

COMMUNITIES AND PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday, 5th July 2018

Time: 10.00a.m. to 12.03 p.m.

Present: Councillors: A Costello, S Criswell (Chairman), K Cuffley (Vice-Chairman), L Dupre, L Every, J French, L Joseph, E Meschini (Substituting for C Richards) and T Sanderson.

Apologies: Councillors: I Manning and C Richards.

At the commencement of the meeting Councillor Criswell welcomed the unexpected, but very welcome attendance of the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Cuffley following his recent health scare.

71. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

72. MINUTES 31st MAY 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 31st May 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

With reference to the appendix Minute Action Log document, updates were provided on the following actions:

Minute 64. Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper

Regarding the action in Councillor Manning's name to provide the Service Director Communities and Safety with details of the University Study undertaken on volunteering and the link to home ownership, an oral update indicated that Councillor Manning had contacted Democratic Services the previous day to explain that the relevant research officer was away on holiday. He undertook to make contact with the person when they returned to progress and complete the action he had undertaken.

Minute 65 Shared and Integrated Services

Regarding the request in b) on page 23 from Councillor Gowing to investigate the reasons for the suspension of the ICT OFR Group an e-mail response was sent to Councillor Gowing on 29th June explaining that the Outcome Focused Review of ICT was looking at two areas:

- The future delivery model for Education ICT – this work was continuing so the service was clear about which model provided the best opportunity for a sustainable future.
- The opportunities for links between the current Education ICT, Cambridgeshire County Council's IT & Digital Service and LGSS IT – this work had been stopped as the focus was now all about the links between Cambridgeshire County

Council's and Peterborough City Council's IT services and how they can support the development of the Shared Service.

It was resolved:

- a) To approve the minutes of the meeting of 31st May 2018 as a correct record.
- b) To note the Minute Action log including the oral updates to Minutes 64 and 65.

73. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None received.

74. DELIVERY MODEL FOR THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE ADULT LEARNING AND SKILLS SERVICE

At the April meeting this Committee agreed that work should progress to develop the proposals to explore alternative delivery arrangements as detailed in paragraph 2.2 of the report. It was also highlighted that the proposals had also previously been discussed at a workshop for the Committee held in December.

For the reasons set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report and previously discussed at the meetings stated above, this report sought authority under the Committee's delegated authority as set out in Part 3B 'Responsibility for functions' of the Council's Constitution in relation to Adults Careers, Adult Skills and the Learning Service to change the current Cambridgeshire Adult Learning and Skills Service delivery and governance model to that of an arms-length service. This would be achieved by extending the Peterborough delivery model across Cambridgeshire.

The proposal would see the creation of a renamed service – the 'Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Community Skills Academy' (CPCSA) – with two operating arms, namely the Cambridgeshire Adult Skills Service (which would still legally remain a department of Cambridgeshire County Council) and City College, Peterborough. As an arm's length entity the County Council would delegate the management of finance, human resources, quality and the day to day running of the service to the Governing Board. This would enable the greater sharing of support functions and expertise (e.g. IT, HR, Finance), whilst still maintaining the sovereignty of the two local authorities. Initially the intention was for the Academy to be set up in shadow form from 1st August with a view to achieving the full delivery model by April 2019.

Details of the financial management scheme proposed were set out in section 2.4 of the report with paragraph 2.6.2 detailing the proposed board structure and representation, the latter which include the Chairman of the Committee and the Director for Communities and Safety. The expected benefits were detailed in paragraphs 2.6.3 to 2.6.5 of the report with the intention to continue to support local objectives.

Issues raised / responses provided included:

- Confirming that the final model proposals would involve a report back to the Committee later in the year for decision.

