



THE EDINBURGH PARTNERSHIP

EDINBURGH PARTNERSHIP - RESOURCES

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Edinburgh Partnership Board in April 2019 agreed to interim support arrangements whilst work was carried out to consider sustainable options for the future including financial commitments.
- 1.2 The original intention was for a paper setting out a sustainable way forward to be presented for consideration in December 2019. This work was remitted to the interim Community Planning Support Team established in June 2019 for a period of 6-months. This intention has not been fully realised for several factors including the resource challenge of the current interim arrangements and competing pressures of establishing new governance arrangements. Notwithstanding these constraints, progress has been made with an initial programme of work having been carried out including a stocktake with partners of governance and facilitation to capture current baseline data and a review of the interim arrangements, together with the identification of potential options for the future model of support. This paper sets out information on these areas of work.
- 1.3 The information is presented for the Board's consideration to inform the next steps in the delivery of the work. Specifically, a view is sought on the options the Board would wish prioritised for further development and detailed engagement with partners. Phasing of the work in this way will allow for the future model to be considered within the context of the transformational programmes currently underway in partner organisations, as detailed in the report, and which will have a potential impact in determining the direction for the future. The outcome of this activity will be reported to the Board in June 2020.
- 1.4 To enable the work to be progressed the paper proposes the continuation of the interim Community Planning Support Team for a further 6 months. Recognising the current challenges of the model, any continuation requires partners to reconfirm their commitment to the approach and to allocate dedicated staff based on the individual(s) having the capacity to carry out the necessary work of the group.
- 1.4 Similar pressures to those identified above have also impacted on the review of third sector participation. Progress has been made however with initial scoping of the work carried out and engagement with the third sector and wider stakeholders completed. Further work is now needed to define a sustainable model and the consequent resource requirements with the intention of this being subject to engagement with partners in advance of a proposal being submitted for consideration by the Board at its meeting in June 2020.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Board is asked to:

- i. note the financial contribution of £10k is still to be realised from the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service;
- ii. agree the options it would wish prioritised for further development and detailed engagement with partners;
- iii. agree to receive a further report on the future resource model in June 2020;
- iv. agree to receive a report on third sector participation in June 2020; and
- v. agree to continue the existing interim community planning support arrangements until June 2020 subject to the reconfirmation sought in paragraph 6.1.

3 CONTEXT

- 3.1 The Board at its meeting in April 2019 agreed interim arrangements for 6 months for the resourcing of community planning whilst a review to identify a sustainable future model was carried out.
- 3.2 In addition, an annual financial contribution of £10k from each of Police Scotland, NHS Lothian, Scottish Enterprise and the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service was agreed. The City of Edinburgh Council was not asked to provide a direct financial contribution recognising its existing support across all levels of the Edinburgh Partnership, both in kind, staffing and direct budget. To date, financial contributions have been received from all except the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service.
- 3.3 The interim arrangements made provision for support for all aspects of the governance framework and work of the Edinburgh Partnership. In line with previous practice the City of Edinburgh Council continued to provide most of this support, with the addition of the establishment of a multi-agency Community Planning Support Team comprising officers from the City of Edinburgh Council, Police Scotland, Scottish Enterprise, Scotland Fire and Rescue Service, NHS Lothian and Edinburgh Voluntary Organisations Council. This recognised the legislative requirement placed on named public bodies to facilitate and support community planning.
- 3.4 To inform the future approach a review of the interim Community Planning Support Team arrangement was commissioned and carried out by Edinburgh University in November 2019. The review was based on one to one interviews and a group discussion with the Community Planning Support Team to identify the opportunities and challenges of the model. The summary findings from this work are included as Appendix 1.
- 3.5 This identified several benefits to the approach, most notably providing for a deep form of collaboration based on a plurality of inputs from a range of partners and greater empathy across the group. It also identified several challenges. Key



amongst these was resourcing, with the need for greater continuity in representation, and a disparity of skill base amongst members of the group. Additionally, whilst the legislative requirement for bodies to participate in community planning is clear, the current framework does not mandate all elements of support in terms of financial and resource commitment.

