

## Highland Community Planning Partnership

### Community Planning Board – 28 February 2020

Agenda Item	5.
Report No	CPB 01/20

## Community Planning Partnership Development – Update February 2020

### Report from the CPP Development Sub-group

The Community Planning Partnership Board is asked to:

- Note the updated Terms of Reference at Appendix 1
- Note the developments to explore interest in the position of Independent Chair for the partnership
- Note the initial work of the Partnership Co-ordinating Group and that from June 2020, reports on performance will be made to the CPP Board
- Consider and agree the Risk Register set at appendix 2A and 2B
- Consider and agree the proposal for Community Engagement training and that the costs for this will be met through the money identified by partners for partnership activity including the small grants budget.
- Note the arrangements for the small grants budget which will commence from April 2020 and that updates on outcomes will be presented to the Board.

## 1. Background

- 1.1 At the CPP Board meeting in December, the partnership agreed to a number of changes in order to improve governance, accountability and performance. This included changes to the structure of the partnership, terms of reference and resourcing support. This report provides an update on implementing the agreed changes.

## 2. Terms of Reference

- 2.1 Following agreement at the last CPP Board in December 2019, the Board's new terms of reference has been updated to reflect the changes agreed. This included:
- The addition of the Scottish Government Location Director as a Member of the Board
  - A Community Partnership representative as a member of the Board and that this would be agreed by the Partnership Co-ordinating Group
  - The inclusion of an action log as part of the Board reporting
  - That CPP Board members would have the authority of their organisations to take decisions with the exception of structural changes to the CPP.
- 2.2 The updated TOR can be found at appendix 1. As agreed in December, the new arrangements will not commence until the June meeting of the Board, to allow for consideration of the new arrangements by the NHS Board and Highland Council. The NHS Board considered and agreed the new arrangements and Highland Council will be asked to consider the new arrangements at its meeting on 12 March 2020 in its response to the BVAR audit.
- 2.3 The Board are asked to note the updated Terms of Reference at Appendix 1.

### **3. Independent Chair**

- 3.1 As part of the new TOR for the Board, it was agreed to extend the tenure for the Chair of the Board to 18 months. It was also agreed to explore whether there would be interest in an unremunerated Independent Chair. An outline of the role and terms of any appointment has been drafted and will be circulated through existing partnership networks. Expressions of interest are invited to the existing Chair. Feedback on levels of interest will be provided at the June meeting.
- 3.2 The Board are asked to note the developments to explore interest in the position of Independent Chair for the partnership

### **4. Partnership Co-ordinating Group**

- 4.1 The Partnership Co-ordinating Group was agreed as part of the new governance arrangements for the partnership. Its core role is to co-ordinate and monitor partnership priorities, report performance to the Board and to ensure the alignment between strategic and local priorities and monitoring shared performance.
- 4.2 The core membership of the group is the Chairs of the Community Partnership, HOIP Delivery Groups and Community Justice Partnership Chairs. HTSI and SDS are also represented as core local partners along with the Council's Audit and Performance Manager to support performance monitoring and reporting.

- 4.3 The first meeting of the group took place on 17 January and focused on reviewing HOIP Delivery Group action plans to ensure local priorities are reflected in strategic action plans. The next meeting, scheduled for early March, will focus on reviewing local action plans to consider inclusion of any strategic priorities locally. Further work is also required to develop key performance measures for monitoring against outcomes and actions to the Board.
- 4.4 At its final meeting the COG agreed that from June, there would be a standing item on the Board agenda to report on performance against the HOIP delivery plan priorities and local performance to deliver locality plans. Work is required to develop reporting templates to ensure effective governance regarding performance reporting.
- 4.5 An outstanding action for the PCG is to identify a Community Partnership Chair to represent all partnerships on the Board. An individual has yet to be identified.
- 4.6 The Board are asked to note the initial work of the Partnership Co-ordinating Group and that from June 2020, reports on performance will be made to the CPP Board

