

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Manchester Partnership (LSP) Board
Held on 6 September 2005**

Present: Councillor Richard Leese MCC (in the Chair)
Michael Eakin North West Arts Council
Khan Moghal MCCR
Justine Curran GMP
David Iredale CN4M
Catriona Fothergill CN4M
John Korzeniewski GM LSC
Briony Simister GM Chamber of Commerce
Jean Laurie GMPTE
Richard Guy Manchester Enterprises
Sue Assar Central Manchester PCT
Bill Marks Jobcentre Plus
Steve Mycio Deputy Chief Executive
Performance, MCC

Also Present: Michael Greenwood GONW
Kath Smythe Manchester Partnership Manager
Louise Atherton Children Families and Social Care
Steve Jones Facilitator/Consultant
Peter Jones MPSL

Apologies: Councillor Imran Rizvi (MCC), Ed Cox (CN4M), Adrian Mercer (South Manchester PCT), Keith Howcroft (GMPTE) and Brian Holmes (GONW)

1. Minutes of the Meeting of the Manchester Partnership Board held on 26 July 2005 and Action Note

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 26 July 2005 and Action Note were presented for consideration.

Resolved/-

That the Minutes and Action Note be received.

2. Youth Nuisance Report Back

Justine Curran introduced a report setting out the work to date of the youth nuisance sub-group. Progress had been made in a number of areas, including an analysis of a range of social, economic and risk factors relating to youth nuisance. The sub-group now proposed that its lifespan be extended by six months in order to complete its work through, for example, a pilot programme of activity in Collyhurst South.

Resolved/-

- (i) that the progress report be noted.
- (ii) that the lifespan of the sub-group be extended by a further six months.
- (iii) that the sub-group report to the Board in March 2006.

3. Community Strategy Review and the LAA

The Chair stated that in the last year the LSP had started to work in a new way and had focused on four key issues: Economic Inactivity, Youth Nuisance, Alcohol Strategy and Neighbourhood Focus. It was now clear that there had to be cross-agency working to delivery the aims of the Partnership. There was a need for “step change” as the existing rate of change was not good enough. The LAA would give an opportunity for more radical solutions. The new Minister was supportive of such “differentiated solutions”, tailored to locations.

Steve Jones stated that the LAA would be an important opportunity to increase the pace of change and achieve step change. Problems in Manchester had broadly remained the same for twenty years. A more radical approach, therefore, seemed sensible. As part of the LAA process, this would involve aligning Community Strategy to Partnership strategies.

The LAA timetable was tight and would involve a great deal of work at all levels. Partners needed to commit to the LAA. Accountability was the key issue and there needed to be a compact with government and a compact between partners.

It was important that the LAA did not comprise a list of activities with PIs and targets. There needed to be a shared vision that would lead to better outcomes with a local focus. The LAA was a complex process. There needed to be clarity over the main causal drivers, available resources and what actually worked. Not all LAA blocks would be equally relevant to Manchester and this had to be covered in the negotiations with government. Some existing activities did not have a good evidence base. So, potential activities in the LAA might be relatively experimental, whereas others would be more evidence based.

The three spines of activities identified by the Management Group, Reaching full potential in education and employment, Neighbourhoods of choice and Individual and collective self esteem, were driven by the economic performance of Manchester and the city’s demography.

In discussion, a number of issues arose, including,

(a) There was general agreement on the three spines at a visioning level and to link these to the LAA blocks which were useful at the activity level. The existing vision for Manchester was now ten years old. Much of it had been achieved. It now needed to be up-dated to take account of the current position and where the city wanted to be in 2015, in comparison to European cities. It was clear that there was:

- A need to get a Vision
- A need to decide the right activities to achieve the Vision
- A need to establish what needs to change to make a difference

(b) The Partnership had to be clear on what its purpose was and how it related to government and to the members of the Partnership. The LAA could build on the success of the Places Project.

(c) Economic performance was the crucial issue. Partners needed to focus on activities that would improve economic performance.

