

## DRAFT MINUTES

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Suffolk Strategic Partnership Board</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup> September 2008</b>
<b>Place:</b>	<b>Police HQ, Martlesham Heath</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>3.00pm – 5.00pm</b>
<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b>Clare Euston, Independent Chair, SSP Board (CE)</b>  <b>Alastair McWhirter, Chair, Suffolk Primary Care Trust (Vice Chair) (AM)</b></p> <p><b>Simon Ash, Chief Constable, Suffolk Constabulary (SA)</b>  <b>David Barker, Suffolk Agricultural Association and Environment Spokesman (DB)</b>  <b>Jane Basham, Director, Ipswich and Suffolk Council for Racial Equality (JBasham)</b>  <b>Kathleen Ben Rabha, Community Affairs Advisor, Diocese St Edmundsbury and Ipswich (KBR)</b>  <b>John Budd, Chair, Suffolk Criminal Justice Board (JBudd)</b>  <b>Terry Clark, Chair, Suffolk Development Agency (TC)</b>  <b>John Clough, Partnerships Director, Suffolk County Sports Partnership (JC)</b>  <b>Tina Ellis, District Manager (Cambridgeshire and Suffolk), Job Centre Plus (TE)</b>  <b>Johanna Finn, Chair, Suffolk Learning &amp; Skills Council (JFinn)</b>  <b>Philip Hayes, Chairman, Suffolk Association of Local Councils (PH)</b>  <b>Sally Hogg, Head of Health Improvement Partnerships, Suffolk Primary Care Trust (SH)</b>  <b>Stephen Singleton, Chief Executive, The Suffolk Foundation (SS)</b>  <b>Dr Ann Williams, Principal, West Suffolk College (AW)</b>  <b>David Wood on behalf of Gulshan Kayembe, Chair, Suffolk Police Authority (DW)</b></p> <p><b><u>Local Strategic Partnership Chairs:</u></b></p> <p><b>Cllr Penny Clarke, Chair, Babargh East Local Strategic Partnership (PC)</b>  <b>Cllr John Griffiths, Chair, West Suffolk Local Strategic Partnership (JG)</b>  <b>Terry Hayward, on behalf of Cllr Elizabeth Harsant, Chair, One Ipswich Local Strategic Partnership (TH)</b>  <b>Cllr Ray Herring, Chair, Suffolk Coastal Local Strategic Partnership (RH)</b></p> <p><b><u>SLGA District/Borough Council Representatives:</u></b>  <b>Cllr John Fields, Mid Suffolk District Council (JF)</b>  <b>Cllr Nick Ridley, Babergh District Council (NR)</b></p> <p><b><u>Business Representatives:</u></b>  <b>Richard Perkins, Richard Perkins and Associates (RP)</b></p>

	<p><b><u>Voluntary Sector Representatives:</u></b>  <b>Jacqui Martin, Chief Executive, Suffolk Family Carers (JMartin)</b>  <b>Jonathan Moore, Chief Executive, Suffolk Association of Voluntary Organisations (JMoore)</b>  <b>Jo Searle, Chief Executive, East Suffolk Mind (JS)</b></p>
<b>Supporting Officers:</b>	<p><b>Lydia Crow, Partnerships Team, Suffolk County Council (LC) (minutes)</b>  <b>Jenny Foster, Partnerships Team, Suffolk County Council (JFoster)</b>  <b>Andrea Hill, Chief Executive, Suffolk County Council (Chief Executive Panel Representative) (AH)</b>  <b>Judith Mobbs, Areas Director, LSC (JMobbs)</b>  <b>Edwina Child, Audit Commission (EC) (observing)</b></p>

