REPORT TO: COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD ON 27 MAY 2010

SUBJECT: LOCAL DELIVERY ACTION PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS FOR 2009-10

AND LOCAL DELIVERY ACTION PLANS FOR 2010-11

BY: CORPORATE POLICY UNIT MANAGER

### 1. REASON FOR REPORT

1.1 The Community Planning Board is asked to approve the Local Delivery Action Plans' achievements for 2009-10 and Local Delivery Action Plans for 2010-11. The Board is also asked to consider proposals for improving the involvement of the theme groups in the key actions.

### 2. **RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 The Community Planning Board is asked to approve the content of the Local Delivery Action Plan Performance 2009-10 for public performance reporting purposes.
- 2.2 The Community Planning Board is also asked to approve the Local Delivery Action Plans 2010-11 in principle and remit them to the Community Planning Statutory Partners to consider if the action can reflect more partnership activity.
- 2.3 The Community Planning Board is also asked to agree the proposals outlined in para 4.7 (i)-(iv) and consideration given to the Community Engagement Group's position within the strategic structure.

### 3. LOCAL DELIVERY ACTION PLANS 2009-10 - ACHIVEMENTS

- 3.1 At the Community Planning Board meeting on 10 June 2009, the meeting approved the Local Delivery Action Plans (LDAPs) 2009-10. These Local Delivery Action Plans have provided the basis of reporting performance to the Board and theme groups throughout 2009-10. The performance against the key actions, reported in a separate report on this agenda, shows that 88% progress has been made.
- 3.2 In addition to the statistical reporting against the key actions, lead officers were asked to provide a summary of the overall achievements and comments against the contribution to the SOA local and national outcomes. This information is contained in the appendix. (APPENDIX 1)
- 3.3 By September the Community Planning Partnership is required to publish performance against the key actions which contribute to the delivery of the Single Outcome Agreement local outcomes. The information in the appendix will be used to inform the Public Performance Report.

- 3.4 Lead officers were also asked to update the LDAPs for 2010-11 against the key action. The LADPs for 2010-11 are contained in the appendix. (APPENDIX 2)
- 3.5 Based on the developments over the past year, lead officers are suggesting the following changes to the key actions:

### Removed in 2010-11

- ➤ GIRFEC
- A95 and A96

## Merged in 2010-11

- > Social inclusion and More Choices, More Chances into Fairer Scotland Fund
- Parenting strategy into Early Years Framework

#### Added for 2010-11

- Mental Health identified by NHS
- Suicide Prevention identified by NHS
- Dementia identified by NHS
- Management of Registered Sex Offenders & Violent Offenders based on evidence gathered from the safer & stronger strategic assessment
- 3.6 In addition to the changes above, there may be a need to identify other key actions based in emerging issues over the past year. The suggestions are:
  - > Strategic Defence Review which now has a task group to consider action but this is not reflected as a key action.
  - ➤ Carbon Management Programme which has been identified as the local outcome with supporting key action but is not actually a key action itself.
  - Moray 2020.
- 3.7 Further the Community Planning Statutory Partners agreed that the Local Delivery Action Plans 2010-11 should reflect more partnership activities with less emphasis on one organisation delivering against a key action. This has not been achieved for all of the LDAPs as many of them developed by the lead officers still contain actions for individual partners rather then a partnership approach to the key action. Given this it is suggested that they be remitted to the statutory partners to consider if a more partnership contribution to can made to achieving the key action. Any amendments to the key actions arising from this consideration will be reported back to the next meeting of this group.

### 4. **PROPOSALS FOR 2010-11**

- 4.1 The table contained in the appendix contains cross references the LDAPs to a number of areas including the operational groups, reporting of key actions to the strategic groups and alignment of key actions to the theme groups. Improvements to the process have been highlighted both through the compilation of the information in the table and from comments during the past year. (APPENDIX 3)
- 4.2 <u>Operational groups management</u> Over the past 2 cycles considerable effort has been made to identify the operational groups linked to the relevant theme group.

Concern has been raised about the number of groups and representative from individual organisations on the groups. Unfortunately the strategic groups were unable to make any considerable changes to the number of groups or representatives.

