



Coventry City Council

5

Public report

---

**Report to**

Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee  
Cabinet

14<sup>th</sup> March, 2007

20<sup>th</sup> March 2007

**Report of**

Chief Executive

**Title**

Coventry Partnership and the Local Area Agreement 2007/08

---

**1 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To seek approval for the refreshed Local Area Agreement 2007/08 and to brief Cabinet Members on the progress of the Coventry Partnership.

**2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 The Cabinet are asked to:
- 2.2 Approve and support the Local Area Agreement 2007/08 attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
- 2.3 Acknowledge the outcome of the Partnership Board Self Assessment and endorse the City Council's active role in this work.

**3 Information/Background**

- 3.1 The aim of the Coventry Partnership is to bring together the local public, private, voluntary and community sectors to facilitate joint working and, in particular, to deliver the Coventry Community Plan and the Local Area Agreement. These plans aim to improve the quality of life and services across the city and narrow the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the city. The Council is a key partner in this work and recognises that to be successful in delivering its vision and corporate objectives it is necessary to work in partnership.
- 3.2 The Coventry Partnership Board includes members from all sectors in the city, including the community and voluntary sectors. The Council is represented by Councillors Taylor, O'Neill, Lakha, McNicholas, Mutton and Foster. The Chief Executive of the City Council is Secretary to the Partnership Board.
- 3.3 Government Office West Midlands has awarded the Coventry Partnership a 'green light' for its progress in 2005/06 recognising the strength in both the quality of partnership working and the delivery of the Community Plan.

- 3.4 The Partnership conducts its business through an Operations Group and eight Theme Groups (Jobs & Economy; Health & well-being; Transport; Learning & Training; Equalities & Communities; Environment; Culture; and Community Safety) and works very closely with Community of Interest Partnerships including the Older People's Partnership; Children & Young People's Partnership; Mental Health Partnership; Physical & Sensory Impairment Partnership and Learning Disability Partnership.
- 3.5 The Chair of the Partnership Board rotates between the public, private and voluntary sector and changes on an annual basis. The Director of the Law Centre currently holds this position and this will be passed to the private sector in April.

#### **4 The Local Area Agreement 2007/08**

- 4.1 Coventry was one of 21 pilots when Local Area Agreements (LAA) were introduced in 2005. Local Area Agreements are designed to be a contract between central and local government to deliver both central and local priorities and a vehicle for allocating significant amounts of area based funding. As of 2007, all areas in England will have Local Area Agreements.
- 4.2 The LAA consists of four blocks:
- Children & Young People
  - Safer & Stronger Communities
  - Healthy Communities & Older People
  - Economic Development & Enterprise.
- 4.3 LAAs are 3 year documents and the expectation is that LAAs will not significantly change during the refresh process, other than to include any new mandatory indicators and funding streams. Therefore, the process for this refreshed LAA has led to minimal change.
- 4.4 However, the Local Government White Paper indicates that Local Area Agreements will be fundamentally different from 2009, in particular seeing them as the delivery plan for Community Strategies. Therefore, the local "super refresh" process that will begin in April for our 2008/09 LAA will start to develop our LAA in this way.

#### **5 The Coventry Partnership**

- 5.1 In September last year the Partnership commissioned a Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor to undertake a review in order to consider the fitness for purpose of the Coventry Partnership structures and processes with a particular focus upon:
- the extent to which partnership working was perceived to be inclusive and adding value; and
  - providing recommendations on how the partnership should develop to position itself to respond effectively to existing local and emerging national changes.
- 5.2 On 9<sup>th</sup> January the Partnership Board, together with Chairs and Advisors of Theme Groups, held a self assessment workshop to look at some of the messages coming out of the Local Government White Paper, Strong & Prosperous Communities and to understand the recommendations that were coming out of the partnership review. The report detailing the outcomes from the workshop is attached as appendix 2. This will inform the development of the Partnership Board Improvement Plan for 2007/08.

## 6 Proposal and Other Option(s) to be Considered

6.1 It is proposed that Cabinet approve and support the Local Area Agreement for 2007/08 attached as Appendix 1.

### 6.2 Other specific implications

|   | Implications<br>(See below) | No<br>Implications |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Best Value                                |                             | ✓                  |
| Children and Young People                 | ✓                           |                    |
| Comparable Benchmark Data                 |                             | ✓                  |
| Corporate Parenting                       |                             | ✓                  |
| Coventry Community Plan                   | ✓                           |                    |
| Crime and Disorder                        | ✓                           |                    |
| Equal Opportunities                       | ✓                           |                    |
| Finance                                   | ✓                           |                    |
| Health and Safety                         |                             | ✓                  |
| Human Resources                           |                             | ✓                  |
| Human Rights Act                          |                             | ✓                  |
| Impact on Partner Organisations           | ✓                           |                    |
| Information and Communications Technology |                             | ✓                  |
| Legal Implications                        |                             | ✓                  |
| Neighbourhood Management                  | ✓                           |                    |
| Property Implications                     |                             | ✓                  |
| Race Equality Scheme                      |                             | ✓                  |
| Risk Management                           |                             | ✓                  |
| Sustainable Development                   |                             | ✓                  |
| Trade Union Consultation                  |                             | ✓                  |
| Voluntary Sector – The Coventry Compact   | ✓                           |                    |

### 6.3 Children & Young People

Children & Young People is one of the four blocks making up the Local Area Agreement.

## 7 Coventry Community Plan

The targets and indicators contained in the Local Area Agreement are integrated into the Community Plan and from 2008, the Local Area Agreement will act as the delivery plan for the Community Plan.

## 8 Crime & Disorder

Community Safety is a key part of the Safer & Stronger Communities Block of the Local Area Agreement.

## 9 Equal Opportunities

The Local Area Agreement will be underpinned by an overriding commitment to promoting greater equality and overcoming disadvantage.

## 10 Finance

The LAA does not, in itself, bring any extra government money to the City, although it is used as the vehicle through which a significant amount of funding is now allocated. However, the Local Area Agreement should lead to greater flexibility in the ways that government and other funding can be used locally. Across the Local Area Agreement there is approximately £28,407,000 aligned funding and £28,475,680 pooled funding.

## 11 Impact on Partner Organisations

The Coventry Partnership is accountable for the delivery of the Local Area Agreement which consists of a range of outcomes and targets belonging to a number of partner organisations.

## 12 Neighbourhood Management

Neighbourhood Management play a critical part in co-ordinating the local delivery of the Local Area Agreement.

## 13 Voluntary Sector

The voluntary sector play a key role on the Partnership Board and Theme Groups and delivery a range of services that contribute to the delivery of the Local Area Agreement.

## 14 Monitoring

The Coventry Partnership Secretariat are currently responsible for administering the performance management process of the Local Area Agreement and facilitating a formal review meeting with the Partnership and Government Office every 6 months. However, this will need to be reviewed as part of the Chief Executive's reorganisation.

|   | Yes                                   | No |
|---|---------------------------------------|----|
| Key Decision  | √                                     |    |
| Scrutiny Consideration<br>(if yes, which Scrutiny meeting and date) | √<br>Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee |    |
| Council Consideration<br>(if yes, date of Council meeting)          |                                       | √  |

List of background papers

Proper officer: *Stella Manzie, Chief Executive*

Author: Telephone 76887919

*Sara Roach, Partnership Development Manager, Chief Executive's*

(Any enquiries should be directed to the above)

Other contributors:

Phil Helm, Finance Manager, Finance & ICT, 024 76831301

Jaz Bilen, Senior HR Advisor (Employment Policy), Chief Executives, 024 76833277

Chris Hinde, Director of Legal & Democratic Services, 024 7683 3020

Richard Brankowski, Principal Committee Officer, Legal & Democratic Services, 024 76833077

Roger Hughes, Head of Corporate Policy, 024 76831077

Barry Hastie, Finance Manager, Children, Learning and Young People Directorate, Finance & ICT, 024 76831643

Papers open to Public Inspection

**Description of paper Location**

APPENDIX 1

# Progress Through Prevention

## A “Refreshed” Local Area Agreement for Coventry



**Coventry City Council**

**Coventry Partnership**

April 2007 – March 2008

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. Coventry City Council and the Coventry Partnership (the city's Local Strategic Partnership) welcome this opportunity to submit its "refreshed" Local Area Agreement (LAA).
- 1.2. Coventry were a pilot LAA area and therefore this is the second refreshed document that has been produced, which will lead to the super refresh process during 2007/08.
- 1.3. Coventry has a good track record of partnership working and a well developed Community Plan (Sustainable Communities Strategy) based on local consultation. This LAA is an integral part of the Community Plan (see Annex 1), although there are still local priorities contained within the Community Plan that are not yet fully represented in the LAA.
- 1.4. The LAA Outcome Framework is part of the Community Plan's bigger Performance Management Database. The Local Area Agreement Outcome Framework can be found at Annex 2.
- 1.5. This year will provide us with an opportunity to rationalise reporting through a single report on both the delivery of the Community Plan and the LAA.
- 1.6. The Coventry Partnership has been designated a "green" LSP and as such has demonstrated its ability to manage its performance effectively. Duplicate reporting creates an additional bureaucratic burden and inhibits our ability to target public funding directly into service improvement therefore, the introduction of a single reporting mechanism is welcomed.
- 1.7. The LAA has been "refreshed" by a range of local partners in discussion with Government Office West Midlands. We have called it "Progress Through Prevention". We see prevention as the key to improvement in all four LAA service blocks and to achieving the overall vision of the Coventry Partnership – "Improving Quality of Life for Everyone in Coventry".
- 1.8. A summary of the Pooled and Aligned LAA Funding is at Annex 3.

## 2. Governance & Accountability

- 2.1 Progress and future development of the LAA will be overseen by the Operations Group of the Coventry Partnership. This group consists of representatives of the City Council, the Coventry Partnership, the Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust, West Midlands Police, the Voluntary Sector, the Private Sector, the Learning & Skills Council and the Community Empowerment Network.
- 2.2. The Local Area Agreement will be delivered as part of the city's Community Plan through the Coventry Partnership's Theme Groups.
- 2.3. Accountability for the local delivery of the LAA will be to:
  - Coventry City Council Cabinet
  - tPCT Professional Executive Committee
  - The Coventry Partnership.

## 3. Performance Management

The LSP has carried out a robust performance management review and has fully integrated the performance management process across the partnership. Partners are engaged below Board level.

There is substantial evidence that the partnership is committed to performance management. The PIE group has led the performance management arrangements.

Each theme group has undertaken an annual review against community plan objectives and is now developing an action plan.

**GOWM, July 2005**

### **"We found the key strengths in terms of performance management in the Coventry Partnership to be**

- Effective investment in:
  - Aligning the Community Plan with the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and Neighbourhood Plans;
  - Mapping targets across the community; and
  - Linking the work of the Partnership to that of the Council's Area Managers.
- The effective use of community consultation to contribute to the review and planning process
- The mentoring and challenge provided to the theme groups by the Progress, Impact and Evaluation (PIE) Group and by the Monitoring and Evaluation Development Officer role
- The development and effective use of the planning document to retain focus on Community Plan priorities, outcomes and mainstreaming
- Acceptance of the value of PMF to strengthen deliverability."

**(Audit Commission 2004)**

- 3.1 The performance management framework for the Coventry Community Plan and the LAA is based upon the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit's Core Requirements (2004-5) for Local Strategic Partnerships.



### 3.2 The performance management system is :-

- Evidence-led
- Focused on the systematic strategic level evaluation and the added value of the Partnership
- Premised on the need to reduce bureaucracy through a single reporting system for Community Plan Outcomes and Local Area Agreement Outcomes.
- Aiming to align the performance management systems of:
  - Coventry Partnership
  - New Deal for Communities Partnership
  - Community Empowerment Network
  - Neighbourhood Management Service
- Based upon a strategic reporting of progress against high level targets (i.e. Government and deprivation related targets)
- Developing a strong resident and service-user focus
- Focused upon the accountability of partner organisations for agreed outcomes and targets
- A Challenging and Learning environment, which tests the plausibility that our actions will deliver the change needed

### 3.3 There is an annual self assessment process at both theme and partnership level which involves:

- Measuring Community Plan outcomes and high level targets in terms of:
  - Progress towards delivery
  - Plausibility that activities are the right ones
  - Success in narrowing the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the city
  - Impact upon communities of interest
- Conducting an annual Partnership Management Review (full review of partnership working 3 yearly)
- Delivering an annual review of strategic gaps and LAA priorities
- Producing Improvement Plans

### 3.4 The mechanisms used include:

- A results-based planning system
- Strategic priorities used to commission activities
- Monitoring of individual activities through an annual "Partnership Prospectus"
- Tracking outcome targets and quarterly review of the performance improvement plan by the Partnership's Progress, Impact and Evaluation Group (PIE)
- An annual Household Survey which assists us in monitoring the qualitative, perception based indicators
- Strategic level research & evaluation of key gaps in delivery
- Project management and evaluation training to build capacity to deliver change
- Involving residents in reviewing impact on neighbourhoods / communities of interest

- 3.5 Full use of trajectory planning is used within our self assessment in order to review, develop and if necessary amend our annual targets. Where Quality of Life surveys are used to assess progress, the Partnership will use these surveys to track an increase or decrease in performance but will not set hard targets.
- 3.6 The Partnership continues to focus upon the impact of partners' services on BME communities. Where this information is available it will be used within the annual self assessment process. Where it is not available, proxy measures will be used wherever possible. These proxy measures include the impact upon those neighbourhoods in the city which have the highest proportion of BME residents.
- 3.7 All members of the Coventry Partnership continue to deliver against the city's commitment to "narrow the gap" between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the city. Wherever possible, our key measures of success include a neighbourhood element.
- 3.8 Coventry's performance management system is designed to measure progress against Government floor targets, PSA targets and/or government deprivation related targets. Additional data (both qualitative and quantitative) will be available during the annual self assessment to track performance at a neighbourhood and community level.
- 3.9 This information is held on the Coventry Partnership Performance Management Database.
- 3.10 The self assessment process will also generate an improvement plan that will address cross-cutting issues and any structural weaknesses that are identified. A Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor was commissioned in November to undertake a review of the Coventry Partnership in order to look at added value, inclusivity and whether the Board is still fit for purpose, following the introduction of the LAA, the Government White Paper and the local introduction of Neighbourhood Management. The outcome of this work will inform the 2007 improvement planning process.

## **4. Statement of Voluntary and Community Sector Involvement**

- 4.1 The Voluntary and Community sectors are represented at every level of the Coventry Partnership i.e. at Board level, within the Operations Group and at Theme Group level (the community sector has two guaranteed places on each group). Both sectors were actively involved in the original development of Coventry's LAA and CVSC and CEN have been involved in the refresh. We hope that the streamlined processes proposed in the Local Government White Paper will make LAAs more accessible to the voluntary and community sectors and thereby strengthen their involvement.
- 4.2 The Coventry Partnership is developing a much sharper focus on culture, leisure and communities of interest. It now encompasses the following Partnerships and Coordinating Groups in the city:
- Cultural Partnership
  - Physical & Sensory Impairment Partnership
  - Learning Disabilities Partnership
  - Older People's Partnership
  - Children and Young People's Partnership
  - Mental Health Partnership

### **Children & Young People**

- 4.3 Partnership working with the voluntary sector has increased through the Children & Young People's Strategic Partnership. A wide range of groups are actively working with the statutory sector to develop the change agenda, including Relate, NCH, NSPCC, WEETC, Panaghar, Valley House, YMCA, and others, and these are brought together into the Children & Young People – Voluntary Sector Network (CYP-VSN) by CVSC.

