

**Minutes of Coventry Partnership meeting held on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> January  
2005, The Alan Higgs Centre, Allard Way.**

**Present:**

Rob Allison	CVSC
Louise Beard	Chamber of Commerce
Sue Bent	Coventry Law Centre
Sarah Bhatat	Community Advocate
Sue Darling	Citizens Advice Bureau
Steve Dugmore	West Midlands Police
Roger Edwardson	Coventry City Council
Howard Farrand	Whitefriars Housing Group
Ray Goy	Henley College
Jane Griffith	Job Centre Plus
Robert Hulland	West Midlands Fire Service
Councillor Lakha	Coventry City Council
Stella Manzie	Coventry City Council
Councillor McNicholas	Coventry City Council
Les Ratcliffe	Jaguar Cars
Chris Smith	Community Advocate
Cllr Ken Taylor	Leader of Council
Andrea Whitworth	Government Office

**Apologies:**

Joan Allen	Community Advocate
Councillor Arrowsmith	Coventry City Council
Robert Browett	Peugeot Citroen
Janet Cairns	UHCW
Chris Duffield	West Midlands Police
Robert Dyson	Warwick University
Virginia Eneje	Community Advocate
Stewart Ferguson	Touchstone Housing
Kate Lee	WEETC Ltd
Trevor McCarthy	Community Alcohol Service
Councillor Mutton	Coventry City Council
Cllr Tony O'Neill	Deputy Leader, Council
Brinder Seni	Community Advocate
Peter Shearing	Learning & Skills Council
Laurence Tennant	Coventry Teaching PCT

**In Attendance:**

Sheila Bates	Coventry Partnership
Sarah Crawley	Coventry Partnership

Adrian Coles	Coventry City Council
David Galliers	Coventry Partnership
Kam Kaur	Coventry City Council
Jos Parry	Coventry City Council
Helen Shankster	Coventry Partnership
Lise Smith	Community Empowerment Network
Nigel Wain	Coventry Partnership
Adrian West	Coventry City Council
Andy Williams	Coventry City Council
James Russell	Coventry City Council

## **1. Welcome and introductions**

- 1.1.** Louise Beard chaired the meeting. She welcomed Chris Smith as a new Community Advocate.

## **2. Minutes of last meeting**

- 2.1.** Cllr Ken Taylor's apologies were not noted in the minutes. With this amendment, the minutes of the last meeting were agreed.
- 2.2.** Robert Hulland provided feedback on the issues arising from the report of the Environment Theme Group at the last meeting. He outlined the strategic direction of the Liveability programme, the type of local projects emerging from the programme, how the programme links with the work of Whitefriars and how both business and community can become involved. (Copy of tabled report attached at Annex 1 for those not present.) Stella Manzie noted the strong links between this programme and the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund of the Local Area Agreement. Robert agreed to provide an update of the programme in 4 months time.

## **3. Transport Theme Group Progress Report**

- 3.1** John McNicholas presented the progress of the group to the Partnership and showed a video which outlined the Swiftlink project that the group had commissioned.
- 3.2.** The following issues emerged in the ensuing discussion:
- The balance between the strategic role of the group and the need to address local issues is important but difficult to achieve;
  - It is important that the group addresses gaps in provision
  - It will be important but difficult to assess the future demand of Swiftlink
  - CEN would be interested in feedback on this work
  - Government is now looking at transport becoming a more regional matter
  - It may be useful to use the Partnership's website to explain the various responsibilities for transport
  - The Theme Group need to ensure that the different groups responsible for transport talk to each other

- The Theme Group should send issues that they receive to the groups that can address them and then “progress chase” the groups’ resulting action.
- Questions that are raised about transport should be forwarded both to Cllr Arrowsmith as Cabinet member with responsibility for transport and also to the Transport Theme Group.
- There is a need to promote Swiftlink more and to get businesses involved.
- There is a gap in the work of the Theme Group relating to other forms of transport such as walking and the use of cycles.
- There is a need for closer links between the Transport Group and the other Theme Groups
- There is a need to focus more upon issues relating to Community Safety and the needs of Young People.

**3.3.** Sarah Bhayat raised some specific issues relating to people with mobility problems and people who speak English as a Second Language which she will talk to the Theme Group about separately. (Two tabled reports are attached at Annex 2 for those not present.)

**3.4.** Howard Farrand said that the Partnership needs to know more about Swiftlink and how it worked.

**Action: Coventry Partnership Secretariat to help improve the links between the Transport Theme Group and other Theme Groups.**

**Action: Cllr McNicholas will circulate a paper giving more details about Swiftlink.**

#### **4. Children and Young Peoples’ Strategic Partnership Progress Report**

**4.1.** Stella Manzie as Chair of the Children and Young Peoples’ Strategic Partnership (CYPSP) presented the progress report for the group outlining its relationship to the LSP, achievements so far, future impact, how it adds value to the work of the Coventry Partnership and how LSP members can support its work.

**4.2.** Key issues that emerged in discussion were:

- The need to link to relevant charities
- The need to build upon the current good links with the voluntary sector
- The need to find ways of tracking the extent to which partners are acting differently as a result of the CYPSP.
- The need to link the inspection framework of the Children’s Service with that of the Local Area Agreement and the Partnership’s Performance Management Framework.
- The need to simplify the bureaucracy.

- The Directory of Services which is currently under development will help to describe which services are being delivered by which organisation.
- The need for the group to engage with Young People.
- Theme Groups need to create better linkages between children and other communities of interest
- We need to create ways of measuring whether people are actually experiencing change as a result of the work of the group

**4.3.** A tabled report giving the background to the CYPSP is available at Annex 3 for those not present.

**Action: The Partnership's Secretariat will develop ways of helping Theme Groups to focus more on Communities of Interest.**

## **5. Local Area Agreement (LAA)**

**5.1.** Stella Manzie explained that the most recent version of the LAA had been circulated to Partnership members on Monday and that a final version will be coming to the Partnership and the Council for their approval in early February.

**5.2.** The LAA Steering Group received some good feedback from Government Office last Friday with some helpful suggestions as to how to improve the document such as increasing the focus upon neighbourhoods.

**5.3.** Those people who wish to comment on and influence the next stage of the development of the agreement should contact Roger Hughes, Stella Manzie, David Galliers, Rob Allison or any of the other people involved in the development of the Agreement.

## **6. Partners as Employers – Your Commitment**

**6.1.** Jane Griffith highlighted an event taking place on 10<sup>th</sup> March on the hospital site which aims to create greater commitment amongst organisations to use their role as employers to help get more people from our priority neighbourhoods and communities back into employment. She urged Partnership members to attend and to sign the pledge enclosed in their papers.

**6.2.** Howard Farrand suggested using the Modern Apprenticeship scheme to deliver some of this work.

**6.3.** It was suggested that some of the wording was changed in the literature.

## **7. Health Theme group Leader.**

- 7.1.** David Galliers explained that Trevor McCarthy has secured a national advisory post with the government and will no longer be able to lead the Health Theme Group for the Partnership. Unless other members of the Partnership wish to take on this role, Trevor suggests that Chris Robinson is asked to become the Leader of the group for the Partnership.

**Action: David Galliers to notify members of this proposal by e-mail and inform the Health Group of any comments.**

## **8. Forward Planner.**

- 8.1.** David Galliers noted that members of the Partnership were invited to Henley College on 9<sup>th</sup> February for a meal to celebrate the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the college. There will be a short meeting beforehand with two items of business which are: Local Area Agreement and The Children's' Games.

## **9. Any Other Business.**

- 9.1.** Sheila Bates informed the Partnership that there will be a joint CEN/Coventry Partnership seminar on Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> February. This is the second feedback of the Partnership to the Community Empowerment Network. The last one was 12 months ago. One person is needed from each Theme Group to present an outline of their work and one activity in more depth.

**Action: Secretariat to contact each Theme Group for a representative.**

- 9.2.** David Galliers informed the Partnership that Allan French, Head of Customer Services & Business Information - Finance & ICT will be inviting Partnership staff to a seminar on 7<sup>th</sup> March at the Techno Centre. It is aimed at staff who wish to explore the possibility of sharing resources such as accommodation, training, advice lines, telephones etc with other organisations in order to improve services.
- 9.3.** David Galliers, on behalf of Chris Smith informed the Partnership that the BBC is collecting reminiscences of those who lived through World War 2. Colleagues can access this initiative through the BBC Website or by going to the Cathedral before September 27<sup>th</sup>.

## **10. Date of next Meeting**

- 10.1.** The next meeting will be at Henley College, 5.30-6.30 pm on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2005.

## Liveability Programme

At the Partnership Board's last meeting, further information was requested on the Liveability programme.

