Highland Community Planning Board – 20 December 2021

Proposals to Support the Resourcing of Community Planning

Report by: CPP Senior Officers Group

Recommendations:

The CPP Board is asked to:
- Note the background and process for agreeing to develop a new approach to resourcing local and strategic Community Planning;
- Consider and agree the proposal and recommended financial model for delivery of the new approach; and
- Note that should the proposal be agreed, each organisation will be asked to consider and agree how it proposes to support and delivery the model.

---

1.   Background

1.1   Since the introduction of the current model of Community Planning in Highland, there have been ongoing discussions on how to support and resource community planning. The current model, where resourcing is the responsibility of the lead agency for each Community Partnership, has had both benefits but also challenges. Agencies, on the whole, have managed to provide administrative resource for minuting meetings, but in the main, have struggled to provide a dedicated resource to support and co-ordinate partnership business.

1.2   The need to reconsider how to support the partnerships in relation to resourcing has been highlighted in a recent NHS Highland internal audit and also the Council's Best Value Audit.

1.3   Between March and June of 2021, a review of locality planning took place. This provided an opportunity to consider what was working well within the partnership but also what needed to change. Similar themes where reflected in partner agency officer seminars and from a seminar with Highland Council elected members. These concluded there was a need for the following to support effective community planning:

- Leadership – need for understanding of roles

- Priorities and Action - Need for focused priorities, aligning priorities
- Commitment – from all local partners and embedding throughout an organisation
- Evidence based decision making – need for data and monitoring
- Understanding of need and inequalities from all involved
- Involving and enabling communities – making it meaningful, co-production/solution focused, learning from covid
- Being the 'day job'

The overall conclusion was that to support delivery of these conclusions, a shift in the current approach to resourcing was required.

1.4   The Community Planning Partnership Board held a workshop to specifically consider the issue of resourcing in September 2021, the discussions being informed by the locality plan review and seminars that had taken place. There was an acknowledgement that certain things are required in order to make community planning work more effectively – some dependent on resource and others not. These included:

- Simplification
  - Of plans, priorities and outcomes
- Prioritisation
  - Data and intelligence to inform a core set of priorities
  - Making plans and priorities relevant to local communities
- Communication and Engagement
  - Improved communication between partners and communities
  - Actively involving communities in prioritisation and delivery
- Leadership
  - To ensure that staff are empowered locally to prioritise this work
  - To ensure that this approach to partnership working needs to be embedded into the roles of local staff – it needs to become the 'day job'.

1.5   Focusing specifically on resourcing it was highlighted:
- There was a need to better utilise and target existing staff resource through better alignment and collaboration against key strategic priorities
- There is a need for resource in order to better co-ordinate and facilitate local community partnership activity to make it effective
- Development officer time to drive to partnership action.
- Need for specific partnership data analyst support to ensure effective and evidence based prioritisation

The workshop concluded with an acknowledgement that the current model for supporting local partnerships is not working leading to varied outcomes for communities and that a different approach was required.

1.6   Post workshop discussions considered how best to progress this outcome and proposed:

- A core central team with the purpose of supporting local partnership working – this would allow sharing of good practice and improved co-ordination across partnerships.
- The central team would combine elements of co-ordination, facilitation and development work in order to address the key issues identified.
- An additional element in any central team would be a partnership data officer to work across strategic and local partnership and provide key data and business intelligence to inform prioritisation.

This proposal was agreed by the CPP Board on 4 December and it was noted that work would be undertaken to identify the level of support required, cost implications and considering different options for how this could be supported by partner agencies in Highland.   This would be reported to the December meeting of the CPP. This report sets out the proposed model and potential options for delivering this.

2.   Proposed Model

2.1   The proposed model for supporting local and strategic Community Partnership planning is set out below. It has been developed in consultation with organisational leads, the Partnership Co-ordinating Group and Community Partnership Chairs.

The model consists of:
   1 x Partnership Development Manager
   5 x Partnership Officers
        1 x Caithness and Sutherland
        1 x East and Mid Ross
        1 x Skye, Wester Ross and Lochaber
        1 x Nairn and Badenoch and Strathspey
        1 x Inverness

The rationale for this approach is a central team would support a shared learning approach and develop consistent approaches across Highland. Further to this a central team would enable mutual aid across partnerships whilst also providing peer support. The size of team proposed balances the level of support required by partnerships with what is considered to be deliverable.

2.2   The proposed roles for the team are outlined below.

The Development Manager role is to provide strategic oversight and supporting the alignment of strategic and local priorities. Their role would include the sourcing of additional funding for partnership activity and actions.

The role of the Partnership Officer is to provide crucial co-ordination and communication across the Community Partnership, ensuring delivery of actions and outcomes. They will provide the role of lead officer for the partnership(s) they are responsible for.