- There was request from several Members for more information on the Peterborough financial model and the board membership and how it worked. It was explained that operational decisions would be taken by staff and strategic decisions taken by the Board. Appointments to the Peterborough Board included those with very specific skills sets / expertise. When recruiting board members, a skills audit was undertaken to identify gaps in expertise to help target the recruitment process to ensure a wide range of views / expertise was available to Board meetings. There was an expectation of regular attendance with three no shows requiring a board member to leave. The core adults' budget from Government grant was £3.98m with turnover currently at £7.5m representing bringing in other work streams / income / grants opportunities not available to a Council service.
- Regarding the area of the Board's remit and measuring its impact, this would include agreeing key sets of indicators and a scorecard to measure the impact on customers, finance, internal processes, staff development / progression.
- Picking up on the wording "...the need for the service to be more agile..." in paragraph 2.2 and referred to again in the presentation, a Member challenged how this would work with the governance model proposed, and whether it referred to decisions being taken in a more timely manner and not requiring to come back to Committee for approval. The response to this was effectively yes, as the Board would have autonomy within the framework set by the Chief Finance Officer as referred to in section 2.4 of the report. An example given was in relation to needing to replace a member of staff which in a Council could involve delays involving recruitment freezes / having to go through lengthy internal recruitment procedures, while in the arms-length model there would be a recruitment process.
- A question was raised regarding what was meant by "extra freedoms" as referred to in paragraph 2.4 of the report. In reply this was linked to the above and being able to respond quickly to finance issues and expressions of interest and to be able to pursue funding not possible if still a council controlled service, e.g. applying for lottery funding.
- On queries around why the model should not include increased elected Member Board representation with voting rights restricted to just them (as Members did not operate in a vacuum but received advice from officers / experts in making their decisions) the reply was that the Board required sustainability and with elected Members changing through elections / being unable to attend, this would require a large training resource to bring them up to speed and would hinder the wide range of expertise / range of relevant expert opinion required to be at hand at each board meeting.
- With regard to Appendix 1 and section 5.1 under the heading 'premises' there was concern regarding the current wording if premises were County Council controlled and leased to the Service, this followed on from the recent experience highlighted at Commercial and Investment Committee where there were issues regarding maintenance not being carried out resulting from infrequent premises inspections. After discussion it was agreed that the wording should be expanded to safeguard

the landlord's interests / responsibilities, which in this case required the Governing Board to not only carry out regular premises inspections, but to notify the County Council of any concerns.

- A question was raised regarding sub-committees and whether these would include elected member representation as the Member had concerns regarding the amount of work required to be undertaken. In discussion it was confirmed that they would not necessarily include elected members, as the intention would be ask governors to specialise in particular areas of the Board's remit and to not ask them to have the full breadth of knowledge and for their relevant skills sets to be taken into account, when appointing to any specific sub-committee.
- Clarification was provided regarding the diagrams that Appendix 3b was the detail for the top half of Appendix 3a and the dotted line on 3b was to separate sovereignty between Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- Whether the papers of the Board and any sub-committees would be in the public domain and available to members of this committee in order for the latter to have a scrutiny overview of the actions being taken. In response the Service Director surmised that he saw no reason why the minutes of the meetings would require to be confidential, unless on any items included specific business / financial sensitivity or personal staffing issues which were then also discussed. **There was a request for clarification on access /accountability issues to board papers / minutes being circulated outside of the meeting. Action: Adrian Chapman to draft up a response to this query to be circulated to all the Committee.**
- Asking what proposals there were for increasing apprenticeships, as currently there was no county wide cohesive plan. In response it was recognised that the fall in the number of apprenticeships was not only a local but a national issue. Discussions were being undertaken with the Combined Authority with a view to producing a paper setting out both the challenges and to encourage more apprenticeship places by:
 - Providing support and training to small businesses
 - Passing on unspent monies from the 10% levy on larger businesses (with a wage bill of over £3m.)
 - Encouraging schools to become more involved in apprenticeship schemes and encouraging there take-up.

Having reviewed, considered and commented on the report:

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To approve the principle of establishing a new delivery model for the Cambridgeshire Adult Learning and Skills Service as described in this report.
- b) To approve the formation of a shadow governing board from 1st August 2018, as described in this report, to oversee the delivery of the delivery plan in order to implement the new delivery model in full by 1 April 2019 at the latest.