### **Safer & Stronger Communities**

- 4.4 Coventry CEN and CVSC are key members of the Community Safety Partnership's Executive Group which is the forum that oversees the delivery of the Safer Stronger Communities Block of this LAA, including the Your Neighbourhood Matters Programme (Neighbourhood Element). CEN is an advocate for safer and stronger communities across its work within the Coventry Partnership.
- 4.5 CEN plays a particularly strong role in community cohesion especially through bringing groups from disparate neighbourhoods and communities of interest together, breaking down barriers, dispelling myths and potential jealousies and building a sense of the community sector standing together. Saturday workshops in particular are well attended by both Black and Minority Ethnic groups and by residents' associations from all over the City.
- 4.6 CEN and voluntary sector representatives are very active on the Coventry Partnership. CEN has maintained a high level of consistency in its representation and most CEN representatives are now well established within Partnership Theme Groups.

## **Healthier Communities & Older People**

- 4.7 The sector has a long tradition of engaging with the statutory sector through CVSC's Health & Social Care Forum. The Older People's Partnership includes extensive representation from both service providers and older people's groups. The voluntary sector is represented on the Health of Coventry Theme Group.

## **Economic Development & Enterprise Block**

- 4.8 The voluntary sector has been represented on both the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) Board and the implementation group and has had extensive involvement in developing the LEGI programme in Coventry.

## 5. Children and Young People Block

- 5.1 Coventry continues to work collaboratively with partners to deliver the Government's Change for Children agenda and the vision that children and young people have for our work:

### Vision Statement

The Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership Vision is:

Working together to find out what children want to make their lives better;

and

Working to keep families together

*Some people's lives are scattered like a jigsaw  
The partnership can make people's lives better  
For children's lives and adult's lives too  
The partnership can put that jigsaw back together  
And make it work again!*

(By Chloe, age 10)

- 5.2 The Children & Young People's Strategic Partnership is committed to working together to ensure that:

- we have clear accountability and governance arrangements within and across all partners;
- children, young people and their families and carers participate at a strategic and operational level in the planning and delivery of services and we respond to what they say;
- services are co-ordinated and integrated as appropriate, experienced as a 'single organisation' and made accessible by being organised around communities, whether geographically or around communities of need, enabling effective local targeting;
- there is recognition and valuing of diversity and planning of services accordingly;
- we jointly commission services (and therefore pool resources) against high standards;
- efficiency is improved and duplication reduced, freeing resources to fill gaps;
- the local voluntary and community sectors are strengthened and sustained by the Partnership;
- we focus on what makes a difference to the lives of children and young people.

- 5.3 Partnership working with the voluntary sector has increased through the Children & Young People's Strategic Partnership. A wide range of groups are actively working with the statutory sector to develop the change agenda, including Relate, NCH, NSPCC, WEETC, Panaghar, Valley House, YMCA, and others, and these

are brought together into the Children & Young People – Voluntary Sector Network (CYP-VSN) by CVSC.

- 5.4 Since June 2003, the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership (CYPSP) has continued to develop and evolve. Children's Commissioning Trust arrangements have been put in place with the establishment of the Children and Young People's Joint Commissioning Board. The Board will be supported and advised by a Professional Advisory Group, a Consultative Forum that will comprise of service users and stakeholders and a performance monitoring group.
- 5.5 In April 2006 Coventry's Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) was agreed by the CYPSP. The Plan articulates the joint commitment of all partners to improving outcomes for children and young people and sets a number of joint commissioning priorities including: child and adolescent mental health services, disability services, speech and language, looked after children and safeguarding services.
- 5.6 The CYPSP has developed a performance management framework that aligns monitoring and reporting arrangements across the CYPP and the Local Strategic Partnership's Community Plan and incorporates LAA and LPSA targets and indicators.
- 5.7 Partners agreed an Information Sharing Protocol in the summer of 2004. The application of this has been underpinned by an on-going programme of roadshows to all staff (over 1,000 participants to date) and implementation of the IT information sharing tool, ShareCare (formerly RYOGENS). Across the City there are over 700 registered users of ShareCare.
- 5.8 Coventry is a leading local area for Common Assessment and Lead Professional agenda, being one of the early adopter sites and having secured grant funding to deliver full e-CAF compliance by April 2007.
- 5.9 The Children's Fund has successfully migrated into the CYPSP and budgets have been pooled within the LAA. The Supporting Families and Friends Sub-Group of the Partnership is overseeing ongoing project work and leading the development of a multi-agency parenting strategy. The Partnership has been successful in attracting £939,000 of external funding to support parenting programmes (to be spent by March 2008).
- 5.10 Participation of children and young people and parents and carers continues to be a focus for the Partnership. Our participation and involvement framework forms the basis of the partnership consultation form.
- 5.11 In June 2006 a **Joint Area Review (JAR)** of children and young people's services took place. In summary, the JAR concluded that *outcomes for children and young people in Coventry are good*. The inspection report recognised:

*'A strong tradition of partnership working in Coventry that is effective in providing good and continually improving services for the children and young people of the city. There is a clear vision for developing genuinely integrated services of which young people have been involved in developing. Some costs are more than would be ideal but are in line with other similar councils.'*

## **Being Healthy**

5.12 Inspectors agreed that children and young people are generally healthy with good partnership arrangements to ensure their continued progress. Organisations across the city work well together to support children in keeping healthy with a well-coordinated approach to promoting healthy lifestyles. Emergency admissions to hospital are falling in some areas. Children and young people are able to access mental health service support from CAMHS where appropriate, although there was some improvement needed in the medium and longer term strategic planning of this service.

## **Staying safe**

5.13 The "Tell us" survey of around 700 school aged children showed that almost all children and young people feel safe living in the city. There is good work going on in the city to support the needs of more vulnerable children and young people. The roll out of the common assessment framework, which has strong partnership support and commitment from all organisations involved, has been particularly successful.

5.14 In terms of the most vulnerable children who are at risk of harm – inspectors noted good progress towards the establishment of the Coventry Safeguarding Board. However, there was some concern over thresholds of neglect used by different organisations and some inconsistencies in the use of police powers.

5.15 Anti-social behaviour and offending have reduced in the city with good work being carried out across partnerships and in the Youth Offending Service.

## **Enjoying and achieving**

5.16 It was found that younger children appear well prepared for school and make satisfactory progress when they are there. Results continue to improve. At the other end of the age range they are well prepared for leaving school and have a good range of opportunities and choices available to them.

5.17 There is effective support in place for parents and carers across the city and particularly in some of the most deprived areas. Inspectors praised the work of the Youth Service with young people's achievement being generally good.

## **Making a positive contribution**

5.18 It was found that children and young people have an outstanding range of opportunities to get involved in decision-making and influence what is decided in organisations across the city. This is at all levels and fully backed by a multi agency forum. It was noted that children and young people were influential in securing agreement that the impact of decisions on children and young people must be included in all council reports.

## **Economic well-being**

5.19 Support for young parents was noted as being good with special advisors in the One Stop Shop to provide particular support. There is childcare provision in around three quarters of all primary schools in the city and over a dozen neighbourhood nurseries. The council is working well with partner organisations to attract inward investment into the city and develop services to support the creation of new jobs. Achievement rates for 16-19 year

olds are improving with an extensive range of options on offer to keep them in education and training.

### Service management

5.20 The management of services for children and young people was found to be good. The inspectors praised the city's strong commitment to partnership and the genuine desire to improve the lives of children and young people in the city.

### JAR grades awarded:

|                                       | Local services overall | Council services | Health services |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Being healthy                         | 3                      |                  |                 |
| Staying safe                          | 3                      |                  |                 |
| Enjoying and achieving                | 3                      |                  |                 |
| Making a positive contribution        | 4                      |                  |                 |
| Achieving economic well-being         | 3                      |                  |                 |
| Service management                    | 3                      |                  |                 |
| Capacity to improve                   | 3                      | 3                |                 |
| Children's services                   |                        | 3                |                 |
| The education service                 |                        | 3                |                 |
| The social care services for children |                        | 3                |                 |
| The health service for children       |                        |                  | 3               |

4: outstanding; 3: good; 2: adequate; 1: inadequate

### Joint Area Review Recommendations

5.21 Areas identified for action over the next six months include:

- ensuring medium to long term financial planning by all partners identifies the resources necessary to meet the needs of young people and to deliver the priorities of the Children's Plan.
- developing a strategy for CAMHS to ensure effective planning and delivery of services.



- ensuring good practice in social care is consistent in all areas including police powers.

5.22 Some longer term actions also include further improvement of educational attainment, extending the range of level one vocational option, and improving the processes for assessing the value for money of services.

5.23 An action plan has been produced to respond to the recommendations and progress will be monitored by the Children and Young People's Joint Commissioning Board.

## **6. Safer and Stronger Communities**

- 6.1 The Coventry Community Safety Partnership (CCSP) has a statutory responsibility for leading, developing and co-ordinating the delivery of strategies to address crime, disorder, drugs and anti-social behaviour. The recent review of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 has introduced a number of requirements and the Partnership will be reviewing their role, particularly in relation to local scrutiny and accountability, in order to comply with these recommendations.
- 6.2 The Coventry Partnership's Environment Theme Group is developing its role to take a strategic overview of the city's environment, although it has no statutory responsibilities for this. Its focus is on 3 areas: reducing the use of natural resources; promoting improvements in neighbourhoods, parks and open spaces; and raising awareness and understanding of how local people can contribute to a better environment. While the City Council has a significant role in design and maintenance of the physical environment, ownership and responsibility is shared across the public, private and domestic sectors. A wide range of disparate grant funding regimes can be utilised to support physical improvements from small to large scale.
- 6.3 There are already a number of linkages locally between community safety and the environment agendas, resulting from successful promotion of Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998. The ASB agenda particularly recognises the links between environmental or signal crimes and a spiral of decline into more serious offending. The SSCF provides a further opportunity to enhance this joined-up approach and provide a smarter way of delivering local services through neighbourhood management. The Coventry Community Safety Strategy includes a priority to build a Cleaner Safer Greener Coventry and the Community Safety Partnership is well placed to oversee the range of activity contained within the Safer Stronger Communities Block.
- 6.4 The City's Council's Neighbourhood Management Service commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005. Neighbourhood Management staff work collaboratively and co-operatively with colleagues in City Services and Community Safety to maximise opportunities to improve local services and create cleaner, greener, safer communities. Particular attention is paid to the deployment of people working in neighbourhoods around street-based activity. This includes Neighbourhood Wardens, as well as those engaged in street services and grounds maintenance. A recent project centred on the removal and disposal of material that had been collected to use for fires over the bonfire period. Co-operation between City Services, the Fire Service, Police, Street Wardens and other partners resulted in 130 bonfires being taken away and disposed of and an overall reduction in nuisance bonfires.
- 6.5 Over the last few years, community safety consultation processes have all identified environmental issues as being a key concern. Experience shows that if minor incidents, e.g. graffiti, abandoned vehicles, vandalism, etc, go unchecked, this can progress to higher level disorder, fear of crime and, in the longer term, serious criminal activity. Joining up the community safety and environmental work at a local level is assisting in preventing crime in the longer term and improving the quality of life in local neighbourhoods.

- 6.6 The LAA will extend the inter-agency approaches to environmental crime already being pursued, such as the recent initiative between Whitefriars Housing Group, the City Council, West Midlands Police and NDC to reduce vandalism, anti-social behaviour and flytipping in Manor Farm. A programme of prevention and intervention involving education, community involvement, surveillance and enforcement was undertaken and is currently being evaluated. This joined up approach is being extended by the development of a Fly-tipping Protocol by the City Council's Environmental Protection Team and other partners. A two year NRF funded programme "Don't Dump It" is introducing common ways of working and new technology to reduce incidents and improve intelligence and tackle offenders. The initial pilot went live in the NDC area in October 2006 and the programme will be rolled out in stages across the city.
- 6.7 The Coventry Community Empowerment Network contributes to building stronger communities across the whole range of issues tackled by the Coventry Partnership, its Theme Groups and Neighbourhood Management. CEN particularly support the building of stronger neighbourhoods by encouraging neighbourhood level activity by groups and linking groups together into mutually supportive mini-networks. CEN contribute to safer communities by building greater understanding of how community groups can contribute to community safety and environmental agendas/outcomes and encourage groups to build closer links to the Police, City Council and other community safety and environment agencies. CEN are an advocate for safer and stronger communities across its work within the Coventry Partnership, especially in promoting the contribution to prevention that community groups can make.
- 6.8 CEN and voluntary sector representatives are very active on the Coventry Partnership. CEN has maintained a high level of consistency in its representation and most CEN representatives are now well established within Partnership Theme Groups. CEN's Saturday Conference Programme tackles citywide issues and provides an important link between the LSP and the wider community sector.
- 6.9 CEN and CVSC are partners within the Your Neighbourhood Matters Programme (Neighbourhood Element) and in addition to its highly successful Saturday Conferences, CEN is organising neighbourhood events around the city to promote cohesion between communities and increase engagement with service providers and decision-makers, including through working with Neighbourhood Management.
- 6.10 CEN will also be recording and sharing community experiences on neighbourhood working in terms of how people get things done, raise concerns, engage with Neighbourhood Management and work with others including service providers to improve local services.
- 6.11 Community cohesion issues are reflected in this section in relation to people's satisfaction with their neighbourhoods as harmonious places to live and with targets in relation to reporting hate crime, etc. CEN plays a strong role in community cohesion through bringing groups from disparate neighbourhoods and communities of interest together, breaking down barriers, dispelling myths and potential jealousies and building a sense of the community sector standing

together. Saturday Conferences in particular are well attended by both Black and Minority Ethnic Groups and by residents' associations from all over the City.