Partnership Development Manager	Partnership Officer
• Oversight, management and direction • Report to the Board on partnership performance and outcomes ensuring alignment of strategic and local priorities • Supporting the co-ordinating group • Sourcing external funding for specific activity/engagement • Training and development of officer skills • Liaison with CPP partners • Co-ordination of rotational secondments	• Communication with the partnership • Organisation of meetings and follow up • Co-ordination of partnership activity and action • Monitoring and performance • Deputise for the Partnership Chair and be the lead officer for the Partnership

2.3   It is proposed that the central team would be hosted in one partner agency and that a shared management model of partnership officers would be adopted between the Partnership Development Manager and individual Community Partnership Chairs. Strategic oversight and direction would be through the Community Planning Senior Officers Group.

3.   Option for Delivering the Model

3.1   Three options are proposed for delivery the model outlined:

Option 1 – All Funded
   • All posts funded by all partner agencies
Option 2 – Mixed Model
   • Funded Development Manager
   • Seconded/Funded Officer Posts
Option 3 – All Seconded
   • All posts seconded from partner agencies

3.2   The following short options appraisal has been prepared to consider the different options.

Option	Benefits	Weaknesses
Option 1 – All Funded	• Consistent sustainable team • Buy-in from all partners • Can effectively deliver support for partnership priorities and outcomes	• Some organisations unable to commit to this • External funding as an option not an alternative as no sustainability • Would miss wider benefits of staff shared learning – CPD. • A separate team may encourage disengagement from partners

Option 2 – Mixed Model Funded Development Manager Seconded/funded Officer Posts	• Consistent manager post to direct and plan for the team • Manager to train and develop officers • CPD opportunities for organisation staff – building understanding and skills • Regularly refreshing the team with new ideas • Financially more affordable • A team is in place to support delivery of partnership priorities and outcomes ensuring consistency with a permanent manager post • Investing in tackling prevention – focus and shift for organisations • Consistency – expert support for the Chair • Supports the cross-pollination of ideas within a mixed professionals team	• Some partner agencies will still be required to directly fund the manager post • Not a consistent officer team • Some organisations may still struggle to second an officer • Finding people with the right skill set • Could create internal organisational pressure to backfill a secondment
Option 3 – All Seconded All posts seconded from partner agencies	• No direct funding required • A team is in place to support delivery of partnership outcomes but will be changes in personnel • CPD opportunities for organisation staff – building understanding and skills • Regularly refreshing the team with new ideas • Financial more affordable • Investing in tackling prevention – focus and shift for organisations	• Some organisation may still struggle to second an officer • Finding people with the right skill set • No consistency in an officer team • Could create internal organisational pressure to backfill a secondment • With no permanent member of staff, co-ordination of rotational secondments becomes complex. • No permanent member of staff weakens the model and sustainability

	• Supports the cross-pollination of ideas within a mixed professionals team	

On balance, based on the feasibility, practical delivery and to ensure the most effective delivery of outcomes, it is recommended that **Option 2**, would achieve the desired aims outlined by the CPP Board.

4. Indicative Costs of Delivery

4.1 The following outlined the indicative costs against each of the delivery options proposed. As noted above, for option 2, the minimum funding required would be £60k although this model recognises that some partner agencies may wish to fund permanent officer posts rather than adopting a secondment model. A fully funded model, option 1, would be at a cost of circa. £290,000.

Options	Direct Funding Required	Funded	Seconded
Option 1 – All funded	Circa £290,000	Development Manager • HC10/NHS Band 7 • Circa. £45k + on costs Partnership Officers • HC8/NHS Band 5/6 • Circa. £35k + on costs	NA
Option 2 – Hybrid	Circa £60,000 (minimum for Development Manager)	Partnership Development Manager • HC10/NHS Band 7 • Circa. £45k + on costs *Potential for additional officers to be funded.*	Partnership Officers Aim for: • Highland Council HC8 • NHS Band 5/6 • Police Sergeant • HIE TBC • Fire TBC
Option 3 – All seconded	NA	NA	Partnership Development Manager • HC10/NHS Band 7 Partnership Officers Aim for: • HC8 • NHS Band 5/6 • Police Sergeant • HIE TBC • Fire TBC

5. Next Steps

5.1   The delivery model and recommended option for resourcing are proposed as the best way of achieving and delivering improved outcomes for local communities across Highland and the stated objectives of the CPP.

5.2   It should be noted that an outstanding element is a partnership data officer position. It is not considered that a secondment model would be able to deliver this requirement. This was regarding as significant and a critical element of the new model. Two potential options are available, one taking a graduate intern approach through a host organisation and secondly the partnership development manager seeking direct funding for this post. An update on this will be reported to a future Board meeting.

5.3   The Board is asked to consider and agree the proposed approach but is asked to note that should this model be agreed, it will be for each individual organisation to consider and agree how it proposes to support and deliver the model. This will be reported to a future meeting of the Board.

Recommendations:

The CPP Board is asked to:
- Note the background and process for agreeing to develop a new approach to resourcing local and strategic Community Planning;
- Consider and agree the proposal and recommended financial model for delivery of the new approach; and
- Note that should the proposal be agreed, each organisation will be asked to consider and agree how it proposes to support and delivery the model.

Author: CPP Senior Officers Group

Date: 12-12-21