## **5. Risk Register**

- 5.1 The new TOR for the partnership included a commitment to develop a risk register for the partnership. This would identify key risks facing the partnership and ensure that these were monitored on an ongoing basis at Board meetings. Five key risks have been identified:
- Reputational – the Community Planning Partnership fails to deliver broadly and specifically the Highland Outcome Improvement Plan
  - Failure to deliver key priorities – the Community Planning Partnership fails to deliver the defined key priorities which have been set and resource delivery of these
  - Commitment of Partners – Individual partners are not supporting or prioritising community planning in terms of time, resource and finance
  - Knowledge/Intelligence Gaps – there is a lack of cross partnership data sharing to effectively fully understand where resources should be intelligently deployed to best address demand/need.
  - Communication – there is a need to have a clearer defined method of communication both internally and externally for the CPP.
- 5.2 The risks have been captured and scored and are set out at appendix 2A. A copy of the risk scoring matrix is included at appendix 2B. For the partnership, two of the identified risks have a medium risk score, two a high risk score and one a very high risk score. Mitigation has been identified to address the risks and these include the changes already made to the partnership way of working. However, the scores reflect that this work is either only just underway or not yet in place. The risk register will be reviewed at each Board meeting.

5.3 The Board are asked to consider and agree the Risk Register set at appendix 2A and 2B.

## 6. Community Engagement Training

6.1 At the December Board meeting, it was agreed to implement a joint programme of community engagement training across the partnership. This was in response to feedback from Community Partnership Chairs of a training need for partnerships and also feedback from the recent CLD re-inspection.

6.2 A proposal has been received from the HTSI to deliver training on behalf of the partnership. The outline for the training is set out at appendix 3. This would mirror training already delivered by HTSI for Police Scotland. It is proposed to deliver 10 sessions (20 half days), one in each Community Partnership area, at a cost of £50 per session to cover administration and materials. The total cost of the training would be £1000, with additional mileage and venue costs to be charged at actual costs (estimated up to £1000). It is proposed that the costs of the training are met from reducing the amount of agreed partners contributions to the partnership Small Grants Budget.

6.3 The Board are asked to agree the proposal for Community Engagement training and that the costs for this will be met through the money identified by partners for partnership activity including the small grants budget.

## 7. Small Grants Budget

7.1 A key area identified by partnerships was the need for a small grants budget. This would be to provide resource to take forward small scale 'tests of change' or 'seed corn' funding for local initiatives or activities. For 2019/20, all 5 core organisations have agreed to contribute to this with £5,000 being set as a benchmark. The intention is to add to this budget annually with the sums agreed by the Board at its June meeting.

7.2 In terms of governance and accountability:

- **Administration:** the fund will be administered and co-ordinated by the HTSI
- **Decision making body:** Partnership Co-ordinating Group (partners may not consider applications from their own partnership or group). The group will review applications twice annually and decisions made on commitment to spend.
- **Who can apply:** Community Partnerships or HOIP Delivery Groups. A lead partner will be identified for each application who could be a core, third sector or community partner.
- **Purpose of application:** to deliver against a partnership/delivery plan priority
- **Grant total:** partnerships can make applications of up to £1,000.
- **Reporting:** partnerships to report back on outcomes against their priorities and plan and this will be reported to the Board.

7.3 The Board are asked to note the arrangements for the small grants budget which will commence from April 2020 and that updates on outcomes will be presented to the Board.

## 8. Next Steps

The CPP Development Sub-group will continue until June 2020 to meet to support the implementation of new arrangements. Several key actions remain in addition to those noted in the paper:

- Priority setting – as per the new TOR arrangements, the February Board meeting would normally focus on priority setting for the forthcoming year. However, given that there remains work to be done around evidence gaps, it was agreed at the COG that priority-setting should take place at the June Board. Work to support this session will take place in the coming months.
- As reported to the Board in December, and reflected in the risk register, work is needed to develop internal and external communication approaches to support the work of the partnership. A key area for initial action is to plan and design a partnership training day for all Community Partnership, Delivery Group and Board members to support the new changes and focus of the partnership. It is proposed this takes place in May 2020.
- An action log will be developed and be in place for the June Board meeting to monitor ongoing progress of the partnership.