- 6.12 CEN is promoting examples of stronger communities through publishing case studies and promoting the sharing of good practice through its Saturday Conferences and neighbourhood events.
- 6.13 The Community Safety Partnership receives a range of external funding to support the delivery of local and national targets/outcomes and this is managed through the Partnership's Joint Commissioning Group. The Local Area Agreement plays a pivotal role in joining up services to implement the overall Community Safety Strategy and provides the opportunity to maximise current and future resources by targeting the activity of a range of agencies and services.
- 6.14 The Community Safety Partnership is also the Community Safety Theme Group for the Coventry Partnership and takes a lead on a number of aspects of the Safer Stronger Communities Block. The Joint Commissioning Group is extending its commissioning arrangements and reviewing membership to accommodate this broader remit. It will also use its Executive Group function to oversee activity across the wider Safer Stronger Communities Block.
- 6.15 The review of the role of the Joint Commissioning Group has led to the development of a sub-group to focus specifically on drugs for both adults and young people. This will provide a sharper focus on the provision of services to reduce the harms associated with substance misuse. Coventry's recent quarter 2 (2006/07) review with the National Treatment Agency shows that Coventry has exceeded many of its targets relating to the numbers of people accessing drug treatment services. A comprehensive needs assessment undertaken during 2006 will inform planning for the next financial year and link with the production of a partnership strategic assessment, which will be a requirement following the review of the Crime and Disorder Act.
- 6.16 There are strong local working relationships with the City Council, the Police, Fire Service and local communities on local community safety and anti-social behaviour issues, including those which adversely affect the environment. This has been strengthened through a multi-agency tactical delivery group who make decisions based on local intelligence and "Active Intelligence Mapping Systems" (AIMS).
- 6.17 The AIMS process provides a forum to agree and deploy resources from a range of agencies. It facilitates effective communication and provides a good understanding of local problems, leading to the joint deployment of collective resources. An AIMS newsletter, produced monthly, is targeted at partner agency staff and through groups such as Neighbourhood Watch. It provides a practical example of the delivery of Section 17 in its broadest sense, representing partnership accountability and reduces the opportunity for crime and encourages community intelligence.
- 6.18 Partners in Coventry's Local Area Agreement are working together to understand better the range and responsibilities of street based officers across all organisations. Identifying and implementing new ways of working supported by investment in technology will ensure that these areas are all tackling issues

consistently and in a joined up way, maximising impact on key targets. This will ensure, for example, that all street based officers understand the contribution that they can make to supporting and maximising the success of the authority's enforcement activities.

- 6.19 Coventry is one of 27 Liveability Pilots, which have introduced measures to improve the management and maintenance of public open space. A series of service reforms have been delivered and the Environment Theme Group of the Coventry Partnership has developed a programme of physical improvements that meet national and local liveability criteria. The programme focuses on streets, neighbourhood shopping areas; design; green spaces and places; neglected buildings; and engaging communities, balancing demonstration projects and smaller scale community based projects.
- 6.20 A Best Value Review of the Coventry Street Scene in 2003/04 identified a significant variation in levels of contact or access for Street Scene Services from the 18 electoral wards across the city. In addition, consultation exercises such as the Coventry Partnership's Household Survey in January 2004, identified different levels of satisfaction with their local environment between priority neighbourhoods and non-priority neighbourhoods across the City. However, where environment issues were perceived as being poor, this did not generate, as might be expected, increased demand from residents for improved service provision.
- 6.21 The main point of contact for environmental issues was formerly the City Services Advice Centre dealing with in excess of 100,000 calls each year, as well as providing a City Centre reception for face to face enquiries. In order to improve access, there has since the mid 1990's been a free-call number and a lot of activity promoting and advertising services. However, as the Citizens Panel survey on environmental health and trading standards in June 2003 highlighted, some of the reasons for not contacting the council included not knowing that we provided the service and not knowing who to contact.
- 6.22 Coventry Direct are seeking to address this and other barriers by providing access to services in ways and at times that customers want, improving the ways we deal with the public and informing people about our services. Call centre hours have been extended and a service redesign programme is identifying ways to improve service delivery and the customer experience. Partners will work together to build on joint working that improves customer access and speed of response. Coventry has implemented the "It's Your Call" ASB reporting line. Calls are encouraged from the public in relation to a range of behaviours including environmental issues such as abandoned vehicles. These reports may require a co-ordinated response from a range of agencies and callers can expect that their calls are acknowledged promptly, with action taken where appropriate and communicated to the complainant.
- 6.23 As well as providing improved access to services via a corporate contact centre and face to face first stop shops, Coventry Direct is supporting Safer and Stronger Communities by significantly improving response and fix times via the use of ICT systems and tools. Some specific examples are:

- Use of hand held computer devices for the Street Services and Building Repair and Maintenance teams. Managers will be able to allocate and schedule work for operatives directly via the hand held devices, thus reducing waiting time. Managers will know the current location of each operative, together with their current workload, which is useful when emergency jobs are received, e.g. broken street lights.
- Use of workflow systems to help tackle anti-social behaviour by better sharing of information between Partner organisations. This can be enabled by increased accuracy in the recording of anti-social behaviour incidents as information can be entered onto the system in real time, which will enable staff to spend more time on prevention and enforcement activities by cutting out duplication of processes and information provision.

- 6.24 As part of the Liveability Training Programme, 3 training days have taken place with street based personnel, from a range of agencies, in order to highlight the importance of their roles in relation to public reassurance and the fear of crime. This training has resulted in an action plan that is being taken forward with partners and will also see the training being mainstreamed. This will be particularly important with the role out of local neighbourhood policing.
- 6.25 Responsibility for street scene maintenance, such as cleansing and grounds, are shared across a number of agencies, particularly the City Council, CV One (city centre company) and Whitefriars Housing Group. Examples of good practice are already in place and will be developed and extended through the LAA. Targets for issues such as street cleanliness are now shared so that organisations are working to consistent goals and the Local Public Service Agreement will raise standards both on particular problem land types and across the city. Opportunities to develop this further and introduce a comprehensive range of common targets for standards and response times will be pursued through the LAA and the Your Neighbourhood Matters Programme (Neighbourhood Element), particularly to deliver cleaner, safer and greener public spaces.
- 6.26 The Neighbourhood Warden Scheme in Coventry is funded through City Council mainstream resources and supports 75 Neighbourhood Wardens. They address a broad range of issues, including the swift reporting of environmental concerns, and acting as 'eyes and ears' of both services and local communities, building up confidence and encouraging local ownership within neighbourhoods. The Warden Service has recently taken responsibility for the identification and coordination of the removal of abandoned vehicles. This is proving an effective and efficient way of improving the environment and reducing the opportunity for crime and ASB associated with abandoned vehicles.
- 6.27 Local Elected Members also play a key role in problem solving through a variety of interactions, including involvement in local Safer Neighbourhood Groups, which support the delivery of community safety at a neighbourhood level.

- 6.28 Many voluntary sector service providers play a major role in community safety through, for example:
- provision of locks/home security advice (Coventry & Warwickshire Community Safety Scheme)
  - work with offenders and ex-offenders
  - work against substance abuse (e.g. Swanswell Trust)
  - intensive work with very disaffected young people (e.g. Neighbourhood Support Fund projects such as MAPS, MANDA, and WATCH)
  - work against Domestic Violence (Haven, Valley House, Panaghar, Cyrenians, Osaba, Coventry Rape and Sexual Abuse Centre, etc)
  - Advice, counselling and crime reporting (e.g. Law Centre, CAB, Age Concern, Refugee Centre, Victim Support, Valley House etc).
- 6.29 Community groups play a major role in community safety through Neighbourhood Watch; projects where residents actively visit isolated residents and keep a general eye on the area, e.g. Paradise Streetwalkers; diversionary activities for children and young people including places to meet, sports and cultural activities; festivals and fun days which build community spirit; residents associations; work to tackle anti-social behaviour (e.g. Paradise Residents Association, St Catherine's Close Residents Association); and befriending people who might otherwise be easy targets for harassment, such as asylum-seekers (e.g. Peace House, Stoke Heath Community Centre).
- 6.30 Community representatives are now also invited to their local Safer Neighbourhoods Groups to take part in general problem solving through direct discussion with local service providers. Through this mechanism we hope to improve the accountability and accessibility of the partnership and provide sustainable solutions to concerns raised by local people. This is particularly significant within the 6 areas receiving additional funding through the Your Neighbourhood Matters Programme (Neighbourhood Element) and will provide a consistent approach to identifying priorities and commissioning activity.
- 6.31 Twenty Safer Neighbourhood Groups have been established providing a forum for multi-agency problem solving in local neighbourhoods. These forums also provide the opportunity to flag Prolific & Other Priority Offenders, particularly those involved in anti-social behaviour. The groups will also provide the primary referral route for those families causing most concern to the Intensive Family Intervention Project. Provision of this project is one of the core elements that must be in place to tackle ASB and its causes within those areas benefiting from delivering the Government's Respect Agenda. Coventry will be one of a number of areas nationally to be confirmed as a Respect Action Area in 2007. This will provide additional support and funding to tackle the causes of ASB and crime through preventative work and support for parents.
- 6.32 The voluntary and community sectors play a major role in environmental work, which also has major community development benefits in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, for example the work of Groundwork, Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and the NEA Energy Action Project. Community groups' current contributions include developing pocket parks; cleaning up urban areas and keeping them clean; restoring people's pride and sense of responsibility for their own streets; providing diversionary activities for young people; and renovating unused buildings and bringing them back into use. The Liveability Programme

has helped establish a Friends Group for the War Memorial Park, Coventry's premier park, and work to extend a network of Friends Groups is being led by the City Council's Community Services Directorate.

- 6.33 Following the introduction of the Licensing Act 2003, the Community Safety Team have played a key role in developing Coventry's local licensing policies and they link closely with Trading Standards and the Police across a wide range of activity including educational and enforcement work on underage sales of alcohol. Similar work is also undertaken in relation to fireworks, knives and spray paints.
- 6.34 The Coventry Partnership recognises that problems related to alcohol use, abuse and addiction is at the heart of a wide range of community problems. This is most apparent in relation to community safety. It is recognised however, that the target population in respect of public nuisance and safety may be different from those individuals or groups involved in, or experiencing, violence in the home or injury/ill health arising from alcohol abuse. Alcohol abuse has a significant impact on a range of services across the City and we will use this LAA to develop more effective joined up services to all affected by alcohol problems.
- 6.35 A Local Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy has been drafted and will form the basis for future activity led by a Coordinator/Commissioner for Alcohol Services and supported through a local delivery group. This new post and associated funding has been provided through Coventry's Performance Reward Grant.
- 6.36 A new Local PSA Target aiming to reduce "contact" violent crimes recorded by the police has now been agreed with CLG. This target will provide an additional focus and joint commitment to reduce this type of crime by 1% more than the violence sub-target under PSA1. Home Office figures suggest that around half of all violent offences have alcohol consumption as a contributory factor.
- 6.37 The Coventry Youth Offending Service is well established and has a range of preventative work that they are leading on. The YOS are a key member of the Community Safety Partnership and associated sub-groups and make a significant contribution to the work locally with children and young people.
- 6.38 Working with offenders to prevent re-offending is a key theme within the Community Safety Strategy. The Coventry Offender Management Group oversees the implementation of the local Prolific & Other Priority Offender (PPO) Strategy and the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP). The PPO's identified through the catch and convict strand are subject to a Risk Assessment which identifies offenders and weights some offence types in line with strategic priorities. There is an opportunity to monitor the impact of the PPO Scheme against local delivery of PSA1, which will ensure more effective targeting of resources and provide a measure of the impact of the PPO Strategy. Work is underway to assess the effectiveness and value of interventions targeted at PPO's compared with the social and economic costs associated with their offending behaviour. This exercise will inform the way in which we develop, deliver and commission services in the future.



- 6.39 The Coventry Youth Offending Service lead the delivery of the Prevent and Deter strand of the PPO Strategy. The key components and principles of this priority are already in place through the Youth Offending Service's established Youth Offending Management Programme (YOMP). This programme identifies and targets persistent young offenders aged between 11 and 16 years who do not meet the eligibility criteria for an Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP), but require more support than is offered by their community sentence. Young people are referred to YOMP if they have been convicted of offences committed on three or more separate occasions, are at risk of receiving a custodial sentence and are disengaged with education. The aim is to divert young people from involvement in further offending behaviour.
- 6.40 The Fire Service working in partnership with the YOS through the CCSP have delivered 2 FIRE projects, which are designed to address offending behaviour, and provide positive role models and encourage community involvement. Two courses ran this year targeting 30 young people identified through the YOS. There are plans to deliver 4 more projects in 2007-08.
- 6.41 The Coventry Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP) Programme provides a co-ordinated approach to the provision of leisure/diversionary activity across the city. The PAYP manager ensures that services are targeted at identified groups of young people. This approach has been highly successful at reducing crime and antisocial behaviour across the city during the school holidays and has consistently reported reductions in Youth Offending rates of over 40%.
- 6.42 The Coventry Positive Futures Project offers a diverse and targeted range of innovative sport, healthy lifestyle and leisure programmes aimed at supporting development of self-esteem, confidence and social/personal skills of participating young people. Between April 2003 and September 2004 the project worked with 589 young people and has evidenced outcomes related to greater social inclusion, engagement in education or employment outside of the programme. The Coventry Positive Futures Programme has been identified nationally and regionally as a model of good practice. Key to this has been the project's development work with service users, supporting them through mentoring, volunteering and trainee coaching schemes (Sport England, 2004).
- 6.43 The Fusion Project funded through NRF is delivering opportunities for behavioural change using Sport and Leisure as a vehicle to engage young people. Similar to PAYP, the project can be targeted through the AIMS process to support other activity.
- 6.44 The Safer Stronger Communities priorities are increasingly reflecting the sustainable development agenda. The Partnership has been actively contributing to the emerging Local Development Framework and the Environment Group has been active in shaping the sustainability appraisal and assessment frameworks that will influence future development. Coventry became a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change in October 2006 and the development of a Climate Change Strategy for Coventry will be a key priority for the coming year. The expansion across the whole city of the Council's service for the kerbside collection of recyclables has resulted in a significant increase in the amount of household waste recycled and composted putting Coventry well ahead

of its statutory target and increasing opportunity for local people to contribute to sustainable waste management.

## **7. Healthier Communities and Older People**

- 7.1 Coventry City Council and the Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust (tPCT) are jointly committed to improving services for local people. This is demonstrated in the way in which we work together through the Coventry Partnership, its sub-groups and the Partnership Boards that have been established, in particular the Older People's Partnership.
- 7.2 In early 2006, the Older People's Partnership Board published the Strategy for Older People which provides an overall vision, set of values and direction for Older People living in Coventry.
- 7.3 In order to turn these ambitions into achievable actions and positive outcomes, the Partnership Board and Steering Group will ensure that the action plans are updated to take account of new local developments and guidance from Central Government. For example, since the publication of the Strategy, the National Service Framework for Older People has been refreshed nationally into 10 new programmes termed "New Ambition for Old Age" and the PCT has recently produced its strategic Local Delivery Plan for 2006-09.
- 7.4 To ensure that we can both evidence and be confident that within the Older People's Partnership Action Plan we are focused on achieving the right things in the right order, we have agreed as our first set of priorities the current key service areas and issues that are driving respective local partners and central government. These include:
- Integrated Intermediate Care
  - Integrated Care Pathways (Strokes)
  - Integrated Commissioning Strategy
  - Integrated Equipment Store
  - Ensuring older people make choices and decisions
  - Ensuring wider leisure, learning, health and employment opportunities
  - Implementation of the single assessment process
  - Ensuring that all people aged 85+ have access to information and services as appropriate from all partner organisations
  - Implementation of the Carers Strategy
  - Reduction of emergency attendances and admissions
  - Ensuring people are able to access community based health services in times of crisis
  - Finalising the Older People's Mental Health Strategy
  - Ensuring that older people are able to live independently and securely in a range of housing options
  - Personal dignity and choice in palliative care at the end of life
  - Older people champions to assess and decide service standards.
- 7.5 As can be seen by the above priorities, the joint commissioning and integration of services between the tPCT and Community Services continue to be key to our intention to deliver and engender improved outcomes for older people.

