

Highland Community Planning Partnership

Chief Officers' Group – 4 September 2018

Agenda Item	7.
Report No	COG 12/18

Community Partnership Resourcing – Discussion Paper

The COG is asked to:

- Consider the costs of the Community Partnerships outlined at section 2
- Consider and discuss the potential options identified to address the resourcing needs of the Partnerships outlined in section 3.

1. Background

1.1 Community Partnerships were first established in October 2016 as part of the Highland Community Planning Partnership's response to implementing the new duties relating to community planning contained within the Community Empowerment Act. It was agreed at that time that the 5 agencies responsible for leading community planning would share the leadership of these partnerships between them. No direct budget was allocated to the partnerships and it was agreed that the lead agency for each would support their particular partnership.

1.2 The Community Empowerment(Scotland) Act 2015 and the associated guidance sets out a clear approach and direction for statutory partners to carry out community planning and offers specific advice on resourcing improvement:

- The CPP and its partners understand how their collective resources are supporting shared local priorities, and whether together these are sufficient and the right resources to enable the CPP to meet its improvement targets.
- Partners demonstrate strong shared leadership by working with other bodies to use collective resources in more effective and efficient ways to improve outcomes and reduce inequalities.
- Partners deploy sufficient resource to meet agreed ambitions for the CPP's local priorities.

- Partners align their collective resources in ways which support its local priorities effectively and efficiently.

1.3 A short paper was presented to COG in April outlining the resourcing challenges initially identified by Community Partnership Chairs. It was agreed that further work was required to understand the costs of the Partnerships and to consider potential options for moving forward. The Chairs Development Group has met twice since the April meeting and this paper outlines the results of these discussions and proposes options for supporting the Partnerships in the future.

2. Community Partnership Identified Costs

2.1 Work has been undertaken with the Chairs of the Community Partnerships to identify the range of costs associated with the running of Community Partnerships. A summary of the identified costs can be found at appendix 1. These can be categorised into three key areas:

2.2 Direct Administrative Costs

2.2.1 The funding currently required in order to support the partnership to operate e.g. meeting expenses (room hire, refreshments), publicity expenses, engagement materials (printing costs for surveys, production of reports, supporting participation e.g. BSL interpreters).

2.2.2 These costs are primarily absorbed by the lead agency for each Partnership and have therefore been difficult to quantify.

2.2.3 There remain a range of views across the Partnerships regarding these costs. Some Partnership Chairs have stated that these are part of the costs of the Lead partner and should be absorbed, however, some have expressed concern that a budget should be identified and provided for these costs enabling consistency across the area. There are recognised challenges with this approach as the costs vary depending upon the size of the partnership (i.e. are external venues required due to the size of the partnership) and the availability of local partner facilities (i.e. in rural communities there are less likely to be partner venues that can be utilised). However, there are clearly costs that some partnerships have identified that would support the need for a budget to be identified, for example, the production of surveys and copies of locality plan surveys given the density of the population.

2.3 Organisational costs

- 2.3.1 Primarily staff time related costs. This is the time required in order to operate the partnership including: the organisation, management and administration of meetings; communication within the partnership and wider community; undertaking engagement and development work with communities; supporting communities who would otherwise not be able to engage; the development and implementation of Partnership plans and time to develop the Partnership.
- 2.3.2 All partner organisations have given staff time to the operation and development of the partnership. Although this requires to be recognised, it is a fundamental necessity of tackling inequality at a local level. However there are particular resourcing challenges for the Lead Agency. The Chairs of each of the individual partnerships have dedicated particular time to both the day to day operation of their individual partnership and liaison and network engagement at a pan-Highland CPP level. The nature of Chair support and activity varies depending upon the other resources available to them locally.
- 2.3.3 Some organisations have provided dedicated officer development time to co-ordinate the operation of the Partnership. This is namely Police Scotland who have dedicated partnership officers in both the Partnerships they lead. The Council has provided some development officer support for the Inverness Partnership however this is not a full time role. Other organisations (Highland Council, HIE) have provided administrative support time to support the organisation and minute taking of meetings. Partnerships who have dedicated resource have noted the significant difference this has made to the successful operation of their Partnership and this has eased the time commitment on other Partnership members.
- 2.3.4 Of the resources identified as critical by the Partnerships, support for engagement and development activity is common amongst all bar one of the Partnerships (Sutherland have external European funding to support this activity). The focus varies between Partnerships, with some focusing purely on support for the engagement and capacity building elements of work, whilst others on supporting the Partnership generally and in the development of Locality plans. This appears to be the most significant challenge for most.
- 2.3.5 Central support has been provided to apply for external funding to support the Partnerships in this manner. There has been no decision yet on the success of the application. Work is ongoing to identify what other external