**Author:** CPP Development Sub Group 21 February 2020

**Appendix 1:** CPP Terms of Reference – Update Feb 2020

**Appendix 2A:** CPP Risk Register (circulated separately)

**Appendix 2B:** Risk Matrix

**Appendix 3:** Community Engagement Training Proposal

## Highland Community Planning Partnership

### Terms of Reference

#### 1. Partnership Purpose

- 1.1 The Community Empowerment Act (2015), set out a new direction for community planning in Scotland. Community planning is about how public bodies work together and with the local community, to plan for, resource and provide services which improve local outcomes. This is with a view to reducing inequalities.
- 1.2 Core principles underpin the work of a Community Planning Partnership. These include:
- Strong shared leadership
  - Community participation and co-production
  - Governance and accountability – apply effective challenge and scrutiny to the delivery of priorities
  - Understanding community needs
  - Tackling inequalities and focusing on prevention
  - Focus on key priorities – those which will have greatest effect in improving outcomes and reducing inequality
  - Resourcing improvement
  - Measuring performance
- 1.3 In Highland, the Community Planning Partnership has refocused following the change in duties and responsibilities. The core work of the Partnership is set out in the Highland Outcome Improvement Plan and this shapes and drives the activity of the Partnership.
- 1.4 The Partnership is governed by a Board supported by a Partnership Co-ordinating Group. HOIP Delivery groups focus on delivering the partnership outcomes set out in the HOIP whilst at a local level, 9 Community Partnership drive local planning and priorities through locality plans and plans for children and adult health and social care.

## 2. Structure



### 3. Community Planning Partnership Board

#### 3.1 Remit

To provide collective strategic leadership and oversight of service delivery with the aim of improving services and outcomes for Highland communities.

Promote and develop improved partnership working.

To provide vision, direction and governance for community planning activity.

To provide oversight and scrutiny of partnership activity and priorities. This includes statutory oversight of:

- Highland Outcome Improvement Plan
- Highland Community Justice Plan
- Highland Community Learning and Development Plan

For the Highland Outcome Improvement Plan:

- The HOIP will consist of 10 year outcomes and 3 year and 1 year priorities to deliver against these outcomes.
- The Board will determine a performance management framework to ensure consistency of reporting and the ability to identify areas of concern.
- The Board will review the HOIP priorities and delivery against these priorities annually through an annual review of the HOIP

The Board will develop a strategic risk register. This will be reviewed at every meeting with mitigating actions identified.

An action log will be developed and will be considered and updated at each Board meeting.

As the strategic body for partnership working in Highland, the Board will receive reports on occasion from the following core partnership groups.

- For Highlands Children Strategic Group
- Adults Commissioning Group
- Public Protection Chief Officer's Group
- Contest Board
- Environmental Forum
- Highland Cultural Strategic Board

#### 3.2 Membership

Membership of the CPP Board is confined to core partners to ensure effective scrutiny and operation. Members of the Board will include:

- 5 statutory partners
- Third sector attendees: Highland Third Sector Interface and High Life Highland
- Organisations with a Highland wide remit and cross priority focus

##### **Core Membership:**

- Police Scotland: Chief Superintendent
- Scottish Fire and Rescue Service: Local Senior Officer
- Highlands and Islands Enterprise: Director
- Highland Council: 2 Elected Members, Chief Executive



- NHS Highland: 1 Non-Executive Board Member, Chief Executive, Director of Public Health
- Scottish Government: Location Director
- 1 Community Partnership Representative

***Third Sector:***

- Highland Third Sector Interface: two members
- HLH: Chief Executive

***Highland Wide Organisations***

- SNH – one senior officer
- UHI – one senior officer
- SDS – one senior officer

Organisations will be expected to provide a substitute for any member unable to attend.

Representatives will be expected to take decisions on behalf of their organisation. The exception to this would be any decision on the structure of the CPP.

***In Attendance:***

HOIP Delivery Group Chairs and the Chair of the Community Justice Partnership will be expected to attend to provide performance updates. They will not be members of the Board.

Community Partnership Chairs may be invited to attend as appropriate.

### **3.3 Meetings**

***Frequency:***

The Board will meet on a quarterly basis in February, June, September and December. The focus of these meetings shall be as follows:

- February: Priority setting meeting for forthcoming year
- June: Annual review of previous year's performance
- September: Mid-year review
- December: General update

Two exceptional meetings will be scheduled for April and October. These will be optional, to be used for development or items of exceptional business dependent upon need. These meetings will be at the discretion of the Chair however any member can request items for these meetings through the Chair.