- 7.6 We have demonstrated the strength of our partnership through the Health Inequalities Strategy (2003-06), which has been updated in "Reducing Health Inequalities in Coventry 2004-07". These documents spell out our joint approach to reducing health inequalities. In addition, the tPCT and the Local Authority, with other key stakeholders and partners, including older people themselves, have been working together to better integrate service delivery and achieve better outcomes. We are committed to jointly commissioning integrated services for older people.
- 7.7 The City Council in its Cabinet Member Plan for Community Services states *'there continues to be a strong focus on enablement and encouraging people to take control'*. We are developing an outcomes based approach across social care and increasing our focus on outcome based assessments which has generated energy and enthusiasm throughout the service.
- 7.8 The City Council, through the Community Services Cabinet Member Plan, aims to continue to maintain lower numbers of people needing and using residential care while we increase both intermediate care services that will offer rehabilitation services to people and also provide a range of better ways of supporting people in their own homes. This will include better use of 'supported housing' and 'extra-care' housing. We will also ensure that there are appropriate services for people to purchase using their direct payments. This will increase the proportion of people being helped to live at home. We will ensure that our financial resources are targeted to meet those people with greatest need.
- 7.9 Both service providers and members of CEN have been represented on the planning group for this block. The voluntary sector is well established as a major provider of contracted services on behalf of Community Services and the tPCT and also adds its own funding to deliver additional services. A priority for 2006/07 is to further voluntary and community sector representation on both the theme group and its sub-groups. The sector has a long tradition of engaging with the statutory sector through CVSC's Health and Social Care Forum. The Older People's Partnership includes extensive representation from both service providers and older people's groups.
- 7.10 Some of the neighbourhood-focused Health Action Groups have good voluntary sector and community sector representation. The role of community groups in preventative work is gaining recognition, for example, the pilot work on falls prevention in Foleshill, the Healthy Communities Collaborative and in peer health education.
- 7.11 In addition to the residential, day and domiciliary care provided by the voluntary sector, the community sector provides many neighbourhood-based opportunities for older people to come together and reduce their isolation. This is strongly reflected within CEN's membership and governance.

- 7.12 Given the negative impact and far reaching consequences that social isolation can have, working with isolated older people has been the key focus of the Older People's Partnership NRF Project. This project has identified and genuinely engaged with over 90 older people who between them combine living in social isolation with low incomes, high levels of physical frailty and mental ill health. The result of this engagement and building of trusting relationships is that 3 specific services have been commissioned by the Older People's Partnership. These include the Befriending Service; One to One Telephone Line; and Volunteer Transport. These services are in varying stages of development and implementation, but early indications show that they are reaching and supporting older people who would come into the above categories of need.
- 7.13 The Older People's Partnership has also received funding for 2 years (2006-08) to introduce an innovative project which in the first stage consists of every person who is or will be aged 85 or over in the next 2 years being offered a visit by a Benefits Advice Worker from DWP (who then completes a form which addresses home safety, incomes, falls prevention, etc). This information is passed on to partner agencies as appropriate who provide services where needed, thus providing an enabling and preventative service which includes outreach workers to support older people with multiple needs. Partner agencies include DWP, Orbit Care & Repair, Age Concern, Carers Centre, Fire Service, Police and the tPCT. The second stage consists of every person aged 60 and over being offered this service by all partner agencies who have made the initial contact with the person.
- 7.14 The LAA for Healthier Communities and Older People is based upon the programmes agreed by the Coventry Partnership and associated Theme Groups and the Older People's Strategic Partnership. These are set out in the Community Plan 2005-10; Reducing Health Inequalities in Coventry 2004-07; and the priorities of the Older People's Partnership Board.
- 7.15 Our LAA for this block includes three themes: Health Improvement and Reducing Inequalities; Strengthening Disadvantaged Communities; and Multi-agency approaches to chronic disease management and emergency care.
- 7.16 We are using the LAA to focus our joint work between the health communities, the Local Authority and the Voluntary Sector in both addressing health inequalities and to specifically better manage chronic diseases. To this end we will build on some existing work to:
- develop Intermediate Care Services, as an alternative to hospital admission, residential care;
  - promote better health care and health care management;
  - develop multi-disciplinary case management (eg. Community matrons, district nurses and social workers sharing skills, knowledge and resources);
  - improve the use of new technologies to help people to feel safer and better supported in their own homes;
  - develop our Falls Prevention Strategy and person centred falls pathway; and

- increase benefit take up and reduce fuel poverty through more focused campaigns and commissioned projects.

- 7.17 Coventry has a comprehensive partnership strategy for 'Reducing Inequalities in Health', with the Local Authority, tPCT and Coventry Partnership being key signatories. Published in 2003, the original strategy followed the 6 priorities as set out in the DoH's Tackling Health Inequalities Consultation on a Plan for Delivery. Each of the six priorities has a senior manager lead and programme delivery sub-group and progress reports are received on a six monthly basis.
- 7.18 The original Health Inequalities Strategy Group merged its agenda with the Coventry Partnership Health and Wellbeing Group and was renamed the Health of Coventry Theme Group. Work to reduce health inequalities continues to grow and there are currently 12 programme delivery sub-groups reporting directly to the Health of Coventry group, providing 6 monthly progress reports. The Health of Coventry Group in turn reports directly to the Coventry Partnership, the Local Authority Cabinet and the tPCT PEC and Board.
- 7.19 In order to impact more fully on health inequalities in the city, significant additional resources have been secured from the tPCT and NRF. Coventry has been named as a 'spearhead PCT' to deliver the DoH's Choosing Health White Paper and we already have in place expanded targets for smoking cessation services.
- 7.20 As part of the LAA for Healthier Communities & Older People, the tPCT's Health Promotion Service and the Local Authority's Health Development Unit are extending and further refining their partnership working arrangements and looking to define a formal partnership agreement in order to maximise the impact of both organisations on reducing health inequalities.
- 7.21 This strategy links to other initiatives at a national and local level, including the Choosing Health White Paper, which has been used as a model for a Coventry's own Choosing Health Document, which has a section on Older People and contains a number of recommendations which support the delivery of our LAA targets.
- 7.22 Key priorities, targets and outcomes for Reducing Health Inequalities in Coventry are focused on delivering improvements in the City's 31 priority neighbourhoods.

## **8. Economic Development and Enterprise Block**

8.1 The Economic Development and Enterprise Block for Coventry is based on HM Treasury's model for economic growth, and has four broad outcomes that we are seeking to address:

- To achieve full employment in the city, and increase the employment rate of disadvantaged groups.
- To build an enterprise society in which small firms thrive and achieve their potential, especially in deprived neighbourhoods.
- To stimulate and support a diverse, productive, innovative and knowledge-based economy.
- To provide people with the skills needed for employment, business success, innovation and economic growth.

The four outcomes are underpinned and supported by the final aim:

- Create the conditions for growth within the city.

8.2 Coventry was successful in securing Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) funding in Round 1. Coventry's LEGI Programme began in April 2006. The programme will have a major impact on enterprise and business growth activity over the next three years. The Coventry LEGI proposal is geographically targeted at the most deprived areas in the city. These generally overlap with priority neighbourhoods. In addition, the proposal identifies the following target communities:

- Those who are economically inactive (particularly those on Incapacity Benefit and those with mental health problems)
- Disabled people
- Ex-offenders
- Lone parents
- Refugees and Asylum Seekers
- BME communities
- Young People

8.3 The Coventry LEGI proposal is based on taking a holistic and transformational approach to developing enterprise and entrepreneurship in the most deprived areas of the city. It will address the three key objectives of LEGI through the following workstreams:

- Business Start-Up Support
- Supporting Existing Businesses to Grow
- Employment for Local People

8.4 However, the Coventry LEGI proposal will also tackle both the supply and demand side to increased economic activity through these cross-cutting workstreams:

- Inspire and Engage
- Developing New Business Opportunities

- 8.5 Underpinning these five workstreams is the key objective of increasing local money flows in the most deprived areas of the city. By increasing the amount of money generated and spent within these areas (through increased employment business activity), the local multiplier effect will help generate further wealth and economic activity, leading to a virtuous cycle of improvement. Together, these activities will provide a significant contribution to Coventry's economic vision and growth objectives as detailed above, stimulating and re-igniting economic and entrepreneurial activity in the most deprived areas of the city.
- 8.6 A two-phased approach is being undertaken for implementation of the Coventry LEGI programme. Phase 1 will focus on implementation of activities within the first year (up to March 2007), while Phase 2 will concentrate on the strategic commissioning process and developing the infrastructure to assist in the delivery of the programme over the next three years (until March 2009).
- 8.7 We will continue to work closely with partners including the RDA on the regional Business Link agenda in the development and implementation of our LEGI programme, and ensure that, through this block of the LAA, LEGI funding complements and adds value to existing and future regeneration funding and activity.
- 8.8 Coventry's economy is rapidly changing. Manufacturing industry continues to retreat as is demonstrated by headline closures. New industries such as business services, R&D, niche higher value manufacturing with new inward investing companies are reinforcing changes. Firms such as TUI, Network Rail Training College, Exel Logistics have moved in. Major investment projects such as the Ricoh Arena, the new Hospital and business parks such as Prologis have created new jobs.
- 8.9 The city has a major regeneration programme of £6.5 billion, which will deliver significant physical, environmental, social and cultural change to Coventry. The City Centre is continuing to undergo a major transformation. The first phase of the £600m Swanswell Initiative has started with the building of the new college commencing onsite and opening in September 2007 and with Phase 2 due to start in January 2007. A £10 million AWM Regeneration Zone outline application for the overall development is proceeding, with a funding decision likely in early 2007. The development of £100m Belgrade Plaza is underway, including the attraction of Coventry's first four-star Radisson hotel. Work has also commenced on site to build IKEA's first city centre store.
- 8.10 Change has brought new business styles, technologies and opportunities and led to a high rate of new business formation – an average of 616pa new VAT registrations in the last 10 years or just over 11% of the average stock level. Deregistration reflect the churn in the economy with new replacing old or those that failed.
- 8.11 The evolving economic structure has affected nearly everyone in the city. The changes have meant that people have had to learn new skills. At any one time, some 14% of the city's workforce is in receipt of job related training but people have been left behind, as technological changes have been so rapid. Support is being directed towards people who lack the skills to participate fully in the job market.
- 8.12 Change has created new jobs in the city with resident employment levels being at record numbers. In a dynamic economy optimising investment, employment and business opportunities is key to continued prosperity.

- 8.13 Coventry already benefits from a long and firmly embedded partnership approach to economic development within the city, and indeed the sub-region. This section of the LAA presents an opportunity to build on and further enhance this strong base.
- 8.14 During 2006/07, we have developed an overarching Economic Development Strategy for Coventry - linked closely to the review of the Sub-Regional Economic Strategy and with on-going dialogue with AWM regarding the review of the Regional Economic Strategy in 2007. Partners have taken this opportunity to review our current structural approach to economic development (particularly in light of changes to the LSC and business support in the region) and to strategically consider how various funding sources (mainstream and external) could be further aligned and/or made more flexible to help achieve local priorities.
- 8.15 In May 2006, Coventry City Council and the Jobs and Economy Theme Group of the LSP convened a 4th Block Summit. The purpose of this summit was to provide an overview of the LAA 4<sup>th</sup> Block and to get partners to start considering the future design of economic development and enterprise in the City. Several key themes emerged from the summit including:
- the need to develop an Economic Development Strategy for the City;
  - a requirement for integrated governance arrangements for the 4<sup>th</sup> Block;
  - the need to build on existing strengths;
  - the image and identity of the City;
  - retention of graduates and young people;
  - housing mix;
  - the need for effective communications.
- 8.16 Actions attached to these themes were proposed, some of which have already been taken forward. Key partners have begun to work on the governance arrangements and priorities for the 4<sup>th</sup> block, with a commitment to establish an Economic Development and Enterprise Board in the medium term. In November 2006, it was agreed to draw up a proposal on the governance arrangements for the block which take account of the existing groups and boards that are currently working on economic development initiatives. Partners agreed to ensure strategic alignment with the Regional Economic Development Strategy to improve economic performance of the city and overall West Midlands region.
- 8.17 A Coventry Employment Strategy has been produced by key partners. The Strategy has identified a number of issues that partners must address to ensure that both those seeking employment in the City and employers are offered an integrated range of high quality and progressive services. Partners have agreed that the strategy should focus on: improving local employability and entrepreneurship; reducing worklessness; boosting upward mobility; and improving support for employers and those in the early stages of employment.
- 8.18 The Employment Strategy will be used as a framework to shape the provision of a more comprehensive and inclusive employment service in Coventry over the next 10 years, building on the significant and effective partnership working that currently operates. Coventry recently saw the start of two NRF projects focusing on proactively working with those on Incapacity Benefit, which may lead to an improvement in these figures – although this will take time to filter through to the need for longer-term work with this client group, and the typical 9-month time lag on data for these indicators. The rise in



unemployment may suggest that we also need to focus on both the economically *active*, as well as the inactive client groups.

- 8.19 Significant work has been underway on providing the City's overall vision and planning policy direction through the Local Development Framework. This has been the engagement mechanism for ensuring that the city achieves a consensus with stakeholders and the community on its broad vision and action plan for creating the conditions for growth. Coventry's goal is to have a clear position statement on growth based on the Core Strategy, the Regional Spatial Strategy by quarter 2 of 2007/08. It has recently become a formal growth point under the government's New Growth Points Programme. This will potentially improve our access to finance for growth, enabling the City council to work in partnership with central government to ensure that both economic and housing growth are delivered together and that it is sustainable.

## **9. Conclusion**

- 9.1 The Local Area Agreement has the potential to provide an effective mechanism for both reducing bureaucracy and focusing upon the key challenges for Coventry.
- 9.2 We believe that the way to achieve this is to ensure:
- A strong local performance management system:
  - An effective partnership both locally and with regional government
  - A supportive and corporate approach from central government.
- 9.3 We look forward to working with local partners and government over the coming year to realise these aspirations.