(d) There needed to be an analysis of where lack of local flexibility was caused by imposed national targets e.g. employment projects and of where there was flexibility but a lack of local resources e.g. educational projects (levels 3 and 4).

(e) Equality of access and equality of opportunity were important issues, particularly for the new strategy for Children's services. Also if attainment levels were improved for some communities, it would help economic activity and improve community engagement.

(f) The five key areas where high level outcomes were needed were:

- population change in the city (including effects of "churn")
- economic performance
- educational potential and achievement
- promotion of self esteem
- sustainable communities

(g) Partners outlined a number of existing activities that were contributing to the achievement of the Vision and pointed to a number of possible flexibilities that could overcome some barriers and improve performance.

Steve Jones set out a number of next steps:

1. A meeting of Management Group to discuss today's meeting and to set out a number of activities and priorities, to be circulated to Partners for comment by the end of September.
2. Common understanding of causal drivers needed by the end of November as part of LAA negotiation.

3. Need commitment of organisations to Vision and LAA.
4. Evidence base for outcomes.

Michael Greenwood, GO, supported the general approach of the meeting. An LAA was supposed to deliver better outcomes with less bureaucracy. There was an opportunity to pool budgets to make the best use of resources. There was a possibility that the final agreement for the LAA would be delayed until January 2006 but the timetable at present was as set out previously.

The Chair summed up as follows:

- A. There was general support for approach of three spine framework linking to Vision and the four LAA Blocks.
- B. There was general support for “high level” outcomes, with the need to ensure that LAA blocks contribute to these.
- C. There was a need to ensure that activities in spines are actionable and measurable.
- D. A new Visioning Statement needed to be drafted.
- E. Further work on familiarisation was required. Partners needed to know what was in the LAA for them. Thematic Chairs and Convenors needed to “buy in” to the LAA and be actively engaged in it. Some issues might need extra bilateral meetings, for example, health).
- F. It was important to focus on mainstream activity and not NRF, as NRF was comparatively small scale.
- G. Government would need to be informed when a lack of changes in primary legislation or of existing legislation was a barrier to LAA innovation.
- H. The evidence base was crucial. It needed to be stated what was likely to work and what was more experimental; also what might be city-wide and what might be piloted in areas, for example, youth nuisance.

RESOLVED/-

- (i) That progress to date be noted.
- (ii) That the three spines of Reaching full potential in education and employment, Neighbourhoods of choice and Individual and collective self esteem be endorsed as the approach to the LAA.
- (iii) That Board member support appropriate capacity within their organisations to ensure delivery of the LAA.

(iv) That refocusing thematic partnership teams to deliver the LAA be endorsed.

(v) That the Management Group progress the relevant priorities and activities and report to the next meeting of the Board.

4. Quarterly Performance Report

A report setting out the first quarterly performance report for 2005-2006 had been circulated previously with the reports for the meeting. The Chair requested that Board members raise any questions about the report with the relevant Thematic Partnership Chair or a member of the Management Group.

Resolved/-

That the report be noted.

5. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

6. Next meeting

The following was noted as the date for next meeting: 4 October 2005, 8.00am to 10.00am.

MEETING OF MANCHESTER PARTNERSHIP BOARD HELD ON 6 SEPTEMBER 2005

ACTION NOTE

1. Minutes of meeting held on 26 July 2005 and Action Note

Noted.

2. Youth Nuisance

Action

- A. Lifespan of sub-group extended by six months.
- B. Report to the Board in March 2006 (**Kath Smythe**)

3. CSR/LAA

Action

- A. Broad direction of report and three areas of activity set out in the spines approved. (**Board**)
- B. Board members support appropriate capacity within their organisations to ensure delivery of the LAA. (**All Board members**)
- C. Thematic Partnership Teams to refocus to deliver LAA (**Thematic Partnership Teams**)
- D. Management Group to progress relevant priorities and activities and report to next meeting of Board. (**Management Group**)

4. Quarterly Performance Report

Action

- A. Any questions on report be raised with Thematic Partnership Chair or Management Group. (**Board**)

5. Next meeting

4 October 2005, 8.00am to 10.00am.