### 1. The Strategic direction of the Programme

Coventry's successful Liveability bid was designed to reflect local priorities and programmes including:

a) The **Coventry Community Plan**, particularly the environmental objective that: *"By 2010 people will see their neighbourhoods, parks and open spaces as more attractive and enjoyable places to be and these improvements will be more rapid in our priority neighbourhoods and communities"*.

The Coventry Partnership's Environment Theme Group terms of reference define these places and spaces in more detail:

- Green space - community gardens, open spaces and parks
- Urban space - pavements, roads and open spaces
- Built environment - use, maintenance and heritage of buildings
- Quality - access, cleanliness, design, maintenance, safety

The programme also supports other Community Plan priorities that are also part of the government's liveability agenda, including equality of access, community safety and transport. Coventry's Liveability proposal also reflected the Plan's own commitment to narrowing the gap.

b) The **City Council's review of its management of the street scene** including:

- The recent restructuring of the authority that reshaped the delivery of street scene services to deliver more efficient, accessible and customer focussed services;
- The Council's modernisation programme, which included the corporate objective to make radical improvements in Street Services;
- The Best Value Review of Street Scene.

c) The city's **Area Co-ordination, community safety and major physical regeneration initiatives**, such as NDC, Swanswell and Road Corridor Regeneration.

Links to the Safer and Stronger Communities block of the Local Area Agreement and Public Service Agreement 2 are now also being made.

### 2. A summary of local projects emerging from the Programme

The Environment Theme Group has developed a balanced portfolio, ranging from complex demonstration projects, which will have major benefits for the surrounding community, to simpler improvements that can be applied city-wide. There are four types of project:

### **A. Service reforms**

These were largely committed in the Liveability bid and have emerged as a result of the need to accelerate service improvements identified in the review of the Council's management of the street scene. To meet the Liveability timetable set by the ODPM, many of these are now completed or underway. Liveability funding is being used for 'up-front' investment to make lasting improvements to services. Examples include:

- **Hand-held digital assistants for front line staff** enabling equipment inspections to be undertaken recorded and downloaded without the need for several separate paper forms and will enable staff on the ground to be notified of issues requiring attention immediately. This will improve the speed of service response and the accuracy of recording and passing on information.
- **Improving access to services** will publicise services more widely and investment in telephone and information technology will ensure that customers are dealt with more quickly.
- **Training for frontline staff** will help to smooth the process of creating *area-based generic teams* by training grounds staff in cleansing methods and training cleansing staff in grounds maintenance.
- **Integration of fly-posting enforcement** with the dog-fouling and fly-tipping enforcement service will ensure better efficiency and co-ordination and a **city-wide drinking ban** in outdoor public places will extend the current City Centre ban to the whole city, reduce the risks of petty crime and anti-social behaviour and free up police time.

### **B. Demonstration projects**

Two flagship green space and one flagship streetscape project are proposed to test the Liveability criteria in Appendix A and test the effectiveness of the service reforms. Liveability investment will maximise external funding investment in both the **Longford Park (£250k)** and the **Far Gosford Street (£340k)** initiatives. In both cases, extensive public consultation, feasibility and design have already taken place and both projects are ready to be implemented. The **Memorial Park (£450k)** project aims to significantly improve access to, movement around and safety in the park by drawing on best practice to significantly improve access to the city's premier park. A process of consultation, particularly with disabled or excluded groups, will be required.

### **C. Block grant schemes**

In response to community concerns identified in the consultation mapping exercise about issues not already covered by existing initiatives, four block grant schemes are proposed. These will operate city-wide and account for nearly half the capital funding.

- a) **The green space block grant scheme (£400k)** will operate at two levels:
  - i) Minor actions that will improve the safety of existing green spaces (e.g. by cutting back vegetation, improving lighting, re-surfacing footpaths).
  - ii) Actions that require re-design of green spaces because they have either fallen derelict or no longer serve their intended function.
- b) **The Streetscape block grant scheme (£250k)** aims to reduce unnecessary street clutter and review the design and function of street features and furniture (e.g. surfacing, railings, kerbs, lights, bins) in the most congested areas.

c) ***The derelict, unsightly and neglected property grant scheme (£400k)***

recognises that the condition of private property can have as much impact on the public face of our environment as the public realm. Modelled on other property grant schemes, it will offer 75% grants, up to a maximum of £15,000, as an incentive to the owners of commercial properties and boundaries presenting a poor face to the public realm. Action will be concentrated in areas of greatest need.

d) ***The Neighbourhood shopping centres block grant (£400k)*** has been identified to match other funds to invest in high priority centres (e.g. Jardine Crescent, Jubilee Crescent).

### **D Investing in people**

A comprehensive ***staff training programme*** in Liveability issues is proposed to raise standards and skills in delivering national and local liveability to relevant employees of the City Council and other organisations, such as Whitefriars and Jacobs Babbie.

It is also proposed to train Capacity Building Officers and other area based staff to ***identify, train and work with local communities*** to establish and maintain 'street watch' and 'friends of' groups.

In addition to the Liveability Project Manager, the programme will also support a project officer to deliver the block grants and landscape/urban design support.

### **3. How the programme is linking with businesses**

Two of the proposed projects involve businesses directly – the *property block grant scheme* and the *neighbourhood shopping centre renewal fund*. Where appropriate, referrals will be made to other programmes e.g. CW 2000's carbon reduction programme.

### **4. How communities can engage with the programme**

Projects must be complete or well underway by March 2006 to meet the ODPM's timetable. This means that projects must be linked largely to existing initiatives, where delivery mechanisms are already in place and community consultation has already occurred. Projects have therefore emerged from a consultation mapping exercise, co-ordinated by the Environment Theme Group, which identified the Liveability issues of most concern to Coventry people. The Theme Group also agreed local and national Liveability criteria that potential projects must satisfy. Potential projects have been measured against these priorities and criteria, which are in Appendix A.

Some projects, such as Far Gosford Street and Longford Park, have already engaged extensively with the local communities. Other investment priorities in areas covered by Neighbourhood Plans have already been identified through the process of local consultation around these Plans. The implementation of these will provide the opportunity for local people to be involved in the design and implementation of smaller scale physical improvements. Competing projects will be scored by the



Environment Theme Group against the priorities and criteria in Appendix A. In areas not covered by Neighbourhood Plans, other methods of engaging communities will be used, including:

- A Ward Members drop-in on 25<sup>th</sup> January
- A meeting with the Coventry Empowerment Network on 9<sup>th</sup> February
- Working with Area Co-ordination to set priorities for the block grant schemes

For the *Streetscape block grant scheme*, members of local communities will be recruited to organised sessions to 'walk/ talk their street' and identify issues that need attention. These will then be implemented in the context of City Services' asset inventory of audit of street furniture.

## **5. How the programme links with Whitefriars**

Through the Council's review of the management of street services, there is already close liaison with Whitefriars to identify potential for joint working, sharing resources and good practice. Potential Liveability projects, particularly through the green space block grant, could occur on Whitefriars owned land and ways of engaging Tenants groups will be established.

## APPENDIX A

### **Priority issues**

1. Streets
2. Neighbourhood shopping areas
3. Design
4. Green spaces and places
5. Neglected buildings
6. Engaging communities

### **Local criteria**

#### ***Definite***

1. Long term benefit
2. Improves perception of city
3. Change and impact is evident in areas of greatest need
4. Deliverable within time required
5. Linked to service reform
6. Encourages joined up working
7. Can be mainstreamed and/or maintained/sustained
8. Has potential for community ownership and participation
9. Narrows the gap between neighbourhoods

#### ***Desirable***

1. Potential for developing good practice
2. Simplifies work practice
3. Results in permanent changes
4. Results in something memorable

### **Government criteria**

1. Makes the best use of the £3.4 million
2. Achieves Value For Money
3. Not just plugging gaps
4. Innovative and transferable
5. 'Adds value' to other programmes and initiatives
6. Maximises the value of match or complementary funding
7. Capable of evaluation

## Coventry LSP “Better Bus Stops”

### **A description of the scheme - what is it? What are the aims and objectives etc.**

The scheme has three elements:

i. Set up a half day partners seminar with those involved in public transport safety to determine the benefit of establishing an inter-agency “Safe Travel Forum”. This will audit existing initiatives in Coventry which impact on safer public transport and lead to an action plan to coordinate the work of the LSP and the Community Safety Strategy for this issue. This follows closely the approach of Wolverhampton and Birmingham City Councils. A number of projects will follow on from the action plan, including potentially:

ii. An add on to the PrimeLines Programme, in line with the programme timetable for its implementation, based on GIS Mapping of anti-social behaviour in the bus corridors being improved, and subsequent measures to address this anti-social behaviour e.g. shelter redesign / relocation, improved lighting, and environmental improvements.

iii. An audit of 2 “local estate” bus route bus stops serving Community Plan priority areas. This audit would consider:

- Stop/shelter safe location/environment
- Street crime GIS mapping audit within 50 metres of each stop
- Stop and shelter condition survey
- Optimum location of stops/shelters
- Other problems, e.g. parked cars, speed humps
- Information provision?