resource could potentially be applied for in order to provide Partnerships with support in this area.

2.4 Sustainable Delivery

2.4.1 Identified as the (future) costs required to support the implementation of partnership activity and ensure that the priorities of the partnership are supported and actioned. At times this may be to attract external funding or to undertake specific pieces of work. The importance of community development work and making best use of resources within communities was highlighted noting that it was not always new or additional pieces of work that were required.

2.4.2 This is not the responsibility of one partner but of all within the Partnership. No Partnership at present has identified financial resource to support this work on an ongoing basis although specific activity has been collectively supported within some Partnerships.

2.4.3 Partnerships have identified the importance of making best use of local resources and reallocating or redirecting resource where possible in order to take forward local activity. In the main, this is the approach that has been adopted to date and is likely to continue; making better use of local resources. However, a number of the Partnerships have indicated that a small budget that could be used to support local activity would enable the implementation of Partnership priorities.

2.5 The Partnerships have found it challenging to quantify the exact spend of the Partnership overall. This is for a number of reasons including the difficulty of quantifying time costs and that much of the day to day direct spend is absorbed within the costs of the various partner organisations, primarily the lead partner. However, they have been able to articulate the areas of spend from direct costs to time associated costs. They have also prioritised the resources required for Partnership operation going forward, although the prioritisation varies between Partnerships. These are set out in appendix 2 along with a summary of the additional resources already provided by individual Partnerships.

3. Options for Resourcing

3.1 As the work of the Partnerships has developed, the implications regarding costs have been clarified. There are differing needs across the Partnerships and, as a result, Lead agencies have adopted different approaches. This was the intention at the outset of Community Partnership creation but almost two years on, some have suggested that this requires to be addressed. An

ongoing challenge remains how to refocus mainstream spend to address inequality. Partnerships are trying to take this approach but it is proving challenging and a strong feeling exists that there are a lack of movable resources locally. Both strategically and locally there will be a continued need to focus on this.

3.2 Going forward, there is a need for COG to consider how to address the immediate needs of the Partnerships. It is noted that this is within a challenging financial context for public sector agencies. In discussion with Chairs, three potential options have emerged. These could be implemented separately or in combination:

- **Option 1: Creating a Central Pot of Funding**

Each partner is required to contribute an agreed amount of funding which is then split equally between the 9 partnerships for them to use as appropriate within their partnership. Partnerships would have control over the funding allocated to them.

Benefits: This would provide flexibility for the Partnerships and enable the different partnership priorities to be addressed. Partnerships could use the funding to support the production of engagement materials, provide small 'seed-corn' funding to start up projects or to support administrative costs.

Challenges: It is anticipated that this would be small amounts of funding. It is unlikely sufficient resource would be available to address the partnership development needs identified such as a dedicated staff member to support engagement and capacity building. There would still be a need to seek external resource to support such activity.

- **Option 2: Agreed core costs**

The core costs to be provided by each Lead Agency are agreed centrally to ensure a fair and equitable approach across the various Partnerships. This would primarily focus on support costs and organisational costs.

