

Executive summary and setting the scene

This plan is under development and will be integrated into the Chief Executives Office plan as the Unit moves over in the next three months.

There is a Review of Locality working being scoped at present which will address a range of issues expressed below.

Executive summary for: (CEO's Office/Community Unit)

Responsible officer: Lorraine Smyth Community Programmes and Performance Manager

To support delivery of the Sustainable Cumbria Strategy, LAA and Council Plan, in 2010/11 the Community Unit will

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. lead on Cumbrian community engagement , working with councilors, corporate directors and partners to influence community life including decisions made by public services | this work funded mainly by local committees |
| 2. support councilors including their locally responsive decision making (delegated executive functions through local committees and more local mechanisms if appropriate) | This work is funded corporately |
| 3. help develop more consistent local management and planning arrangements , across the council and where appropriate with partners. | This work is funded corporately |
| 4. community capacity building - develop the capacity of local communities to shape their environments by | |
| 4.a) managing 'giving' through community grants (including neighborhood forum grants) | this work funded by local committees |
| 4.b) managing 'investing' in community infrastructure to build the strength and capacity of local councils and the Third Sector | this work is mainly funded corporately |
| 4.c) managing 'buying' critical services, including money advice | this work is funded by local committees |
| 5. Lead on priority inclusion programmes , including financial inclusion, rural inclusion and pathways to youth employment. This activity underpins Anti Poverty Strategy delivery | this work is funded corporately |

Setting the scene

This is a brief overview of what your directorate or service does and its priorities.

Executive summary for: (CEO Office/Community Unit)

Responsible officer: Lorraine Smyth Community Programmes and Performance Officer

The Community Unit's key role is to lead council and partnership based community and stakeholder engagement to ensure that our services and programmes continue to be locally relevant, and that we respond as one council to changing community needs. We do this by organising in excess of 400 community events each year, managing 1300+ grants and supporting development of over 150 community plans.

Secondly the Unit ensures that platforms for local engagement are utilized: by the Council, its partners and the related services to ensure that we work effectively in communities; and by the community to deliver on their aspirations. This work is closely aligned to the work of councilors as community and civic leaders. This role is challenging in the light of new legislation and increased devolved working affecting residents, staff and councilors.

Thirdly we provide additional support to groups of residents and communities where Members determine there are additional needs. We do this through

- a number of community inclusion and *investment* programmes (, rural inclusion, local councils and the third sector, credit union development, youth pathways to employment and co-ordination of the Anti Poverty Action Plan);
- buying a limited number of services including the money advice service; and
- programmes of grant *giving*, such as neighborhood forum grants.

The above corporate and community based work is delivered through a small central team and six area based teams.

Where are we now?

How does the service meet user expectations?

We meet user and stakeholder expectations in a wide variety of ways depending on local needs but these fit into six different approaches:

- ❖ Organising community events and providing an engagement platform for the Council and its partners
- ❖ Supporting councilors in their civic and community leadership roles including the executive work of local committees.
- ❖ Helping CMT to build consistent local management and planning arrangements
- ❖ Managing community grants and capacity investment determined by the local committees
- ❖ Managing inclusion programmes and commissioning services to support individuals and communities at risk of exclusion (e.g. money advice) to support the delivery of the anti-poverty strategy
- ❖ Helping to communicate the impact of these activities in communities.

How did your service perform in 2009/10?