- 3.6 Whilst these findings provide an applied insight to the potential way forward, any approach needs developed within the current organisational landscape. This includes transformation programmes that have a potential impact in determining the direction for the future.
- 3.7 Under the existing interim arrangement, the City of Edinburgh Council continues to provide the main support through the locality teams for the community planning arrangements at the locality and neighbourhood levels. Discussions on the future of the current locality way of working have been taking place informally within the Place and Communities and Families Directorates during 2019. These discussions have led to a wider set of ideas emerging under the auspices of the City of Edinburgh Council's Change Programme. On 18 September 2019, these discussions were taken forward through the City of Edinburgh Council's new approach to organisational change which sets out a process for the development of such proposals, starting with widespread staff engagement which would then help develop concrete proposals and, where appropriate, organisational reviews. This initial phase of staff engagement resulted in a significant number of responses being received. These contributions are now being considered carefully, to ensure these inform any organisational change proposals. Given the amount of material to consider, and the complexity of the services, it is therefore now the aim to begin the formal organisational review by the end of January 2020 with the resultant timeframe for the likely implementation of any new structure not anticipated before April/May 2020.
- 3.8 In NHS Lothian the Public Health Directorate is currently under review. The aims of this process are to reinforce internal governance, clarify a common purpose, review and strengthen the public health offer to colleagues and partners, and improve alignment with the community planning partnerships and the Integrated Joint Boards. This review is being undertaken alongside the national public health reform, which is being led by the Scottish Government and COSLA and will support different ways of working to develop a whole system approach to improve health and reduce inequalities. The outcome of the NHS Lothian review and how the Directorate will be structured going forward remains unclear at this time.
- 3.9 The Enterprise and Skills review has prompted the creation of a series of Regional Economic Partnerships across Scotland, with Scottish Enterprise asked to undertake a key role in ensuring that regional economic strategies are developed and inform a series of regional investment prospectus which then attract the necessary people, business and funding to realise those opportunities and spread inclusive economic growth across Scotland's communities. In light of



this form of engagement at a regional level and the additional resourcing required, Scottish Enterprise is currently in the process of reviewing whether that is an effective means by which to deliver its statutory obligations in relation to community planning partnerships, or whether a blended or different approach is required. It is anticipated that this review will conclude by end 2020.

- 3.10 A further consideration in developing a new model is the partners' current and future support for community planning in the city. To better understand this landscape a stocktake with partners was carried out details of which are set out below.

4 STOCKTAKE

- 4.1 The stocktake focused on governance and facilitation, to capture current baseline data and views around a sustainable future state model. This was carried out with partners during the period July to November 2019. Undertaken by Police Scotland, the programme involved face to face and telephone interviews of 21 people, drawn from within and across partners including Board Members or their nominated representative(s).
- 4.2 Whilst partners attend the Edinburgh Partnership Board, Local Outcome Improvement Delivery Group, Locality Community Planning Partnerships, as appropriate, and have, where relevant, committed resource to the Community Planning Support Team, a review of the available data identified significant variance in respect of the resource and time commitment provided to actively support the facilitation and governance of the Edinburgh Partnership.
- 4.3 The City of Edinburgh Council and Police Scotland are currently independently and collectively broadly discharging the facilitation and governance requirements of the Edinburgh Partnership, which includes progressing and delivering on most of the Edinburgh Partnership work programme. This has resulted in an increased commitment to the interim arrangement from Police Scotland than originally agreed in April 2019.
- 4.4 As noted earlier the City of Edinburgh Council continues to provide the majority of the support including development support for the neighbourhood networks; active participation of the Locality Managers in all four of the locality community planning partnerships together with secretariat support; lead officer support for two of the locality community planning partnerships; facilitation of the Local Outcome Improvement Plan Delivery Group through the provision of the a lead officer for the group and priority 3; and lead officer and the secretariat function for the Board. The lead officer support and secretariat function are also provided for the Edinburgh Community Learning and Development Partnership, Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership and Integrated Children's Services Partnership.
- 4.5 Alongside the City of Edinburgh Council, Police Scotland is fully embedded within the Edinburgh Partnership framework, with each of the four Local Area Commanders actively participating in their respective locality community planning



partnerships, supplemented by lead officer support for two of these partnerships. Police Scotland also Chair the Local Outcome Improvement Plan Delivery Group and provide the secretariat function.

