

**Minutes of a Meeting of the  
Manchester Partnership (LSP) Board  
Held on 21 March 2006**

**Present:** Sue Jarvis Manchester Enterprises  
(in the Chair)  
Councillor Richard Leese MCC  
Councillor Simon Wheale MCC  
Kirsty Rawlinson GM Chamber of Commerce  
Justine Curran GMP  
Keith Howcroft GMPTE  
Lyndsey Harman Jobcentre Plus  
Steve Mycio Deputy Chief Executive  
Performance, MCC

**Also**

**Present:** Michael Greenwood GONW  
Geoff Little Assistant Chief Executive  
Performance Improvement, MCC  
Kath Smythe Manchester Partnership Manager  
Peter Jones MP SL

**Apologies:** Councillor Imran Rizvi (MCC), Michael Eakin (North West Arts Council), Mark Nesbitt (CN4M), Briony Simister (GM Chamber of Commerce) and Richard Guy (Manchester Enterprises)

**1. Minutes of the Meeting of the Manchester Partnership Board held on 14 February 2006**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 14 February 2006 were presented for consideration.

**Resolved/-**

That the Minutes be received.

**2. Matters Arising**

(a) Public Service Board (minute 4)

Kath Smythe informed the meeting that the sub-group led by Angie Robinson on private sector involvement would meet later in March. Board members interested in joining the sub-group should approach Kath Smythe. It was suggested that Eamonn Boylan be approached to join the Group.

(b) Performance Management (minute 6)

Kath Smythe requested Board members to let her know the name of the senior performance manager within their organisation who would be involved in the development of the new performance approach.

### **3. Report back on Youth Nuisance**

Justine Curran introduced a discussion paper from the Partnership Sub-Group on Youth Nuisance. She reminded the Board that the Group had been established because Youth Nuisance was one of four issues identified by the Board as having a significant impact on the lives of communities in Manchester. The Group had carried out an analysis of existing factors and activities and looked at contributory factors such as lack of employment and low levels of educational attainment. A pilot scheme in Collyhurst was currently being evaluated. The main proposals of the report centred on the identification of appropriate structures and mechanisms through which to address youth nuisance and recommended that a target be established using the definition based on National Standard of Incident Recording, used by police forces across the country system. A governance structure was proposed whereby those agencies involved in youth nuisance and who had signed up to the targets in the Children's Plan would be accountable to the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Performance Board and the Children's Board. Structures for effective joined up working would be developed based on the current Crime and Disorder structure with an enhanced role for Community Safety Officers, the Youth Service and the imminent Children's Services local structure. A more extensive pilot scheme to be established in the A5 area of the city, which included the Newton Heath, Miles Platting and Bradford wards. This intended to deal with immediate concerns and with underlying factors such as housing, health, education, employment etc.

A number of issues arose in discussion, including

(a) employment was one of the key concerns; in some communities there was a culture of unemployment and it took a long time to reduce unemployment figures;

(b) it was important to get all relevant agencies involved, including for example the NRU and those involved with the Respect Agenda; cross-over in the membership of the two Boards would also help to ensure appropriate involvement;

(c) there was a commitment at a high level to reducing youth nuisance; it would, however, be challenging on the ground to make progress; also, other agencies such as those involved with health and children's services had to commit resources to dealing with the issue.

#### **Resolved/-**

(i) that the report be noted.

(ii) that the Board endorse proposals set out in the report concerning targets, accountability *etc.*

(iii) that a further progress report be given to the Board in six months time.

#### **4. Manchester Conference**

Kath Smythe gave a verbal report on the Manchester Conference, held on Saturday, 18 March 2006. She said that around 600 people had attended the Event that had launched the Community Strategy and the consultation on the proposed Mancunian Agreement. There had been workshops and a round table discussion on various aspects of what made Manchester a good place to live. 1,200 responses had been gathered as part of the round table discussions and a detailed analysis of them would be carried out in the next two weeks. A survey at the Event had indicated about 67% in favour of a Manchester Agreement, in contrast to the recent poll in the *Manchester Evening News*.

Geoff Little added that there had been a good quality debate at the Event and the workshops in particular had been successful.

Kath Smythe added that amongst the next steps would be an analysis of key messages from the Event and then the start of the consultation, which would include a strategy to gain media support for the Agreement.

#### **Resolved/-**

- (i) that the report be noted.
- (ii) that Kath Smythe, the Manchester Partnership Team and all those involved in the organisation of the Event be thanked for all their hard work in ensuring its success.
- (iii) that a further report be submitted to the next meeting of the Board.

#### **5. Community Strategy**

Kath Smythe introduced a report requesting that Board members inform the meeting of the progress being made concerning how their organisation would sign up to the Community Strategy and how their governing body would progress the priorities of the Strategy. The meeting was informed of progress as follows:

##### **(a) Manchester Enterprises**

Sue Jarvis stated that the Executive Board would later that day consider a report on the Strategy and then each operating company would be asked to demonstrate how it intended to implement the Strategy.

(b) GM Chamber of Commerce

Kirsty Rawlinson reported that the GMCCI had no problem with endorsing the Strategy in general terms. She queried the individual commitments that the Chamber would be asked to make. Kath Smythe reported that any specific commitments would be subject to detailed negotiations held as part of the development of the Partner Agreement.

(c) Government Office

Michel Greenwood informed the meeting that Government Office would support the progression of the Community Strategy through its role in the Local Area Agreement (LAA) and that the Community Strategy priorities would be referenced in his team's plan for Manchester.

(d) Greater Manchester Police

Justine Curran reported that she and the other three Divisional Commanders would sign off the Community Strategy and reported her disappointment at the lack of progress made and getting sign-off and buy-in at a Greater Manchester level. It was agreed that there should be some discussion through AGMA with other LAA areas to try to make more progress.