Objectives	Performance and any issues

<p>See below on NI's and Work programme for detail on 27 delivery measures.</p> <p>Immediate and ongoing support to communities effected by flooding in Autumn 2010</p> <p>External contracts Thriving third sector</p> <p>Building locality capacity</p> <p>Anti poverty strategy</p>	<p>26 Green – see NI's below 1 red awaiting national 3rd Sector Survey</p> <p>Working in and with communities affected by flooding. Embedding responsive management to community issues raised and providing coordination for local activity and support for community recovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Cumbria CVS - contract with clear operational targets relating to volunteering and sectoral development; commissioning approach developed ❖ Community led planning c£35k contract delivery ❖ CALC support c£25k – contract delivery ❖ Money Advice contract based on benchmarked activity costs. The contract currently rests with Citizens Advice Bureaux. c£329k – contract delivery exceeded ❖ Youth Pathways - maintained 70 youth placements during 2009/10; despite increased overheads c£318k
--	---

Results of key indicators

Indicator	2009/10 Actual	2010/11 Target	Your Performance (RAG)	Performance against Benchmark
NI1	78.30	80.30	Green	Top quartile
NI2	68.30	None set	Green	Top quartile
NI3	15.00	None set	Amber	Unknown
NI4	28.80	32.00	Green	Middle quartile
NI5	85.00	None set	Green	Top quartile
NI6	26.30	33.00	Green	Top quartile
NI7	17.40	21.30	Red – awaiting survey in Autumn 2010	Top quartile

Key achievements

Comment on how your service has improved in 2009/10 and how have you shared good practice/learning?

- ❖ Engagement in national empowerment hubs particularly business case, and peer review process with other councils
- ❖ Delegated functions to Local committee have been increased recognizing the value of local decision making

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ frequently share practice with other local authorities on engagement and devolved functions ❖ Quarterly reporting to Local Committees on Community Engagement activity. Annual results are 451 events across Cumbria with 15,500 residents participating. ❖ 70 young people supported into employment on the Youth Pathways Scheme. Success shared in national and local press. ❖ Nationally recognised for Social Clauses development achieved in part through a p/t secondment with procurement. ❖ Pilot of Community Engagement Standards with four directorates leading to a roll out in the council and with partners ❖ Use of the Together We Can initiative at the LGA Conference ❖ Development of a Partnership Agreement with Cumbria Neighborhood Watch and the Police to improve support for CNHWA ❖ Support for development and delivery of the anti poverty strategy
<p>What are your legislative/statutory obligations? <i>Describe which elements of the service are a statutory duty (citing relevant legislation)</i></p>
<p>Local Government Act 2007 duties: including support for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • councilors call for action and related community development activity; • delivery of the duty to involve through an engagement framework and charter; • support for the delivery of LINKs – (Local Involvement Networks) by the third sector <p>All parts of the Unit’s activities are included in current government advice, sustainable Cumbria, Council Plan and LAA outcomes.</p>

Benchmarking

		Source of evidence
Service cost	<p>Cumbria is one of the few authorities to embed community engagement and devolved decision making so there are few authorities (particularly rural authorities) to benchmark against. Additionally empowerment is handled differently in each Council and there is no single set of local authority comparators to hand. This makes benchmarking challenging. We have however informally benchmarked against comparator local authorities (and led this theme nationally), identifying that (given the geography and population) costs of community engagement are competitive relevant to other NEA authorities. However overall we believe our costs to be within the top half of county councils.</p> <p>At present there are limited synergies across services, indeed considerable</p>	<p>Network of Empowering Authorities (NEA)</p> <p>Network of Empowering Authorities</p>

	<p>duplication in those attending community events and engaging on sometimes minor concerns. This problem is not unique to Cumbria. We are working with other NEA partners to identify councils where this work has been particularly effective.</p> <p>Overall costs of devolved decision making is perceived to be high because of the management arrangements (i.e. CU, MSU, highways etc) number of meetings and agenda items and the overall volume of business dealt with through the local committee executives.</p> <p>Overall unit costs of grant giving are around those of comparator councils (10% is held to be an average overhead - although no published information is available for comparison). Cost could be reduced by reducing the overall scale of grant giving, and the variety of grants</p> <p>Our contracts with CVS are higher than most comparator authorities and still thought to be in the top quartile. CVS can be asked to source additional comparative information</p> <p>Our locality management costs are difficult to peg against other areas operating devolved decision making and managing community engagement but are thought corporately to be in the top quartile because of the scale of devolved decision making and community engagement, and the parallel working of locality management and engagement within directorates.</p> <p>Inclusion programmes There is no consistency in how councils manage programmes but on the basis of ad hoc benchmarking support for inclusion programmes are thought to be mid table.</p>	<p>NCVS Ad hoc reviews as part of NEA and LGIU investigations</p> <p>IDeA</p> <p>Ad hoc benchmarking</p>
Service income	Community engagement (neighborhood development) is secured through local committees investment (this covers the costs of neighborhood forum management,	-