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units             | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / Outturn | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |   |                   | 2004-5 Update       |          | 2005-6 Update        |          | 2006-7 Update        |          | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement |  |
|--|--|--|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---|-------------------|---------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
|  |  |  |                   |                         | City Avg           | 2005-6                             | 2006-7 | 2007-8                                    | 2008-9            | Date of Data        | City Avg | Date of Data         | City Avg | Date of Data         | City Avg | 2005/06 Col 21- 33       | 2006/07 Col 22- 40 |                         |  |
| <b>CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSON'S STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>   |  |  |                   |                         |                    |                                    |        |   |                   |                     |          |                      |          |                      |          |                          |                    |                         |  |
| * by 2010 the quality of life of children and young people will have improved. This improvement will be more rapid for those living in priority neighbourhoods and disadvantaged communities |  |  |                   |                         |                    |                                    |        |   |                   |                     |          |                      |          |                      |          |                          |                    |                         |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9  | 13                | 14                      | 15                 | 21                                 | 22     | 23  | 24                | 25                  | 26       | 32                   | 33       | 39                   | 40       | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49   |
| 1  | Children and young people's achievements and aspirations have been fulfilled to the benefit of themselves, their communities and their neighbourhoods. (laa outcome)<br><br>children and young people with disabilities are able to maximise their potential for healthy, happy and successful lives (laa outcome) | A greater proportion of children reach a good level of development by the end of the foundation stage (6+ in each PSE, CLL scale)  | %                 | Academic Year 02/03     | 45.0               |                                    |        | Awaiting GO targets, expected Summer 2007 |                   | Academic Year 03/04 | 48.3     | Academic Year 2004-5 | 43.9     | Academic Year 2005-6 | 41.1     | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to assess     | New attainment measure. Targets to be set by the DFES January 2007 for summer 2008.  |
| 2  | children and young people feel part of their local neighbourhood and community and behave in a way which enables them to fulfil their potential and that of their neighbourhood and city. (laa outcome)<br><br>children in early years have the foundation for happy, healthy and successful lives (laa outcome)   | A greater proportion of 11 year olds achieve level 4 or higher in english (at key stage 2)   | %                 | Academic Year 02/03     | 72                 | 78.0                               | 79.0   | 80.0                                      | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04 | 76       | Academic Year 2004-5 | 76       | Academic Year 2005-6 | 77       | -2.0                     | -2.0               | Amber                   | Comments are included in the CYP LAA half year performance report  |
| 3  | Looked after children and young people are able to maximise their potential for healthy, happy and successful lives (laa outcome)  | A greater proportion of 11 year olds achieve level 4 or higher in mathematics (at key stage 2)   | %                 | Academic Year 02/03     | 69                 | 78.0                               | 79.0   | 80.0                                      | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04 | 71       | Academic Year 2004-5 | 73       | Academic Year 2005-6 | 73       | -5.0                     | -6.0               | Amber                   | Comments are included in the CYP LAA half year performance report  |
| 4  | Raise standards in English, maths, ICT and science in secondary education so that by 2008, in all schools at least 50% of pupils achieve level 5 or above in each of English, maths and science. (NRU Key Outcome)   | By 2008 all schools located in Local Authority Districts in receipt of NRF to ensure that at least 50% of pupils achieve level five or above in each of in english maths & science | Number of schools | Academic Year 02/03     | 15                 | 16                                 | 18     | 19  | 19                | Academic Year 03/04 | 14       | Academic Year 04/05  | 16       | Academic Year 2005-6 | 17       | 0.0                      | -1.0               | Amber                   | Out of 19 secondary schools only two have not achieved 50%- one in one subject and the other in two subjects. This is based on provisional results and appeals are being considered. |
| 5  |  | Number of schools in priority neighbourhoods where at key stage 3 50% or more pupils achieve level 5 or above in english maths & science   | Number of schools | Academic Year 02/03     | 2                  | 2                                  | 3      | 3   | 3                 | Academic Year 03/04 | 2        | Academic Year 04/05  | 2        | Academic Year 2005-6 | 3        | 0.0                      | 0.0                | Green                   | This is school level analysis and is therefore not available by area   |
| 6  |  | Increase the proportion of pupils achieving level 5 or more at the end of key stage 3 in:  |                   |                         |                    |                                    |        |   |                   |                     |          |                      |          |                      |          |                          |                    |                         |  |
| 7  |  | English  | %                 | Academic Year 02/03     | 69.0               | 75.0                               | 75.0   | 76.0                                      | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04 | 68.0     | Academic Year 2004-5 | 71       | Academic Year 2005-6 | 69       | -4.0                     | -6.0               | Amber                   |  |
| 8  |  | Maths  | %                 | Academic Year 02/03     | 67.0               | 75.0                               | 75.0   | 76.0                                      | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04 | 69.0     | Academic Year 2004-5 | 71       | Academic Year 2005-6 | 74       | -4.0                     | -1.0               | Green                   |  |
| 9  |  | Science  | %                 | Academic Year 02/03     | 63.0               | 70.0                               | 70.0   | 73.0                                      | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04 | 63.0     | Academic Year 2004-5 | 65       | Academic Year 2005-6 | 67       | -5.0                     | -3.0               | Amber                   | Comments are included in the CYP LAA half year performance report  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / Outturn | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |                   |                   | 2004-5 Update         |              | 2005-6 Update         |              | 2006-7 Update        |              | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement |   |
|--|---|---|-------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|
|  |   |   |       |                         |                    | City Avg                           | 2005-6 | 2006-7            | 2007-8            | 2008-9                | Date of Data | City Avg              | Date of Data | City Avg             | Date of Data | City Avg                 | 2005/06 Col 21- 33 |                         |   |
| <b>CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSON'S STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>   |   |   |       |                         |                    |                                    |        |                   |                   |                       |              |                       |              |                      |              |                          |                    |                         |   |
| * by 2010 the quality of life of children and young people will have improved. This improvement will be more rapid for those living in priority neighbourhoods and disadvantaged communities |   |   |       |                         |                    |                                    |        |                   |                   |                       |              |                       |              |                      |              |                          |                    |                         |   |
| 1  | 8   | 9   | 13    | 14                      | 15                 | 21                                 | 22     | 23                | 24                | 25                    | 26           | 32                    | 33           | 39                   | 40           | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49  |
| 10   |   | ICT   | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 63.0               | 73.0                               | 75.0   | 76.0              | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04   | 69.0         | Academic Year 2004-5  | 70           | Academic Year 2005-6 | 68           | -3.0                     | -7.0               | Red                     |   |
| 11   |   | A greater proportion of 16 year olds achieve 5 or more gcse's at grade a*-c or equivalent at the end of key stage 4   | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 45.8               | 53.0                               | 53.0   | 55.0              | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04   | 45.6         | Academic Year 2004-5  | 46.4         | 2005-06              | 48.1         | -6.6                     | -4.9               | Too early to assess     | Comments are included in the CYP LAA half year performance report |
| 12   | LPSA Priority Area 5-Children and Young People. Target 11 Improving Outcomes for Boys and Looked After Children | A greater proportion of 16 year olds BOYS achieve 5 or more gcse's at grade a*-c or equivalent at the end of key stage 4, including English and Mathematics | %     | Academic Year 04/05     | 30.9               |                                    |        | 38 (summer 2008)  |                   |                       |              |                       |              | 2005-06              | 33.9         | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to assess     |   |
| 13   |   | Educational achievement of looked after children compared with their peers:   |       |                         |                    |                                    |        |                   |                   |                       |              |                       |              |                      |              |                          |                    |                         |   |
| 14   |   | More looked after children aged 11 who obtain level 4 in key stage 2 english and maths  | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 38.0               | 41.0                               | 42.0   | 45.8              | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04   | 50.0         | Academic Year 2004-5  | 46.0         | Academic Year 2005-6 | 47.7         | 5.0                      | 5.7                | Green                   |   |
| 15   |   | More children who have been looked after for a year or longer sit at least one gcse   | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 44.0               | 70.0                               | 80.0   | 80.0              | To be set in 2007 | Academic Year 03/04   | 62.5         | Academic Year 2004-5  | 63.0         | Academic Year 2005-6 | 50.0         | -7.0                     | -30.0              | Red                     | Comments to be included in the summary                            |
| 16   | LPSA Priority Area 5-Children and Young People. Target 11 Improving Outcomes for Boys and Looked After Children | More children who have been looked after for a year or longer attain 5 or more gcse's at grades a*-c  | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 8.0                | N/A                                | 6.0    | 9.5               | 16.0              | Academic Year 03/04   | 5.0          | Academic Year 2004-5  | 3.4          | Academic Year 2005-6 | 2.4          | NA                       | -3.6               | Red                     | Comments to be included in the summary                            |
| 17   |   | More care leavers attain one or more gcse's at grade a*-g   | %     | Financial Year 2003-4   | 42.1               | 49.0                               | 60.0   | 62.0              | 64.0              | Financial Year 2004-5 | 45.9         | Financial Year 2005-6 | 58.1         |                      |              | 9.1                      | NA                 | Too early to assess     | No data available for 2006  |
| 18   |   | More care leavers attain five or more gcse's at grade a*-c  | %     | Financial Year 2003-4   | 2.6                | 11.0                               | 8.0    | To be set in 2007 | To be set in 2008 | Financial Year 2004-5 | 10.8         | Financial Year 2005-6 | 4.7          |                      |              | -6.3                     | NA                 | Too early to assess     | No data available for 2006  |
| 19   |   | Improvement in pupil attendance rates:  |       |                         |                    |                                    |        |                   |                   |                       |              |                       |              |                      |              |                          |                    |                         |   |
| 20   |   | Primary schools   | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 93.7               | 94.0                               | 94.1   | 94.3              | 94.5              | Academic Year 03/04   | 93.9         | Academic Year 04/05   | 94.0         | Academic Year 05/06  | 93.4         | 0.1                      | -0.7               | Amber                   | Localised viral infection impacted on attendance                  |
| 21   |   | Secondary schools   | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 90.7               | 91.3                               | 91.7   | 92.1              | 92.6              | Academic Year 03/04   | 91.2         | Academic Year 04/05   | 91.2         | Academic Year 05/06  | 91.8         | -0.1                     | 0.1                | Green                   | Localised viral infection impacted on attendance                  |
| 22   |   | Special schools   | %     | Academic Year 02/03     | 86.8               | 88.9                               | 89.8   | 90.7              | 91.6              | Academic Year 03/04   | 88.1         | Academic Year 04/05   | 88.0         | Academic Year 05/06  | 89.5         | -0.9                     | -0.3               | Amber                   | Localised viral infection impacted on attendance                  |
| 23   |   | Reduce exclusions so that there are less than 15 permanent exclusions across all phases   |       |                         |                    |                                    |        |                   |                   |                       |              |                       |              |                      |              |                          |                    |                         |   |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome                 | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units                            | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / Outturn City Avg | Performance Targets (City Average) |   |   |   | 2004-5 Update       |          | 2005-6 Update       |          | 2006-7 Update            |          | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement |   |
|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|
|  |                             |  |                                  |                         |                             | 2005-6                             | 2006-7                                      | 2007-8                                      | 2008-9                                      | Date of Data        | City Avg | Date of Data        | City Avg | Date of Data             | City Avg | 2005/06 Col 21- 33       | 2006/07 Col 22- 40 |                         |   |
| <b>CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSON'S STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>   |                             |  |                                  |                         |                             |                                    |   |   |   |                     |          |                     |          |                          |          |                          |                    |                         |   |
| * by 2010 the quality of life of children and young people will have improved. This improvement will be more rapid for those living in priority neighbourhoods and disadvantaged communities |                             |  |                                  |                         |                             |                                    |   |   |   |                     |          |                     |          |                          |          |                          |                    |                         |   |
| 1  | 8                           | 9  | 13                               | 14                      | 15                          | 21                                 | 22  | 23  | 24  | 25                  | 26       | 32                  | 33       | 39                       | 40       | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49  |
| 24   |                             | Primary schools  | Number                           | Academic Year 02/03     | 4                           | Less than 15 across all phases     | Less than 15 across all phases              | Less than 15 across all phases              | Less than 15 across all phases              | Academic Year 03/04 | 1        | Academic Year 04/05 | 0        | Academic Year 05/06      | 0        | NA                       | 15.0               | Green                   | Numbers too small for area analysis   |
| 25   |                             | Secondary schools  | Number                           | Academic Year 02/03     | 66                          | Less than 15 across all phases     | Less than 15 across all phases              | Less than 15 across all phases              | Less than 15 across all phases              | Academic Year 03/04 | 4        | Academic Year 04/05 | 9        | Academic Year 05/06      | 8        | NA                       | 6.0                | Green                   | Numbers too small for area analysis   |
| 26   |                             | Special schools  | Number                           | Academic Year 02/03     | 1                           | Less than 15 across all phases     | Less than 15 across all phases              | Less than 15 across all phases              | Less than 15 across all phases              | Academic Year 03/04 | 0        | Academic Year 04/05 | 0        | Academic Year 05/06      | 0        | NA                       | 15.0               | Green                   | Numbers too small for area analysis   |
| 27   |                             | Increase the proportion of year 11 students whose first destination after statutory education school is categorised as continuing in learning  | %                                | Nov-03                  | 89.9                        |                                    | 92.2  | 92.8  | 93.4  | Nov-04              | 92.0     | Nov-05              | 91.7     | Nov-05                   | 91.7     | NA                       | -0.5               | Amber                   | An annual count - next update Nov 06  |
| 28   | Achieve economic well being | Percentage of 16-18 year olds not in education employment or in training (neet)  | %                                | Nov-02                  | 11.9                        |                                    | 8.8   | 8.1   | 7.4   | Nov-05              | 8.6      | N/A                 | N/A      | Q1 2006-07               | 9.70%    | NA                       | -0.9               | Red                     | Comments to be included in the summary  |
| 29   |                             | Halt the year on year rise of obesity in children  |                                  | 2005/06                 | 20.5%                       |                                    | 17.9%                                       | 18.2%                                       |   |                     |          |                     |          |                          | NA       | NA                       |                    |                         | Baseline is based on year six children only since reception age data are not available. Targets are based on reception and year six combined. |
| 30   | Be Healthy                  | Reduction in the under 18 conception rate  | Rate per 1000 females aged 15-17 | 2001-3                  | 60.6                        | 47.0                               | 43  | 39  | 27.2 by 2010                                | 2002-2004           | 59.6     | N/A                 | N/A      | N/A                      | N/A      | NA                       | NA                 | Amber                   | Comments to be included in the summary  |
| 31   |                             | Percentage of the sexually active population aged 15-24 accepting screening for Chlamydia.   | %                                |                         |                             |                                    | Awaiting DOH, should be available Spring 07 | Awaiting DOH, should be available Spring 07 | Awaiting DOH, should be available Spring 07 |                     |          |                     |          |                          | NA       | NA                       |                    | Too early to assess     | The PCT are awaiting information from the DoH who are setting a national target expected Spring 07.   |
| 32   |                             | Reduce the use of class a drugs and frequent use of any illicit drugs among all young people under the age of 25, especially by the most vulnerable young people and reduce the harm caused by illegal drugs by: |                                  |                         |                             |                                    |   |   |   |                     |          |                     |          |                          |          |                          |                    |                         |   |
| 33   |                             | All young people assessed by the youth offending service (via asset) to have identified needs in relation to substance misuse  | %                                | 2004-05                 | 89.0                        | 85                                 | 90  | 95  | 95  | 2004-05             | 89.0     | 2005/06             | 94       | 2006/07 (6 Month Update) | 97.2     | 9.0                      | 7.2                | Green                   | In line to achieve this target for the year.  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units                      | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / Outturn City Avg | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |                                  |                   | 2004-5 Update |             | 2005-6 Update |             | 2006-7 Update            |            | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement |  |
|--|-------------|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
|  |             |  |                            |                         |                             | 2005-6                             | 2006-7 | 2007-8                           | 2008-9            | Date of Data  | City Avg    | Date of Data  | City Avg    | Date of Data             | City Avg   | 2005/06 Col 21- 33       | 2006/07 Col 22- 40 |                         |  |
| <b>CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSON'S STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>   |             |  |                            |                         |                             |                                    |        |                                  |                   |               |             |               |             |                          |            |                          |                    |                         |  |
| * by 2010 the quality of life of children and young people will have improved. This improvement will be more rapid for those living in priority neighbourhoods and disadvantaged communities |             |  |                            |                         |                             |                                    |        |                                  |                   |               |             |               |             |                          |            |                          |                    |                         |  |