- c) To delegate responsibility to the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with Legal Services, for decisions relating to the detailed implementation of the proposed delivery model, and for agreeing the final financial management and governance arrangements presented in draft form in appendix 1 to this report, as well as a scheme for financial management subject to amending in 5 (1) under the heading 'Premises' to add the words "of any concerns" after the word 'informed' so that it reads

"5 Premises

(1) The Governing Body shall regularly inspect, and keep the CCC informed of any concerns as appropriate, as to the condition and state of repair of Service premises."

- d) To delegate authority to the Service Director Communities and Safety to prepare wording in respect of ensuring the accountability of the elected member representing the Committee on the Shadow Board to be circulated to the Committee outside of the meeting.

75. POVERTY STRATEGY

In 2014 this Council in partnership with the district councils, developed a strategy for tackling child and family poverty and economic disadvantage in Cambridgeshire– the 'Breaking the Cycle 2' Strategy adopting the following four key priorities to focus the work:

- Building communities
- Building futures
- Supporting the most vulnerable
- Communication, information and advice

The Government as part of its commitment to ending child poverty passed the Welfare Reform and Work Act in 2016, focussing on social mobility and on developing life chances as the primary focus for tackling poverty in the United Kingdom (UK). The commitments within it being set out in paragraph 1.2 of the report.

It was now considered timely to review the Strategy in line with the 2016 Act to focus activities with partners to enable social mobility across the County, building on the work already undertaken, while also recognising the need to make an impact on the Council's and partners demand led budgets.

This report provided the Communities and Partnership Committee with:

- a) An overview of the national and local strategy for tackling poverty
- b) Examples of work being undertaken with our partners, to tackle poverty
- c) Twelve recommendations for the Committee to consider proposing an extensive work programme in order to significantly refocus work designed to enhance social mobility.

A key step to this was the recommendation proposing forming a cross-party working group to lead the development of a social mobility strategy and action plan to take forward the other 11 recommendations.

In subsequent discussion:

- One Member expressed her concerns about the paper highlighting that while the title of the paper referenced the word 'poverty' the recommendations were all in relation to social mobility which was not the same as poverty, which was about not having enough money. She believed the recommendations should be taken away and brought back with ones that made recommendations to tackle poverty. She questioned the wording in the second bullet in recommendation iv in paragraph 2.4 reading 'address barriers to long term worklessness' as if anything we should be looking for barriers to long term worklessness. She suggested what was needed were significant, specific and focussed recommendations taking on board recommendations formulated by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation / Charitable Trust, designed to make a difference. She highlighted that recommendation v of the report seemed to blame people for their circumstances and should not be a message that the Committee was giving. She questioned how the Combined Authority could be made to engage and listen to the proposals being suggested. In terms of other committees' being involved, she supported this proposal suggesting that what was needed was someone with a responsibility for libraries. As a response the Chairman highlighted that this was essentially a background report and a starting point with the proposal for an action plan and the joint working group being the important tools to action the recommendations, all of which aimed to have an effect on helping reduce poverty.
- The Vice Chairman highlighted the need for NHS involvement and made reference to ensuring better systems were in place to help speed up people's ability to return to work. This suggestion was supported by other Committee members. In response it was explained that the NHS would be involved and engaged through the Senior Officers Community Network Group.
- There was a suggestion that a definition of 'worklessness' was required.
- Another Member making reference to the section titled 'Youth and Community Team' at paragraph 2.2.4 questioned how it was intended to create cohesion and coverage when there were groups of good practice, highlighting the need for community and youth workers teams to work together and pool good practice guidance for a strategy to ensure countywide coverage. In response, the intention was that the Strategy would be the framework to target activity to areas where it would make a difference, through working with established programmes such as the Innovate and Cultivate Fund with an aim to help attract funding for local area specific needs.
- The proposal for a cross party group was widely supported by the Committee with the suggestion that there should also be a Member representative from the district councils. In respect of Cambridge City Council, Councillor Richard Johnson the Executive Councillor for Communities was name checked, due to the work they were currently undertaking in this area.

- Volunteers were sought from within the Committee to serve on the proposed cross party working group with requests received from Councillors Costello, Dupre, French and Sanderson. Councillor Meschini stated that she would wish to be included if Councillor Richards was approached and declined to be involved. She also suggested approaching Councillor Hoy as the Vice Chairwoman of Children and Young People's Committee. The lead officer suggested that the Chairman should be added to the Group and as there was already representation from the above volunteers to cover Adults and Children's Committee and to facilitate this to also seek two further Member representatives, one from the Economy and Environment Committee and one from the Health Committees to ensure their Committee's views / expertise was included.

Having voted on the recommendations in the report, the Committee, with the exception of Councillor Dupre, who abstained:

resolved to approve:

- a) to immediately form a cross-party working group to lead the development of a social mobility strategy and action plan to include on it the following Members of the Committee:

Councillor Costello
Councillor Dupre
Councillor French
Councillor Criswell
Councillor Sanderson
Councillor Richards or Meschini (to be confirmed)

To seek a member from both the Health and Economy and Environment Committees and representation from district councils following up on suggestions made at the meeting.

- b) to engage formally with the Council's other Service Committees, particularly Adults, Children's and Health, to determine what those Committees can do to contribute to a newly aligned approach and how the Communities and Partnership Committee can support them to achieve this.
- c) to assess all current activity for impact and relevance, and adapt this activity as a result of this assessment.
- d) to identify and commence delivery of new actions aligned to the themes contained in the Government's Strategy.
- e) to focus specifically on behaviour change programmes that serve to encourage and enable our residents and communities to take greater personal and collective responsibility for increasing their social mobility.
- f) to comprehensively engage with our key partners to ensure we are aware of, able to influence, and do not duplicate, relevant activity they are delivering.

- g) to specifically engage with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority in relation to its Economic Commission, in order to provide support and advice to that work and to help the Combined Authority deliver its outcomes within our communities.
- h) to ensure that, if the separate proposals are approved by Committee, the new Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Skills Academy has as one of its primary priorities, a focus on enhancing social mobility, tackling worklessness, and improving life chances.
- i) to make early decisions about the future of any currently-commissioned services, including the Time Credits programme and Support Cambridgeshire contract.
- j) to formally request that the theme of social mobility, and in particular the recommendations agreed by the Committee, form an important element of the work of the Senior Officers Communities Network.
- k) to ensure that existing and emerging opportunities to enhance participation, social action, education, skills and employment are widely publicised and communicated in a planned and co-ordinated way.
- l) For the Committee to receive regular updates on progress at both formal Committee meetings and in Committee workshops.

76. WISBECH 20/20

The Wisbech 2020 Vision was launched in 2013 by the Leaders of Fenland District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, and the MP for North East Cambridgeshire, with the aim of making Wisbech a great place to work, live and visit. Since then, the aims of the Vision had adapted and evolved and from 2015 there had been a shift for a greater focus on infrastructure and growth, town centre, skills and education, health and wellbeing and communication. This reflected the evolution of circumstances in Wisbech and recognition that a greater focus was needed on social issues.

The report provided the Committee with an overview of the Wisbech 220 Vision Programme and an opportunity to determine ways in which the Council could support the programme to help achieve its objectives. It was highlighted that in 2017, the original 2013 vision was formally refreshed with the 2017 Vision document attached at appendix 1 to the report with the programme now focussed on achieving four key themes:

- Education and skills
- Health, wellbeing and cohesion
- Infrastructure and the built environment
- Local economy

A number of important and significant achievements had been delivered since the Wisbech 2020 Vision was first published and these were set out in the 2017 Vision document and also listed in paragraphs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the report.