A programme of small scale improvements, compatible with Centro’s work programmes, would then follow in line with the recommendations of the audit.

This audit would be managed by Coventry City Council with Centro on the Steering Group. Study to be managed by the Coventry Transport Delivery Unit.

Recommendations for shelters would be implemented by Centro Development Team, in liaison with Centro Bus Strategy and Bus Infrastructure Teams. The scope for coordination of passenger information improvements would be considered as part of implementation of Centro’s Bus Passenger Information Strategic Plan.

Recommendations for stops would be implemented by Travel Coventry.

Recommendations for highway treatments would be implemented by Coventry Transport Delivery Unit.

The aims of the scheme will be to provide “better bus stops”, particularly in relation to community safety objectives and reducing perceived and actual personal security concerns over using bus services in Coventry.

- **Potential links to other groups and scheme ideas.**

The links of the proposed scheme are predominantly with the Community Safety theme group. There are also links with the Equalities and Communities theme, and the environment theme group.

- **Potential funding streams**

Funding would be sought from the LSP NRF. Other potential funding would be through Centro Local Transport Plan and revenue budget funding, Travel Coventry and Coventry City Council (any others?)

- **Supportive of the Transport Objective in the Community Plan?**

Yes.

- **Will add value to existing services?**

Yes

Jake Thrush, Centro  
Matt Collins, Coventry City Council

## **Swiftlink Community Transport Project**

### **The Problem**

Securing better access to transport is a key issue that cuts across many of the Community Plan Outcomes.

Half the people living in priority neighbourhoods do not have access to their own transport (compared to 23% in non-priority neighbourhoods). They are also far more likely to experience unemployment, poor health and disability. Lack of transport makes it more difficult for residents of priority neighbourhoods to access jobs, health services, places of learning, food shops, recycling facilities etc. that would bring improved quality of life.

### **Testing out a new solution**

A major focus of the Transport Theme Group over the last year has been to commission and oversee the development of a demand-led community-based transport, called 'Swiftlink'.

The project is being funded by Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and will provide a fleet of 3 fully accessible minibuses & 2 multi- purpose vehicles operating up to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to and from designated priority neighbourhoods in North East Coventry and Hillfields to specific employment, health, leisure and educational sites in the city.

The service is being delivered by Community Transport, and complements existing mainstream transport services - for example providing transport to help people to get to new jobs in development sites not served by public transport or to access shift-work at times when buses do not run. It will also take people to medical centres and hospitals so they can access health services.

It will take passengers on pre-booked journeys to and from designated areas on a "many to many" system. For instance, pick-ups will be initially only in the priority neighbourhoods of Wood End, Bell Green and Hillfields, and the destinations will be specific: Prologis Park, Walsgrave Hospital and Business Park, Middlemarch Business Park, Courthouse Green (for shopping and leisure) and the Arena and super-surgery sites when up and running.

### **Evaluation**

The Theme Group has commissioned the Community Research & Evaluation Service to conduct an evaluation of the project and help determine whether Swiftlink has beneficial impacts such as helping people to access jobs and health services. The research specification is set out below.

## **Evaluating the Swiftlink Transport Scheme: Draft Project Specification**

### **Summary of Project Aims**

The Focus of the NRF-funded project links to the objectives of the Community Plan's specific transport goals but also crucially as a cross cutting issue particularly in relation to goals in relation to jobs and economy, health and wellbeing. Swiftlink's immediate aims are to help provide access to work for the long term unemployed, and to improve access to health care. The transport scheme aims to provide flexible services that would not normally be available from existing public transport. This may be because of time of day, or route, i.e. the lack of cross city routes. The provision of the service is strongly evidenced by work in Coventry and elsewhere that indicates that transport problems serve as a significant barrier to people accessing jobs, especially on hard to access sites, and also the likely impact of shifts in city provision of health care. The project will be phased, initially starting in NE Coventry and Hillfields, and this evaluation specification focuses on providing an initial evaluation of this first phase [check that this is correct], although our hope is to sustain it for the duration.

### **Aims and Objectives of the Research**

In the light of the Project's objectives identified on the NRF form, and wider Community Plan objectives, this Evaluation of the first phase of the Swiftlink transport scheme will utilise the Coventry Partnership Evaluation Framework in order to:

- Take stock of the progress of the Swiftlink project to date, and start analysing the impact and outcomes of the service upon those who use it, triangulating and adding value to available statistical evidence gathered by the management team, with qualitative research to be conducted by CRES.
- Draw out any lessons that will be useful for extending the work for subsequent phases, and for eventual mainstreaming.

### **Key Research Questions**

There will be a focus on both process and impact evaluation. This will be conducted in terms of a 'realist' evaluation approach which takes account of both contextual and project effects in producing or inhibiting change. It also puts emphasis on the need to clearly articulate the 'theory of change' involved. As far as this project is concerned, we think the Joseph Rowntree Trust 'snakes and ladders' approach to poverty is relevant. What we take the broader aim of the Swiftlink scheme to be which we will be evaluating, is the extent to which transport offers a ladder out of poverty by providing access to sustainable employment which enhances people's incomes and wellbeing. It is this element also that links to wider Community Plan objectives.

The first phase will focus on access to jobs rather than health care [is this correct? – if not we will need to develop another set of impact and outcome criteria]

- (1) **Process issues:** How have and do those in the partnership involved in developing and launched the scheme worked together? What successes and problems have they encountered, and what lessons have been learned?
- (2) **Impact and Outcome issues:** What is the immediate impact of the Swiftlink service and what more lasting outcomes results occur as a result of using the service? There is an immediate concern with how well the service is appreciated and helpful, but also a longer term concern to track whether it helps to provide sustainable employment and ladders out of poverty.

The latter will need to be analysed in the light of who has used the service and why (including analysis of why others have not used it), and whether or not it has met their expectations. There will therefore be a focus on the impact on different groups e.g. by gender, race/ethnicity, age, economic status (i.e. in employment, on JSA, unemployed but not on JSA, on incapacity benefit, workless households), place of residence, refugee status etc. Some specific questions include:

- Who has and has not been accessing the service, and why?
- What immediate impact has it made, and what are the longer term outcomes in terms of 'ladders out of poverty' through access to jobs to those who have used it?
- Does the transport system allow employees to cover shift working and difficult to access locations that would otherwise not be feasible?
- What factors enhance success and minimise failure?
- Is Swiftlink a solution in its own right, or in conjunction with other community based approaches? How far do community transport solutions combine through partners with other forms of assistance to 'help people up ladders'?
- Would Swiftlink users have found other transport solutions to access jobs or not, and what are the relevant personal and financial costs – i.e. what is the added-value?
- Does the scheme enable people to sustain jobs?

## **Strategy and Methods**

The **process research** will commence with a collective participative research exercise to enable Swiftlink partnership members to take stock of progress and

experiences to date. This will be followed up with selective interviews with Core Group members and external partners.

The **impact and outcome research** will start with a workshop pulling together available statistical monitoring evidence and methods that the management team plan to use to assess the impact of the scheme, and establish how CRES can enhance this work. This could also involve one or two members of the Transport Theme Group. This will result in an agreed division of labour between Swiftlink management and CRES.

The Research Questions and Specification will then be finalised, and utilising the Coventry Partnership's Evaluation Framework, the programme of qualitative research will involve:

- Interviews with Project Members and Workers (4)
- Interviews with range of partners, e.g. employers, training providers, voluntary organisations, community groups, etc (9)
- Analysis of relevant project documentary materials and records
- Background documentary analysis, and brief visit to, similar practice elsewhere, e.g. the Salford project (4 days)
- Implications of other local research, e.g. Community Profiles of Hillfields and WEHM research (3 day desk research)
- Observation research of the Community Transport (6 events)
- Qualitative 'case study' narrative interviews with a sample of 'users' of Swiftlink to assess impact and relevance in light of their aspirations (20) – some of these could later be repeated to check outcomes in terms of 'distance travelled' and sustainable employment. As identified above, we would utilise the 'ladders out of poverty' approach developed by Joseph Rowntree Trust. It needs to be emphasized that we would not just seek to identify success stories, though hopefully some of these will emerge
- Analysis and writing up of results

Some interviews will be tape-recorded and transcribed. There may be a need to utilise interpreters and translators.

