the skills of our people and developing them.

The world class environment of Highland is protected, enhanced and enjoyed by residents and visitors.

Highland is an attractive place to live, work and learn, where people and communities can achieve their potential, supported and connected by good infrastructure, amenities and services. In growing up and growing older we enjoy a good quality of life, living in safe communities, taking care of each other and looking out for those who need more support.

Highland communities are better supported to do things for themselves, with opportunities for wider participation in local decision-making and community led services.

As a public body, we are resource efficient, work smarter using up to date technology and trying out new approaches. We are business-like, operating commercially in order to support public services. Our staff and Members are closely connected to their local communities and are supported in their commitment to public service. We work with other public services to ensure all our public resources are used effectively and to prevent poorer outcomes which result in higher costs in the future.

Service delivery options to consider in Highland Council redesign

1. In-house services – running these better and more efficiently, learning from where this has been demonstrated in the Council already[1] and with a 'Lean' approach currently being tested;

2. In-sourcing of services currently contracted out;

3. Shared services – both provided by us and provided for us;

4. Outsourced services – including an interest in different approaches to commissioning (by outcomes, by payment by results, by measuring social value) to encourage preventative services and demand reduction;

5. Services delivered in partnership and integrated services;

6. Arms-Length External Organisations and Trading Operations to enable more commercial practice and sustainability of service;

7. Community-run services;

8. Opportunities for new place-based approaches with partners arising from the new local Community Partnerships;

9. Stopping services (with the framework from the Accounts Commission recommended for use[2] alongside impact assessment).

10. Commercial practice.

---

[1] As examples the Board has heard about the approach to integrating welfare payments and advice (£3.3m of savings/income) and through the Digital Highland programme (£5m of savings). Both demonstrate the scope to make savings while improving service delivery.

[2] This provides a rationale for stopping services where: there is little or no demand for the service; the costs outweigh the benefits; alternative providers exist and people using those providers would not be disadvantaged; the function does not contribute to Council objectives; and there is no statutory or strategic requirements to make provision. Source: Accounts Commission (March 2016) An overview of local government in Scotland 2016

Insights for Redesign - Phase 1
Feedback from the CPP Chief Officers Group

Things work well between partners and the Council when engagement takes place in these circumstances:

Focus on **shared outcomes** – a shared purpose and vision and agreement on how to get it.

Challenge the status quo **by not being constrained by organisational boundaries**.

Challenge the status quo by reviewing who is to do what **and agreeing to shift power.**

Challenge the status quo and access **total resources** in partnership and across communities.

See **challenge** as helpful.

When staff are empowered - avoid the need to pass on for a decision.

Shared knowledge and understanding – for partnership working.

Being open - for partnership working.

Developing **mutual respect and trust** at a personal level – for partnership working.

Being **clear how each partner contributes**.

A clear policy to make engagement with partners easier would be welcomed.

Feedback from the meeting between the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board and the Highland CPP Chief Officers' Group 11.8.16

Background

The Chief Officers Group (COG) of the Highland CPP includes senior officers from: the Council, NHSH, HIE, Police Scotland (PS), Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), SNH, Skills Development Scotland, UHI, Highlife Highland, the Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA), The Scottish Government (SG) and the Highland Third Sector Interface (HTSI). All were in attendance apart from the UHI and CNPA on 11.8.16 and the meeting was chaired by Elaine Mead, Chief Executive of NHSH.

The Convener provided an overview of the Board's progress and advised that the Board was currently identifying functions to review. She asked for views from partners on how they wanted to be engaged in redesign and whether we could all look at shifting responsibility for services by working more collaboratively, asking if they felt there were services that the Council provided that they could do better and vice versa.

Key points for redesign:
1. All partners had been under review and continually adjusting their business models and so understood the need for redesign.
2. The national review on economic development (for HIE, SDS and SFC) would report in the autumn and could fundamentally affect what all public bodies do on economic development. The review of NHS structures was noted and would affect all partners.
3. All partners needed to focus on prevention, with links to better information sharing.
4. There are opportunities for redesign for doing things differently together through the new community planning structures and particularly the new network of local community partnerships.
5. All are keen to engage on the efficiency agenda and are open to opportunities from the Council's redesign. The benefits of physical co-location were acknowledged.
6. Areas of shared interest included:
    a. Property;
    b. Business Gateway;
    c. The Science Technology Engineering Maths and Digital (STEM D) agenda;
    d. Winter gritting (SFRS);
    e. Workshops, fleet and depots (SFRS and PS);
    f. Other services could be delivered through the ALEO model and HLH is able to offer advice on the set up of any new ALEOs if that was needed;
    g. Joint approach to data analysis and intelligence across the partners;
    h. Joining up engagement and consultation with the public in localities;

      i.   Joint training and learning, especially in CPP requirements;

      j.   Potentially rural payments (SG).