Benefits: each Partnership is being supported to a consistent level with clear expectations.

Challenges: each Partnership's scale and scope differs and therefore their costs also differ. Partnerships have already struggled to quantify their specific spend. It is likely that there would still be a requirement for variable levels of support across the partnerships.

- **Option 3: Dedicated Staff Resource**

The financial challenges of the public sector at the current time are well documented. This would focus on partners utilising resources that they do have but in a different way and provide a dedicated staff resource to support each partnership area in which they lead.

Benefits: it has been noted that many of the organisational costs have been absorbed by lead agencies, however, the main challenge is have dedicated resource to support the partnership, particularly with regards engagement and capacity building.

Challenges: this would not resolve all the challenges for the partnership and some organisations may find it difficult to dedicate a full time resource.

3.3 As noted in the introduction to this report, the intention behind the Community Empowerment Act is for agencies to address inequality together by better directing and refocusing existing resources and considering how to act more preventatively together. This ultimately must be the long term goal for the CPP not just at a local level but strategically. However, the Partnerships have identified that in order to support them coming together and working together to address local priorities designed to tackle inequality, some level of resource is required to enable this.

3.4 COG are asked to consider the costs of the Community Partnerships outlined at section 2 and consider and discuss the potential options identified to addressing the resourcing needs of the Partnerships outlined section 3.

Author:

Alison Clark, Acting Head of Policy, Highland Council

Identified Community Partnership Costs

Direct Administrative Costs

- Meeting expenses
 - Room Hire,
 - Refreshments
 - Public/Partnership Meetings, Sub-group meetings
 - Publicity
- Engagement Costs
 - Materials – surveys and distribution, focus groups
 - Production of reports – can't just be electronic
 - Support for accessibility and inclusion – signers/translation

Organisational Costs

- Meetings
 - Managing Meetings – organisation of venues/refreshments etc. agendas/action notes, preparation time
 - Meetings – partnership, core, sub-groups
 - Communication to partnership
- Engagement
 - Communication to the public
 - Development work with community groups to enable participation
 - Engagement events
- Chair/Strategic Development
 - leadership activities – pan-Highland meetings
 - development of the partnership
- Plan Development and implementation
 - plan development
 - Taking forward actions within the plans

Sustainable Delivery

- Implementation
 - Funding small scale 'tests of change' / 'seed corn' funding for activities activities
 - Re-directing internal existing resources to take forward actions
- Community development and empowerment to support inclusion and participation

Appendix 2

Resources in Place and Resourcing Needs Identified

Community Partnership	Agency Responsible	Additional Resources in Place	Resourcing Needs Identified
Inverness	Highland Council	Administrative support for arranging meetings and note taking Part time officer support for partnership development	Cost of producing/printing documentation (e.g. surveys, plans) for wider community engagement Need for support to undertake community capacity building and engagement Seed-corn funding for driving forward partnership action
Nairn	Police Scotland	Dedicated officer support for partnership development	Seed-corn funding to support partnership action
Badenoch and Strathspey	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service	Supported by the Chair within existing resources	Resource to support engagement and taking forward/co-ordinating partnership actions
Caithness	HIE	Administrative support for arranging meetings and note taking	Budget agreed for lead agency costs such as administration, venue hire, refreshments etc.
Sutherland	Police Scotland	Full time officer support for partnership development	Seed-corn funding to support partnership action
East Ross	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service	Supported by the Chair within existing resources	Dedicated resource to support engagement activity and locality plan development
Mid Ross	NHS Highland	Supported by the Chair/lead officer within existing resources	Dedicated resource to support partnership action Seed-corn funding for projects Support from CLD staff for community engagement.
Skye, Lochalsh and Wester Ross	HIE	Administrative support for arranging meetings and note taking	Seed-corn funding to support partnership action
Lochaber	NHS Highland	Supported by the Chair/lead officer within existing resources	No information available