	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Relevant business considered, facts noted, the decision taken and its rationale</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	<p>CE welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>The following apologies were noted:  <b>Professor Robert Anderson, Pro Vice Chancellor, University Campus Suffolk</b>  <b>Tony Butler, Director, Museum of East Anglian Life</b>  <b>Tim Clarke, Customer Innovation Ltd</b>  <b>Susan Feary, Chair, Suffolk Magistrates' Association</b>  <b>Dawn Girling, Spokesman, Suffolk Wildlife Trust</b>  <b>Gulshan Kayembe, Chair, Suffolk Police Authority (David Wood attending)</b>  <b>Cllr Jeremy Pembroke, Leader, Suffolk County Council</b>  <b>Bernard Williamson, Chair, Great Yarmouth and Waveney Primary Care Trust</b></p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting (16<sup>th</sup> June 2008)</b>	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were approved. CE, following informal discussion with board members before the meeting, stated that local government restructuring for Suffolk would not be on the agenda as there were so many conflicting views and the previous week's meeting with the Boundary Committee had given most of the board members present ample opportunity to make their case. She repeated the Boundary Committee's request that written submissions should be sent to them for consideration as soon as possible.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>SSP and LAA Governance</b>	<p>AH sent her apologies for a late arrival at the meeting and asked RC to present the paper on her behalf. RC led through the paper on SSP and LAA Governance, explaining the reasoning behind the diagram and structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was queried whether there could be any duplication in membership at all between the Performance Management Group (PMG) and Delivery Partnerships (DPs). It was explained that the PMG was not meant to be representative of every single organisation as it concentrated on performance management only and also that, though individuals could not sit on both the PMG and a DP, an organisation could hold a place on both. It was also stated that, given the nature of small certain organisations, this would be monitored and reviewed in case it caused any</li> </ul>

		<p>significant problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact ‘health’ appeared in the titles of two DPs was queried. It was explained that there is a big difference between health, wellbeing and care, and the health economy. However, it was noted that this could cause issues to ‘slip between the gaps’ of the two groups. It was agreed that this would be monitored and reviewed.</li> <li>• JMartin stressed the need to show joint working between the DPs and the fact that some of the DPs will have other responsibilities (e.g. statutory commitments) as well as LAA targets to consider. It was noted that, in practice, the actual LAA targets might be a very small part of the work of the DPs, and that the exact role of the DPs needed to be explored in order to be consistent.</li> <li>• The DPs, though led by the aims of the Community Strategy, should nevertheless have the opportunity to take charge of issues affecting their focus areas. It was queried where overall strategic leadership sat in the structure with the answer being that it is hoped the structure is flexible enough to adapt on a ‘needs must’ basis for the SSP Board to show strategic leadership as necessary.</li> <li>• It was noted that the arrangements concentrated on the importance of delivery for the next 18 months, in response to the current political climate.</li> <li>• JBasham welcomed the PMG as an opportunity to embed ISCRE concerns throughout the structure as the organisation was not large enough to embed these concerns throughout all of the DPs.</li> <li>• It was noted that the relationship between the LSPs and DPs needs to be based on a two-way dialogue with the LSPs working out the relationships on an individual basis.</li> <li>• It was noted that the DPs acted as ‘gateways’ to further smaller partnerships and boards as necessary (e.g. Criminal Justice Board). These are not listed on the structure so as to keep the diagram neat and understandable.</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that the SSP has a positive strategy and there is a need to move on with the delivery, even if this means reviewing the structure as time passes.</p> <p>The Board were happy to accept the recommendations put forward.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Delivery Partnerships</b></p>	<p>JF led through the paper on Delivery Partnerships (DPs) explaining that, of nine partnerships, eight already exist. Work is currently being undertaken to formalise arrangements for each of the partnerships. It was stressed that the DPs offer a new way of working; they are not merely replacing the Block Boards. The focus will be on delivering outcomes rather than the LAA targets, with the by-product being that if the outcomes are delivered successfully then the targets will be met.</p> <p>Cross-cutting outcomes are already being flagged up and communicated to all DPs to ensure all outcomes are met.</p> <p>The Board were happy to note progress on the DPs.</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Making Suffolk Exceptional</b></p>	<p>RC led through the ‘Making Suffolk Exceptional’ paper, explaining that it was imperative that Suffolk does not lose focus during the LGR process, and instead</p>

		<p>focus its resources on positive outcomes. The project is being sponsored by RIEP, and supported by the National Leadership Centre for Local Government.</p> <p>The Board were asked only to be enthusiastic at this stage, and offer support in principle. Though the project will be consistent with the Community Strategy aims, not everything it focuses upon will be an LAA2 target. The aim is to engage different types of people through less formal meetings.</p> <p>It was noted that the county needs to overcome the mental hurdle of LGR, and that this is a fantastic opportunity for Suffolk to move forward as a county, ignoring all potential reorganisations and discovering social networks that would otherwise be untapped. At this stage, all comments are being taken on board and will be considered at the close of the foundation stage. Potential difficulties with language, cultures and age were all noted.</p> <p>The Board approved the project enthusiastically.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	There was no other business to discuss.
	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> December 2008, 3.00pm – 5.00pm (provisional)