Other issues

1. HTSI is keen for engagement on redesign with them and the 3rd sector.
2. How best to support the move to more community run services and the infrastructure for that.
   a. the need to provide reassurance for communities that public bodies will be there to support them to do it – and that they won't have to do it on their own. The mantra of 'doing it for myself – not by myself' might be helpful;
   b. for support infrastructure to be able to help when things run into trouble. Issues of governance and volunteer fatigue were raised;
   c. how could public sector staff with skills to support community bodies be released to help with such issues – volunteering schemes as part of employee development? Also with potential as a benefit for the private sector to be involved in – with payback as staff skills development and business development and organisational learning.
   d. concerns about different capacity in communities to be involved and how this could widen inequalities if support was not targeted and coordinated better in the CPP;
   e. the need to involve communities of experience and not just of place.
3. SNH is feeling the effect of Council VR on biodiversity duties and considering how to take those forward.
4. How the CPP can work together to re-set public expectations of public services given the changes across all public bodies.
5. Whether the committee structure might feature in redesign was raised and confirmed.
6. The CPP wanted SG support to remove artificial restraint for working collaboratively.

Next steps
A commitment was made to factor all of these ideas into the redesign process, to engage on individual function reviews and strategically around the themes of the roles of respective public bodies and community support infrastructure. There would be ongoing dialogue with the CPP collectively and with individual partners.

C McDiarmid 25.8.16

Community group representatives participating in a workshop with Redesign Board Members on how to be an enabling Council 23.8.16

Maureen Ross	Seaboard Centre
Linda Malik	Tannach and District Community Council
Catriona Grigg	Embo Trust
Suzanne Barr	Abriachan Forest
Jane O'Donavan	Boleskine Community Care
Duncan Bryden	Strathdearn Trust
Alan Michael	Men's Shed and other projects, Inverness
Fiona Begg	Kyle of Lochalsh Community Trust
Steve Pennington	Highland Home Carers, Muir of Ord
Iain McCallum	Ferintosh Community Council
Karen Derrick	Voluntary Action Badenoch and Strathspey
Katrina MacNab	Pultney Town People's Project
Jo Ford	Skye and Lochalsh CVO and HTSI

Written information was provided by Harry Whiteside, Fort Augustus and Glenmoriston Community Company.

**How to be an enabling Council
Summary of the output from the workshop with Redesign Board Members
and representatives from a range of community bodies
Archive Centre, Inverness 23.8.16**

Introduction
Representatives from 15 community bodies were invited to attend a workshop with Members of the Redesign Board to consider 'How to be an enabling Council?' The workshop was well attended with 13 community bodies taking part and another providing written feedback. The groups and people contributing are listed in Appendix 1. They were involved in a wide range of activities and came from across the Highland region.

Format
Community bodies attending were asked to provide a short description of their activities in small groups. Councillors listened to these descriptions by spending time at each of the groups. Conversations were then facilitated around the following questions, which Community bodies had considered in advance of the workshop:
- What works well just now - and why?
- What would make that even better?
- What might be holding you back from doing more?
- What you would like to see the Council do to support more community-run services locally?

The feedback from the groups on these questions is attached in Appendix 2.

Key messages
Community-run services work well because they are local, personal, driven, engaging and flexible.

Community-run services are locally relevant and would otherwise not be available or sustained. They can provide services the Council is less able to provide, with enhanced service possible because of additional resources they can attract. Council support is required, and this can include financial and service level agreements. Community-run services also provide wider community benefits including employment opportunities and population retention, especially important in rural communities.

Many ideas have been provided to support community organisations further and the Redesign Board is asked to consider how they can be designed-in to Council redesign. The ideas are about improving the support available to community bodies and different funding approaches.

Improving the support available to community bodies
Many ideas focused on practical things to support community bodies; while others were more about changes sought in attitudes.

The practical things include: connecting volunteers to volunteering opportunities at a local level (local coordinators sought); help to apply for funding (see below); having a single point of contact for community groups locally to access help, advice and development; acquiring a physical base; having clear steps for asset transfer; and sharing of fleet and vehicles. The idea of having a support or brokerage service in the Highland was raised.