- 4.6 Interviewees variously voiced frustration and/or disappointment that the Community Planning Support Team had yet to initiate development work, a feeling shared by the Team themselves. It was recognised that this had been as a consequence of the abridged resource, now resolved, and varying levels of contribution by partners.
- 4.7 Further, whilst some participants articulated having been unclear as to the initial ask, with the benefit of applied perspective, and with acknowledgement of competing priorities, there was broad agreement around the efficacy and intention of the dedicated resource, with wider requirements predominantly mirroring the Community Planning Support Team's ongoing work programme. This includes the development and embedding of a performance framework, development of a communication / digital media strategy, awareness raising activity across and within all member organisations and a community participation strategy.
- 4.8 Notwithstanding the acknowledged challenges of ongoing transformational work, budgetary pressures and competing priorities, the membership of the Edinburgh Partnership Board were considered key to delivering successfully on the collective ambitions and aspirations with this being achieved through mandating the availability and continuity of a diversely skilled and invested multi-agency Community Planning Support Team resource.

5 OPTIONS

- 5.1 The initial programme of work, in addition to the stocktake, included the identification of potential future models of support. Information on each of these is summarised below.

Option 1: Fully outsourced external solution

Engage with an external third party to take on the support and facilitation of the Edinburgh Partnership.

Pros Innovative new model of delivery
Alleviates personnel pressures of individual organisations
Allows for a tailored service based on the required skills and experience
Provides for contractual accountability

Cons Availability of suitable third party service provider
Substantial and secure financial commitment required by partners
Potential inflexibility of contractual model including staff terms and conditions
Lead partner required to procure and manage service
Increased timescale given need for procurement process



- Not integrated within community planning partners
- Untested approach
- Increased reputational and operational risks
- No clear lines of accountability to Board
- Lack of shared ownership

Option 2: A Support Office

The remit of the support office would be to provide support, co-ordination and development for the Edinburgh Partnership and could take several forms. These range from informal to formal arrangements as detailed below.

(a) Support office based on formal secondment/recruitment under new brand or entity

This option would involve the Edinburgh Partnership becoming a new business entity with employer status and the ability to recruit to the support office on a permanent basis. This could be achieved through the Edinburgh Partnership becoming an incorporated body as legislated for in the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 with the consent of the Scottish Government.

- Pros**
- Innovative new model of delivery
 - Increased joint accountability and improved governance
 - Provides for autonomy
 - Allows partners to pay for a resource
 - Achieves joint ownership and not led by one partner
- Cons**
- Requires Edinburgh Partnership to become an incorporated body with consequent legal and financial implications
 - Does not embed collaborative working within existing organisations resulting in potential disconnect
 - Does not take account of governance framework and separate legislative requirements of strategic partnerships
 - Requires a substantial financial commitment
 - Untested approach
 - Increased timescale for development and implementation
 - Requires partner approval and commitment
 - Relies on Scottish Ministerial approval

(b) Support office based on formal secondment under existing partner organisations

This option would involve a lead managing partner to be identified, job descriptions, contracts and conditions to be issued to formally second employees for a defined period.

- Pros**
- Existing mechanisms and protocols likely to exist for quick implementation
 - Relationships and integration within partner organisations maintained
 - Formalisation and enhancement of interim model
 - Allows partners to pay for a resource
 - Ensures accountability of support office to the Edinburgh Partnership
 - Embeds collaborative working within existing organisations
 - Increased accountability and improved governance
 - Alleviates personnel pressures of individual organisations
 - Allows for the clear definition of expectations of role and skills required to support delivery
 - Mitigates churn associated with an informal arrangement
 - Fewer legal requirements/burdens on the Edinburgh Partnership
- Cons**
- Short term secondment problematic
 - Requires the identification of a lead partner
 - Challenges in identifying appropriate secondees

(c) Support office based on informal secondment with existing partner organisations

This replicates the current interim arrangement, where each organisation commits an employee(s) to participate in Edinburgh Partnership support activities.