***Quorum and voting:***

The quorum of the Board will be half its total membership.

Decisions will be by consensus. In exceptional circumstances and when required, voting will be on a simple majority basis. The Chair will have the casting vote.

***Chair of the Board:***

Will be shared amongst the 5 statutory partners and rotate every 18 months.

## 4. Partnership Co-ordinating Group

### 4.1 Remit

The Partnership Co-ordinating Group is responsible for:

- co-ordinating and monitoring partnership priorities
- reporting performance to the Board
- ensuring alignment between strategic and local priorities and monitoring shared performance
- identifying successes and good practice
- identifying where resources are required deliver improvement
- identifying where training or development is required across the partnership in order to deliver improvement
- to agree Community Partnership representation on the Board

### 4.2 Membership

Membership of the Partnership Co-ordinating Group will be:

- HOIP Delivery Group Chairs
- Community Partnership Chairs
- Chair of the Community Justice Partnership
- HTSI
- Skills Development Scotland

### 4.3 Meetings

*Frequency:*

Meetings of the Group will be every two months to ensure effective monitoring and improvement.

*Chairing:*

The Chair of the group will rotate each meeting between the 5 HOIP Delivery Group Chairs.

## 5. HOIP Delivery Groups

### 5.1 Remit:

- Responsible for the delivery of their outcome and associated priorities
- Will develop an action plan to take forward the identified priorities and deliver against the key outcome
- May task other relevant partnership groups for the delivery of particular actions.
- Will be responsible for ensuring delivery of the cross-cutting themes in relation to their outcome.
- Will take cognisance of the locality plans developed by Community Partnerships in relation to the delivery of their outcome and priorities identified.
- Will develop appropriate performance indicators in order to measure the delivery of each action plan.
- Responsible for reporting on outcome area to the Board, reflecting performance locally and strategically to deliver against the outcome.

## 5.2 **Membership**

- Representation from each of the five lead partners and third sector plus others as appropriate and required.
- Will include a named person from the Equality and Diversity Group.

## 5.3 **Meetings**

- A minimum of 4 per year
- Meetings will be chaired by one of the 5 lead agencies as per agreement of the Board. This agency will be responsible for chairing and organising the meeting however all partners are equally responsible for activities, actions and delivery.

## 5.4 **Review**

- Every three years, each group will be responsible for leading on the review of the three year priorities for their particular outcome.

# 6. **Community Partnerships**

## 6.1 **Remit**

- Developing Local Plans for Children and Adults
- Develop Locality Improvement Plans/CLD plans focusing on communities facing the greatest level of inequality as a result of socio-economic disadvantage
- Identify local actions and priorities

## 6.2 **Membership**

- All 5 statutory partners – Scottish Fire and Rescue service, HIE, Highland Council, NHS Highland, Police - and Third Sector representation arranged by the Highland Third Sector Interface at each Local Partnership
- Other 10 named partners would attend as and when required on a thematic basis
- Local partnerships to determine other organisational representation including community organisations
- All partners have shared and equal responsibility

## 6.3 **Meetings**

- Local partnerships will meet no less than 4 times annually
- Consider taking a thematic approach to meetings
- Scrutiny of local plans should be action focused and based on evidence
- Meetings should be in public but not public meetings. There should be the opportunity on each agenda for members of the public to contribute