	<p>grant application processing, community planning support and related community development activities)</p> <p>Pathways to Youth Employment</p> <p>LINks (Department of Health) CIW posts associated with NMI (South Whitehaven & S Workington Sports development worker (Barrow)</p>	<p>Contracts with some placement providers to cover up to 50% pt placement costs</p> <p>National pro rata funding</p>
Service performance	<p>NI performance (see above)</p> <p>Surrogates including: Number of community events Average attendance at community events Community issues raised and resolved Satisfaction of those involved in community events. Number of grants awarded Satisfaction of Members Satisfaction of other stakeholders</p> <p>Community engagement practice has been recognised (CLG, NEA) in top quartile although it is accepted that the organisational benefit is still to be fully realized.</p> <p>Programme activity is regularly identified as top quartile (Treasury (third sector); Rural (IDeA)</p>	<p>Place survey (annual)</p> <p>Internal sources Internal sources Internal sources Internal sources</p> <p>Internal sources Commissioned research Commissioned research</p> <p>NEA</p> <p>Treasury (2007) IDeA (2007)</p>

Expenditure and income analysis - to be advised

	Locality & Unit management	Community support	Community performance	Pathways to youth employment	Third Sector Links Money Advice	Area Support	Total
Expenditure	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	C£1,900
Employee costs	405		133	317 (net)		C761	1,600
Other	48		9		CAB 317 (local committees) Debt	61	815

					Managem ent 50(part (CVS 238 Links) CVS 150 Money		
Income	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	Links 238 (From DoH		
Grants	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)			(X)
Fees and charges	(0)	(0)			CAB -297 (local committees) Debt Managem ent 50 (part)		(-347)
Other	(0)	(0)	(0)				(0)
Net budget	452	160	55	317	214	C822	c1900

Workforce analysis

No of FTE staff engaged in service management	7.6		4	0.2	0		11.8
No of FTE staff engaged in service support	0	9.3	0				9.3
No of FTE staff engaged in frontline service delivery	0	19.3	0				19.3
Total No of FTE staff	7.6	28.6	4	0.2	0	0	40.4

Where do we need to be?

Directorate/Service SWOT analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councilors support and trust - Local Committees and Neighborhood Forum platform and work processes - Area teams embedded in localities, having expert and tacit intelligence, capable of supporting other parts of CCC - strong local networks and access to partnerships - influence on national policy - Expertise in a range of community engagement techniques - other specialisms (e.g. third sector, rural) - Relationships with local partners - National reputation on community empowerment work - Experience in developing community led plans, locality and area plans - Existing resource commitment to community projects - Good working relationships with strategic partners (CALC, CBS, CAB, CUs, Neighborhood watch, GONW) - Successful delivery of programmes e.g. Youth Placements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited 'one county' approach to engagement and locality management including lack of consistency in geographical arrangements in directorates - Limited consistent application of county strategy/policy (e.g. community engagement framework) - Lack of capacity to respond to significant developments around community engagement, place shaping, local partnership development and localism - Lack of demonstrable evidence to prove how services are being and can be more effectively delivered locally - Limited powerful local intelligence including performance monitoring - limited communication with residents - Strong departmental themed structures often with limited application to place - Perception that what the Unit manages is expensive - Lack of back office support for Managers
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new statutory framework (duty to involve, councilor call for action) to deliver - to make more 'good news' stories from the work the council is involved with - a chance to refresh local working arrangements - Build the 'strong communities' focus within the new LAA - Build on Government (and opposition parties) commitment to localism and community engagement through 'empowering authorities' network - To ringmaster all the Council's engagement activity - Developing collaboration in Directorate and rest of corporate core - Collaboration with property unit on community assets agenda - Cumbria observatory to aggregate and communicate locality intelligence - New commitment to refresh approach to social and economic inclusion through anti-poverty strategy - Focus on development of credit unions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perception that community engagement in Cumbria is expensive despite lack of comparative information - Perception that community engagement staff are too responsive to communities and not facilitative enough to council services. - perception that community engagement staff's close working with local councilors means they are at risk of 'going native' - Continued departmental <i>and</i> area based silo thinking both for management and engagement - Limited organisational learning in some services, eg repeated use of unsuccessful techniques - Challenges in developing role of the frontline councilor - variable commitment to the councils community engagement framework - Lack of belief that working with local people can help improve services - complex and difficult to understand county and sub-county partnership working