- Pros**
- Flexible model allowing for intra and interagency working
 - Allows for relationship building and sharing of knowledge
 - Fewer legal requirements/burdens on the Edinburgh Partnership
 - Allows partners to pay for a resource
 - Achieves joint ownership and not led by one partner
 - Allows for quick implementation
- Cons**
- Relies on parity of commitment (personal and organisational)
 - Lack of continuity as a consequence of churn and competing priorities
 - Lack of clear lines of accountability and governance to Edinburgh Partnership

Option 3: Embedded Community Planning Support Group

This option would require the support activities to be integrated into each team member's remit as part of their 'day job' and, as a compulsory and consistent task to be fulfilled moving forward.

- Pros**
- Provides flexibility within partner organisations
 - Fewer legal requirements/burdens on the Edinburgh Partnership
 - Achieves joint ownership and not being led by one partner
 - Allows for quick implementation
- Cons**
- No clear management
 - Relies on parity and sustained commitment (personal and organisational)
 - Lack of continuity as a consequence of churn and competing priorities
 - No surety around the skill base of contributing partners
 - Lack of clear lines of accountability and governance to the Edinburgh Partnership

Option 4: Partners financially contribute to costs of one partner providing necessary staffing all drawn from that organisation

- Pros**
- Clear lines of accountability and management
 - Mitigates churn associated with an informal arrangement
 - Alleviates personnel pressures of individual organisations
 - Increased accountability and improved governance
 - Allows for the clear definition of expectations of role and skills required to support delivery
 - Fewer legal requirements/burdens on the Edinburgh Partnership
 - Allows for quick implementation
- Cons**
- Lack of clear lines of accountability and governance to the Edinburgh Partnership
 - Does not provide for shared ownership and collaborative working
 - Requires significant financial commitment which certain partners may have difficulties in meeting
 - Does not embed community planning across partners

6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 To take this forward, further detailed work and a programme of engagement with partners and the strategic partnerships is required. With the current interim arrangement ending in December 2019, the Board is asked to agree to the continuation of the Community Planning Support Team to allow for the necessary work to be carried out and the existing work programme to continue. This relies on the individuals identified having the capacity to carry out the necessary functions of the group and partners are asked to reconfirm contribution on this



basis. The outcome will be presented to the Edinburgh Partnership Board in June 2020 at which time the interim arrangement will end.

7 CONTACTS

Community Planning Support Team:

Michele Mulvaney, Strategy Manager (Communities), City of Edinburgh Council

Sam Ainslie, Chief Inspector, Police Scotland

David Rennie, Team Leader, Scottish Enterprise

Peter O'Brien, Group Manager, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service

Kerry Murray, Senior Health Promotion Specialist, NHS Lothian

Ian Brooke, Depute Chief Executive, Edinburgh Voluntary Organisations Council

Edinburgh Partnership Board: Community Planning Support Team

This paper is based on individual semi-structured interviews with 5 members of the Community Planning Support Team on Wednesday 30th October (Michele Mulvaney, City of Edinburgh Council (CEC); Lee-Ann MacCallum (SE); Catherine Stewart (CEC); Sam Ainslie (Police Scotland); Peter O'Brien (SFRS); Ian Brooke (EVOC) and one meeting with all members of the Support Team together on Wednesday 6th November 2019. In addition, papers were consulted on the background to the establishment and functions of the Support Group. The aim of this exercise was to facilitate discussion on and contribute to the review of the Group and consider any changes to the existing model.

Key themes emerged in discussions that are discussed below:

- functions and purpose;
- resourcing;
- accountability;
- role of partners

Functions and Purpose

Tasks

- Progress monitoring and reporting.
- Liaise with and support for partnership structures and members.
- Plan design, development and delivery.
- Project planning and management including risk management, option appraisal and cost benefit analysis.
- Performance management including development of measures and data development and sharing.
- Development of engagement approaches involving partners and communities including digital platforms.
- Undertaking research and data analysis including horizon scanning, researching best practice, and benchmarking with other CPPs and nationally.
- Development of links across the city to ensure synergies/opportunities for joint working are maximised.
- Agenda planning and organising meetings.
- Action tracking and coordination.

The Support Group has performed a **secretariat function and implementing the new arrangements agreed through the review** in this first phase of the revised partnership. This has involved bringing papers to the Board which have largely focused on processes. Much of this work has been done by CEC and Police Scotland Support staff. It is envisaged that this role will continue to be required in future. It is also anticipated that the work of the Group should become more involved in **developmental work** with a view to encouraging the **delivery** of greater partnership. Much early work has involved **monitoring and reporting on progress**, liaising with partners.

