

Survey of Community Planning Partnership structures and arrangements 2012

Summary Report

David Barr

Bob Christie

May 2012

Contents

- 1. Introduction**
 - 2. Key findings**
 - 3. Membership and operation of the CPP Board**
 - 4. Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP**
 - 5. Membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships**
 - 6. Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements**
 - 7. The SOA and Community Plan**
 - 8. Comments on Community Planning arrangements**
- Annex A – the full survey and responses**

Survey of Community Planning Partnership structures and arrangements 2012

1. Introduction

In April 2012 the Improvement Service undertook a baseline survey of Community Planning arrangements in Scotland, to inform the joint Scottish Government / COSLA review of Community Planning and SOAs. As the review is intended to improve the way in which Community Planning operates, SOLACE and the IS wished to ensure that it is informed by a clear understanding of the current position.

The survey ran from 3rd – 23rd April 2012 and received a 100% response rate, with all 32 CPPs responding and addressing all of the survey questions relevant to their local arrangements. All 32 CPPs also provided supplementary information which described their particular circumstances and intentions.

The survey asked CPPs about the membership and operation of their boards, of their executive groups, of their thematic groups and partnerships, and of their localised Community Planning arrangements. The survey also asked CPPs about the status of their Single Outcome Agreement and its relationship to their Community Plan.

By mid May the IS had been able to resolve anomalies and gaps in the information provided by a small number of CPPs. The resultant breadth and depth of information both ensures that the baseline survey is accurate and authoritative, and can be used to inform the IS' ongoing support work with individual CPPs.

CPPs were assured that their individual responses will only be available to their council's chief executive and their Community Planning manager. However, the IS undertook to publish this overview summary of the responses received, as a contribution to the review of Community Planning and SOAs.

The survey was structured with 5 sections:

- Membership and operation of the CPP Board
- Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP
- Membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships
- Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements
- The SOA and Community Plan

Key points from CPPs' responses are summarised in this report, together with a range of anonymised but illustrative comments which were provided by CPPs as supplementary information and which indicate both the diversity of local approaches to Community Planning and the consistency of CPPs' views on the way forward.

While the survey now provides an excellent indication of the current position of CPPs, the IS will follow this up with a number of CPPs to further substantiate and understand their responses to specific questions in the survey.

Annex A sets out the 52 questions asked in the baseline survey, with the summarised responses in full.

2. Key findings

Membership and operation of the CPP Board

- While all CPP boards contain councillors from the ruling administration, 21 CPP boards (70%) also contain councillors from other parties.
- The representation on CPP boards of other statutory Community Planning partners is varied. While Scottish Enterprise or HIE sit on 27 CPP boards, members of health boards sit on 25, members of police and fire boards each sit on 18, and regional transport partnerships sit on 17.
- In addition, FE/HE institutions sit on 23 CPP boards and Skills Development Scotland sits on 18 CPP boards. Scottish Government sits on 3 CPP boards.
- All CPP boards include representatives of the voluntary sector, but only 50% of CPP boards include representatives of the private sector
- Whilst all CPP boards regularly receive performance management information, only 7 boards (23%) were reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of partners.

Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP

- Only 5 CPP executive groups (17%) include representatives of the private sector.
- Only 9 CPP executive groups (30%) were reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of Community Planning partner organisations, and while 24 CPP executive groups (80%) report to the CPP board, 6 (20%) do not.

Membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships

- Community Health Partnerships, Alcohol and Drugs Partnerships, and Community Safety Partnerships often appear not to be regarded as within the scope of Community Planning.
- While 28 CPPs (90%) have thematic groups which receive performance information on partners' contributions to the SOA, only 7 CPPs (23%) reported that they have thematic groups which significantly influence partners' resource allocation decisions

Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements

- 20 CPPs (63%) now have localised Community Planning arrangements, although there is considerable variation in the criteria used to define these sub-areas.
- 90% of localised arrangements include community councillors and representatives of the voluntary sector. 42% include representatives of the private sector.

The SOA and Community Plan

- 20 CPPs (63%) have now integrated their SOA and Community Plan or are doing so.
- 15 CPPs (47%) are currently revising their SOA and 10 (31%) did so in 2011.
- 17 CPPs (54%) have 9 or more priority outcomes, or have unprioritised outcomes.
- 30 CPPs (94%) believe that the SOA has significantly influenced the integrated working of partner organisations
- But only 14 CPPs (44%) believe that the SOA has significantly influenced partners' resource decisions.

Community Planning arrangements

The majority of CPPs are actively reviewing their structures and arrangements alongside their SOA. There is considerable variety in their local approaches, but also considerable consistency in their focus on outcomes, on integrated working, on the localisation of Community Planning and on working more closely with communities. However,

prioritisation and resource management remain as significant challenges.

Summary of Findings

3. Membership and operation of the CPP Board

The survey asked about the strategic body or board of the CPP, including its composition and its roles in relation to resource and performance management.

- 30 CPPs have a strategic board.
- 27 CPPs have both a strategic board and an executive group.
- 1 CPP has a body which is both its strategic board and its executive group.
- 2 CPPs have a strategic board but no executive group.
- 2 CPPs have an executive group but no strategic board.

The survey asked about the composition of the CPP board, both from the statutory Community Planning partners (councils, health boards, police boards, fire boards, Scottish Enterprise, Highland and Islands Enterprise, regional transport partnerships) and others.

- All 30 CPP boards contain councillors from the ruling administration.
- 21 boards (70%) also contain councillors from other parties.
- 29 boards (97%) contain chief executives (or partners' equivalent).
- Members of health boards sit on 25 CPP boards (83%)
- Members of police and fire boards each sit on 18 CPP boards (60%).
- Scottish Enterprise or HIE sit on 27 boards (90%)
- FE/HE institutions sit on 23 boards (77%)
- Skills Development Scotland sits on 18 boards (60%)
- Regional transport partnerships sit on 17 boards (57%)

In addition SNH, Scottish Government, SEPA, Scottish Water and Community Justice Authorities each sit on 4 or fewer CPP boards (<13%).

- All 30 CPP boards contain representatives of the voluntary sector
- 16 boards (53%) contain representatives of community groups
- 15 boards (50%) contain representatives of the private sector
- 8 boards (27%) contain representatives of localised CPPs

Comment - The board has a seat for the Chamber of Commerce but they felt they are no longer able to participate, as it is too onerous on their time. There are also seats available for youth and Community Councils but these have not been taken up.

Comment – the CPP enhanced its governance arrangements in 2011, this included revising membership to establish partner representation from most partners to be at Board level.

The survey asked about the roles of the CPP board in relation to resource and performance management. On resource management:

- 12 CPP boards (40%) have a budget allocated to them by CP partners and 18 (60%) do not. The size and purpose of boards' budgets is not identified.
- 7 boards (23%) are reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of CP partners
- 10 boards (33%) are reported as advising on the resource allocation decisions of CP partners
- 13 boards (43%) are reported as neither significantly influencing nor advising on the resource allocation decisions of CP partners

On performance management:

- All CPP boards regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their executive group and/or thematic groups and/or partners.
- 22 CPP boards (73%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their executive group
- 21 boards (70%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their thematic groups or partnerships
- 17 boards (57%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, their individual CP partners on their contributions to the SOA.

Comment - the intention is to work towards discussion on resource allocation.

Comment - The Board has yet to reach the point of challenging/calling to account, each other or the theme groups, regarding performance / delivery of outcomes.

Comment - Elected Members within the Council's Corporate and Community Planning Standing Scrutiny Panel provide a scrutiny function for the CPP Board by scrutinising performance reports provided against the SOA.

From the supplementary information provided by CPPs it is clear that many CPP boards are reviewing their current arrangements.

Comment - We undertake a formal review of our structures and arrangements every two years to ensure that they are fit for purpose

Comment – the Board has recently completed a PSIF self evaluation which has identified improvement actions which will be taken forward during 2012/2013. A series of Board Development days are being held from June both to improve the effectiveness of the Board and feed into the development of the next phase of the SOA.

Comment - Following a self-assessment exercise using PSIF the Leadership Board has agreed an Improvement Plan. This has already changed the CPP's structure including combining our former Leadership and Management Groups into a new Leadership Board.

4. Membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP

The survey asked about the executive / working / senior officer group of the CPP, including its composition and its roles in relation to resource and performance management.

- 30 CPPs have an executive group
- Chief executives (or partners' equivalents) sit on 22 executive groups (73%)
- FE/HE institutions sit on 13 executive groups (43%)
- Members of health, police or fire boards each sit on 8 executive groups (27%)
- Councillors sit on 6 executive groups (20%)

18 CPPs identified the other partner organisations which sit on their executive groups, with the most frequently identified being Scottish Enterprise/HIE and Skills Development Scotland.

- Representatives of the voluntary sector sit on 19 executive groups (63%)
- Leaders of thematic groups sit on 15 executive groups (50%)
- Representatives of the private sector, localised CPPs and community groups each sit on 5 executive groups (17%).

The survey asked about the roles of the CPP executive group in relation to resource and performance management. On resource management:

- 4 executive groups (13%) have a budget allocated to them by partners and 26 (87%) do not.
- 9 executive groups (30%) are reported as significantly influencing the resource allocation decisions of partners.
- 10 executive groups (33%) are reported as advising partners on their resource allocation decisions.
- 11 executive groups (37%) are reported as neither significantly influencing nor advising on partners' resource allocation decisions.

On performance management:

- 24 executive groups (80%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, thematic groups or partnerships
- 22 executive groups (73%) regularly receive performance management information from, and discuss that information with, individual partners on their contributions to the SOA.
- 24 executive groups (80%) report to the CPP board and 6 (20%) do not.

Comment - further work is required to ensure that resources and service delivery support the delivery of key outcomes.

Comment - the partnership recently used the PSIF to develop an improvement plan, which includes a number of key actions aimed at improving outcome based approaches, and reviewing partnership structures and performance reporting arrangements. A key aim is to align partner/partnership budgets more closely to support the delivery of community plan outcomes.

Comment - The Executive Body acts to coordinate reporting by thematic groups to the Board and receives requests from the Board to carry out specific pieces of work.

5. Membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships

The survey asked about the thematic groups or partnerships of the CPP, including their typical composition and roles in relation to resource and performance management.

- 31 CPPs (97%) have thematic groups or partnerships.
- 20 CPPs (65%) have 4-6 thematic groups or partnerships, 29% have more and 6% have fewer.

The typical membership of thematic groups or partnerships includes:

- councillors from the ruling administration (65% of CPPs)
- councillors from other parties (45% of CPPs)
- members of health, police or fire boards (48% of CPPs)
- representatives of the voluntary sector (94% of CPPs)
- representatives of the private sector (74% of CPPs)
- representatives of community groups (58% of CPPs).

23 CPPs identified the other partner organisations which sit on their thematic groups or partnerships, with the most frequently identified being Scottish Enterprise/HIE, Skills Development Scotland and DWP/Job Centre Plus, reflecting the strong and increasing focus of Community Planning on economic recovery and employment.

Almost all CPPs have a formal Community Health Partnership, Alcohol and Drugs Partnership, and Community Safety Partnership. However, the responses to the survey suggest that these are often not regarded as being thematic groups or partnerships of the CPP.

The survey did not ask about the remits of thematic groups or partnerships as these (and their interpretations) can vary widely for informal thematic groups. However, the supplementary information provided by CPPs indicates that many have informal thematic groups or partnerships for children, employment, poverty/regeneration, economy and environment.

Comment - The membership and operation of thematic partnerships varies widely, often based on historical precedent.

Comment - The CPP removed thematic partnerships from its structure as it was widely accepted that these added little value and duplicated existing multi-agency activity. However, there are a number of multi-agency partnerships such as the ADP, CHP and Community Safety Partnership which report on outcomes in the SOA.

Comment - The thematic groups are predominantly strategic bodies, with membership accordingly. Each group has a number of sub groups, where more operational planning and activity takes place.

Comment - Thematic Groups typically function as the "boiler room" of the CPP.

The survey asked about the roles of thematic groups or partnerships in relation to resource and performance management. On resource management:

- 18 CPPs (58%) have thematic groups or partnerships which have budgets allocated to them by CP partners, and 13 (42%) say that they do not.
- 7 CPPs (23%) reported that they have thematic groups which typically significantly influence partners' resource allocation decisions
- 13 CPPs (42%) reported that they have thematic groups which typically advise on those decisions
- 11 CPPs (35%) reported that they have thematic groups which typically neither significantly influence nor advise on resource allocation decisions.

However, almost all CPPs have CHPs, ADPs and Community Safety Partnerships, which have budgets provided by one or more partners, and so there have clearly been different interpretations of whether or not these partnerships fall within the scope of Community Planning.

On performance management:

- 28 CPPs (90%) have thematic groups which typically receive performance information on individual partners' contributions to the SOA.
- In all CPPs thematic groups typically report performance information to the CPP board and the executive group, usually doing so every 3-6 months.

Comment - No specific budgets allocated to thematic groups. Thematic groups bid for CPP funding where it is delivering a multi agency programme of work that fits with SOA and is match funded

Comment - Board meetings are preceded by seminar sessions at which thematic groups have an opportunity to engage with Board members in a more informal setting to discuss performance and issues being tackled by partners represented in the thematic group.

6. Membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements

The survey asked about localised Community Planning arrangements for sub-areas of the CPP's area, including their coverage, composition and roles.

20 CPPs (63%) now have localised Community Planning arrangements for sub-areas within their area.

There is considerable variation in the criteria used to identify sub-areas for Community Planning. 4 CPPs base their localised arrangements on single multi-member wards, 7 base them on groups of wards and 9 base them on other boundaries

Of the CPPs with localised arrangements 90% include councillors representing the local area, 90% include community councillors, and 90% include representatives of the voluntary sector.

Of the CPPs with localised arrangements 79% include area based staff, 79% include representatives of residents'/tenants' associations, and 79% include representatives of other community groups. 42% include representatives of local schools, 42% include representatives of the private sector and 37% include representatives of housing associations.

Of the CPPs with localised arrangements 94% prepare or advise on a local Community Plan or equivalent, but only 19% prepare or advise on a local version of the SOA, although 31% report that they significantly influence the CPP's SOA.

Of the CPPs with localised arrangements 40% have budgets allocated to them by CP partners and 60% do not. 40% also award grants to local organisations and 60% do not.

Comments - Not all partners are able to become directly involved at local level due to limited staff resource, so the main localised community planning partners are Council, Police and the Third sector.

Comment - Area community planning forums are run by local communities themselves, with capacity building support provided where required by the Communities Team within the local authority. Community Planning partner agencies are invited to attend on the basis of specific agenda items. Local police and Councillors are invited to attend all meetings.

Comment - There is some conflict between community organisations, which have different interpretations of their respective mandates and of relevant legislation (community planning, housing, local democracy, planning, etc.).

Comment - Following review of community planning we have made considerable improvements to local community planning arrangements. Local agendas are now more focussed and meaningful. Partner participation and contribution has improved and there are improved opportunities for performance scrutiny.

Comment - Local Area Committees are formally sub-committees of the council. Each LAC prepares a localised action plan each year, focusing on agreed local community planning priorities.

7. The SOA and Community Plan

The survey asked about the relationship between the SOA and the Community Plan, including their levels of prioritisation and influence.

On the relationship between the SOA and the Community Plan:

- 18 CPPs have integrated their SOA and Community Plan and 2 are doing so (63%).

On the timescales for the SOA and the Community Plan:

- Most SOAs currently run to 2012-13 or 2013-14
- Many Community Plans run to 2015 or 2020
- The timescales for integrated SOAs/Community Plans are highly variable.

On the prioritisation of the SOA:

- 15 CPPs (47%) are currently revising their SOA and 10 (31%) did so in 2011.
- 4 CPPs (13%) have up to 4 priority outcomes
- 11 CPPs (34%) have 5-8 priority outcomes
- 13 CPPs (41%) have 9 or more priority outcomes.
- 4 CPPs (13%) have not prioritised their outcomes.

On the influence of the SOA:

- 30 CPPs (94%) believe that the SOA has significantly influenced the integrated working of partner organisations
- 22 CPPs (69%) believe that it has significantly influenced partners' policy decisions
- 21 CPPs (66%) believe that it has significantly influenced partners' business plans
- 14 CPPs (44%) believe that it has significantly influenced partners' resource decisions.

Comment - The Community Plan will remain as the overall direction - running from 2008 to 18. The SOA will act as the delivery plan for the Community Plan.

Comment - Our 'community plan' is the SOA and its Delivery Plan. The SOA sets out the outcomes and targets and the Delivery Plan includes the actions to achieve them.

Comment - The current SOA is easier to understand and digest than SOA 2009 and the, now discontinued, Community Plan which had no long term targets and was not performance managed.

Comment - SOA is the key document, community plan is no longer relevant

Comment - Currently producing integrated SOA/Community Plan for 2012 onwards.

Comment - The PSIF self evaluation has identified improvement actions which will impact on the development and implementation of the SOA/ Community Plan including:

- *Rationalise and improve how evidence is used to inform decision making*
- *Review the scrutiny role of the Board in relation to performance management*
- *Review the SOA outcomes and targets and develop a process to allow prioritisation*

Comment - The current version of the SOA was developed through the partnership and with an outcomes focus, compared to previous iterations, consequently there seems to be more commitment from partners to ensuring delivery on the priority areas and integrated working, though there is still improvement in this approach to be made.

(cont.)

Comment – *The SOA has been a significant driver in determining shared priorities. It has the potential to really drive forward joint working and pooling of budgets. It is important that the SOA is based on local priorities.*

8. Comments on Community Planning arrangements

Each section of the survey concluded with an open question inviting respondents to offer comments on that section. Respondents were also invited to offer their general comments on Community Planning arrangements. The large number and reflective nature of the comments offered suggests that CPPs are actively engaged in their own local reviews of the effectiveness of their SOA and Community Planning.

Comment – *the CPP found that the agreement of the SOA in 2008/09 provided a useful catalyst to focus the partnership on driving performance improvement. However, we now feel we need to develop more sophisticated mechanisms that will support our CPP to make the step change necessary to deliver public sector reform*

Comment – *The SOA has helped in providing a shared focus for the CPP. The pace and scale of change that it has inspired varies across outcomes, with the greatest change so far relating to the integration of children's services and in community care. Partnership activity around environmental and economic outcomes has improved, but this has not (yet) led to more integration of services.*

Comment – *The emphasis on requiring public body joint planning to undertake preventive interventions, share resources and demonstrate impact is welcomed. It will be important to balance these recommendations with requirements to place communities of place and interest at the heart of planning, through community capacity building, community engagement, co-commissioning and co-production. National agencies will require assistance to balance central policy direction with local planning approaches.*

Comment – *Much work is needed to embed this new culture of working to shared outcomes rather than individual organisational goals – a focus on policies and plans is important but it is perhaps more important to change the attitudes and behaviours of leaders, managers and staff.*

Comment – *The CPP is keen to drive forward key elements of the new community plan to deliver 'new ways of working' – supporting and enabling individuals and communities to play a bigger role in the ownership and management of community assets, new service delivery models and in the improvement of their local areas.*

Comment – *Community planning does not just take place through structures and formal partnerships, especially when governance still remains largely with individual partner organisations. Community planning is also about the process of working which routinely involves considering partner input and community views. Sometimes too much emphasis is placed on structures as the way of getting things done, especially when accountability in current CPP arrangements is unclear.*

Survey of Community Planning Partnership structures and arrangements 2012

SECTION A: Questions about the membership and operation of the CPP Board

1. **Name of Community Planning Partnership**
2. **Name of respondent**
3. **Job title**

4. **The CPP has a strategic body or board (if not, please continue to section B)**

Yes	30
No	2
Total	32

5. **The CPP also has a separate executive body (e.g. executive group / working group / senior officer group)**

Yes	27
No	3
Total	30

6. **Members of the CPP board include:**

Councillors from the ruling administration party / parties	30
Councillors who are <u>not</u> from the ruling administration party / parties	21
Any members of health boards	25
Any members of police boards (or joint committees	18
Any members of fire boards (or joint committees	18
Chief executive officers (or equivalent)	29
Executive Directors (or equivalent)	17
Heads of Service (or equivalent)	8
Leaders of all thematic groups / partnerships	12
Representatives of localised Community Planning partnerships	8
Representatives of community groups	16
Representatives of the private sector	15
Representatives of the voluntary sector	30
Representatives of FE / HE	23
Other members (e.g. Scottish Enterprise/HIE, SNH, DWP, SEPA) – please identify organisations	29
Total of responding CPPs	30

7. **The CPP board is chaired, co-chaired or chaired in rotation by:**

Council leader	25
Other councillor	3
Member of a CP partner board	2
Council chief executive	1
Other CP partner chief executive	0
Other chair - please provide details	2
Total of responding CPPs	30

8. **Does the CPP board have a budget allocated to it by CP partners?**

Yes	12
No	18
Total	30

9. **The CPP board (please select the answer which applies):**

Advises partner organisations on their resource allocation decisions	10
Significantly influences the resource allocation decisions of partner organisations	7
Neither advises nor significantly influences partner organisations resource allocation decisions	13
Total	30

10. **The CPP board regularly receives performance management information from, and discusses that information with:**

An executive / working / senior officer group on the performance of the CPP overall	22
Thematic groups or partnerships on their performance	21
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the SOA	17
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the community plan	10
The CPP board does not receive and discuss performance management information	0
Total of responding CPPs	30

11. **The CPP board meets:**

Quarterly	20
Monthly or bi-monthly	5
Two or three times a year	5
Total	30

12. Do you have comments on the membership and operation of the CPP Board?
(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

SECTION B: Questions about the membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP - e.g. an executive / working / senior officer group.

13. The partnership has an executive body (if not please continue to section C):

Yes	30
No	2
Total	30

14. The executive body is also the strategic body or board of the partnership

Yes	5
No	25
Total	30

15. Members of the executive body include:

Councillors from the ruling administration party / parties	6
Councillors who are <u>not</u> from the ruling administration party / parties	2
Any members of health, police or fire boards (or joint committees)	8
Chief executive officers (or equivalent)	22
Executive Directors (or equivalent)	14
Heads of Service (or equivalent)	14
Service managers (or equivalent)	7
Corporate / policy managers	14
Leaders of thematic groups / partnerships	15
Representatives of localised Community Planning partnerships	5
Representatives of community groups	5
Representatives of the private sector	5
Representatives of the voluntary sector	19
Representatives of FE / HE	13
Other members (e.g. Scottish Enterprise/HIE, SNH, DWP, SEPA) – please identify organisations	18
Total of responding CPPs	30

16. The executive body is chaired, co-chaired or chaired in rotation by:

Council leader	4
----------------	---

Other councillor	1
Member of a CP partner board	1
Council chief executive	17
Other CP partner chief executive	2
Other chair - please provide details	8
Total of responding CPPs	30

17. Does the executive body have a budget allocated to it by CP partners?

Yes	4
No	26
Total	30

18. The executive body (please select the answer which applies):

Advises partner organisations on their resource allocation decisions	10
Significantly influences the resource allocation decisions of partner organisations	9
Neither advises nor significantly influences partner organisations resource allocation decisions	11
Total	30

19. The executive body regularly receives performance management information from, and discusses that information with:

Thematic groups or partnerships	24
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the SOA	22
Individual partner organisations on their contribution to the community plan	9
The Executive body does not receive and discuss performance management information	4
Total of responding CPPs	30

20. The executive body meets:

Monthly or bi-monthly	17
Every three or four months	12
Bi-annually	1
Annually	0
Total	30

21. The executive body reports to the CPP board:

Monthly or bi-monthly	4
Every three or four months	16
Bi-annually	4

Annually	0
The executive body does not report to the board	6
Total	30

22. Do you have comments on the membership and operation of the executive body of the CPP?

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

SECTION C: Questions about the membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships

23. Please indicate how many thematic groups or partnerships (e.g. for community safety, employability, environment) there are (if none please continue to Section D):

None	1
1 to 3	2
4 to 6	20
7 to 9	7
10 or more	2
Total	32

24. Please indicate the typical membership of a thematic group or partnership

Councillors from the ruling administration party / parties	20
Councillors who are <u>not</u> from the ruling administration party / parties	14
Members of health, police or fire boards (or joint committees)	15
Chief executive officers	7
Executive Directors (or equivalent)	16
Heads of Service (or equivalent)	29
Service managers (or equivalent)	26
Corporate / policy managers	19
Representatives of localised Community Planning partnership	9
Representatives of community groups	18
Representatives of the private sector	23
Representatives of the voluntary sector	29
Representatives of FE / HE	25
Other members (e.g. Scottish Enterprise/HIE, SNH, DWP, SEPA) – please identify organisations	25
Total of responding CPPs	31

25. Please indicate the typical frequency of thematic group or partnership meetings

Monthly or bi-monthly	7
Every 3 or 4 months	16
Bi-annually	0
There is significant variation in frequency between thematic groups or partnerships	8
Total	31

26. **Do any thematic groups or partnerships have budgets allocated to them by CP partners?**

Yes	18
No	13
Total	31

27. **If thematic groups or partnerships do have budgets allocated to them by CP partners, which thematic groups of partnerships?**
(See comments in summary report)

28. **Do the thematic groups or partnerships typically (please select the answer which applies):**

Advise on the resource allocation decisions of partner organisations	13
Significantly influence the resource allocation decisions of partner organisations	7
Neither advise nor significantly influence partner organisations resource allocation decisions	11
Total	31

29. **Thematic groups or partnerships typically receive performance information on individual partner organisations' contributions to the SOA:**

Monthly or bi-monthly	2
Every 3 or 4 months	16
Bi-annually	4
Annually	6
Never	3
Total	31

30. **Thematic groups or partnerships typically report to the executive body with performance information:**

Monthly or bi-monthly	1
Every 3 or 4 months	10
Bi-annually	11
Annually	4
Thematic groups or partnerships do not report to the	5

executive body	
Total	31

31. Thematic groups or partnerships typically report to the CPP board with performance information:

Monthly or bi-monthly	0
Every 3 or 4 months	12
Bi-annually	10
Annually	6
Thematic groups or partnerships do not report to the CPP Board	3
Total	31

32. Do you have comments on the membership and operation of thematic groups or partnerships?

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

Section D: Questions about the membership and operation of localised Community Planning arrangements.

33. The partnership has localised Community Planning arrangements for sub-areas within the CPP's area (if not, please continue to Section E)

Yes	20
No	12
Total	32

34. Please indicate whether these localised arrangements cover:

All sub-areas	14
Some sub-areas, and eventually all sub-areas	4
Some sub-areas, with no plan to cover all sub-areas	2
Total	20

35. Please indicate whether these sub-areas are based on:

A multi-member ward	4
Several multi-member wards	7
Other area boundaries	9
Total	20

36. Please indicate the typical membership of a localised Community Planning partnership:

Councillors representing the sub-area	17
Other councillors	2
Executive Directors (or equivalent)	1
Heads of Service (or equivalent)	6
Service managers (or equivalent)	12
Area-based staff	15
Community councillors	17
Representatives of residents' / tenants' associations	15
Representatives of other community groups	15
Representatives of housing associations	7
Representatives of local schools	8
Representatives of the private sector	8
Representatives of the voluntary sector	17
Other members - please identify these members	5
Total of responding CPPs	19

37. Please indicate the typical frequency of localised Community Planning partnership meetings:

Monthly or bi-monthly	3
Every 3 or 4 months	13
Bi-annually	0
There is significant variation between localised Community Planning partnerships	4
Total	20

38. Localised Community Planning partnerships typically

Prepare or advise on a local Community Plan or equivalent	15
Prepare or advise on a local version of the SOA	3
Advise on the CPP's SOA	7
Significantly influence the CPP's SOA	5
Advise on the resource allocation decisions of CPP partner organisations	4
Significantly influence the resource allocation decisions of CPP partner organisations	2
Receive performance information for their sub-area from CPP partner	3

organisations	
Total of responding CPPs	16

39. Do sub-areas have budgets allocated to them by CPP partner organisations?

Yes	8
No	12
Total	20

40. Do localised Community Planning partnerships award grants to local organisations?

Yes	8
No	11
Total	19

41. Do you have comments on localised Community Planning arrangements?

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

42. Is there any further information on your CPP structure or arrangements that is relevant but has not been covered so far?

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

Section E: Questions about the SOA and Community Plan

43. The CPP has an integrated SOA and community plan

Yes	18
No	14
Total	32

44. Please identify the timescale for the integrated SOA / community plan (e.g. 2011 to 2020)

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

45. The CPP has a separate SOA and community plan

Yes	14
No	18
Total	32

46. Please identify the timescales for both the SOA and for the Community Plan (e.g. SOA 2009-10 to 2011-12 and Community Plan 2008 to 2018)

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

47. **If there is a separate community plan does it identify clear outcomes which set out what will change for the area and its people?**

Yes	13
No	1
Total	14

48. **The most recent substantial revision of the SOA was in:**

2010	7
2011	10
Under revision	15
Never revised	0
Total	32

49. **Please indicate how many priority outcomes the CPP has identified in the SOA:**

Under 4	4
5 – 8	11
9 or more	13
Not prioritised	4
Total	32

50. **Please indicate whether the SOA has significantly influenced the following:**

Resource decisions of partner organisations	14
Business plans of partner organisations	21
Policy decisions of partner organisations	22
Integrated working of partner organisations	30
Total (CPPs)	32

51. **Do you have comments on the SOA and Community Plan?**

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

52. **Do you have any other comments on local Community Planning arrangements?**

(Illustrative anonymised comments are quoted in the summary report)

ENDS