NB The above research resources could be provided by CRES but we would acknowledge that they relatively modest given the size and spend of the Swiftlink scheme.

### **Timetable**

Research will be completed and written up by September 2005.

### **Resources to be Deployed**

The work will be delivered within the resources allocated to the Transport Theme Group, which are a minimum of 55 Community Researcher, 10 Research Fellow, 4 Project Director and 2 Associate Director days. We estimate that it will involve around 50 days research, including the work involved in developing and implementing the Research Specification.



A CRES project costing methodology has been developed and the overall cost of the project against CRES resources, including both direct staff costs, and overhead and support costs, will be £14,003.

**Briefing Note**  
**Children Act 2004**

The Green Paper *Every Child Matters* took a wide-ranging approach to supporting children. It set specialist services, including child protection, within an overall framework of universal support for children and young people. It sought to improve outcomes for children by early intervention for families who require additional support. As a response to the report on the death of Victoria Climbié it also sought to safeguard children by improving accountability and encouraging partnership working.

Some of the measures identified in the Green Paper required legislation, and this is provided through the Children Act 2004, which passed into statute in November 2004.

Copies of the full documents can be downloaded as follows:

Every Child Matters [www.dfes.gov.uk/everychildmatters](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/everychildmatters)  
Children Bill (2004)  
[www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/pabills.htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/pabills.htm)  
Children Act <http://www.hms.gov.uk/acts/acts2004/20040031.htm>

**Main Measures in the Children Act 2004**

**Children's Commissioner**

A Children's Commissioner will be established with responsibility for promoting the views and interests of children in the United Kingdom. The Commissioner must involve and consult with children and have regard to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Commissioner will report to Parliament through the Secretary of State. The Commissioner will be in post by April 2005 with children involved in the process.

**A new duty on agencies to co-operate to improve the well-being of children and young people**

Children's services authorities such as Coventry must promote co-operation within the authority and with partners who, in turn, are required to co-operate with the authority to improve children's well-being. Well-being covers physical and mental health, protection from harm and neglect, education and training, contribution to society and social and economic well-being. Partners can establish pooled funds to carry out this duty.

Partners include police, probation, district councils where relevant, Strategic Health Authorities and PCTs, Connexions, and the Learning and Skills Council.

## **A duty to make arrangements to safeguard and promote the welfare of children**

Partner agencies are required to discharge their functions with regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. They must also ensure that any body providing services on their behalf must do the same. The purpose of this duty is so that agencies give appropriate priority to safeguarding children and share concerns at an early stage to encourage preventative action.

Partners include Children's services authorities, district councils, Strategic Health Authorities, PCTs, NHS trusts, police, probation, youth offending teams, governors of prisons or secure training centres, Connexions

## **A power to set up a new database with information about children**

The Secretary of State may establish regulations to require children's services authorities to set up local databases of information about children or may make regional or national arrangements. There may also be secondary legislation on matters such as security, access and management of information. The purpose is to facilitate information sharing where there are concerns about a child's safety or well-being.

## **Local Safeguarding Children Boards**

Children's services authorities must establish Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCB) to replace area child protection committees with statutory membership from 'Board partners'. The partners include those identified above, plus the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service. There is a duty of co-operation between the children's services authority and Board partners. The purpose of LSCBs is to co-ordinate the work of Board partners for the purpose of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children and to ensure effectiveness. Two or more children's services authorities may decide to form a joint LSCB.

## **A Director of Children's Services**

Children's services authorities in England must appoint a Director of Children's Services to be accountable for all local authority children's education and social services and any services for children provided on behalf of the NHS under section 31 of the Health Act 1999 (which provides for local authorities and the NHS to pool budgets, provide integrated services and lead commissioning of services). The Local Authority Social Services Act 1970 will be amended to require Directors of Adult Social Services. The Children and Young Persons Act 1933 which requires a Chief Education Officer will also be amended.

### **A lead council member for children's services**

Children's services authorities in England must designate a lead member for the arrangements covered by the post of Director of Children's Services. Guidance will indicate that the lead member should have a specific focus on child protection.

### **A framework for inspection and joint area reviews**

An integrated Framework will be devised by the Chief Inspector of Schools in consultation with other bodies including the Commission for Social Care Inspection and the Commission for Healthcare Audit and Inspection. Inspecting bodies have a duty of co-operation for the purposes of inspections and reviews. Joint area reviews to evaluate the extent to which children's services improve the well-being of children in the area will take place.

### **New powers of intervention in failing authorities**

Powers under the Education Act 1996 to secure proper performance of local education authorities' functions will be extended to cover children's social services functions.

### **A duty to promote the educational achievement of looked after children**

Section 22 of the Children Act 1989, which requires authorities to safeguard children and promote their welfare, will be amended to include a particular duty to promote the educational achievement of looked after children.

**Minutes of Coventry Partnership meeting held on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2005,  
Alan Higgs Centre, Pinley**

Joan Allen	Community Advocate
Madeleine Atkins	Coventry University
Stephen Banbury	CVSC
Sheila Bates	Chair, Community Empowerment Network
Louise Beard	Chamber of Commerce
Sue Bent	Coventry Law Centre
Sarah Bhayat	Community Advocate
Chris Duffield	West Midlands Police
Robert Dyson	Warwick University
Virginia Eneje	Community Advocate
Howard Farrand	Whitefriars Housing Group
Stewart Ferguson	Touchstone Housing
Mike Fowler	Coventry Cyrenians
Ray Goy	Henley College
Jane Griffith	Job Centre Plus
Robert Hulland	West Midlands Fire Service
Councillor Lakha	Coventry City Council
Stella Manzie	Coventry City Council
Cllr Tony O'Neill	Deputy Leader, Council
Brinder Seni	Community Advocate
Peter Shearing	Learning & Skills Council
Les Ratcliffe	Jaguar Cars
Chris Robinson	Community Alcohol Service
Sara Roach	Community Safety Team
Max Sahota	West Midlands Police
Steve Stewart	Connexions
Laurence Tennant	Coventry Teaching PCT
Andrea Whitworth	Government Office

**Apologies:**

Councillor Arrowsmith	Coventry City Council
Robert Browett	Peugeot Citroen
Janet Cairns	Coventry & Warks University Hospital
Sue Darling	Citizens Advice Bureau
Roger Edwardson	Coventry City Council
Kate Lee	WEETC Ltd
Councillor McNicholas	Coventry City Council
Councillor Mutton	Coventry City Council
Cllr Ken Taylor	Leader of Council
Simon Vasey	Eon Energy

**In Attendance:**

David Galliers	Coventry Partnership
Helen Shankster	Coventry Partnership
Sarah Crawley	Coventry Partnership
Lise Smith	Community Empowerment Network
Anne Skene	
Adrian Coles	Coventry City Council
Andy Williams	Coventry City Council

**1. Welcome and introductions**

- 1.1. Louise Beard welcomed Madeleine Atkins (Coventry University) Chris Robinson (Community Alcohol Service) and Max Sahota (West Midlands Police) to the meeting.

**2. Minutes of Last meeting**

- 2.1 Minutes from the last meeting were agreed.
- 2.2 The Neighbourhood Management presentation was deferred and will take place at the July meeting.

**3. Housing Theme Group**

- 3.1 Stewart Ferguson presented the Housing Theme Group progress report. He outlined the make up of housing within the city and explained how it needs to develop in order to improve the "housing offer" to citizens and prospective citizens.
- 3.2 Stewart outlined how the Theme Group had restructured itself and revised its membership and also described the activities that the group had commissioned.
- 3.3 He said that Coventry needs to make its case for more investment in housing both regionally and nationally.
- 3.4 The following issues were raised in discussion:
- Links need to be made between the Housing Group's' One Stop Shop' and similar facilities within local communities.
  - The work of the Housing Group needs to be closely linked with the work of the NDC.

**4. Senior Managers' Seminar**

Sarah Crawley reported that this event, which took place in October 2004, had proved to be very successful, with a very high commitment from senior managers drawn from Partner organisations. 54% of participants said that their understanding of the Coventry Partnership had increased 12% said it had stayed the same and 34% said their understanding of the Partnership had increased a lot. Participants made a number of pledges. 46% of these had

been completed and 24% are currently being actioned which showed that the majority of participants had delivered on their promised actions.

**4.1 It was agreed that another Senior Managers' seminar should be organised for this coming year**

**5. Code of Conduct**

- 5.1** David Galliers reminded the meeting that Trevor McCarthy had suggested that the Partnership develop a code of conduct in order to ensure that members of the Partnership Board and the Theme Groups have a degree of protection against possible conflicts of interest. He said that Sarah Crawley will be sending an e-mail version to Board members and Theme Group members asking them to complete the attached form within 28 days. If colleagues were unsure as to the details of the Code of Conduct, they should ring Hema Chauhan or Sarah on 02476 539149 who will be happy to advise them.

**The Code of Conduct was agreed.**

**6. Crime & Disorder Strategy**

- 6.1** Sara Roach explained the new strategy and how it has been developed. Over the last three years the achievements of the group has been recognised locally and nationally The group has decided to take a Thematic approach to reflect the Local Area Agreement and are now working with the Environment Theme Group on Liveability issues and other agencies such as CEN and Neighbourhood Management to provide greater support to communities.
- 6.2** Reducing harm from illegal drugs is a key theme of the Strategy and the Community Safety group is working with the Health Theme Group and New Deal for Communities to learn from good practice.
- 6.3** In relation to Offender Management, The Home Office and the Community Safety Group are keen to ensure that the right help gets to the right people at the right time.
- 6.4** 'Reducing crime' including crimes against businesses is still a key issue in the new strategy and there are many activities in operation to address this issue including gating schemes and work on anti-social behaviour.
- 6.5.** Another key theme in the new strategy is Children and Young People. The group is working with the Children & Young Peoples' Strategic Partnership on this theme.
- 6.6** Discussions took place in small groups and the following issues were raised:
- The communities need to be assured in order that they can feel comfortable when working with the police/community safety teams.

- It is important to recognise the contribution that communities can make to the success of community safety schemes and to learn from good practice.
- The New Deal for Communities project on drugs is good practice. Funding is falling out and we must learn from good practice.
- A community cohesion strategy is needed.
- There is a need to celebrate success, and educate the media to create positive stories and not damage positive news with negative coverage.
- There maybe potential to develop a cohesion strategy via the Equalities & Communities theme group. This would benefit the whole city.
- We need to talk to the Government to broaden the spectrum of funding. Perhaps the Local Area Agreement will help this..

## **7. Forward Planner**

- 7.1** A further Senior Managers' Seminar will be added to the Forward Planner along with a presentation on Neighbourhood Management in July.
- 7.2** Ray Goy said that the game Trouble is being launched at the Education Exhibition, at the NEC on Friday 18<sup>th</sup> March and the Coventry Partnership logo is being used on the game's box.
- 7.3** Jane Griffiths from Job Centre Plus thanked everyone for the success of the Partners as Employers event. A number of pledges were made by organisations at the seminar which took place at the Clinical Science Building, Walsgrave Hospital,
- 7.4** Louise Beard said that the recent Customer Services Seminar was very successful, with attendance of over 60 people and a range of commitments to action.
- 7.5.** Sheila Bates said that there was not enough follow-up of issues raised by CEN at Board meetings.

**Action: Specific issues will be minuted and sent to Theme Groups by the Partnership Secretariat for response. These will then be taken up in the following Partnership meeting under Matters Arising.**

- 7.6** Robert Hulland informed everyone of a Seminar taking place at the Techno Centre on 'Liveability' on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> April. Details will be sent out by Sarah Crawley.
- 7.7** A big thank you went to Louise Beard for her excellent work as Chair of the partnership. The next Chair will be Councillor Ken Taylor.

## **8. Date of next meeting**

- 8.1** The next meeting will be on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> May, at 5.00pm – 7.00pm at the Alan Higgs Centre, Allard Way, Pinley.



**Minutes of Coventry Partnership meeting held on Wednesday  
18<sup>th</sup> May 2005, Alan Higgs Centre, Pinley**

**Attendance:**

Andrea Whitworth	Government Office
Brinder Seni	Community Advocate
Chris Robinson	Community Alcohol Service
Cllr Arrowsmith	Coventry City Council
Cllr Ken Taylor	Leader of Council
Cllr McNicholas	Coventry City Council
Cllr Tony O'Neill	Deputy Leader, Council
Councillor Lakha	Coventry City Council
Howard Farrand	Whitefriars Housing Group
Jane Beaver	Job Centre Plus
Jane Griffith	Job Centre Plus
Joan Allen	Community Advocate
Keith Williams	PCT
Les Ratcliffe	Jaguar Cars
Madeleine Atkins	Coventry University
Max Sahota	West Midlands Police
Mike Fowler	Coventry Cyrenians
Peter Shearing	Learning & Skills Council
Ray Goy	Henley College
Robert Dyson	Warwick University
Robert Browett	Peugeot Citroen
Robert Hulland	West Midlands Fire Service
Sheila Bates	Chair, Community Empowerment Network
Simon Vasey	Eon Energy
Stella Manzie	Coventry City Council
Stephen Banbury	CVSC
Steve Stewart	Connexions
Sue Darling	Citizens Advice Bureau

**Apologies:**

Chris Duffield	West Midlands Police
Councillor Mutton	Coventry City Council
Janet Cairns	Coventry & Warks University Hospital
Kate Lee	WEETC Ltd
Roger Edwardson	Coventry City Council
Sarah Bhayat	Community Advocate
Stewart Ferguson	Touchstone Housing
Virginia Eneje	Community Advocate

**In Attendance:**

Andy Howitt	
Andy Williams	Coventry City Council
Bridget Mauldridge	Government Office
Carol West	Whitefriars Housing
David Galliers	Coventry Partnership
Helen Shankster	Coventry Partnership
Kam Kaur	Coventry City Council
Sarah Crawley	Coventry Partnership

**1. Welcome & Introductions**

Cllr Ken Taylor the new Chairman of the Coventry Partnership welcomed everyone.

**2. Minutes of the last meeting**

Minutes of last meeting were agreed. There were no matters arising

**3. Communications Group Progress Report**

Howard Farrand presented the work of the Communications group.

He said that the role of the group was to coordinate communications and give a lead to the Partnership on communications.

The communications group is there to support the theme groups but not to do the work for them. It offers support and expert advice on communications. It is important that each Theme Group thinks about a communication strategy before new projects take place. The Communications Group will monitor the groups' progress in terms of media coverage and will provide support where necessary.

Whilst the Partnership has reached a potential audience of 572,000 through various local and national media outlets we need to improve our targeting and ensure that each audience is addressed through appropriate media. The Group has got some feedback for example that we make better use of radio for some groups.

The Communication Group will shortly be overhauling the website, and making connectivity through the web friendlier. At present the group are in the process of re-tendering for consultancy support and will be providing greater support to groups through a broader membership of the Communication Group.

In discussion following the presentation the following issues were raised:

- The Partnership could make use of Hillfields local radio

- The Environmental Group's Liveability Project is sponsoring Young People to communicate with their peer group for the project.
- More use could be made of Speakeasy
- The Children & Young Peoples Partnership is training young reporters who could be used to help target the younger audience.

#### **4. Local Area Agreement**

Stella reported that discussions have been taking place with the Government office to clarify some issues.

The LAA Steering Group will be reconvened and will develop some proposals as to which groups and individuals will be accountable for the delivery. The group will also be proposing ways in which we can use a single system for monitoring and evaluating the LAA, the Local Public Service Agreement and the Community Plan.

The proposals will come back to the next Partnership for consideration.

#### **5. Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI)**

Jane Griffiths reported on this new initiative which is designed to help enterprise in the most deprived communities. It will act as the 4<sup>th</sup> strand of the LAA. There is potential to bid for up to 10 million pounds per year.

The Jobs and Economy Theme Group ran a seminar which was well attended, to discuss possible ideas with a wide range of partners. Over the summer the Council will put a draft proposal together and if successful the 1<sup>st</sup> phase will commence in April 2006.

Jane thanked Paula Deas, Dave Hill and Rebecca Young for all their work.

As Jane is to retire this month, Jane recommended that her successor Jane Beaver take her place on the Partnership and as Leader of the Jobs & Economy Theme Group.

#### **This was agreed by the Partnership**

Stella thanked Jane on behalf of the Partnership for her work in helping to deliver the Community Plan. She also reported that Laurence Tennant retired earlier in the month and she thanked him in his absence for his valuable contribution.

#### **6. Neighbourhood Management**

Stella reported that the Neighbourhood Management initiative is moving forward and that the boundaries of the revised structure would be based on the police OCU boundaries.

Three District Managers have been appointed, Phil Dunn, Jackie Fox and John Payne. A letter will be sent out to residents and groups to keep them up to date with progress.

September is the target date to have everything in place.

Tony O'Neill reinforced the need to keep residents well informed.

Max Sahota said it was an exciting proposal and the police are fully supportive of the developments as they move towards neighbourhood policing. The approach that will be taken will be the 'Active Intelligence Mapping (AIM) system which is a targeted problem solving approach between partners/organisation.

As the developments take place, Area Coordination will carry on as usual.

## **7. Cultural Partnership**

Liz Millet presented the Cultural Partnership's contribution to the delivery of the Community Plan.

She outlined:

- What Culture Covers.
- Who is on the Cultural Partnership
- How leisure and culture can and does contribute to the regeneration across all the Community Plan Themes.

She said that it would not be appropriate to add a 'Culture' theme to the Community Plan. The Cultural Partnership wants to work more closely with all the theme groups and the whole Partnership.

Liz mentioned that the Cultural Partnership meets every quarter and wants to develop projects across their organisations

### **Sheila requested that a CEN member join the Cultural Partnership.**

The Partnership discussed how the Cultural Partnership could become more involved. The following options were identified:

- Feed members into Theme Groups from the Cultural Partnership.
- Focus its efforts in Equalities & Communities Theme Group.
- Seek advice on activities from the Equalities & Communities Theme Group and vice versa.

- A member from the Coventry Partnership should sit on the Cultural Partnership with some coordination between the two.
- Link Cross Cutting Advisors to the Cultural Partnership. They can then feed issues into Theme Groups.

The general view was that there should be more links between the Cultural Partnership and Coventry Partnership.

**Action: The Operations Group to consider the above options and to bring back some proposals to the next Coventry Partnership meeting and that of the Cultural Partnership.**

## 8. Lady Godiva Half Marathon

Helen Kelly outlined this project which originated in the Health of Coventry Group. With funding support from NRF, it aims to help reduce health inequalities through increasing participation in physical activity and focusing mainly on priority neighbourhoods and communities of interest. The Half Marathon includes running, walking at all levels, corporate team entries, fund raising for charities and events for different ages.

The 3 official charities have been chosen and these are:

- Coventry Mind
- Enterprise Centre for Disabled People
- Tamarind Centre

NT Aerospace have become the first corporate sponsor, others are being sought.

The Sports Development Team has a 'hands on' approach within the priority neighbourhoods to raise awareness of this event.

The following offers and suggestions were made:

- Howard Farrand offered to advertise in the Whitefriars publication
- Jane Beaver offered to have leaflets to distribute at all their Job centre outlets.
- Les Ratcliffe suggested that transport may be needed to ferry participants from the more deprived neighbourhoods to and from the venue.
- Using Swiftlink was suggested.
- The initiative could make stronger links with the NDC.
- The Community advocates could be used to publicise the events.

## **9. City Council Draft Corporate Plan**

Cllr Ken Taylor said that the Council under a new administration remains totally committed to the Partnership and the Community Plan, to help provide best quality and diminish deprivation. He said that we need to improve our overall services and to narrow the gap between the most deprived communities and the rest of the city. He stressed that we need to work with our partners including our voluntary organisations to improve our services and that the voluntary sector play a valuable role in our work

The draft plan will go to cabinet on the 21<sup>st</sup> June. It is not a fixed document at the moment, so there is still time to discuss and make amendments to it.

### **Comments:**

- It is good to hear the Council is valuing the voluntary sector and its role in the city.
- It's important that people comment on the Plan and influence it.
- It's also important that the existing workforce gets the opportunity to up skill themselves to take advantage of the higher skilled job opportunities.
- The Corporate Plan has to be general, but underneath it, there sits a range of more detailed plans.
- Feed back was requested by Cllr Taylor.

## **10. Liveability Update.**

Robert Hulland drew the meeting's attention to the Liveability Update that was requested in January.

He said that Appendix A identified the priorities of the programme, and the local and government criteria. Appendix B details the budget allocated to the specified areas. Appendix C describes how the 4 block grants were to be promoted. Over 100 applications have been received. 5 out of the 8 of the planned initiatives have already commenced and it is hoped that all eight started by September

## **12. Forward Planner**

**12.1** David said that at the next meeting the Partnership will receive a draft annual report, an update of the Partnership/CEN protocol and a report on Neighbourhood Management. He said that private sector colleagues would like to present an update on the Business Charter for Social Responsibility in September.

**12.2** Stella asked for feedback on the venue. It was felt that the venue was good but that the acoustics could be improved.

- 12.3** Peter Shearing asked everyone to look at the evaluation report of the Common Purpose Infuse programme that had taken place. He said that the Learning Regeneration Partnership thought it was a good programme and would like to repeat it using a 'fee-based' system to finance it.
- 12.4** Robert Hulland announced that he would like to retire as Leader of the Environment Theme Group and would like to nominate Bob Keith to take his place.

**This was agreed subject to the support of the Theme Group.**

**13 Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2005,  
at 5.00pm -7.00pm at the Alan Higgs Centre, Allard Way, Pinley.

**Minutes of Coventry Partnership meeting held on Wednesday  
14<sup>th</sup> July 2005, Alan Higgs Centre, Pinley**

**Attendance:**

Alan Durham	Chamber of Commerce
Bob Keith	Groundwork
Bridget Mauldrige	Government Office
Brinder Seni	Community Advocate
Cllr Ken Taylor(Chair)	Leader of Council
Jane Beaver	Job Centre Plus
Max Sahota	West Midlands Police
Mike Attwood	Coventry PCT
Mike Fowler	Coventry Cyrenians
Peter Shearing	Learning & Skills Council
Ray Goy	Henley College
Robert Browett	Peugeot Citroen
Robert Dyson	Warwick University
Robert Hulland	West Midlands Fire Service
Sarah Bhayat	Community Advocate
Sheila Bates	Chair, Community Empowerment Network
Stella Manzie	Coventry City Council
Stephen Banbury	CVSC
Steve Stewart	Connexions
Sue Darling	Citizens Advice Bureau
Virginia Eneje	Community Advocate

**Apologies:**

Cllr John Mutton	Coventry City Council
Cllr Tony O'Neill	Deputy Leader, Council
Councillor Mutton	Coventry City Council
Howard Farrand	Whitefriars Housing Group
Les Ratcliffe	Jaguar Cars
Madeleine Atkins	Coventry University
Cllr Ram Lakha	Coventry City Council

**In Attendance:**

Adrian Coles	Coventry City Council
Andy Williams	Coventry City Council
Anne Skeene	CEN
Cynthia Jordane	Coventry University
David Galliers	Coventry Partnership
Janice Nicholls	Coventry City Council
Kam Kaur	Coventry City Council
Lise Smith	CVSC
Nigel Wain	Coventry Partnership
Phil Jones	CEN



**1. Welcome & Introductions**

Cllr Ken Taylor (Chair of the Coventry Partnership) welcomed everyone. In particular he welcomed Mike Attwood, the new Joint Chief Executive from the PCT who was attending for the first time, Bridget Mauldrige who attended for Mike Tovey the Partnership's new GOWM link and Edith Galliers an officer from Wellingborough Council. Cllr Ken Taylor asked Bridget to pass on thanks from the Partnership to Andrea for her support and advice. He also read out a card from Jane Griffiths who had retired in May.

**2. Minutes of the last meeting**

Minutes of last meeting were agreed. There were no matters arising which were not already on the agenda.

**3. CEN/LSP Protocol**

Rob Allison and Sheila Bates updated the partnership with progress on the CEN / LSP Protocol.

The protocol covers CEN representation on the LSP. (The slides which were tabled are attached as Appendix 1. )

Rob said that much progress has already been made. CEN reps regularly attend Theme group meetings, The CEN newsletter, Speakeasy, now contains detailed articles on LSP issues. Saturday workshops involving LSP members and Theme Groups have been particularly successful at linking the community to the Partnership. Rob identified some areas which needed more work i.e. Community involvement with LSP partners, broadening the pool of voluntary and community sector representatives, involvement with Regional and national policy consultations and ensuring the representation is meaningful.

The partnership was asked to confirm support for the following recommendations:-

- That LSP partners to supplement the Core funding of CEN from Mar 2006.
- That CEN becomes a strong partner in the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund LAA Agenda.
- That questions raised by Community Advocates at LSP meetings are responded to before the next LSP meeting.
- That CEN has a standing item on LSP agendas
- That All Theme groups have a standing CEN agenda item.
- That Theme groups ensure that Voluntary and Community Sector people are given the opportunity to influence decisions.

Sheila Bates finished with her 3 wishes for CEN which were that:

- CEN adds value by linking Theme groups to the Community
- Theme groups would respond to long term strategic issues raised through grass roots issues
- A mechanism is developed to draw all local intelligence together to obtain a clear picture of Coventry

Sheila committed that CEN would deliver the first wish.

Stella responded that the these very practical proposals from CEN should be followed by the Partnership Secretariat with Theme Group Advisors as necessary.