- 4.3 Operational groups linked to key action 2009-10 Of the 68 groups, 25% of them are not linked to a key action.
- 4.4 Key actions 2009/10 reported to theme group Over the past year, besides the limited comments within the monitoring statements, 68% of the key actions have either not been reported to the theme group or if it has it was for noting purposes only. This means that only 32% of key actions have involved the theme group in decisions relating to the key actions.
- 4.5 <u>Key action 2010/11 linked to theme groups</u> A number of comments have been received regarding the allocation of key actions to the themes, particularly for the safer & stronger theme which seems to have an interest in a number of key actions reported to other theme groups. A re-allocation of some of the key actions is listed in the final column. Additionally it should be noted that the Community Engagement Group has no key actions.
- 4.6 <u>Summary of analysis</u> It appears from the analysis that the bulk of the work is being carried out without the involvement of the strategic group. It also appears that some considerable amount of time is taken up with operational groups, some who do not link to the key actions. Finally, the key actions need to be reallocated in some instances to better align the work of the theme groups.
- 4.7 <u>Proposals to strengthen the involvement of the theme groups in key actions</u> The following proposals are suggested to improve the operational of the partnership:
  - (i) Operational group management Many of the milestone actions within the key actions are to develop or implement a strategy. This work does not necessarily have to be done by a group and many times it is more efficient to assign one officer to the action. Once developed it can be circulated to a wider group for consultation. Therefore it is proposed that a responsible officer is identified by the lead organisation for the relevant actions and the group is disbanded.
  - (ii) Operational group representatives Many of the representatives are sitting on a number of groups but may only have a small role to play within the action. Therefore where a group is still required to meet either through legislation or no available officer, then representatives are limited to a core group. If input is required from other specialists for a small part of the action then this can be gained outside the meeting not requiring them to attend all meetings.
  - (iii) <u>Key actions reported to theme group Many of the theme groups have the same representatives as the relevant operational groups.</u> Therefore it would be more streamlined and accountable to have officers report back to the

theme group for consultation or approval purposes rather than the operational groups.

- (iv) Key action 2010/11 allocation to theme groups The main re-allocation of key actions is around the safer & stronger theme. This theme has an interest in many of the actions in other themes and lacks a key action on one of its main priorities of antisocial behaviour. Therefore the changes proposed are removing alcohol related offending from health and road accidents from wealthier and fairer to re-allocate them to safer & stronger. It is also proposed that the apprentice scheme to remitted to the Board given that the scheme is delivered through the Fairer Scotland Fund.
- (v) <u>Community Engagement Group</u> No key actions are remitted to this group. Consideration should be given to how it sits within the Strategic Structures and whether any changes should be made.
- 4.8 These proposals would strengthen the role of the theme group, make decisions more open and be more efficient.

# 5 **SUMMARY OF IMPLICATIONS**

(a) Single Outcome Agreement/Service Improvement Plan
The SOA should inform the contents of the Community Plan and partners' strategic documents.

# (b) Policy and Legal

The Council must meet requirements of the Scottish Government to comply with the Concordat.

### (c) Resources (Financial, Risks, Staffing and Property)

The resource implications of the local delivery action plans are highlighted under each theme group discussion.

#### (d) Consultations

Consultations have been held with the statutory partners on the general content of the Local Delivery Action Plans.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The monitoring of the LDAPs 2009-10 provide a starting point for the content of the public performance report which the Community Planning Partnership must submit to the Scottish Government as part of its concordat commitments.
- 6.2 There are minor changes to the Key Actions from 2009-10 to 2010-11 but a few new actions should be considered. The LDAPs have been updated by the lead officers for 2010-11 but some still lack a partnership approach. These LDAPs will be considered by the Community Planning Statutory Partners to consider further.

6.3 Finally, from the analysis of activity of the year, improvements can be made to enable the partnership to operate more effectively, efficiently and meaningfully. These improvements involve reducing the number of operational groups and the partners representatives, strengthening the role of the strategic groups by reporting of key actions and re-align some of the key actions to other strategic groups. The role of the Community Engagement Group within the strategic structure should also be considered.

Author of Report: Background Papers:

Ref: BM/jg/778823