(e) Community and Voluntary Sectors

Davy Iredale said that the voluntary sector had broadly signed up to the Strategy and wanted to contribute. The network would be targeting resources and funding in line with Community Strategy priorities and that they were revamping how they did things to provide more support to voluntary groups to focus in on the key priorities.

(f) Manchester City Council

Steve Mycio informed the meeting that the Community Strategy had been considered by five of the Scrutiny Committees and had received a broadly favourable response. The Children's Services Scrutiny Committee would consider it in detail on May, along with the Children's Plan. It had already been endorsed by the Executive.

(g) Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive

Keith Howcroft stated the Strategy would be considered by the PTE's Executive Board in April or May. He expected it to be endorsed at that high level. There was already a broad alignment between the Strategy and a number of the Executive's activities in promoting public transport and regeneration. There was a need to work through the relationship between any potential partner agreements and the transport Corridor Partnerships.

(h) Job Centre Plus

Lyndsey Harman said who would sign off the Strategy would depend on negotiations on freedoms and flexibilities being sought through the LAA. Lyndsey would sign off the Strategy as things stood. If Manchester, however, was successful in securing the freedoms and flexibilities sought through the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), it would need higher level sign-off.

In discussion, it was agreed that it was important that the Community Strategy priorities now be reflected in partner organisations' business and service plans and that the Board return to this matter later in the year to ascertain the extent to which this was happening.

**Resolved/-**

(a) that the current position be noted.

(b) that the Strategy should form part of the business plans of organisations and that a further report on this be made to the Board at its July 2006 meeting.

(c) that the Community Strategy be placed on the agenda for the first available meeting of AGMA Executive.

**6. Report Back on Economic Inactivity**

***Councillor Richard Leese took the chair for this item.***

Sue Jarvis introduced the report updating the Board on activities during the last six months to reduce economic inactivity rates in Manchester. She reminded the Board that this was one of the four issues previously identified as a priority for the partnership. Progress had been made in some areas such as reducing the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training in the last year to 10.8% and reducing the number of residents claiming out-of-work benefits by nearly 9,000 between 1999 and 2006. The scale of the task, however, should not be under-estimated, with 40% of Manchester's working age residents not in employment, compared with a national average of 25.6%. The Economic and Local Employment Partnership was pursuing three key themes through a number of activities and projects such as Stepping Stones: improving economic activity rates through engaging with workless residents and improving access to training etc; improving basic employability and occupational skills of those not in work; and encouraging employers to recruit people from local disadvantaged communities.

A number of issues arose in discussion, including

(a) it was difficult to analyse “onflow” figures for people coming on to registers; it was further complicated by people coming on and off the register at different times; further analysis of benefit payments and access to a longitudinal survey might help inform future activities; a task force evaluating the Stepping Stones and Pathways to work projects was due to report in April 2006

(b) the Pathways to Work project would try to tackle non-engagement by imposing a legal duty on “onflow” claimants to attend interviews for employment;

(c) care had to be taken with using uncorrected census information as it was incorrect for some wards; data from Job Centre Plus would be more accurate if available for use;

(d) as regards new claimants, General Practitioners (GPs) had a key role as the entry point to the system; engagement with GPs had started through meetings with GP groups to explain job referral procedures and a national conference had been held on Pathways to work;

(e) the effect of migration from new EU countries on employment was difficult to assess; there was some evidence that migrants did do lower levels of work avoided by IB claimants but also created additional employment;

(f) the capacity to deliver greater numbers returning to work was an issue; the government was likely to set a target of getting an employment rate of 80% by 2015; Stepping Stones, however, had engaged only 7% of IB claimants; further discussions with DWP would take place;

(g) the recent Green Paper proposed a city strategy initiative for unemployment; responses from partners should emphasise that this should be concentrated on the cities with the largest densities of claimants; this could also be linked to issues such as community engagement;

(h) improving employability, skills for employment and pre-recruitment work were key issues; the GM Learning and Skills Council had a role in supporting and committing resources to these initiatives; the Board requested that the LSC be asked to give details of its contribution to support this important agenda to a future meeting of the Board.

(i) it was important to build a business case so that employers could see the benefit of taking part in these initiatives.

**Resolved/-**

- (i) that the progress report and proposed initiatives be noted and endorsed.
- (ii) that the LSC be invited to give details of its contribution to the Economic Inactivities agenda to a future meeting of the Board.
- (iii) that a further report be submitted to the Board in six months.

**7. Board Development Programme**

Kath Smythe introduced a report setting out a schedule of work for the April, June and July meetings of the Board to allow the Board to consider the three key development areas: structure and function, performance management and the Community Strategy.

**Resolved/-**

that the schedule of work be approved.

**8. Comprehensive Performance Assessment**

Geoff Little informed the meeting of the Comprehensive Performance Assessment on the City Council that would be carried out in 2006. The process had already started. A self-assessment had been submitted and the analysis would take place the week following the Board meeting. Inspectors would be on site in May 2006.

It was possible that Board members would be interviewed in the context of the Council's leadership role. Briefings would be provided for Board members and thematic partnerships.

**9. Quarterly Performance Report**

The Quarterly Performance Report for the third quarter 2005-2006 was noted. Keith Howcroft informed the meeting that there was now a more accurate system of reporting crimes and anti-social incidents on public transport. Tackling crime on public transport was a continuing issue for the PTE and its partners.

Kath Smythe added that this report as the last in its present format and the next report would be in a revised format with more emphasis on strategic issues.

**Resolved/-**

that the report be noted.

## **10. Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

## **11. Next meeting**

25 April 2006 8.00am to 10.00am