**Action: The Partnership Secretariat to work with advisors and Theme groups to respond to the CEN proposals.**

Stella also made the following points

- Input from communities to the Partnership and service providers comes from many different sources including Neighbourhood Management.
- The sharing of this information is a big issue which we have started to address with our Data Sharing Partnership and this would be developed further.
- The issue of funding of CEN by the Partners must be looked at. It could be addressed through a "patchwork" of mainstream and NRF once the future allocations and regulations were agreed.
- Stella expressed disappointment for Bridget to pass on to GO at the way the funding for CEN had been reduced.

#### **4. Cultural Partnership**

David Galliers updated the meeting with the recommendations from the Operations group re improving links with the cultural partnership. :

- The Cultural Partnership should have a seat on the Coventry Partnership
- The Cultural Partnership should, once the Council's Head of Culture and Leisure is in post, lead on delivering the following Community Plan priority:

*"Work to increase the quality and choice of local facilities and local public services including cultural and leisure opportunities"*

- A LSP Board member from the Community Empowerment Network should sit on the Cultural Partnership and should represent the LSP.

- A Cross-Cutting Adviser (Nigel Wain) should be the operational link with the Cultural Partnership and should feed issues from the Cultural Partnership to relevant Theme Groups and vice versa.
- The Cultural Partnership should report on its progress in delivering aspects of the Community Plan to the Coventry Partnership in the same way that Theme Groups report.

Sheila commented that by offering a place on the board to the Cultural Partnership we may be opening the door to requests from other partnerships. Stella replied that Culture and Leisure should really have been included as a Community Plan Theme and the Cultural Partnership can be considered similar to a Theme group.

Brinder Seni asked what the process was for adding new members to the Partnership board; Dave replied that the constitution allowed for the co-opting of members with specialist skills.

Sarah Bhayat asked if the CEN steering group would be asked to nominate the representative to join the cultural partnership board and asked why the representative needed to be an existing CEN LSP board member.

Stella confirmed that the CEN steering group should nominate the person to join the Cultural Partnership. Stella also replied that an existing board member would ensure the LSP board was linked to the Cultural Partnership, If this was not to be the case then the LSP would need to reconsider how links at the board level were maintained.

**Action: The CEN steering group to nominate a representative to join the Cultural partnership.**

Mike Attwood commented that Leisure and Culture contribute heavily towards health outcomes so he commended any proposal which achieved 2-way accountability and integrated thinking between the partnerships.

## **5. Household Survey**

Cynthia Jordane presented the findings from the Coventry Partnership Annual Household survey.

These showed mix results with the gap for Priority Neighbourhoods narrowing for 5 targets (recycling, feeling hopeful about the future, Smoking Cessation, satisfaction with bus services and households with no-one in paid work) but not narrowing for 4 (satisfaction with neighbourhood as a place to live, satisfaction with cleanliness, antisocial behaviour and feeling unsafe at night).

David Galliers summarised the major actions from the Theme groups which are already in hand to address these issues.

Mike Fowler commented that the survey was a valuable resource but requested that consideration be given to asking the views of people living in temporary accommodation.

Sue Darling was concerned that the results were questionable as this years survey was held at a different time of year. This fact had been recognised by the team and will be addressed in any future survey.

Some debate followed about capturing the views of all the communities of Interest listed in the Community Plan. Stella asked if the PIE group could look at the way the Partnership focuses on the needs of the different communities if interest.

Stella reiterated the value of the household survey and its usefulness in measuring progress. The Government Office has also recognised its value. It is recognised as national best practice

Stella pointed out that the funding for surveys was not in place and circulated a letter to all partners asking them to consider contributing towards the £31,000 cost of next year's survey and to use the survey in place of existing survey work where appropriate. Stella's letter is attached as Appendix 2.

Stella also noted the good evaluation work that CRES (Community Research and Evaluation Service) has done for the Partnership. She asked all partners to help to continue this work (again noted as national best practice) by inviting CRES to tender for any relevant work within their organisations.

**Action: Partners to respond to David Galliers by the end of July regarding support for the Household Survey.**

**Action: Partners to invite CRES to tender for relevant work**

**Action: PIE to look at ways in which the Partnership can focus on Communities of Interest**

## **6. Environmental Inequity Study**

Bob Keith presented the results of a study into environmental inequity. The presentation is attached as appendix 3.

The main conclusions of were:

- The environment is integral to the quality of life
- People living in deprived neighbourhoods in our area experience a lower quality of environment
- A poor environment deters business investment

- Poor environmental, economic and social conditions are mutually reinforcing
- Environmental improvements attract business and bring benefits in health, skills, community development, community safety, education, youth, housing and employment
- Greater integration of environmental regeneration required across Community Plans, RZ Implementation Plan, European programmes and development plan system

Virginia Eneje asked how the Environment Theme group could ensure that environmental issues could be put on the agenda of the other Theme groups. It was suggested that the theme Group Leaders meeting would be the best forum for ensuring this happens.

Stella commented that we had probably focused too heavily on the Liveability agenda and now was the time to take forward the recommendations from the study.

Mike Attwood suggested that the Environment Theme group should hold Partner organisations to account for their environmental impacts.

**Action: Bob Keith to produce a note on how the Partnership's Theme groups can take the recommendations forward led by the Environment Theme Group**

## 7. Coventry Partnership Review 2005

Robert Dyson presented a report on the progress of the Partnership this year and recommended some improvement objectives. The slides are attached as Appendix 4

The self assessment process for the year had generally been positive. The Government were increasingly focusing on BME issues and Floor Targets as well as "narrowing the gap". These priorities were confirmed by government very late in the self assessment programme

Robert listed a number of key areas where the Partnership had added value in the year and pointed to the 75 partnership activities which had benefited over 48,000 beneficiaries from Priority Areas and the different communities of interests.

Robert recommended the following improvement objectives be adopted by the partnership:-

- Target "the gaps" through better engagement with Neighbourhood Management.
- Track progress through residents' experiences & reduced target set.
- Focus on strategic analysis & "what works".
- Increase our ability to mainstream

Bridget from GOWM was invited to comment by Ken Taylor. She confirmed that GOWM had made initial comments on the self assessment to David and had received replies. Any follow on points will be discussed at the Annual Review on the 21<sup>st</sup> July. There are no big issues outstanding. The Government would complete its performance review and recommend a traffic light assessment to the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit by 9<sup>th</sup> Sept.

Stella suggested some time should be allocated at a future meeting to plan how the improvement actions could be taken forward.

David held a brief show of hands to self assess the LSP performance over the last 12 months. The result was unanimous - amber green.

Comments from the tables were there was too little time allocated for discussion and CEN was not recorded in the Partnership achievements for the year.

**Action: David to ensure that CEN's achievements are included in the Partnership's published Annual Report.**

## **8. Neighbourhood Management**

Janice Nichols handed out a presentation on Neighbourhood Management and gave a brief update to the meeting. The slides are attached as Appendix 5.

She reported that there had been good progress with the Police on agreeing co-terminus boundaries and agreement with other providers could now follow. Staff had been appointed to the 3 Neighbourhood Manager posts and to the other new positions. For the time being all 6 existing Area Coordination offices would be maintained. The service would be launched in September.

Mike Attwood commented that the PCT were looking at revising the PCT boundaries to align them with the new Neighbourhood Management boundaries.

## **9. Forward Planner**

No issues were raised apart from the earlier point about making time available to discuss progress on the improvement actions.

Stella assured the meeting that there would be more time allocated for discussion at future meetings.

David also confirmed that, if there were no objections, another venue would be found for the next meeting.

**10. Any Other Business**

Virginia Eneje commended to Partnership on its Learning from Communities training programme. Extensive learning had taken place between the community and service providers and it also brought the Stoke Aldermoor Community closer together.

Brinder Seni asked Ken Taylor for any feedback from the Children's Games. Ken reported that it had been the best yet and has raised the profile of the city as it bids for Olympic Games training camps. The Godiva festival, on at the same time had also seen the largest attendance yet and is now the biggest free festival in Europe.

**11. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be on Thursday 14th September 5.00 to 7.00 pm.

# Minutes of Coventry Partnership meeting held on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2005, Moat House School, Deedmore Road, Coventry

## Attendance:

Louise Bennett	Chamber of Commerce
Sue Bent	Coventry Law Centre
Stephen Jones	PCT
Cllr Arrowsmith	Coventry City Council
Cllr Ken Taylor	Leader of Council
Cllr McNicholas	Coventry City Council
Cllr Tony O'Neill	Deputy Leader, Council
Bob Keith	Groundwork UK
Roger Lewis	Peugeot Citroen
Joan Allen	Community Advocate
Les Ratcliffe	Jaguar Cars
Peter Shearing	Learning & Skills Council
Ray Goy	Henley College
Robert Browett	Peugeot Citroen
Sheila Bates	Chair, Community Empowerment Network
Stella Manzie	Coventry City Council
Virginia Eneje	Community Advocate

## Apologies:

Brinder Seni	Community Advocate
Chris Robinson	Community Alcohol Service
Councillor Lakha	Coventry City Council
Howard Farrand	Whitefriars Housing Group
Jane Beaver	Job Centre Plus
Madeleine Atkins	Coventry University
Max Sahota	West Midlands Police
Mike Fowler	Coventry Cyrenians
Robert Dyson	Warwick University
Robert Hulland	West Midlands Fire Service
Simon Vasey	Eon Energy
Stephen Banbury	CVSC
Steve Stewart	Connexions
Sue Darling	Citizens Advice Bureau
Chris Duffield	West Midlands Police
Councillor Mutton	Coventry City Council
Janet Cairns	Coventry & Warks University Hospital
Kate Lee	WEETC Ltd
Sarah Bhayat	Community Advocate
Stewart Ferguson	Touchstone Housing

## In Attendance:

Andy Williams	Coventry City Council
Helga Edstrom	Government Office
David Galliers	Coventry Partnership



Helen Shankster	Coventry Partnership
Sarah Crawley	Coventry Partnership
June Jeffrey	Community Advocate
Anne Skene	Community Advocate
Lise Smith	CEN
Rob Allison	CVSC
Adrian Coles	Coventry City Council
Ruth Snow	Acting Director of Education
Nigel Wain	Coventry Partnership
Hema Chauhan	Coventry Partnership

## 1. **Welcome & Introductions**

Cllr O'Neill welcomed Roger Lewis from Peugeot who is replacing Robert Browett on the LSP Board, Stephen Jones, Joint Chief Executive of the PCT and Helga Edstrom from the GOWM who came instead of Mark Tovey, our new GOWM advisor. Susan Bassnett who was not present will be replacing Robert Dyson as a member of the Board. However, Robert is willing to continue as Chair of PIE and will attend the Board when he can if this is acceptable.

**This offer was warmly accepted**

## 2. **Minutes of the last meeting**

3.

The following actions/issues from the previous meeting were reported:

### **CEN/LSP Protocol**

- David said that Theme Group Leaders would be asked to ensure there was a standing item on their agenda so that CEN reps could raise issues. They will also be asked to ensure that voluntary and Community reps are fully involved in decision making. Sheila Bates said that CEN were now offering workshops for public sector organisations to get feedback on their services and proposed developments

### **Cultural Partnership**

- Brinder Seni has agreed to represent both CEN and the LSP on the Cultural Partnership. Sheila requested that they have two representatives as it is quite a commitment for one Representative alone.

**Action: CEN to discuss with the Cultural Partnership when the new Head of Leisure Services takes up her post in October.**

### **Household Survey**

- At the last meeting Partners were asked to support the Household survey. David thanked the Planning Department of the Council, Henley College, Job Centre Plus and PCT for their contributions amounting to £19,500 out of the £31,000 needed. Work to cover the shortfall is ongoing.

- At the last meeting Partners were asked to include CRES (Community Research & Evaluation Service) in future tendering for work, to ensure CRES can be self funding. As a result CRES is negotiating work with the Planning and Development department of the Council, Communities that Care and the Heart of England Community Foundation.

#### **Environmental Inequity Study.**

- Bob Keith announced that the Study will be launched in October along with practical recommendations for action which he will present to the Theme Groups. He would like to present these recommendations at the next Leaders and Advisors meeting

#### **4. Making a Difference and Moving On**

David presented the Partnership's 4 Improvement objectives for this coming year along with the Performance Improvement Plan for 2005/06. The 4 objectives are:

- Better alignment of Community Plan priorities, floor targets and Residents' experiences.
- Focus on strategic analysis and 'what works'
- Increase our ability to mainstream
- Target 'the gaps' through better engagement with neighbourhood management.

David explained that even though Government office is recommending a "green light" status for the Coventry Partnership we need to become more focused and targeted. The 4 objectives along with the Improvement Plan are designed to make this happen.

Members then discussed the improvement objectives and their comments are attached to these minutes.

#### **5. Forthcoming Events**

David outlined four key events which were planned to take place before Christmas.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| • PIE Enquiry Workshop                   | Thursday 29 <sup>th</sup> September 2005 (pm) |
| • Property Summit                        | Wednesday 26 <sup>th</sup> October 2005 (am)  |
| • Coventry Partnership Annual Conference | Tuesday 29 <sup>th</sup> November 2005 (am)   |
| • Learning & Training Summit             | Wednesday 7 <sup>th</sup> December 2005 (pm)  |

For further information on any of the events above please contact Hema Chauhan, 024 7688 7910 or [hema.chauhan@coventrypartnership.com](mailto:hema.chauhan@coventrypartnership.com)

## **6. Big Lottery Fund Living Landmarks Programme**

David briefly outlined a proposed bid for around £25,000,000 under the Lottery's Living Landmark Programme from Coventry. It was being lead by John McGuigan who is asking for any "inspiring" ideas to be sent to [stuart.dunkley@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.dunkley@coventry.gov.uk), by the end of this week.

## **7. Forward Planner**

David asked for suggestions for future agenda items from the Board. Suggested items to be included on future agendas are:

- Neighbourhood Management – Jan Nichols
- Restructuring of the Health Service PCT 5 year visions – Stephen Jones
- The contribution of the private sector to Neighbourhood Renewal

## **8. Any Other Business**

To update the group it was announced that Kate Lee has stepped down as Leader of the Learning & Training Theme Group. The Board expressed thanks to her for her work. The group has recommended that Angie Kokes, Vice Principal of Henley College become the Leader of the group. Accountability to the Partnership Board can be through Ray Goy.

### **This was agreed**

Cllr Taylor as Chair of the Coventry Partnership presented Robert Browett from Peugeot Citroen with a present and card on his retirement, The Partnership thanked him for his contribution to the City.

## **9. Date of next meeting**

Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2005, Moat House School, Deedmore Road  
5.00pm – 7.00pm.

### Making A Difference And Moving On

The following points emerged from a discussion by the Partnership Board on increasing the partnership's impact using the LAA, the Partnership's Improvement Objectives, and the use of NRF:

1. The community must be involved using their expertise and enabling them and us to understand the process and outcomes.
2. All activities must add value to existing projects - we need to gain an understanding of what is already in existence and the good practice from it needs to be shared.
3. The quality and timing of evaluations need to be improved with mid project evaluations sharing lessons. The data needs to be accurate, appropriate and reliable, but also used and interpreted in the correct way.
4. We all need to know and hear simple key messages coming from the Coventry Partnership and its member organisations
5. We need to spend enough time on the process, but not so much that it eats into the delivery time for activities.
6. Cross-cutting links regarding gaps need to be shared between groups and commitment given
7. Not all theme groups have floor targets related to them and therefore we should not lose site of their involvement.
8. Planning needs to happen sooner and be more organised with next year and the year after being thought through.
9. It is important that we gain an understanding of budget cycles within organisations to enable more effective mainstreaming and joint working to occur.
10. Mainstreaming needs to be at the forefront of the work we do with good practice and an understanding of the concept among everyone. It is not just the responsibility of the organisation running the project i.e. The Council. There needs to be a commitment from organisations regarding mainstreaming when the projects are being commissioned.
11. The views of young people need to be included, possibly through the CTC Audit, and younger children, and those outside traditional education.
12. Other organisations should be identified; i.e. community and voluntary sector, as deliverers.
13. The process which is developed must be robust with targeted actions which justify the amount of money spent and consideration must be taken regarding the process and people.
14. It is the community that run and live in an area; they do not own floor targets.
15. Be brave, not oven ready as these are not always the best.

16. No more targets!! The number of targets should be a target in itself
17. Review, refresh and consult all the time, which may involve more than one workshop allowing for further involvement and fully assessed evidence.
18. If a gap is initially identified it should be checked thoroughly as it may not actually be an issue.
19. All organisations need to gain a better understanding of Neighbourhood Management
20. Mainstreaming and exit strategies are important with work on budget and fulfilling organisations targets as well.
21. How do we already find out what exists within the time constraints
22. We need to know how much we can influence organisations' business plans and budget cycles.
23. An approach which could be used is the 'Gateway' method - Everyone involved assesses the projects progress at key milestones and agrees whether or not it is on track and should continue.
24. The C&YPSP has already analysed its budgets undertaken by Richard Keble and has launched an on-line directory of services covering Coventry & Warwickshire.
25. There is evidence of cross-cutting themes that we don't want to lose.
26. Maybe we need to begin to be risky and innovative.