There was interest in how community bodies could access expertise in the Council e.g. legal, governance and human resources services and in having support in dealing with big organisations including utilities.

Specific areas for development for community bodies were highlighted as follows: how to identify local priorities; how to break down barriers to people participating; community development and capacity building; identifying and managing risk; business planning and acumen. The scope for community bodies accessing Council training in a planned way was raised.

A suggestion was also made to create modern apprenticeships in community development to encourage young people locally to be more involved in civic affairs.

New ways of working with the Council are sought that include changing attitudes about community organisations. A request is made for the Council to be more open generally including knowing who to contact about things, especially after staff changes from integration and voluntary redundancy. A request for better responses and response times was made. This was for individual requests, for payment of invoices as well as on feedback to community consultations. Communicating through Skype and other technology was suggested. Being better at listening was highlighted.

Other attitudinal change called for includes a greater willingness to negotiate, compromise, being flexible and less risk averse. This includes changing the rules and restrictions on what community bodies can and can't do if that is what is needed. Others sought more appreciation among Council staff of what a community body could do and to see them positively and not as a threat to Council jobs. Being open to challenge would be important especially where the community has different priorities to the Council. To help with attitudinal change community bodies could provide learning and development for Council staff.

From some there was a call for the Council to show leadership on engaging with the community and in a way that will excite, engage and enable creative thinking. For others the change needed would also come from lots of small changes.

Getting off to the right start with the new local community partnerships was also highlighted and included requests for using Plain English, considering who to involve and not having a sense of hierarchy, the number and frequency of meetings, how to learn and share the good and to have proper consultation before changing any services. Some acknowledged their experience of a partnership approach holding them back. The importance of NHS support was highlighted.

<u>Different funding approaches</u>
Consensus was found on the need for easy access to small grants. These could be for feasibility studies or supplying materials to volunteers but they should be easy to access and responded to quickly. The ward discretionary budgets were appreciated and there was a suggestion to re-name then as a Community Investment Fund. Ensuring prompt of all Council awards was emphasised.

Consensus was found on the need for support to attract other funding, knowing about sources, helping to complete application forms which are often complicated and gathering letters of support.

For some it was important to acknowledge the limits on some services being self-sufficient with core funding required. Others confirmed that reductions in funding have occurred and these have impacted on community-run services.

Others highlighted the need to learn from experience, including from the Community Challenge Fund which would have benefitted from better targeting to groups with capacity. Those with experience of tendering for Council services also had experience to share. Those involved in the Council's new approach of participatory budgeting found the local events to be positive and that we should learn from the experience of those involved, with a call for more lead in time for applications and feedback on them.

<u>Community Councils</u>
Views on community councils were mixed. For some there was interest in how to encourage more people to be involved in their community council and to share their workload; while for others there was a concern that there is over reliance on community councils to provide a community voice and that other groups with local knowledge should be engaged.

Reviews for redesign

Significant reviews for redesign

Phase 1 (October to January)
- Services for children and young people – looked after children and residential care
- Adult social care – noting that the scope of the review requires negotiation with NHSH (scope may be limited to setting a savings target with the detail of the review a matter for the contracting partner)
- Waste services – all 11 functions
- Street lighting
- Additional support for learning, specialist services and school transport additional needs
- Transport services
- Administration within schools

Later phases
- HLH services – libraries and archive services
- Street and road cleansing
- Environmental Health services
- Mental health services
- Regulated property maintenance
- Procured legal services
- Children's services: fostering and adoption, commissioned preventative services, child protection, allied health professionals

Reviews underway that may require Redesign Board consideration

- Facilities management and cleaning
- Road verge, amenity and grass cutting and planted areas (4 functions)
- Capital programme management
- Harbours
- Trading standards
- Community right to participate and asset transfer to community groups.
- Supporting CPP, local committees and DPs and engagement and scrutiny of police and fire services (Members requested that the latter should focus on rationalising the no. of places for reporting)
- Depots, stores and fleet maintenance 3 functions.
- Procurement – recent decision for a shared service.
- HR function

Mini reviews, largely affecting income, charges and commercial opportunities.

1. Review of charging for the pre-application planning service (major and local developments).
2. Collection of monies for BIDs
3. Collection of Scottish Water charges
4. Income potential to be explored from materials testing lab for construction projects
5. School hostels
6. Music tuition
7. School catering
8. Private sector housing grant
9. Car parking and car parks
10. Public conveniences
11. Elections – cost recovery on providing information to political parties, agents etc. on information associated with counts
12. Estates service – review of income target
13. Council energy supply / generation company option