

‘West Cheshire Together’ LSP Thematic Leads meeting.

Date: Monday 17TH August 2009.
Time: 1.30pm
Venue: Committee Room 2B, County Hall, Chester.

Attending:

Tim Jackson (Chair)	Cheshire Constabulary
Helen Bellairs	NHS Western Cheshire
John Stephens	Cheshire West and Chester Council
Alistair Jeffs	Cheshire West and Chester Council
Sara Mogul	West Cheshire College
Debbie Washington	Job Centre Plus
Peter Bulmer	Cheshire West and Chester Council

Apologies: Steve Robinson and Cllr. Lynn Riley (Cheshire West and Chester Council), Jane Staley (Cheshire Groundwork), Mark Wilson (Job Centre Plus) and John Salt (Cheshire Fire and Rescue Service).

Visitors: Steve Kent (Cheshire West and Chester Council).

Support Staff: Alison Armstrong and Robbie Taylor (Cheshire West and Chester Council).

Item No.1	<p>Welcome, introductions and apologies.</p> <p>Tim chaired the meeting in Steve’s absence and welcomed members of the group, apologies were noted.</p>
Action - Decision	None required.
Item No.2	<p>Minutes and matters arising from last meeting.</p> <p>The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the last meeting: noting Jim Hughes is the NHS Western Cheshire representative working on the Tackling Health Inequalities project.</p> <p>Debbie confirmed the Future Jobs Fund (FJF) bid had been successful for the sub-region, with 750 jobs to be created over an 18 month period to the value of £ 4.8m. The programme is aimed at 18 – 24 year olds, but there would be some discretion to work and place under 18 year olds NEETS and 25 + age group from the worst performing neighbourhoods in the area in FJF jobs. The strategy to deliver the programme is still being finalised, with Dept. Work Pensions still releasing details of the governance of the programme. West Cheshire will attempt to fill a number of posts from day one (1st October).</p>

	<p>Alistair confirmed that Jim Hughes is the local lead for the 'Tackling Health Inequalities' social marketing and mapping project and that the specification was underway and local typologies were being considered.</p> <p>The Health and Well-being Group will look to develop the Alcohol Strategy on behalf of the West Cheshire Together and will report progress at future Leads meetings and return to the LSP with the completed strategy for final approval and implementation in due course.</p>
Item No. 3	<p>Local Area Agreement: delivery planning</p> <p>A number of actions were agreed at the LSP meeting (30/07) concerning the LAA Performance Management Framework (PMF) and agreed actions and timescales. Mixed progress had been reported in the final approval and sign-off of LAA delivery plans by the five Thematic Partnerships and their Chairs.</p> <p>Colleagues agreed to return to the item at the next meeting for confirmation that each delivery plan is both sufficiently robust and of a good standard of quality.</p>
Action - Decision	<p>The signed approval of each LAA delivery plan to be completed ahead of a deferred date of 21st September, by each Chair in accordance with the LAA PMF.</p>
Item No.4	<p>Western Cheshire Tobacco Control Alliance Strategy</p> <p>Colleagues had received two documents prior to the meeting, concerning the tobacco control strategy and a complimentary Charter concerning advice for health and social care practitioners. The strategy had been developed following earlier advisory work from the National Support Team and their subsequent visit to West Cheshire.</p> <p>The LSP will be asked to approve the Strategy at its next meeting, in the meantime there is much partners can do to support the delivery of the strategy. Helen remarked that it was important for all organisations and partnerships to play their part in its implementation. Part two of the strategy contains six priority actions, which partners need to consider and then accept associated actions, in order to successfully deliver the strategy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing smoking rates and health inequalities caused by smoking by making it easier to stop. 2. Reducing smuggled tobacco in our communities and the availability of tobacco to underage consumers. 3. Protecting children and young people from smoking and

	<p>normalising a smoke free lifestyle.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Leading by example: 'Normalising a Smoke free Lifestyle'. 5. Supporting smokers to quit and finding ways to make services attractive to people who may not think they can quit. 6. Marketing and Communication. <p>Partners need to identify which priorities their organisation already, or plans to, sign-up to in order to support the new strategy and what has been put in place as a key measurable action, which we can review and evaluate for LAA delivery and CAA evaluation purposes at a later date. For example, targeting support at certain student groups known for their association with tobacco could be a key action for local colleges.</p>
Action - Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategy is formally presented to the LSP for approval and implementation at a future date (30th October). <p>In the meantime;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Western Cheshire Tobacco Control Alliance Strategy to be circulated to the LSP and throughout the five Thematic Partnerships and the broader LSP Network of partners: along with a table to capture what is currently being done locally and what is planned to target the six priorities by all agencies.
Item No.5	<p>Linking the 'strategic' with the 'local'</p> <p>Following a number of informal questions raised at the last Leads meeting, it was thought beneficial to return to an earlier piece of work especially as all tiers had started to function now. Colleagues were provided with a description of the links and key functions between the strategic (LSP), tactical (Thematic Partnerships) and operational (Area Partnership Boards (APB) and Community Fora and Neighbourhood Partnerships) elements of the partnership framework by Alison.</p> <p>The 'partnership delivery and planning cycle' presentation slides explained the relationship, roles and responsibilities between the component parts of the LSP framework. The 'cycle' essentially demonstrates the process of how local partners, both inform and deliver the joint outcomes agreed for the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and LAA, throughout those three tiers. There were feelings of some tension between the roles, tasks and capacity of the Thematic Partnerships and APBs/Community Fora as their relationship was still relatively unclear.</p> <p>Partners mentioned they were still uncertain where to turn for more details on the APBs, their Chairs and that their boundaries do not cover natural communities and their size is unhelpful. A range of questions and issues arose during the discussion, where</p>

further clarity was sought, including:

- where is the point of interaction between the Thematic Partnerships and APBs, to ensure a consistent position is achieved on delivering outcomes and agreement on key issues;
- where do we build national policies, perspectives and priorities into the Partnership Framework and our strategies and plans?
- often, a number of partners do not realise they attend Thematic Partnership meetings to represent their sector and not just their own organisation – so we need to reiterate membership roles and responsibilities to reinforce our lines of communication and representation;
- it's right the Community Fora identify issues, but how are they captured and fed into the 'cycle', little information emerges from them;
- How is performance information fed from the local to the thematic structures in a timely way, to meet our governance and reporting arrangements for the LAA and now CAA needs?
- We understand how the Thematic Partnerships are accountable to the LSP as the overarching strategic body – are the APBs in turn accountable to the Thematic Partnerships?
 - If this is the case, how does this work in practice, are elected Members or senior Council officers responsible as the consistent link to tie it all together?
- Partners who Chair an APB, do not then attend a Thematic Partnership as that Chair, they attend because they specialise on a key issue or theme;
- Are all APBs then expected to identify a representative to attend each Thematic Partnership meeting or vice versa, to ensure connectivity and consistency?
- There does not appear to be a mechanism of accountability in place and little governance between the partnership levels;

More information and descriptions are needed to explain the issues facing the Thematic Partnerships, a number of examples where provided, these included:

- How do we respond to strategic issues like climate change and simultaneously, local pavement condition complaints raised by an APB or Community Forum?
- The APBs are seeking to establish their 'distinctiveness' from each other, which then throw up competing demands for each area and it's residents. Should our APBs be competitive with each other and does the LSP or Thematic Partnerships decide which APB demands to prioritise; where there are insufficient capacity and resources?

The discussion concluded with Partners agreeing they wished to

	influence how to move this area forward and suggested a future, joint meeting with all the APB Chairs when they are all in place.
Action - decision	<p>Thematic Partnership Chairs to receive a copy of the presentation slides, complete with membership details of the APBs (where available), contact details of the APB Chairs and the Board boundaries.</p> <p>Partners agreed it would be helpful for the Thematic Partnership Chairs to return to the model in the future for further discussion, as more experience of the Partnership Framework is gained.</p>
Item No.6	<p>Thematic Partnerships: progress, work programme and emerging issues</p> <p>Sara confirmed the Business, Enterprise and Culture Partnership had gelled together, although virtually, to produce a strong local bid for the FJF. The first meeting of the broader range of partners is being planned and will hopefully produce a number of sub-groups of the Partnership's Board to focus on the key tasks. A number of task and finish groups are likely to emerge, a recent example of local businesses and the risks of arson had emerged as a theme. But work would be dependent on funding being provided to support ad hoc pieces of work. LAA delivery plans had been signed off by the Chair and senior partners.</p> <p>The National Support Team follow-up meeting with the Children, Young People and Families Trust and GONW, had gone well and findings and analysis surrounding local teenage pregnancy had been received well too. John also commented on some early reports concerning test results for 11 year olds and apparent successes in some areas which have experienced persistent problems for numbers of years. More details would be available in the future.</p> <p>Peter Bulmer, attending on behalf of Jane Staley and John Salt, updated colleagues on the Environmental Sustainability Thematic Partnership latest news. The LAA delivery plans had been approved and signed off by the Chair and delivery groups of partners had been established for the waste and CO2 emission reduction outcomes and would seek to tie in a range of partners, including from APBs and Community Fora.</p> <p>Tim reported that Manchester Municipal University will be meeting partners from the Safer and Stronger Communities Group, to provide an external perspective and further analysis on the Strategic Assessment. Any further work will be done if improvements to the Assessment are recommended and agreed.</p> <p>In addition to progress made with social marketing with the Dr.</p>

	Foster consultancy, the West Cheshire Alcohol Strategy and the Western Cheshire Tobacco Control Alliance Strategy: the Health and Well-being Group were due to meet later in week and look at work on a Healthy Weight Strategy. The Group will also review the CAA Self Assessment submission, LAA performance management and recent developments to produce the new Sustainable Community Strategy.
Action - Decision	None required.
Item No.7	<p>Any other business</p> <p>Four issues arose for further information and action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners were encouraged to continue to provide comments on their experience of using the national performance indicators and use the opportunity to respond to the GONW consultation to do so. 2. Contact details for the relevant risk management officer are still being collected for the LSP, in order that an exercise to evaluate our individual practices and policies may take place. The LSP does need to undertake a risk analysis, it is hoped this analysis will focus more on partnership ambition and good practice rather than organisational governance. 3. The Business, Enterprise and Culture Partnership have requested its partners contribute to the collection of evidence and actions concerning local responses to the 'credit crunch'. This will enable West Cheshire to continue to address a potential 'red flag' for CAA evaluation and to benchmark current economic performance to help gauge improvements as the recession recedes. 4. GONW colleagues have requested a joint meeting with the Thematic Leads collectively, October would be the preferred date at this stage. An agenda will be discussed at the Thematic Leads meeting in September.
Action - Decision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments on national indicators to Robbie. 2. Risk management officers contact details to Robbie. 3. The 'Credit Crunch' response template to be forwarded to all LSP members for responses. 4. Monday 19th October confirmed as joint West Cheshire Thematic Leads and GONW Leads meeting date.

Details of next meeting: Monday 21st September, 1.30pm – 3.00pm,
Committee Room 2B, County Hall Chester.

Signed (Chair):

Date: