

MINUTES

Title:	SSP Performance Management Group
Date:	Thursday 9 July 2009
Place:	Rose Room, Endeavour House
Time:	3.00pm – 5.00pm
In Attendance:	<p>Andrea Hill, Chief Executive, Suffolk County Council (Chair)</p> <p>Paul Baker, Deputy Chief Executive, Age Concern Suffolk (VCS Representative)</p> <p>Stephen Baker, Chief Executive, Suffolk Coastal & Waveney District Councils</p> <p>Ian Barton on behalf of Steve Green, Government Office – East of England</p> <p>Shona Bendix, Chief Executive, Suffolk Association of Local Councils</p> <p>David Burnip, Chief Executive, Forest Heath District Council</p> <p>Dafydd Evans, Environment Agency (Area Manager, Eastern)</p> <p>Andrew Good, Chief Executive, Mid Suffolk District Council</p> <p>Celia Hodson, Chief Executive, Suffolk Development Agency</p> <p>Andrew Hunkin on behalf of Pat Rockall, Babergh District Council</p> <p>Jacqui Martin, Chief Executive, Suffolk Carers (VCS Representative)</p> <p>Judith Mobbs, Area Director, Suffolk Learning & Skills Council</p> <p>Jonathan Moore, Chief Executive, Suffolk Association of Voluntary Organisations (VCS Representative)</p> <p>Jon Perigo on behalf of James Hehir, Ipswich Borough Council</p> <p>Richard Rafe, Regional Programme Manager, Natural England</p> <p>Geoff Rivers, Chief Executive, St Edmundsbury Borough Council</p>
Supporting Officers:	<p>Edwina Child, Audit Commission</p> <p>Paul Emeny, Planning & Performance Improvement Team, Suffolk County Council</p> <p>Katie Hazelton, SSP Administrator, Suffolk County Council (Minutes)</p> <p>Jill Korwin, Planning & Performance Improvement Team, Suffolk County Council</p> <p>Jenny Wilson, Corporate Strategy & Partnerships Team, Suffolk County Council</p>
Observers:	<p>Cllr Helen Levack, LAA Scrutiny Panel</p> <p>Rachel Litherland, IDeA (Secondee from Suffolk County Council)</p> <p>Cllr Martin Redbond, LAA Scrutiny Panel</p> <p>Tony Shepherd, LAA Scrutiny Panel Chair</p>

	Item Description	Relevant business considered, facts noted, the decision taken and its rationale
1.	Welcome and Apologies	<p>Andrea Hill welcomed everybody to the meeting and noted that the following apologies had been given:</p> <p>Simon Ash, Chief Constable, Suffolk Constabulary</p> <p>Chris Bally, Planning & Performance Improvement Team, Suffolk County Council</p> <p>Candice Danleigh, Acting District Manager (Cambridgeshire & Suffolk), Job Centre Plus</p> <p>Steve Green, Suffolk Lead, Government Office – East of England</p> <p>James Hehir, Chief Executive, Ipswich Borough Council</p> <p>Pat Rockall, Chief Executive, Babergh District Council</p> <p>Carole Taylor-Brown, Chief Executive, NHS Suffolk (Vice-Chair)</p> <p>John Turner, Interim Director of Performance, Great Yarmouth and Waveney PCT</p> <p>Paul Zollinger-Read, Chief Executive, Great Yarmouth & Waveney Primary Care Trust</p>
2.	Performance Reward Grants	<p>Andrea explained briefly the context of Paper A and the letter from Clare Euston on behalf of the SSP Board which had been circulated separately to the meeting papers.</p> <p>The PMG were being asked to consider how effectively the nine proposals meet the principles for funding, including innovation, added value and joint working and to consider whether an alternative process for the allocation of PRG is appropriate given the SSP Board's concerns.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on the bids submitted and the process which had led to this point. There was a general consensus that the bids were good projects but did not show startling innovation. There was also concern that the bids did not show joined up working and cross fertilisation across the delivery partnerships. It was suggested that engaging communities could have a bigger input if joined up across the delivery partnerships.</p> <p>There was sympathy for the concerns expressed in Clare Euston's letter but members felt it was too late to restart the process. It was felt that the offer of guidance and advice from Suffolk Foundation should apply to the next round to provide a robustness of advice, transparency and analysis of all paperwork. Members agreed that they had agreed to devolve responsibility to delivery partnerships and could not keep reversing decisions made. Concern was expressed that re-evaluating at this stage would cause too much delay and would mean delivery partnerships would not receive funding until January 2010.</p> <p>It was also noted that PMG had agreed to not explore smaller bids and had requested big bids which make a big impact. It was commented that there was confusion on whether the aim is to achieve Suffolk's priorities in the Community Strategy or the national indicators.</p> <p>Andrea Hill stated that there was nothing administratively wrong with the process and that the delivery partnerships had by and large achieved what was asked of them. Andrea advised members that the decisions to be made were if any bids were too inappropriate and whether the PMG was now not comfortable due to the SSP Board comments.</p> <p>Members agreed that they did not want to consider an alternative process and where happy to give direction to go through the details and fund as much as possible.</p>

		<p>Discussion moved to the involvement of the Suffolk Foundation and it was felt that in the next round they could be used as an assessor to condense and provide a statement against bids recognising added value, past success, crossover, innovation and evidence that they would work.</p> <p>Members also discussed the monitoring of this round and how success would be measured. Andrea advised that the Corporate Strategy & Partnerships Team at Suffolk County Council would discuss with the Suffolk Foundation providing monitoring and evaluation of the current round with a view to this being developed for the next round as discussed.</p> <p>ACTION: The PMG gave direction to officer to go through the details of the Delivery Partnership bids and fund as much as possible.</p> <p>ACTION: Corporate Strategy & Partnerships Team at Suffolk County Council to discuss monitoring and evaluation of current round with Suffolk Foundation.</p>
3.	<p>Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) Update</p>	<p>Jill Korwin introduced Paper B and explained the work that had gone into getting the data to this point with the gathering of data from partners, commentary from delivery partnerships, consolidation and consultation and review. Jill advised that a Performance Officer has now been allocated to each delivery partnership to provide support to embed meaningful activity measures and design proxy measures where necessary..</p> <p>Jill highlighted that it was hoped the paper and appendix would work as a reference document.</p> <p>Jill noted that key concerns at the end of year one were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attainment: Examined at PMG in May 2009 • Skills: Examined at PMG in March 2009 • Serious Violent Crime: (Alcohol/Substance Misuse) • Some indicators are only base line information giving less time for improvement • Some data is lagging i.e. CO2 emissions data is from 2006 • Link between delivery partnership action plans and the National Indicators targets <p>Jill introduced discussion on the CAA and how the process had been dealt with. Jill presented a slide which showed how all the work fitted together and advised that work is currently ongoing to produce a summary document.</p> <p>A presentation was given by Edwina Child, Audit Commission on progress to date on the CAA which provided a very helpful overview to members.</p> <p>Edwina noted that the public reporting would now be on 10 December 2009. It was also noted that the self assessment would close after this meeting.</p> <p>Stephen Baker referred to the housing report and stated that this had made him think of the previous item and how funding could be used to support these areas.</p> <p>A proposal was made that it would be great to see Suffolk how Suffolk compared against other areas and to link it with the "Total Place" project counting against the sum of money coming into Suffolk. It was agreed this should be done.</p>

		<p>Various points were made regarding the CAA presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency clearly views the project in Bawdsey as good practice. • To stand still on climate change would mean a doubling in investment. • Consideration should be given to education and skills transformation and innovation. It is not green flag but is a strand of exceptionally good work; the potential red tag relates to currently low attainment and skills levels in Suffolk. • Need for maximum value from third sector – assess how much other money is brought into the county by the sector. Need to show added value as well as outcome value. <p>ACTION: To show Suffolk against other areas and counting against the sum of money coming into Suffolk.</p>
<p>4. PMG Review of Progress to Date</p>		<p>Jill Korwin introduced this item and highlighted the following key points that had arisen from previous discussions:</p> <p>PMG – what has worked well so far</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic style “clinics” have provided a common focus across organisational boundaries. • Some actions for improvement successfully agreed e.g. ideas to more effectively support apprenticeships • Opportunities to understand / hear external perspectives • The concept of Chief Executives and senior key leaders driving the performance is the right way forward, i.e. a performance engine. <p>PMG – making the group more effective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for clarity around the relationship between the PMG and SSP Board and a clear understanding of PMG’s role. • PMG to have a more focussed strategic role and become “change agents” e.g. explore improvement actions that have been successful in other areas. • Greater value would be added if members supported individual delivery partnerships/themes where they have expertise. • Less time spent on looking at lots of data and more on identifying real solutions to support future outcomes. • Too “county council” focussed and not as inclusive as should be. <p>PMG members broke into three groups to discuss the following three questions, one per group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the experience of the Lives We Lead: The Leaders We Need project, what could PMG do differently? • How does PMG add value and link everything together within the SSP framework and the whole Suffolk System? • How has and can PMG stimulate collaboration across organisations and Delivery Partnerships?

Following fifteen minutes of group discussion members came back together and heard feedback from a spokesperson for each group.

Group 1 – Feedback by Dafydd Evans

- Passionate about Lives We Lead: Leaders We Need project
- This is not what PMG do, questioned why PMG is here
- Needs to be a thinking space / free thinking
- What is the fundamental role of PMG
- Who, What, Why – needs governance
- There is energy to work towards free thinking
- Delegate performance management to another group

Group 2 – Feedback by Geoff Rivers

- Ten years ago was very complicated
- Nine delivery partnerships, same pitfalls though as ten years ago
- Communication is the critical word
- Reduce number of delivery partnerships – nine too many
- Norfolk mirrored with outcome champions reporting on progress to this group
- Sure we know what delivery partnerships are trying to achieve, delivery partnership action plans have not been seen – this needs fixing
- How does PMG feed up to SSP Board, should PMG be change agents and remove barriers

Group 3 – Feedback by Stephen Baker

- Looking back had very little collaboration, increase in number of delivery partnerships had bad effect
- Cross cutting themes a mirage, not really collaboration
- Effectiveness of clinics, focus on information and awareness, not on actions, lack of understanding
- To improve collaboration needs consistency of attendance, this needs leadership from PMG
- Engage more effectively outside meetings and build network strength
- Different way of working needed
- Manage information to avoid information overload

Andrea summarised the feedback into three questions for consideration on how do we move forward:

- Need to reduce number of delivery partnerships?
- Change style of this group?
- Become change agents / remove barriers?

There was consensus that what the PMG does have to change and work to bring core themes together. The issue of who should look at performance reports was

		<p>considered and this is to be explored further.</p> <p>There was agreement that the number of delivery partnerships should not be altered at this stage. It was agreed there is a need to work better with what there is.</p> <p>It was also agreed that there is a need to challenge delivery partnerships to bring critical issues to the PMG, giving a dynamic meeting forum. This group can add value in a free thinking area – help to think outside this box on big issues.</p> <p>Andrea summarised that members felt the changes needed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give performance management responsibility to SSP Board • This group to become dynamic – refer up to SSP Board for ultimate sanction • Pick three or four issues to sort and focus on solving, better to make a big difference on three or four problems than a small difference to lots • Have an independent facilitator at meetings, not a chairperson. • Have better influence on SSP Board • This group will become change agents, remove barriers and be free thinking <p>Andrea stressed the importance of substitutes at today's meeting bringing this discussion and decisions made to the attention of the main attendees.</p> <p>It was agreed that each member should propose three issues, specific or generic, for the group to look at. All members should circulate this by email.</p> <p>It was also agreed that each delivery partnership should be asked for one cross cutting issue.</p> <p>Andrea asked for members to email her comments on how to do the next meeting. She would then circulate a proposal for member's comment.</p> <p>ACTION: Substitutes at today's meeting to bring this discussion and decisions made to the attention of the main attendees.</p> <p>ACTION: Performance reporting to be explored further by PPI.</p> <p>ACTION: PMG to become a more dynamic group with focus on solving issues and no longer having a chair, and instead an independent facilitator.</p> <p>ACTION: Each member to propose three issues, specific or generic, for the group to look at. All members should circulate this by email.</p> <p>ACTION: Each Delivery Partnership to submit one cross cutting issue.</p> <p>ACTION: Circulate proposal for next meeting to members for comment.</p>
5.	Any Other Business	<p>Andrea Hill invited all members of PMG to the Leadership Thinking session on Tuesday 14 July afternoon and evening. Invitations were circulated to members.</p> <p>It was noted that the date of the next meeting needs to be changed and alternative dates will be circulated to members.</p>