Risk Score	
20-25	Very High
12-16	High
8-10	Medium
1-6	Low

Risk ID & Date	Risk Category	Target Score		Risk Description	Untreated Probability	Untreated Impact	Untreated Score	Management Plan			Risk Owner Review	Target Date	Risk Movement	Escalation	Risk Closure Date	Risk Owner	Risk Lead
		Risk Appetite	Risk Tolerance					Current Probability	Current Impact	Current Score							
01/20 23.01.2020	Public Confidence	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16	<p><u>Risk Title: Reputational</u></p> <p>Risk Description: Community Planning Partnership fails to deliver broadly and specifically the Highland Outcome Improvement Plan</p> <p>Impact: Loss of public confidence</p>	4	3	12	3	3	9	<p>(1) Date of Review: 14/02/2020</p> <p>(2) Review Notes - Ongoing review during reporting periods of 20/21 will identify any specific areas for concern and these will be priorities and actioned accordingly.</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						
02/20 23.01.2020	Public Confidence	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16	<p><u>Risk Title: Failure to deliver key priorities</u></p> <p>Risk Description: Community Planning Partnership fails to deliver the defined key priorities which have been set and resource delivery of these</p> <p>Impact: Loss of Public Confidence and impact on local Partnerships and communities</p>	4	4	16	4	3	12	<p>(1) Date of Review: 14/02/2020</p> <p>(2) Review Notes - Ongoing review during reporting periods of 20/21 will identify any specific areas for concern and these will be priorities and actioned accordingly.</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						
03/20 23.01.2020	Service Delivery	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16	<p><u>Risk Title: Commitment of Partners</u></p> <p>Risk Description: Individual Partners not supporting or prioritising Community Planning in terms of time, resource and finance</p> <p>Impact: Loss of confidence/credibility within the Board and similar impact at a local level</p>	4	4	16	4	5	20	<p>(1) Date of Review: 14/02/2020</p> <p>(2) Review Notes - the partnership has experienced a sustained period of challenge linked to the ownership/chairing of Local Partnership Groups, whilst this has been addressed by recent changes, until said changes have been fully implemented and there is stability in these areas the risk of effective leadership and direction in these areas continues to be a concern to the partnership.</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						
04/20 23.01.2020	Service Delivery	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16	<p><u>Risk Title: Knowledge/Intelligence Gaps</u></p> <p>Risk Description: There is a lack of cross partnership data/sharing to effectively fully understand where resources should be intelligently deployed to best address demand/need.</p> <p>Impact: Failure to fully understand Threat, Risk and Harm impacts across the Partnership/Communities.</p>	3	3	9	3	3	9	<p>(1) Date of Review: 14/02/2020</p> <p>(2) Review Notes - This is an ongoing area for focus within the partnership and we should have a number of shared products in 20/21 which will provide a better understanding of gaps/demand.</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						
05/20 23.01.2020	Public Confidence	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16	<p><u>Risk Title: CPB Communication</u></p> <p>Risk Description: There is a need to have a clearer defined method of communication both internally and externally for the CPP</p> <p>Impact: Lack of knowledge/understanding of Partnership and how it can support communities and achieve collaborative outcomes.</p>	3	3	9	4	3	12	<p>(1) Date of Review: 14/02/2020</p> <p>(2) Review Notes - It is acknowledged that the Community Planning Board needs to better communicate its purpose, intentions and outcomes internally with all stakeholders and with our wider communities. This will be subject of increased discussion and focus during 20/21.</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						
		#N/A	#N/A	<p>Risk Title:</p> <p>Risk Description:</p> <p>Impact:</p>			0			0	<p>(1) Date of Review:</p> <p>(2) Review Notes -</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						
		#N/A	#N/A	<p>Risk Title:</p> <p>Risk Description:</p> <p>Impact:</p>			0			0	<p>(1) Date of Review:</p> <p>(2) Review Notes -</p> <p>(3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):</p>						

Risk ID & Date	Risk Category	Risk Appetite	Risk Tolerance	Risk Description	Untreat: Probab	Untreat: Im	Untreated Sr	Management Plan	Cur Probab	Current Im	Current Sr	Risk Owner Review	Target L	F Moven	Escala	Risk Clof L	Risk Ow	Risk L
		#N/A	#N/A	Risk Title: Risk Description: Impact:			0	Current Controls in place:			0	(1) Date of Review: (2) Review Notes - (3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):						
		#N/A	#N/A	Risk Title: Risk Description: Impact:			0	Current Controls in place:			0	(1) Date of Review: (2) Review Notes - (3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):						
		#N/A	#N/A	Risk Title: Risk Description: Impact:			0	Current Controls in place:			0	(1) Date of Review: (2) Review Notes - (3) Further Controls Required (include action owner and date for completion):						

Category	Appetite	Tolerance
<b>Finance</b>	Averse 1-6	Cautious 8-10
<b>Legal</b>	Averse 1-6	Averse 1-6
<b>Service Delivery</b>	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16
<b>Public Confidence</b>	Cautious 8-10	Moderate 12-16

Averse 1-6
Cautious 8-10
Moderate 12-16
Open 20-25

**Risk Matrix**

In considering the matrix (overleaf) you should consider the potential areas of impact that your risk presents to the Highland Community Planning Partnership and score appropriately. The final assessment of the impact of your risk is not an aggregation of your scores - it is based on your highest score in any one of the following categories. They are provided as a guide and professional assessment will determine the most applicable impact score.