Community Unit PESTLE analysis

<p style="text-align: center;">Political</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declining control of RDAs from 2012 onwards • Increasing focus on the civic leadership role of councilors • government recognition of the future role of councilors as demonstrated in publications of all three main political parties 	<p style="text-align: center;">Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to frame these decisions in the community about budget/service reductions. • Threat that insensitive procurement will have an adverse impact on Cumbrian based services • Significant risk to services in Cumbria's rural and remote communities as costs of public services in these areas increases at a greater rate than the national average
<p style="text-align: center;">Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that communities of place are less able and wiling to play a role in place shaping • public sector role in community intervention continues to be questioned • belief that professionals have all the answers has no public support • community increasingly feeling at arms length from the council's that serve them • paradox - turnout in elections decreasing at a time when issues affecting communities and local public services at a high point • demographic change – older population; more diverse ethnically; young increasingly see themselves as paying for the old – pressure on established social norms • drying up of local communications (e.g. local press, TV) to ground what public services do in communities. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Technological</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time lag in Cumbria securing broadband – two speed access – exclusion issues • Opportunity for more sophisticated use of web technologies to develop a dialogue with certain communities of interest and place • CCC will become an authority that communicates (one way- top down) to communities and staff exclusively by email and the web.
<p style="text-align: center;">Legal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional legal duties • The Council's policy informed by: the Democracy Commission Report(2006); Cabinet Reports on locality working and Council Plan. • Relevant national policy includes: 'New Localism - Citizen engagement, neighborhood and public services (2005)'; and the Local Government etc Act 2007. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Environmental</p>

Future directorate/service priorities

		Impact/benefit
New priorities for 2010/11	<p>1. More Effective Community Empowerment NI's 2, 3, 4, 5</p> <p>Building the best practice in community engagement and consultation for and with the communities in Cumbria Embedding the community engagement standards and consultation guidance As part of our drive to support communities develop their voice we will continue to develop our techniques and processes which engage local communities. This will provide Councilors and colleagues with better intelligence on local views, concerns and wishes - collated in a way relevant to secure service improvement. We will use this to 'feedback' the value of our approach to internal 'clients' and to communities, securing their future 'buy-in' to community influence, particularly where service changes are envisaged.</p> <p>2. Local Management & Governance – NI's 2, 3, 5</p> <p>Supporting and developing locality working Strategic and local initiatives that assist people to influence issues that affect their locality (NI4) To 'join-up' services effectively at an area or neighborhood level we need to continue to improve the arrangements in place to coordinate the Council and our partner's work. This can include many different initiatives from multi-use of premises to partnership working arrangements with other agencies. The Unit will continue to support the Corporate Management Team (CMT) in building area management arrangements to develop this work and support the Council to devolve service governance. This will include a continued focus on area plans and performance management. Local Committee development and involvement in this work is vital. The plans for this work should be evidenced in the Locality plans produced at Local Committee</p> <p>3. Leading the County's anti poverty and financial inclusion programmes Addressing the needs of those on limited or no income -</p>	<p>Better use of council resources and improved responsiveness to community raised issues</p> <p>Involving people in decision making at the most local level Cllrs carrying out a full community leadership role</p> <p>Delivering the council's commitment on inclusion</p>