| 1  | 8           | 9  | 13                         | 14                      | 15                          | 21                                 | 22     | 23                               | 24                | 25            | 26          | 32            | 33          | 39                       | 40         | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49   |
| 34   |             | To receive appropriate specialist care within 5 working days, and;   | %                          | 2004-5                  | 52.0                        | 85                                 | 90     | 95                               | 95                | 2004-05       | 52.0        | 2005/06       | 71          | Q1 2006/07               | 97.4       | -14.0                    | 7.4                | Amber                   | Comments to be included in the summary   |
| 35   |             | Following assessment, access the early intervention and treatment services they require within 10 working days | %                          | 2004-5                  | 77.0                        | 85                                 | 90     | 95                               | 95                | 2004-05       | 77.0        | 2005/06       | 91          | Q1 2006/07               | 91         | 6.0                      | 1.0                | Green                   | As at quarter 1 2006/07, performance is on target.   |
| 36   |             | Increasing the Number of young people aged under 18 receiving structured interventions and treatment           | Number of under 18s        | 2005/06                 | 85.0                        | 85.0                               | 107    | 129                              |                   | N/A           | N/A         | 2005/06       | 108         | Q1 2006/07               | 58         | 23.0                     | -49.0              | Green                   | As at quarter 1 2006/07, performance is on target.   |
| 37   |             | Increasing the percentage of young people aged under 18 receiving structured interventions and treatment       | %                          | 2005/06                 | 47.0                        | 47.0                               | 52     | 57                               |                   | N/A           | N/A         | 2005/06       | 50          | Q1 2006/07               | 29         | 3.0                      | -23.0              | Green                   | As at quarter 1 2006/07, performance is on target.   |
| 38   |             | Increase the Number of under 18s completing treatment successfully.  | Number of under 18s        | 2005/06                 | 36.0                        | 36.0                               | 55     | 73                               |                   |               |             | 2005/06       | 36          | Q1 2006/07               | 6          | 0.0                      | -49.0              | Amber                   | Comments to be included in the summary   |
| 39   |             | The proportions of children and young people offending   | % (number)                 | 2003-4                  | 3% (1021)                   | 4%                                 | 4%     | 4%                               | 5%                | 2004-05       | 4.1% (1364) | 2005-06       | 4.2% (1375) | 2006/07 (6 Month Update) | 2.0% (672) | NA                       | NA                 | Green                   | This indicator is down 52.4% due to the fact that we are only reporting on a 6 month period. At the half way point we are in line to meet the 4% target.                                   |
| 41   |             | Re-registrations on the child protection register are reduced  | Number                     | Financial Year 2002-3   | 21.0                        | 14.0                               | 13     | To be set in 2007 (by end March) | To be set in 2008 | 2004-5        | 14.6        | 2005-6        | 10.9        | Apr-Sep 06 (6 mths)      | 26.8       | -3.1                     | 13.8               | Amber                   | New processes now in place between Safeguarding Service & Locality Services to better examine the need for registration it is anticipated that this will bring performance back on target. |
| 42   |             | Stock and take up of child care for all families - under development   | Number of childcare places | 2005-6                  | 10049                       | N/A                                | 10249  | 10349                            |                   | 2005          | 11583       | 2006          | 10049       | 2006                     | 10329      | NA                       | 80.0               | Green                   | During 2005/6 the National Ofsted database was introduced to provide numbers of Childcare places to local authorities. New baselines and targets were set based on these new figures.      |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units                         | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / Outturn | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |                   | 2004-5 Update |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |              | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement |  |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
|  |  |  |                               |                         |                    | City Avg                           | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8            | 2008-9        | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg                 | 2005/06 Col 21- 33 |                         |  |
| <b>CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSON'S STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>   |  |  |                               |                         |                    |                                    |        |        |                   |               |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                    |                         |  |
| * by 2010 the quality of life of children and young people will have improved. This improvement will be more rapid for those living in priority neighbourhoods and disadvantaged communities |  |  |                               |                         |                    |                                    |        |        |                   |               |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                    |                         |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9  | 13                            | 14                      | 15                 | 21                                 | 22     | 23     | 24                | 25            | 26           | 32            | 33           | 39            | 40           | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49   |
| 43   |  | The Number of children's centres operational   | Number of operational centres | 2003                    | 4 SureStart        | 8                                  | 5      | 4      |                   |               |              | 2006 (March)  | 8            | 2006 (March)  | 8            | 0.0                      | 3.0                | Green                   | By March 2006, there were eight children's centres open and by June 2006 there will be an additional 4 centres opening. 2006-2008 will see an additional 7 new centres opened. Targets for 2006-07 and 2007-08 were set incorrectly. Target should have been 4 as Foleshill Children's Centre is included in the phase 2 allocation not the first. |
| 45   | LPSA Priority Area 5- Children and Young People. Target 11 Improving Outcomes for Boys and Looked After Children | The number of children discharged from care who were adopted, subject to Residence Orders or Special Guardianship Orders as a percentage of Children Looked After for 6 months or more   | %                             | 2005-6                  | 5.6                | No Target                          | 9.0    | 10.5   | To be set in 2007 |               |              | 2005-6        | 5.6          |               |              | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to assess     |  |
| 46   | LPSA Priority Area 5- Children and Young People. Target 11 Improving Outcomes for Boys and Looked After Children | The percentage of children aged under 16 living in foster placements or placed for adoption who have been looked after for 2.5 years or more and who have been in the same foster placement for 2 years or more or are placed for adoption   | %                             | 2005-6                  | 63.4               | No Target                          | 72.0   | 75.0   | To be set in 2007 |               |              | 2005-6        | 63.4         |               |              | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to assess     |  |
| 47   | LPSA Priority Area 5- Children and Young People. Target 11 Improving Outcomes for Boys and Looked After Children | The ratio of the percentage of young people looked after on 1 April in their 17th year (aged 16) who were engaged in education, training or employment at the age 19, compared to the whole population 18-24   | %                             | 2004-5                  | 0.48               | 0.55                               | 0.75   | 0.75   | 0.75              | 2004-5        | 0.48         | 2005-6        | 0.77         |               |              | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to assess     |  |
| 48   | Be Healthy   | The percentage annual increase in the number of schools with an approved school travel plan (STP) required to achieve 100 percent STP coverage by March 2010. This should be profiled against the current number of schools with an approved STP in place and the appropriate delivery point on a trajectory which would achieve 100 percent coverage by 2010. | %                             | 2005-6                  | 38%                | 40%                                | 55%    | 70%    | 85%               | N/A           | N/A          | 2005-6        | 38%          |               |              | 2%                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units          | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets                     |        |         |  | 2004-5 Update  |              | 2005-6 Update |                    | 2006-7 Update                           |                                       | Target v Actual Variance              |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |  |
|---|---|---|----------------|-------------------------|---|--------|---------|--|--|--------------|---------------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
|   |   |   |                |                         | City Avg                                | 2005-6 | 2006-7  | 2007-8   | 2008-9   | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data       | City Avg                                | Date of Data                          | City Avg                              | 2005/06 Cal 21- 33 |                         |                     | 2006/07 Cal 22- 40   |
| <b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT &amp; ENTERPRISE BLOCK.</b>   |   |   |                |                         |   |        |         |  |  |              |               |                    |   |                                       |                                       |                    |                         |                     |  |
| <b>JOBS &amp; ECONOMY (JOBS STRATEGY GROUP) OUTCOMES:</b>   |   |   |                |                         |   |        |         |  |  |              |               |                    |   |                                       |                                       |                    |                         |                     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by 2010 there will be fewer households in priority neighbourhoods and communities with nobody in paid employment.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be improvements to advice services so that people get the benefits to which they are entitled.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be a wider range of business and job opportunities across the City .</li> </ul> |   |   |                |                         |   |        |         |  |  |              |               |                    |   |                                       |                                       |                    |                         |                     |  |
| 1   | 8   | 9   | 13             | 14                      | 15                                      | 21     | 22      | 23   | 24   | 25           | 26            | 32                 | 33                                      | 39                                    | 40                                    | 46                 | 47                      | 48                  | 49   |
| 1   | Achieve full employment in the city, and increase the employment rate of disadvantaged groups (legi outcome)  | Increase in the employment rate across the city   | %              | Apr 2004 - Mar 2005     | 70.3                                    |        | 71.5%   | 73.0%  | 74.5%  |              |               | Apr 2005- Mar 2006 | 71.9%                                   | Data Available 2007                   | Data Available 2007                   | NA                 | NA                      | Amber               |  |
| 2   | more people from disadvantaged groups are in paid work. (laa outcome)As part of the wider objective of full employment in every region, over the three years to Spring 2008, and taking account of the economic cycle: • demonstrate progress on increasing the employment rate, • increase the employment rate of disadvantaged groups (lone parents, ethnic minorities, people aged 50 and over, those with the | Increase in the employment rate for the bme community across the city   | %              | Jan - Mar 2005          | 56.1 (BME Community across the City)    |        | 58.0%   | 60.0%  | 62.5%  |              |               | Apr 2005- Mar 2006 | 57.6%                                   | Data Available 2007                   | Data Available 2007                   | NA                 | NA                      | Amber               |  |
| 3   | lowest qualifications and those living in the Local Authority wards with the poorest initial labour market position); and• significantly reduce the difference between the employment rates of the disadvantaged groups and the overall rate (NRU Key Outcome)  | Reduce levels of worklessness (those unemployed + those on incapacity benefit & severe disablement allowance in the 16 64 male population and 16 to 59 Female) in the priority neighbourhoods   | %              | Aug-04                  | 16.2 (Priority Neighbourhood Average)   |        | 14.3    | 12.5   | 10.8   |              |               | Feb 06             | 16.9 in Priority Neighbourhoods         |                                       |                                       | NA                 | NA                      | Red                 |  |
| 4   | Within each NRF district , for those living in the ward identified by DWP as having the worst labour market position (as at Feb 2004), significantly improve their overall employment rate and reduce the difference between their employment rate and the overall employment rate for England  | Fewer people surveyed say that there is no-one in their household in paid work  | %              | 2003                    | 22                                      |        | 16      | 15   | Target is to increase on existing baseline & through the in-year review further targets will be set. | 2004-5       | 18.8          | 2005-6             | 16.7                                    | Data Available 2007                   | Data Available 2007                   | NA                 | NA                      | Amber               |  |
| 5   | Simulate and support a diverse, productive, innovative and knowledge-based economy (legi outcome) coventry's economic performance improves. (laa outcome)   | Within that NRF district a reduction by 2007/8 of at least 1.72 percentage point in the overall benefits claim rate for those living in the Local Authority Wards identified by DWP(Foleshill) as having the worst initial labour market position.(A reduction of 1.6% p in the percentage of residents in Foleshill ward who recieve benefits) | %              | 2005                    | 28.596 (Foleshill)                      |        |         | 26.88 (Foleshill Target)                       |  |              |               |                    |   | Should be available in June/July 2007 | Should be available in June/July 2007 | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess |  |
| 6   |   | Within that NRF district a reduction by 2007/8 of at least 1.72 percentage point in the difference between the overall benefits claimant rate for England and the overall rate for the local authority wards with the worst labour market position.   | %              | 2005                    | Gap 11.5 Foleshill 28.596 England 17.12 |        |         | 9.756  |  |              |               | 2005               | Gap 11.5 Foleshill 28.596 England 17.12 | Data Available July 2007              | Data Available July 2007              | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess |  |
| 7   |   | Increase in gva per capita for the city   | 100=UK average | 2003                    | 102                                     |        | 102     | 103  | 105  | 2004         | 103           | 2005               | should be available end 2007            | should be available end 2008          | should be available end 2008          | NA                 | NA                      | Red                 | On an annual basis GVA per capita has been dropping consistently since 1998.   |
| 8   |   | Increase the average household incomes across the city  | £              | 2005                    | £27,692                                 |        | £28,800 | £29,950  | £31,150  |              |               | 2006               | £ 30,225                                |                                       |                                       | NA                 | NA                      | Green               |  |
| 9   |   | Reduce the gap in average household incomes between the city average and the priority neighbourhood average   | £              | 2005                    | £5664 (gap)                             |        | £5,450  | £5,200   | £4,900   | 2005         | £5664 (gap)   | 2006               | £4,800 (gap)                            | available 2007                        | available 2007                        | NA                 | NA                      | Green               | Incomes in Priority Neighbourhoods are increasing but at a similar rate to the Rest of the City. The gap is not narrowing. |
| 10  | Creating the conditions for growth (laa outcome). Attract appropriate inward investment and franchising into deprived areas, making use of local labour resources (legi outcome)  | Total Number of inward investment enquiries per 10,000 economically active population   | Number         | 2005                    | 7                                       |        | 25.0    | Target will be set based on 2006/7 performance | In development and based upon Audit Commission recommended indicators                                |              |               | 2005/06            | 25.7                                    | Available 2008                        | Available 2008                        | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units                       | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets                 |        |  |  | 2004-5 Update   |              | 2005-6 Update             |              | 2006-7 Update      |                     | Target v Actual Variance |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |   |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--|--|---|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
|   |   |   |                             |                         | Baseline / City Avg                 | 2005-6 | 2006-7   | 2007-8   | 2008-9  | Date of Data | City Avg                  | Date of Data | City Avg           | Date of Data        | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> |                         |                     | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i>  |
| <b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT &amp; ENTERPRISE BLOCK.</b>   |   |   |                             |                         |                                     |        |  |  |   |              |                           |              |                    |                     |                          |                              |                         |                     |   |
| <b>JOBS &amp; ECONOMY (JOBS STRATEGY GROUP) OUTCOMES:</b>   |   |   |                             |                         |                                     |        |  |  |   |              |                           |              |                    |                     |                          |                              |                         |                     |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by 2010 there will be fewer households in priority neighbourhoods and communities with nobody in paid employment.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be improvements to advice services so that people get the benefits to which they are entitled.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be a wider range of business and job opportunities across the City .</li> </ul> |   |   |                             |                         |                                     |        |  |  |   |              |                           |              |                    |                     |                          |                              |                         |                     |   |
| 1   | 8   | 9   | 13                          | 14                      | 15                                  | 21     | 22   | 23   | 24  | 25           | 26                        | 32           | 33                 | 39                  | 40                       | 46                           | 47                      | 48                  | 49  |
| 11  |   | Total amount of new investment and b) re-investment made in the area as a result of activity by partners  | £                           | NA (New Data Set)       | NA (New Data Set)                   |        | £40 M  | Target will be set based on 2006/7 performance                             | In development and based upon Audit Commission recommended indicators |              |                           |              | Available 2007     |                     | Available 2008           | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess |   |
| 12  | Build an enterprise society by:<br>a) increasing total entrepreneurial activity amongst the population in deprived areas<br>b) support the sustainable growth, and reducing failure rates of, locally owned businesses in deprived areas (legi outcome) | Increase in net new vat registrations   | Numbers                     | 2004                    | 125                                 |        | 50   | 90   | 120   | 2004         | 125                       | 2005         | 205                |                     | 2 year lag               | NA                           | NA                      | Amber               | Vat registrations (stock at end of year) have been consistently increasing year on year since 1998. Net new registrations remain positive but the total amount fell in 2004 |
| 13  |   | Increase rates of total entrepreneurship activity (tea) in legi target area   | %                           | 2005                    | 1.34% (avg 10% most deprived LSOAs) |        | Survey will be held every 3 years, (2008/9 next) so no interim targets set | Survey will be held every 3 years, (2008/9 next) so no interim targets set | 2%  | 2005         | 1.34% (LEGI Area average) |              | next update 2008/9 |                     | next update 2008/9       | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess |   |
| 14  |   | Increased levels of self employment in the city   | %                           | April 2004-March 2005   | 8.50                                |        | 8.6  | 8.8  | 9.1   |              |                           | Apr05-Mar 06 | 9.20               | data available 2007 | data available 2007      | NA                           | NA                      | Amber               |   |
| 15  |   | Increase in average size (by Numbers employed) those firms in bottom third of the idbr for the city   | Average Number of employees | 2004                    | 1.92                                |        | 1.93   | 1.96   | 2   |              |                           | 2005         | 1.92               | data available 2007 | data available 2007      | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess | New IBDR data is available but is unreliable at present   |
| 16  | LPSA Priority Area 1- Jobs and our Local Economy<br>Increase the number of employment opportunities for workless people with health problems  | Number of people with health problems in receipt of a DWP working age benefit helped by Coventry City Council into paid work of at least 16 hours a week for 13 consecutive weeks or more as measured by Coventry City Council and supported by Jobcentre Plus evidencing, where alternative sources are not made available | Number of people            | 2005-6                  | 0                                   |        |  | 100 (3 year cum)   |   |              |                           |              |                    | data available 2007 | data available 2007      | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess |   |



Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units   | Baseline / Outturn Date    | Baseline / City Avg   | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |                                    | 2004-5 Update            |          | 2005-6 Update            |          | 2006-7 Update              |                            | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
|  |  |   |   |                            |                       | 2005-6                             | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9                             | Date of Data             | City Avg | Date of Data             | City Avg | Date of Data               | City Avg                   | 2005/06 Col 21- 33       | 2006/07 Col 22- 40 |                         |  |
| <b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT &amp; ENTERPRISE BLOCK.</b>  |  |   |   |                            |                       |                                    |        |        |                                    |                          |          |                          |          |                            |                            |                          |                    |                         |  |
| <b>ADULT LEARNING &amp; TRAINING THEME GROUP OUTCOMES:</b>   |  |   |   |                            |                       |                                    |        |        |                                    |                          |          |                          |          |                            |                            |                          |                    |                         |  |
| * by 2010 the Number of adults living in our priority neighbourhoods accessing and succeeding in education and training will have risen faster that the rest of the City |  |   |   |                            |                       |                                    |        |        |                                    |                          |          |                          |          |                            |                            |                          |                    |                         |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9   | 13  | 14                         | 15                    | 21                                 | 22     | 23     | 24                                 | 25                       | 26       | 32                       | 33       | 39                         | 40                         | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49   |
| 1  | More adults have the skills and qualifications needed for employment | Reduce Number of adults in the workforce who lack an nvq2 or equivalent | %   | LFS March 2003 to Feb 2004 | 34.5% (48,700 people) | 34%                                | 34%    | 32%    | 30%                                |                          |          | APS Jan 05 to Dec 05     | 34.60%   | Data available 2007        | Data available 2007        | 0.6%                     | NA                 | Amber                   | The ONS have discontinued Labour Force Survey analysis of qualifications - monitored quarterly and replaced it with data from the Annual Population Survey (APS). Most recent APS data suggests the economically active population without a level 2 is 34.6%. This is 0.1% above the previous LFS figure but it is not possible to determine a trend from this, due to the slight nature of change compared to the 2% confidence interval the data is subject to. |
| 2  |  | Increase the Number in coventry receiving skills for life training      | Number of learners received skills for life (Cumulative figure) | August 2004 to July 2005   | 3500                  | 5,000                              | 7,400  | 8,500  | New target will be agreed with LSC | August 2004 to July 2005 | 3595     | August 2005 to July 2006 | 5895     | Data available 2007        | Data available 2007        | 895.0                    | NA                 | Green                   | Coventry & Warwickshire LSC data shows that the number of adults achieving a skills for life qualification is increasing year on year and the target set aims for Coventry and Warwickshire to meet it's allocated target for 2007, a year early. The LSC is currently unable to provide this precise information at a Local Authority level due the way it is collected and monitored nationally, however we anticipate that this will be available in the future |
| 5  |  | Number of 18+ year olds entering higher education                       | Number Aged 18+   | 2004/5                     | 3116                  | 3427                               | 4759   | 5235   | tba                                |                          |          | Oct 05                   | 4385     | Data available Spring 2008 | Data available Spring 2008 | 958                      | NA                 | Too early to assess     |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome | Performance Measure / Indicator | Units | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |        | 2004-5 Update |          | 2005-6 Update |          | 2006-7 Update |          | Target v Actual Variance     |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments |  |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|--|
|  |             |                                 |       |                         | City Avg   | 2005-6                             | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9 | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i> |                         |          |  |
| <b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT &amp; ENTERPRISE BLOCK.</b>  |             |                                 |       |                         |            |                                    |        |        |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |          |  |
| <b>TRANSPORT THEME GROUP OUTCOME:</b>  |             |                                 |       |                         |            |                                    |        |        |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |          |  |
| <i>by 2010 the quality of local public transport services will have improved and people will find it easier and safer to get to work, places of learning and leisure, health services and shops.</i> |             |                                 |       |                         |            |                                    |        |        |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |          |  |
| <i>These improvements will be more rapid in our priority neighbourhoods and communities.</i>   |             |                                 |       |                         |            |                                    |        |        |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |          |  |
| 1  | 8           | 9                               | 13    | 14                      | 15         | 21                                 | 22     | 23     | 24     | 25            | 26       | 32            | 33       | 39            | 40       | 46                           | 47                           | 48                      | 49       |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units   | Baseline / Outturn Date                        | Baseline / City Avg | Performance Targets (City Average) |             |                                       |                    | 2004-5 Update           |             | 2005-6 Update           |             | 2006-7 Update            |                          | Target v Actual Variance     |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |   |   |  |                     | 2005-6                             | 2006-7      | 2007-8                                | 2008-9             | Date of Data            | City Avg    | Date of Data            | City Avg    | Date of Data             | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i> |                         |   |  |
| <b>HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE BLOCK</b>  |  |   |   |  |                     |                                    |             |                                       |                    |                         |             |                         |             |                          |                          |                              |                              |                         |   |  |
| <b>Health and Well-Being (Health of Coventry Group) Outcome:</b><br>by 2010, people in Coventry will be living healthier lives which will contribute towards people living longer in the future.<br>These improvements will happen more quickly in priority neighbourhoods and communities |  |   |   |  |                     |                                    |             |                                       |                    |                         |             |                         |             |                          |                          |                              |                              |                         |   |  |
| 1  | Increase the level of health & fitness for all (laa outcome).<br><br>Reduce premature mortality rates and reduce inequalities in premature mortality rates between wards/neighbourhoods with a particular focus on reducing the risk factors for heart disease, stroke and related disease. (CVD)(Smoking, diet and physical activity) | Reduce directly standardised mortality rates from circulatory diseases in people under 75, so that the absolute gap between the national rate and the rate for the district is narrowed, at least in line with LDP trajectories by 2010                   | Rate per 100,000 People, 3 year rolling average   | 2001-3 (2002 mid point)                        | 115.4               | 101                                | 96          | 91                                    | City 86: PN 105    | 2002-4 (2003 mid point) | 107         | 2003-5 (2004 mid point) | 103.5       | Data Available Sept 2007 | Data Available Sept 2007 | 2.5                          | NA                           | Green                   | Latest data in 2005 shows a continued reduction on a 3 year rolling average basis (mid point year 2004) to 103.5 per 100000, and therefore below the target of 106. Rates in Priority Neighbourhoods and BME areas also continue to fall and are narrowing the gap against non Priority Neighbourhood Areas.  |  |
|  |  | Reduce health inequalities between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the district average, using indicators that are chosen in accordance with local health priorities and will contribute to a reduction in inequalities in premature mortality rates |   |  |                     |                                    |             |                                       |                    |                         |             |                         |             |                          |                          |                              |                              |                         |   |  |
| 2  |  | Reduce in mortality rates from cancer in people aged under 75   | Rate per 100,000 People, 3 year rolling average   | 2001-3 (2002 mid point)                        | 130.1               | 127                                | 125         | 124                                   | City 122: PN 137   | 2002-4 (2003 mid point) | 127.9       | 2003-5 (2004 mid point) | 129.2       | Data Available Sept 2007 | Data Available Sept 2007 | 2.2                          | NA                           | Amber                   | Latest data in 2005 indicates a slight increase in mortality rates on a 3 year rolling average basis (mid point year 2004) to 129.2 per 100000. This is slightly above target. A comparison of Priority and Non Priority Areas indicate a narrowing of the gap in 2005. Mortality Rates in BME areas appear to have reduced in the last two time periods and are below the city average.                        |  |
| 3  |  | Reduce health inequalities as measured by infant mortality  | Rate per 1000 live births, 3 year rolling average | 2001-3 (2002 mid point)                        | 7.6                 | 6.8                                | 6.6         | 6.3                                   | 6                  | 2002-4 (2003 mid point) | 8.2         | 2003-5 (2004 mid point) | 6.8         | Data Available Sept 2007 | Data Available Sept 2007 | 0.0                          | NA                           | Amber                   | There has been an apparent reduction in Infant Mortality in 2005(provisional figures) to 4.4 per 1000 and to 6.8 per 1000 on a 3 year rolling average (mid point year 2004). Reduction in rates in 2005 reflected in Priority Neighbourhoods also. Numbers are too small for BME reporting.   |  |
| 4  |  | Reduce percentage of women smoking in pregnancy   | % Smokers at the time of delivery                 | 2002-3 City Wide, 2003-4 PN & Rest of the City | 24.6                | 17.8                               | 16.8        | 15.8                                  | City 15%: PN 17.3% | 2004-5                  | 20.6        | 2005-6                  | 18.9        | Data Available Sept 2007 | Data Available Sept 2007 | 1.1                          | NA                           | Amber                   | The proportion of women smoking in pregnancy reduced to 18.9% in 2005/06 (previous year 20.9%). The PCT is just above its target in 2005/06. Reduction in rates in 2005/06 more so reflected in Priority Neighbourhoods and in BME areas.   |  |
| 5  |  | Reduce the average age of death gap between males in priority neighbourhoods and the whole population   | Mean age of death (3year rolling average)         | 2001-3 (2002 mid point)                        | 72.5                | 73.3                               | 73.5yrs     | 73.8yrs                               | 74.0yrs            | 2002-4 (2003 mid point) | 72.8        | 2003-5 (2004 mid point) | 72.2        | Data Available Sept 2007 | Data Available Sept 2007 | -1.1                         | NA                           | Red                     | The mean age of death increased in 2005 to 72.2 from the previous year. However, on a 3 year rolling average basis (mid point 2004) there has been a slight reduction to below target.<br>Latest data indicates a widening of the gap between Priority Neighbourhoods and rest of the city. Mean age of death in BME areas is much lower than the city average and has declined over the last two time periods. |  |
| 6  |  | Reduce the average age of death gap between females in priority neighbourhoods and the whole population   | Mean age of death (3year rolling average)         | 2001-3 (2002 mid point)                        | 77.9                | 78.4                               | 78.6yrs     | 78.8yrs                               | 79.0yrs            | 2002-4 (2003 mid point) | 78.2        | 2003-5 (2004 mid point) | 78.5        | Data Available Sept 2007 | Data Available Sept 2007 | 0.1                          | NA                           | Amber                   | Latest data shows an improvement City wide in line with target in 2004 (mid point year). However there has been a slight widening of the gap between priority neighbourhoods and rest of city since 2003. Mean age of death is much lower in BME areas compared to the city average.  |  |
| 7  |  | Reduce adult smoking rates in the city  | %   | 2003-4   | 30.2                | 26.5                               | 24.7        | 22.8                                  | 21                 | 2004                    | 28.7        | 2005                    | 29.1        | Data available 2007      | Data available 2007      | 2.6                          | NA                           | Amber                   | The 2005 data indicates a City wide improvement from the 2003 baseline from 30.2% to 29.1%.   |  |
| 8  | LPSA Priority Area 2 Health and Well Being Target 5 Improving health and reducing health inequalities by increasing the number of people who quit smoking  | Reduce percentage of people from priority neighbourhoods who smoke  | %   | 2003-4   | 42.6 in PNs         | 38.3                               | 36.8 in PNs | 35.4 in PNs<br>34% Calendar year 2008 | 34 in PNs          | 2004-5                  | 39.7 in PNs | 2005                    | 35.2 in PNs | Data available 2007      | Data available 2007      | NA                           | NA                           | Green                   | Rates in Priority Neighbourhoods have reduced significantly in the same period from 42.6% to 35.2%.   |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome                                   | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units            | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |                                   |        | 2004-5 Update |          | 2005-6 Update |          | 2006-7 Update |          | Target v Actual Variance    |                             | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments   |   |
|--|---|--|------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|--------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|
|  |   |  |                  |                         | City Avg   | 2005-6                             | 2006-7 | 2007-8                            | 2008-9 | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | 2005/06<br><i>Cal 21-33</i> | 2006/07<br><i>Cal 22-40</i> |                         |  |   |
| <b>HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE BLOCK</b>  |   |  |                  |                         |            |                                    |        |                                   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                             |                             |                         |  |   |
| <b>Health and Well-Being (Health of Coventry Group) Outcome:</b>   |   |  |                  |                         |            |                                    |        |                                   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                             |                             |                         |  |   |
| <i>by 2010, people in Coventry will be living healthier lives which will contribute towards people living longer in the future. These improvements will happen more quickly in priority neighbourhoods and communities</i> |   |  |                  |                         |            |                                    |        |                                   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                             |                             |                         |  |   |
| 1  | 8   | 9  | 13               | 14                      | 15         | 21                                 | 22     | 23                                | 24     | 25            | 26       | 32            | 33       | 39            | 40       | 46                          | 47                          | 48                      | 49   |   |
| 9  | Who quit smoking                              | The numbers of people reporting to GP, pharmacy and specialist services as recorded by the specialist smoking cessation service, and who set a quit date and who are still not smoking at 4 weeks. | number of people | 2002-5 (3 Year figure)  | 5460       |                                    |        | 11,990 (Cumulative 3 year figure) |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                          | NA                          | Too early to Assess     |  |   |
| 10   | Improve health and reduce health inequalities | Reduce health inequalities within the local authority area and the England population by narrowing the gap in all age, all-cause mortality   |                  |                         |            |                                    |        |                                   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                             |                             |                         |  | This is a new target within both the LAA and in the PCT local delivery plan. At this stage a plan cannot be submitted until confirmed within the LDP submission in Feb/Mar 07. The PCT acknowledge that the aim of this target is to aim along the trajectory provided which would lead to a narrowing of the gap by at least 10% by 2010 ( compared to baseline 1995-97)(awaiting confirmation from PCT) |