The Committee was asked to formally define and agree its role as the lead Committee overseeing the Council's general input to and commitment towards the Wisbech 2020 programme, and to make this a recommendation to the General Purposes Committee. This was in line with the Committee's responsibility for partnership working, although it was recognised that some aspects of the delivery programme (i.e. major infrastructure projects) would still need to be overseen by other relevant Committees. The Committee was also asked to agree a series of practical measures, activities and interventions to be taken to support the current Wisbech 2020 Vision priorities. The intention was to achieve this through a dedicated focus for discussion at the cross-party social mobility working group already agreed as part of the previous report, with key priorities to focus this work set out under section 2.6 of the report under the four key themes of the 2017 Vision document.

It was highlighted that the Wisbech 2020 Vision programme was currently being co-ordinated by Fenland District Council, with officer input wherever possible from the County Council and the other partners as set out in section 1.4 of the report. However, there was no dedicated Wisbech 2020 Vision programme manager or delivery team; instead, the work formed part of the wider role of a number of officers. Recommendation 3 of the report sought support investment towards a dedicated Wisbech 2020 Vision programme manager / programme team in order to escalate delivery momentum. However there were no financial details provided in the report. As an oral update it was indicated that the County Council could be approached for a £50k contribution. In discussion on this, without detailed funding proposals properly costed with an appropriate business case, this recommendation could not be considered, as any bid would require to be made to General Purposes Committee at the appropriate time. It was therefore agreed to defer consideration of the recommendation reading:

'To support investment towards a dedicated Wisbech 2020 Vision programme manager / programme team in order to escalate delivery momentum'

In further discussion:

- Concern was expressed at the proposed cost of the team, as Fenland District Council had also been approached for a £50k contribution. As the total cost appeared to be in the region of £100k, Members asked whether a more appropriate mechanism to pay would for this dedicated officer support would be from top slicing from the projects, with a suggestion that the whole package should be linked to economic development, especially as there was no longer in-house support available from Fenland. **The officers agreed that this suggestion and consideration of other funding options would need to be looked at further and brought back to a later meeting. Action A Chapman.**
- There was concern expressed that as 2020 was only two years away, whether the Project should consider renaming itself as having a set date was a hostage to fortune in terms of achievements being fulfilled by the target date. However the other side of the argument to this was that the title was a well-known brand.
- Regarding progress on the projects, the Chairman and lead officer were currently in discussions with the Combined Authority to understand the County Council's

role, as until the Combined Authority appointed permanent directors, the latter were not in a position to follow through the projects.

- There was criticism on some of the achievements listed which were attributed to activities from the Vision, with some Members suggesting some would have happened anyway and that some had been potentially miscredited.
- Regarding theme 3 'Infrastructure and the built environment' and proposals to reduce journey times between Cambridge and Wisbech one Member expressed concern that this goal and the economic powerhouse of Cambridge could just lead to more residents from Wisbech commuting to Cambridge jobs, as opposed to jobs being created in Wisbech, leading to it becoming another dormitory town. There was a need to future proof this from happening by making Wisbech more attractive to work in and through the creation of more local employment opportunities.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) To agree the role of the Communities and Partnership Committee to oversee the County Council's strategic and practical contribution to the Wisbech 2020 Vision ensuring it remains a high priority for delivery and action.
- b) To request that the cross-party working group agreed in the previous minute to lead on the development of a social mobility strategy specifically consider issues and opportunities in Wisbech as part of its work, in order for the Council to support the Wisbech 2020 Vision.

77. INNOVATE AND CULTIVATE FUND RECOMMENDED APPLICATIONS

The Innovation Fund was initially launched in November 2016 and is open to receiving applications from voluntary, community and social enterprise sector organisations based in and outside of Cambridgeshire and public sector bodies within Cambridgeshire, to realise their projects and ideas that help address the needs of local residents. There are two funding streams:

- **Cultivate:** small grants of £2,000-£10,000 aimed at encouraging local networks where people help themselves and each other.
- **Innovate:** larger grants of up to £50,000, for larger projects that demonstrate an innovative approach within one of the seven key priorities for Cambridgeshire.

A total of 14 completed applications for the Cultivate Fund were received in the current round, along with 3 second stage applications for the Innovate Fund.