	<p>Coordinating activity across the council to address poverty and financial inclusion including the development of Credit unions and links with local Committees.</p> <p>4. Building community cohesion with targeted initiatives and support for the targeted community engagement programme – NI 1</p> <p>We will build the relationships between different inclusion programmes to ensure these make a measurable contribution towards community cohesion and better support individuals and groups to access services equitably. During 2010/11 – with the help of other colleagues we wish to coordinate these programmes and relationships and develop an approach to inclusion which more clearly identifies the community impact of the Council's work.</p> <p>5. Developing and promoting thriving third sector relationships - NI's 6, 7</p> <p>Working with the Third Sector Network and facilitating the Council 'Reengineering services' process. Supporting volunteering and promoting opportunities for staff and the public</p>	<p>Equality for all</p> <p>Strong effective partnerships that benefit the people of cumbria</p>
<p>Alternative delivery models</p>	<p>Tie grant management costs to overall grant budget</p> <p>Revise council approach to area management and devolved decision making to reduce overall costs e.g. reduce number of local committee meetings and scale of exec business to reduce the overall management cost</p> <p>Shared staffing arrangements with other corporate services building on experience with procurement and communications.</p> <p>Reduce management overheads by combining Unit with another service area</p> <p>Devolve ASM costs associated with local committees (i.e. one third) and other related</p>	<p>Contribution to 'one-council' culture</p> <p>Review planned for 2010</p>

	council costs to local committees	
Further income generation	<p>PCT and police financial support for community engagement activity</p> <p>Redevelop internal contracts to deliver consultation and engagement activity on behalf of other directorates or services e.g. highways, BSF</p>	
Cost reduction	<p>Local Committee grant management – investigate options to reduce overheads including tying grant management costs to 10% of the overall grant budget with consequent scope to better manage costs.</p> <p>Management reviews – Managers within this Unit represent a critical community and corporate resource. They provide the interface between the Council, local partners and community groups. They manage the Council's local engagement including our support for local committees and members. However recognising current budget pressures there may be a value in reviewing the number and role of the Unit's management as part of a wider Directorate or corporate review. This could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • varying number of area based managers to reflect an established Council position on area management across directorates; • varying the service management model including a structural change to delete Head of Service post – Implemented <p>Both of the above are dependent on a clear corporate view of the role and value of the services the Unit provides and of how these relate to other council services and could not usefully be undertaken independently of this.</p> <p>Investigate scope for more effective integration of community engagement and locality management activities across council services, and with strategic partners which could realize significant cumbria wide economies</p> <p>More joined up approaches to back office services and administration at a directorate and corporate level including collocation and more effective shared admin and back office support</p>	

	<p>(limited savings are feasible in this Unit as many back office services have already been stripped out (not integrated) in previous directorate restructurings</p> <p>Lastly, as this Unit manages many of the local committee general provision and community budgets, it is recommended that local committees themselves review and prioritize local budgets in the context of the impact these budgets make -through grant giving, investment and buying of services – to the delivery of the council plan and LAA targets. The Unit will provide initial analysis to local committee chairs and the Council's leadership to support this work. No specific savings proposals are made in respect of local committee budgets in this service plan template.</p>	
--	---	--

		Impact/benefit
Are there any known major budget pressures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New priorities listed above, include expectation for increasing number of consultation and engagement activities associated with service reviews! • Additional management input associated with restructurings • Increased due diligence support for increased local committee devolved responsibility • Anticipated increased locality working 	Critical to meet corporate objectives

How will we get there?