**Impact – What could happen if the risk occurred?** Assess for each category and use the highest score identified.

The impact scale is from a partnership perspective. It reflects the key areas that if impacted could prevent the partnership achieving its priorities and objectives.

The scale is a guide and cannot cover every type of impact therefore judgement is required.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Very Low Score 1</b>	<b>Low Score 2</b>	<b>Medium Score 3</b>	<b>High Score 4</b>	<b>Very High Score 5</b>
<b>Finance</b>	Cost/non achievement of benefits across the partnership or an area amounting to less than £1000.	Cost/non achievement of benefits across the partnership or an area greater than £1000.	Cost/non achievement of benefits across the partnership or an area greater than £10,000.	Cost/non achievement of benefits across the partnership or an area greater than £100,000.	Cost/non achievement of benefits across the partnership or an area greater than £1,000,000.

Category	Very Low Score 1	Low Score 2	Medium Score 3	High Score 4	Very High Score 5
<p><b>Legal</b> (Compliance, Equality and Diversity and Environmental)</p>	<p>No breach of procedure/ policy/ law with negligible impact.</p>	<p>Policy non-compliance but on an individual or much localised basis with minor effect.</p>	<p>Non-compliance with regulatory or legal frame work at a local Community Planning level. Likely to result in criticism externally.</p>	<p>Serious breach of regulatory/legal framework likely to result in independent enquiry and follow up recommendations from scrutiny bodies.</p>	<p>Critical breach of regulatory/ legal framework potentially resulting in significant scrutiny and recommendations.</p>
<p><b>Public Confidence</b></p>	<p>Individual complaints from members of the public which are easily resolved.</p> <p>No press / media coverage.</p> <p>Little or no effect on public confidence in the Community Planning Board.</p>	<p>Small number of public complaints from a local group which are easily resolved.</p> <p>Local press / media coverage.</p> <p>No regulatory / enforcing authority interest.</p> <p>Minor detrimental effect on public confidence in the Community Planning Board.</p>	<p>Sustained public complaints at a local level. Difficult to resolve.</p> <p>Local press / adverse media coverage.</p> <p>Negligible / informal involvement from regulatory authority.</p> <p>Moderate detrimental effect on public confidence in the Community Planning Board.</p>	<p>Sustained public complaints at a Highland wide level.</p> <p>Serious complaint upheld.</p> <p>National adverse media / press coverage.</p> <p>Advisory letter from regulatory authority and increased scrutiny / inspection.</p> <p>Major detrimental effect on public confidence in Community Planning Board requiring serious remedial action.</p>	<p>Serious complaint upheld resulting in significant penalties.</p> <p>National adverse media / press coverage, potentially over a sustained period.</p> <p>Failure to comply with regulatory authority recommendations increases scrutiny.</p> <p>Scottish Government parliamentary inquiries / debates /intervention.</p> <p>Public perception that Community Planning Board.is a failing.</p>



Category	Very Low Score 1	Low Score 2	Medium Score 3	High Score 4	Very High Score 5
<b>Service Delivery / Community Planning Board Priorities</b>	<p>Negligible impact in an area and no impact to wider Community Planning Board priorities.</p> <p>Resolved through day-to-day management at an individual or wider partnership level.</p>	<p>Impact across multiple areas.</p> <p>Negligible impact on the wider delivery of Community Planning Board priorities.</p> <p>Short term effect (less than 3 months) and inexpensive to recover.</p>	<p>Impact across a wider area.</p> <p>Significant impact at a regional level that could lead to wider Community Planning Board impact on partnership priorities.</p> <p>Medium term effect (up to 3 months) to recover.</p>	<p>Impact in multiple areas.</p> <p>Impact to delivery of wider Community Planning Board priorities in-year.</p> <p>Medium to long term effect (up to 6 months) to recover.</p>	<p>Impact across the entire Highland area.</p> <p>Critical impact to performance of Community Planning Board against stated priorities.</p> <p>Community Planning Board failure.</p>