The report provided the Committee with:

- a) Recommendations from the 19th June Innovate and Cultivate Fund (ICF) Recommendation Panel
- b) A summary of funded ICF projects to date
- c) Deadlines for upcoming funding rounds
- d) The proposed scope of an end of year evaluation report.

Since the refresh of the Innovate and Cultivate Fund in September 2017 and up to May 2018, twelve projects had received grant funding, including eight Cultivate and four Innovate projects. Five projects previously received funding as a result of the original Innovation Fund, bringing the total number of projects receiving funding to seventeen. A total of £398,077 of grant funding from the Innovation Fund and the Innovate & Cultivate Fund has been committed up to May 2018 with more detail provided in Appendix 3 to the report.

An end of year evaluation report was due to be submitted to the 8th November Committee meeting with the following proposed to be included:

- Brief summary and analysis of the quarterly project monitoring reports and potential returns on investment from the four Innovation Fund projects completing the first year of funding.
- Total number of Innovate & Cultivate Fund applications received by type; number of successful funded projects by type and geographic area; most common reasons for rejection for unsuccessful applications; and applicants supported in other ways, including access to other funding.
- Progress of all 'live' projects: start and end dates; early monitoring outcomes and good news stories.
- Summary of lessons learnt from the first year of the Innovate & Cultivate Fund. (ICF)
- Proposal to review ICF fund service priorities if additional funds were allocated to the Innovate & Cultivate Fund above the initial £1 million.

In discussion:

- There was a suggestion that the evaluation report should review the role of officers and the Panel.
- Cambridgeshire and Community Foundation and Officers should look to identify at an earlier stage, applications that were clearly not going to meet the ICF criteria to avoid them coming forward to the Panel and to suggest to them more appropriate funding sources. Further to this it was suggested that the Recommendation Panel score sheet should be amended to include the option "better suited to other funds".
- It was suggested it would also be useful to identify geographically unsuccessful bids.
- It was suggested by one Member that further consideration should be given to whether waste should still be one of the priority areas due to the difficulty of preparing bids which were deliverable, but also met the current criteria. The Chairman indicated that the ICF Steering Group there had already had some prior discussions regarding this issue and had agreed to remove waste from the advertised service priorities after the closing date for the current round of funding

(August) having recognised that a return on investment would require groups to divert enormous quantities of waste from landfill. On the Adult Social Care service priority, in response to a question raised on how easy it was for community groups to show that projects they were proposing could save money, it was admitted that it was very difficult and was the greatest challenge, particularly where savings were hard to quantify. It was intended to make it easier by providing background advice through pre-application advice sessions explaining to applicants how the County Council spends money and the costs of delivering services. This would provide them with sufficient information to gauge if their project would be able to provide the service cheaper / offer a return on the investment. Officers were also looking at cost benefit analysis work to see if it could be adapted more widely.

- Councillor Costello queried why the Ramsey Time Bank application had been unsuccessful in terms of the money they had requested. (the recommendation from the Panel was for £7,500 compared to £10,000 applied for) while as set out in Appendix 3, Houghton and Wyton Time Bank had received the full £10,000. It was explained that the latter had been for a specific project and the amount awarded to Ramsey reflected the comparative operating costs of other time banks. There would be the scope to reapply for funding for specific projects in later bidding rounds.
- It was suggested that Section 2.7 should be amended to separate the two issues of reviewing service priorities and requesting additional funds into two separate bullet points.

Having considered the recommendations of the Recommendation Panel and having voted on them, the Committee with the exception of Councillor Costello who abstained,

Resolved:

- a) To confirm agreement to fund:
 - i) The following four applications through the Cultivate Fund (with the detail as set out in Appendix One to the report):
 - Cambridge Women's Resource Centre: Birth as a medium 4 change
 - East Leightonstone PCC: Thrive Huntingdon
 - Ramsey Neighbourhoods Trust: Ramsey Timebank
 - Cambridgeshire Hearing Help: Transforming our technology infrastructure to meet the demands of Cambridgeshire's ageing population
 - ii) The following three applications through the Innovate Fund (with the detail as set out in Appendix Two of the report):
 - The Meadows Children and Family Wing: Freedom Forever Together
 - Romsey Mill Trust: Trumpington Youth Development
 - The Cinnamon Network: Demand Reduction Partnerships – Cambridgeshire.