Further detailed actions and milestones to achieve each of the service objectives listed below are described in more detail in our team plans.

<p>Service objective 1:</p> <p>To enhance people and communities opportunities to influence issues that effect them</p>	<p>Lead person:</p> <p>Lorraine Smyth</p>	<p>Council Plan outcome:</p> <p>Better People have a say about issues that effect them</p>
--	---	---

Performance measure(s):	2010/11 target or expected output:	2011/12 target or expected output:	2012/13 target or expected output:
Measurably better Community engagement and consultation activity across the council	Roll out of engagement standards and new consultation guidance	Review	Review
Improved responsiveness to community raised issues	Meeting and exceeding customer care standards through the Issue Resolution database		
Delivery of the Stronger Group work programme	Achievements against targets		
Improved Place Survey score on % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their neighborhood	People experience council as more responsive to their needs and therefore that they can influence issues that effect them		
Resources: Unit Budget and CIEP Communities Theme budget		Risk reference:	Partners: All Directorates Stronger Group partners

Service objective 2: Supporting and developing decision making at the most locally relevant level (locality working)		Lead persons: Karen Johnson Phil Atherton Dianne Whitehead	Council Plan outcome: Better People find Council services easy to use and influence
Performance measure(s):	2010/11 target or expected output:	2011/12 target or expected output:	2012/13 target or expected output:
Increased joined up service delivery at an area or neighborhood level	Development of locality working initiatives such as Local Area Partnerships in South Lakeland, The Allerdale Project and Cluster Community Planning groups	Review	Review
Effective functioning of Local Committees	Strategic and locally relevant Locality plans in place and being delivered against for each Local Committee		
Supporting Directorates to plan, deliver and engage locally			
Supporting Councilors in their local role	Delivery of the 12K Capital schemes Regular community engagement opportunities (links to Obj 1)		
Resources: Unit Budget		Risk reference:	Partners: All Directorates

Service objective 3: Improve social inclusion and opportunities for targeted groups and communities	Lead person: Lorraine Smyth	Council Plan outcome: Better Local people have confidence that their Council delivers effective and efficient services that provide value for money
--	------------------------------------	--

<p>Performance measure(s):</p> <p>Leading the County's anti poverty and financial inclusion programmes</p> <p>Promoting and developing the Pathways to Youth Employment Programme</p>	<p>2010/11 target or expected output:</p>	<p>2011/12 target or expected output:</p> <p>Review</p>	<p>2012/13 target or expected output:</p> <p>Review</p>
<p>Resources:</p> <p>Unit Budget</p>		<p>Risk reference:</p>	<p>Partners:</p> <p>All Directorates</p> <p>Training providers</p> <p>Partners</p>

Service objective 4: Strengthen community cohesion and greater respect in communities (NI 1)		Lead person: TBC Ted Thwaites David Sheard Lorraine Smyth	Council Plan outcome: Better 1 People find council services easy to use
Performance measure(s): Increase the percentage of people who feel that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together	2010/11 target or expected output: Consistent and improving scores in the Place Survey against NI 1 A comprehensive multi-agency action plan to address cohesion issues Successful engagement with gypsies/travelers in influencing decision making Successful delivery of the Unit's Social Inclusion Programmes in support of the NI1 target	2011/12 target or expected output: Review	2012/13 target or expected output: Review
Resources: Unit Budget		Risk reference:	Partners: All Directorates

Service objective 5: A thriving Third Sector		Lead person: Lorraine Smyth	Council Plan outcome: Better 1 Local people have confidence that their Council delivers effective and efficient services that provide value for money
Performance measure(s): Effective engagement with the Third Sector Network Consistent implementation of the Compact across council Directorates	2010/11 target or expected output:	2011/12 target or expected output: Review	2012/13 target or expected output: Review
Resources: Unit Budget		Risk reference:	Partners: All Directorates