The Group also has a **network function**, serving as the link between the Board and the wider partnership. This involves both communication up to the Board and into the various partner organisations.

The Support Group has gelled well despite challenges (see below) and operates as a deep form of collaboration. The value of the Group lies in the **plurality of inputs** reflecting the different organisations. This creates inevitable tensions given the diverse nature of the partners organisations but has allowed each member of the team to gain a better understand of other partners. This has contributed to greater **empathy**, an essential feature of successful partnership working.

There is broad agreement within the Group that the basic concept is correct but greater emphasis is now required on **development work**. In addition, **resourcing of the group needs to be addressed**.

Resourcing

A key issue that has emerged is the **resourcing** of the Support Group. One of the challenges is ensuring a greater degree of continuity. Change in the membership cannot be avoided but results in a need for new members to familiarise with the work, work to become part of the team and become socialised into its operation. Efforts are required to minimise the negative impact of churn. A key part of this is to ensure that continuity planning becomes a responsibility of each partner, ensuring that when change occurs this does not disrupt the group. Embedding partnership more formally within each partner would improve the prospect of success for the Edinburgh Partnership.

The skills and experience required that were outlined when the Group was established proved a good base. Such skills and experience need to be more embedded throughout partners to enhance partnership working. But these cannot be the exclusive property of the support group but need to become embedded throughout each partner organisation. Greater efforts will be required to develop these skills within each partner.

Skills and experience

- Ability to provide advice and contribute to decision making based on technical/specialist knowledge
- Demonstrated competence in managing complex projects/programmes
- Change management knowledge and skills
- Experience of performance management and evaluation
- Experience of working in partnership settings and the development and leading of multi-agency groups on specific initiatives
- Ability to communicate and negotiate effectively at all levels and maintain effective relationships with a diverse range of people and organisations
- An understanding of community planning and relevant policy, public service and community issues
- Experience of community engagement practice and methodologies
- Demonstrated competence in championing and promoting cultural change
- Ability to work in a dynamic environment with a large number of stakeholders

A key issue concerns the resources made available to the Support Group while acting as a lynchpin in Edinburgh Partnership. Different options exist including making a financial

contribution, as distinct from appointing designated staff. Such funding might buy staff time which could be devoted to the Group but Group members need to be able to have roots in each partner organisation and stability of membership so far as possible. A key lesson of the informal secondments characterising the Support Group to date suggests that secondments allow for good partnership working. But **formal named secondments** would be a major step towards deeper collaboration and minimise disruption caused by changes in personnel.

Accountability

Accountability is a challenge in any partnership which leaves individual members with the degree of autonomy that exists within Community Planning. **Members of the Group are primarily accountable to line managers in their partner organisation but not the partnership as a whole.** Members of the Support Group have a dual responsibility as members of the Group to the partnership as a whole. This can create tensions and frustrations.

The Edinburgh Partnership, in common with all Community Planning Partnerships, is a loose confederation of bodies which aspires to create greater integration but faces institutional challenges to breaking out of silo working. This is an endemic and unavoidable feature of Community Planning Partnerships. Though there may be a statutory obligation to be a member of a partnership that obligation is silent on the precise nature of membership and the commitment involved. Additionally, Community Planning is a very small element in the statutory and other obligations of each partner with often few FTE allocated to this work. Enhancing the sense of commitment to the Edinburgh Partnership is thereby challenging.

Role of Partners

Community Planning Partnerships have evolved but, according to Audit Scotland, 'not yet delivering the ambitious changes in the way public services are organised and delivered, with and for communities, that were envisaged in the Statement of Ambition'. In order to achieve this ambition, partners need to **embed collaboration** throughout the partnership. This cannot be done by a small Support Group on its own but requires leadership throughout the partners. Consistent and repeated messaging from senior leaders is essential. Partnership working can only succeed when it is owned throughout the partnership and not only by the Board or Support Group.

Reporting and monitoring

A key role for the Support Group will continue to be monitoring and reporting both of its activities but more importantly of partnership working. **Annual reporting** will allow best practice to be highlighted and identifying areas which needs to be addressed by the Partnership Board.