- b) Agree the scope of the end of year evaluation report, subject to re-wording the text in the last bullet regarding the reference to £1m.

78. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT (FPR)

The report was presented to the Committee to provide the opportunity to comment on the financial and performance position as at the end of May 2018.

The key headlines included that:

- On the table under paragraph 3.1 showing the Committee's budget lines at May 2018, while actual transactions that had been processed wereshowing a credit position of £464K against the 2018-19 budget, this was due in part to reserve payments yet to go through and some slight delays in payments through the ERP system. Grant income payments were also higher than the current expenditure levels. The forecast outturn for 2018-19 was currently 0 and it was likely there would not be an adverse variance from the original budget. At the end of May, the overall P&C position was a forecast overspend of £1,107k of which £0k was attributable to Communities and Partnership (C&P) budget lines.
- The major savings agenda continued with £99.2m of savings required across the Council between 2017 and 2022. The planned savings for the People and Communities Directorate (P&C) in the 2018/19 financial year totalled £21,287k, of which those that were directly attributable to Communities and Partnership (C&P) totalled £0k.
- The Directorate continued to face demand pressures, particularly in children's services related to the rising number of looked after children. It had been identified that the Council was not moving children through the system quickly enough as detailed in the report. Further work was ongoing to quantify the extent of the pressure in 2018/19 as original budgets were predicated on lower numbers in care than was likely to be achievable. It was proposed that in future the FPR cover reports presented to the Committee would reference specific areas of the C&P Delivery Plan and also identify areas of significant financial concern from across P&C to give a broader financial awareness.
- The following were the four new C&P Performance Indicators for future updates, which were not RAG (Red, Amber, Green) rated as they had no targets:
 1. Number of young first time entrants into the criminal justice system, per 10,000 of population compared to statistical neighbours
 2. Victim-based crime per 1,000 of population compared to statistical neighbours (hate crime)
 3. Proportion of new apprentices per 1,000 of population, compared to national figures
 4. Engagement with learners from deprived wards as a proportion of the total learners engaged
- The major change programmes and projects underway across P&C were detailed in Appendix 8 of the report with the 'Building Community Resilience' programme

within C&P currently assessed as green at the end of 2017-18. The P&C portfolio was currently being reviewed to align with the business planning proposals for 2018/19.

- In respect of the tracker report to be produced quarterly, based on current forecasts as at mid-June, including the delivery of some additional funnel savings, the overall position for P&C was a £2,007k shortfall against plan. However, the expectation was that stretched targets for existing savings and additional funnel savings would support delivery of the overall £21,287k P&C savings target.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the report.

79. COMMUNITIES AND PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN WORKSHOP AND TRAINING PLAN AND OUTSIDE BODIES APPOINTMENTS

Subject to the inclusion of an update item on New Communities to the August Workshop

It was resolved unanimously:

to note the workshop (training plan)

80. COMMUNITIES AND PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN AND OUTSIDE BODIES APPOINTMENTS

Following confirmation that the Annual Risk Management Report had been moved to the September Committee,

It was resolved unanimously:

to note and agree the agenda plan.

81. ORAL UPDATES FROM AREA CHAMPIONS

The Committee noted brief oral updates provided from the following Councillors with the details to be provided in schedules included as an appendix to the minutes:

Councillor Costello (appendix 1 to the Minutes)
Councillor Every (appendix 2 to the Minutes)
Councillor French (appendix 3 to the Minutes)

The submission from Councillor Richards who had given her apologies for the meeting would also be included as part of the Minutes. (appendix 4)

82. DATE OF NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING – 27th SEPTEMBER 2018

Chairman
27TH September 2018