**Probability – What is the likelihood of the risk occurring? Assess the likelihood of the risk occurring using the criteria below.**

Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5
It is assessed that the risk is <u>very unlikely</u> to ever happen.	It is assessed that the risk is <u>not likely</u> to happen.	It is assessed that the risk <u>may</u> happen.	It is assessed that the risk is <u>likely</u> to happen.	It is assessed that the risk is <u>very likely</u> to happen.

**Risk Assessment Table – Multiply probability score by impact score to determine the risk rating (score).**

<b>Probability</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Low 5</b>	<b>Medium 10</b>	<b>High 15</b>	<b>Very High 20</b>	<b>Very High 25</b>
	<b>4</b>	<b>Low 4</b>	<b>Medium 8</b>	<b>High 12</b>	<b>High 16</b>	<b>Very High 20</b>
	<b>3</b>	<b>Low 3</b>	<b>Low 6</b>	<b>Medium 9</b>	<b>High 12</b>	<b>High 15</b>
	<b>2</b>	<b>Low 2</b>	<b>Low 4</b>	<b>Low 6</b>	<b>Medium 8</b>	<b>Medium 10</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>Low 1</b>	<b>Low 2</b>	<b>Low 3</b>	<b>Low 4</b>	<b>Low 5</b>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
		<b>Impact</b>				

**Review Timescales** – When a risk rating has been assigned the criteria below should be used to assess the review timescales.

<b>Out with appetite &amp; tolerance</b>	Requires monthly monitoring and updates.
<b>Within tolerance</b>	Requires monthly monitoring and updates.
<b>Within appetite</b>	Requires quarterly monitoring and updates.



# CP Engaging and Facilitating in Communities Training

The proposed session is delivered across two separate days, half day each day, and includes some preparatory work, reflective and peer learning and creative exercises. Ideal group session would include no more than 12 with a preference for 8–10 people. The sessions will be tailored to work within a Community Partnership, with a modification to support a broader inclusion for the 'mop up' session intended for members from multiple CPs.

### Overview

*Pre course survey: each participant will be asked to complete a short four/five question survey anonymously to assist with the initial appraisal of barriers and characteristics of their experience of engagement through partnership working.*

#### **Day 1 Summary (3.5 hrs, option to add on period for lunch)**

They day will focus on considering stakeholders, their needs and the challenges to engagement and building relationships before moving to consider specific activities, within the control of the participants, that can be done to tackle those challenges or barriers. The group will agree a small list of key stakeholders for individuals to work on as part of the preparatory work for day 2.

#### **Day 2 Summary (subject to variance depending on numbers 3.5hrs on average)**

Participants are asked to prepare a 10 minute taster engagement session for their designated stakeholder group to deliver within the group. This allows ideas and concepts to flow which the group can build on in working and engaging with their stakeholders as a partnership. We will complete the session by considering how to handle challenging behaviour within the engagement process and the importance of personal integrity and approaches.

### Delivery

It is proposed to deliver one session in each CP area with an additional session for those who were unable to attend the one in their area but would still like the opportunity, totalling 10 (a total of 20 half day sessions). It would be preferable to deliver day one twice in a day covering Caithness and Sutherland, Mid and East Ross, Inverness and Nairn on the same days and repeat for day two.

#### **Cost**

Costs associated with venues and millage would be charged at actual costs, meaning that if a venue can be provided free of charge by a partner the overall cost will be less. (budget of £450 for millage and £1k for venues)

The fee HTSI would apply to each session to cover admin time and materials etc. would be £50, totalling £1k for delivery of all the sessions.

### Timescales

Due to current commitments we wouldn't schedule any of the sessions until April 2020 with a views to holding days 1 and 2 about 2/3 weeks apart. We would avoid the Easter holidays and aim to have them complete by the end of June.

Dates available for training delivery:

16th, 17th, 22nd and 24th April 2020

4th, 8th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 21st and 22nd May 2020

3rd, 4th, 5th, 11th, 12th and 19th June 2020