| 11   |   | Male Mortality Rate  |                  |                         | 842.0      |                                    |        | 763                               |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                          | NA                          | Too early to Assess     | Target are provisional , awaiting PCT confirmation |   |
| 12   |   | Female Mortality Rate  |                  |                         | 568.0      |                                    |        | 529                               |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                             |                             | Too early to Assess     | Target are provisional , awaiting PCT confirmation |   |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units                               | Baseline / Outturn Date            | Baseline / City Avg          | Performance Targets (City Average) |              |              |        | 2004-5 Update                      |                              | 2005-6 Update                      |                               | 2006-7 Update                      |                       | Target v Actual Variance |            | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments  |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------------|---|
|   |  |  |                                     |                                    |                              | 2005-6                             | 2006-7       | 2007-8       | 2008-9 | Date of Data                       | City Avg                     | Date of Data                       | City Avg                      | Date of Data                       | City Avg              | Cal 21- 33               | Cal 22- 40 |                         |   |
| <b>HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE BLOCK</b> |  |  |                                     |                                    |                              |                                    |              |              |        |                                    |                              |                                    |                               |                                    |                       |                          |            |                         |   |
| <b>Older People's Partnership</b>                   |  |  |                                     |                                    |                              |                                    |              |              |        |                                    |                              |                                    |                               |                                    |                       |                          |            |                         |   |
| 1   | 8  | 9  | 13                                  | 14                                 | 15                           | 21                                 | 22           | 23           | 24     | 25                                 | 26                           | 32                                 | 33                            | 39                                 | 40                    | 46                       | 47         | 48                      | 49  |
| 1   | The effective rehabilitation and increased independence of older people through a multi-agency approach to chronic disease management and emergency care (LAA outcome) | Reduce preventable hospital admissions:  |                                     |                                    |                              |                                    |              |              |        |                                    |                              |                                    |                               |                                    |                       |                          |            |                         |   |
| 2   |  | Reduce the Number of accident and emergency attendances by 5% across all specialities for people over 65 (city)                    | People admitted aged over 65        | 2002/3 - 2004/5 (2003-4 mid point) | 20081                        | 20081                              | 19981        | 19780        | 19479  |                                    |                              | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 19901                         | 2004/5 - 2006/7 (2005-6 mid point) | Available July 07     | -180.0                   | NA         | Green                   | Q1 Performance for 2006/07 is 2% ahead of target for Q1 2006/07.  |
| 3   |  | Reduce the Number of accident and emergency attendances by 5% across all specialities for people over 65 (priority neighbourhoods) | People admitted aged over 65        | 2002/3 - 2004/5 (2003-4 mid point) | 6732 Priority Neighbourhoods | 6395 by 2008                       | 6395 by 2008 | 6395 by 2008 | 6395   |                                    |                              | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 6597 (Priority Neighbourhood) | 2004/5 - 2006/7 (2005-6 mid point) | Available July 07     | NA                       | NA         | Green                   |   |
| 4   |  | Number of hospital admissions for people over 65 with "0" days length of stay (city)   | People admitted aged over 65        | 2002/3 - 2004/5 (2003-4 mid point) | 1650                         | 1650                               | 1601         | 1502         | 1353   |                                    |                              | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 1995                          | 2004/5 - 2006/7 (2005-6 mid point) | Available July 07     | 345.0                    | NA         | Red                     | This is a nationally set target, and our actual performance appears as if it is declining, as it is a 38% increase on the target. However, this is mis-leading as it reflects improved practice via the introduction of observation wards and diagnostic testing, which has served to improve both patients treatment and experience. |
| 5   |  | Number of hospital admissions for people over 65 with "0" days length of stay (neighbourhoods)                                     | People admitted aged over 65        | 2002/3 - 2004/5 (2003-4 mid point) | 568 Priority Neighbourhoods  | 397 by 2008                        | 397 by 2008  | 397 by 2008  | 397    |                                    |                              | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 685 (Priority Neighbourhood)  | 2004/5 - 2006/7 (2005-6 mid point) | Available July 07     | NA                       | NA         | Red                     |   |
| 6   |  | Total emergency admissions for UHCW for people over 65 (city)  | People admitted aged over 65        | 2003-4                             | 9572                         | 9572                               | 9524         | 9428         | 9285   | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 10180                        | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 10180                         | 2004/5 - 2006/7 (2004-5 mid point) | Available July 07     | 608.0                    | NA         | Red                     | Q1 Performance is an increase of 15% (declining performance) against the Q1 Target for 2006/07.   |
| 7   |  | Total emergency admissions for UHCW for people over 65 (neighbourhoods)  | People admitted aged over 65        | 2003-4                             | 3266 Priority Neighbourhoods | 3103 by 2008                       | 3103 by 2008 | 3103 by 2008 | 3103   |                                    |                              | 2003/4 - 2005/6 (2004-5 mid point) | 3431 (Priority Neighbourhood) | 2004/5 - 2006/7 (2005-6 mid point) | Available July 07     | NA                       | NA         | Red                     |   |
| 8   |  | Increase uptake of intermediate care services for admission prevention   | Users of Intermediate Care Services | 2005-6                             | 913                          | 913                                | 913          | 913          | 1597   |                                    |                              | 2005-6                             | 913 Baseline year             | Available Aug 07                   | Available Aug 07      | NA                       | NA         | Too early to Assess     | 2005/6 is baseline year   |
| 9   |  | Reduce emergency hospital admissions amongst people with chronic diseases / complex care packages (city)                           | Number of hospital admissions       | 2004-5                             | 3122                         | 3122                               | 2966         | 2654         | 2342   | 2004-5                             | 3122                         | 2005-6                             | 2665                          | Data available Aug 07              | Data available Aug 07 | -457.0                   | NA         | Green                   | Q1 Performance is a reduction of 23% (improving performance) against the Q1 Target for 2006/07.   |
| 10  |  | Reduce emergency hospital admissions amongst people with chronic diseases / complex care packages (neighbourhoods)                 | Number of hospital admissions       | 2004-5                             | 1273 Priority Neighbourhoods | 955 by 2008                        | 955 by 2008  | 955 by 2008  | 955    | 2004-5                             | 1273 Priority Neighbourhoods | 2005-6                             | 1061 Priority Neighbourhoods  | Data available Aug 07              | Data available Aug 07 | -106.0                   | NA         | Green                   |   |
| 11  |  | Number of falls resulting in serious injury (for fracture neck of femur) in over 75s (city)  | Number of falls                     | 2004-5                             | 197                          | 197                                | 193          | 185          | 177    | 2004-5                             | 197                          | 2005-6                             | 184.0                         | Data available Jun 07              |                       | -13.0                    | NA         | Amber                   | Overall falls have reduced, but increased in PN areas. BME proxy areas not reported due to small numbers.   |
| 12  |  | Number of falls resulting in serious injury (for fracture neck of femur) in over 75s (Neighbourhoods)                              | Number of falls                     | 2004-5                             | 39 Priority Neighbourhoods   | 35 by 2008                         | 35 by 2008   | 35 by 2008   | 35     | 2004-5                             | 39 Priority Neighbourhoods   | 2005-6                             | 56 Priority Neighbourhoods    | Data available Jun 07              | Data available Jun 07 | -21.0                    | NA         | Amber                   | See Line above for progress in neighbourhoods   |
| 13  |  | Maintain low levels of admission to long term care (nursing and residential) in over 65s   | No of admissions per1000 population | 2001-2                             | 108                          | 58                                 | 58           | 58           | 58     | 2004/05                            | 58.2                         | 2005-06                            | 57.7                          | Data available Jun 07              | Data available Jun 07 | -0.3                     | NA         | Green                   | Q1 & 2 Performance is 5% lower (improving performance) than Q1 & 2 2006/07 Target   |
| 14  | To increase the number of older people aged 60+ who receive services or equipment that makes them safer, warmer and more secure at home.                               | Number of 'Contact and Connect' visits to people aged 85+  | No of visits to people aged 85+     | July - Dec 06                      | 1020                         |                                    |              | 2280         | TBA    |                                    |                              |                                    |                               | Data available 2007                | Data available 2007   | NA                       | NA         | Too early to Assess     |   |
| 15  |  | Number of 'Contact and Connect' visits to people aged 60+  | No of visits to people aged 60+     | July - Dec 06                      | 90                           |                                    |              | 360          | TBA    |                                    |                              |                                    |                               | Data available 2007                | Data available 2007   | NA                       | NA         | Too early to Assess     |   |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units   | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |         |         |         | 2004-5 Update          |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |              | Target v Actual Variance |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |  |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
|   |  |   |   |                         | City Avg                           | 2005-6  | 2006-7  | 2007-8  | 2008-9                 | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Cal 21- 33</i> |                         |                     | 2006/07<br><i>Cal 22- 40</i>           |
| <b>HEALTHIER COMMUNITIES AND OLDER PEOPLE BLOCK</b> |  |   |   |                         |                                    |         |         |         |                        |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| <b>Older People's Partnership</b>                   |  |   |   |                         |                                    |         |         |         |                        |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| 1   | 8  | 9   | 13  | 14                      | 15                                 | 21      | 22      | 23      | 24                     | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39           | 40                       | 46                           | 47                      | 48                  | 49                                     |
| 16  | LPSA 2 Target 2 - Improving the take up of benefits by older people in Coventry                        | Increase the Number of people over the age of 60 in the City of Coventry who are in receipt of Pension Credit, Attendance Allowance, and Council Tax Benefit (CTB) (aggregate of 3 benefits).   | Number of people over the age of 60 in the City of Coventry | 2004-5                  | 40252                              |         |         |         | 41,934 (By March 2009) |              |               | 2005-6       | 39617         | Sep-06       | 39699                    | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess | LPSA Target ending Mar 2009            |
| 17  | LPSA-2 Target 3 - Improve the quality of life of older people via home care services.                  | The gap between the percentage of people 65 and over using either home care services provided through Coventry or who directly purchase services using Direct Payments who report being satisfied with the help they receive, and perfection (= 100%) | %   | Feb-06                  | 60%                                |         |         |         | 71%                    |              |               | NA           | NA            | NA           | NA                       | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Comparison survey will be held in 2009 |
| 18  | LPSA-2 Target 4 - Improve the quality of life of older people by reducing emergency hospital bed days. | Reduce the number of emergency unscheduled acute and community hospital bed days (defined in the Department of Health guidance for Local Delivery Plans 2005-2008) occupied by a person aged 75 or more in NHS hospitals in Coventry.                 | Number of hospital bed days                                 | 2003-4                  | 117,683                            | 113,712 | 111,726 | 109,740 |                        |              |               | 2005-6       | 113,712       | NA           | Data available 2007/8    | 0.0                          | NA                      | Too early to Assess |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units  | Baseline / Outturn Date                   | Performance Targets (City Average) |                                 |                                 |                                 | 2004-5 Update   |              | 2005-6 Update                    |              | 2006-7 Update                    |                | Target v Actual Variance         |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments |   |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|---|---|
|  |   |  |  |   | Baseline / City Avg                | 2005-6                          | 2006-7                          | 2007-8                          | 2008-9  | Date of Data | City Avg                         | Date of Data | City Avg                         | Date of Data   | City Avg                         | 2005/06 Cal 21- 33 |                         |          | 2006/07 Cal 22- 40  |   |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |   |  |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   |   |
| <b>COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>  |   |  |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by 2010 there will be less crime and anti-social behaviour and people will feel safer, these improvements will be felt fastest in our priority neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be more effective support for people who misuse alcohol and drugs</li> </ul> |   |  |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   |   |
| 1  | To reduce crime, the harm caused by illegal drugs and to reassure the public reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. (LAA outcome)<br>Reduce crime by 15%, and further in high crime areas by 2007-08. (NRU Key Outcome)<br><br>Reduce crime. | Reduce BCS comparator crime by 20%   | Crimes   | 2003-4                                    | 24507                              | 23074                           | 21776                           | 20554.1                         | 19150.0   | 2004-5       | 22792                            | 2005-6       | 21,493                           | Q'S 1 & 2 2006 | 11025                            | -1580.6            | -10751.0                | Amber    | Increases in TFMV in Coventry may threaten achievements within the BCS comparator reduction target. This could have been reflected as Green as it is close to being met however the Amber rating reflects the awareness of the partnership for additional activity to be carried out. |   |
| 2  |   | Reduce BCS comparator crime by 20%   | Crimes per 1000 people                           | 2003-4                                    | 81.5                               | 76.7                            | 72.7                            | 68.9                            | No target as PSA1 target expires in March 2008. New targets will then be set. | 2004-5       | 75.8                             | 2005-6       | 71.4                             | Q'S 1 & 2 2006 | 36.6                             | -5.3               | -36.1                   | Amber    | Increases in TFMV in Coventry have been identified and action is underway to tackle the threat with new activity being commissioned and actioned through the AIMs process and SNGs  |   |
| 3  |   | Reduce the proportion of BCS comparator crimes that take place in priority neighbourhoods compared to the rest of the city by 1% per annum                               | % crimes   | 2003-4                                    | 49.2                               | 48.5 in priority neighbourhoods | 48.0 in priority neighbourhoods | 47.5 in priority neighbourhoods | No target as PSA1 target expires in March 2008. New targets will then be set. | 2004-5       | 48.4% in priority neighbourhoods | 2005-6       | 48.9% in priority neighbourhoods | Q'S 1 & 2 2006 | 49.2% in priority neighbourhoods | -0.4               | NA                      | Red      | The proportion of offences recorded in Priority neighbourhoods and BME neighbourhoods the Rest of the City has widened slightly.  |   |
| 4  |   | Reduce the proportion of adult and young offenders and prolific and other priority offenders who re-offend   |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   |   |
| 5  |   | Young People- Achieve a 5% reduction in the re-offending rate for 2006/7, when compared with the 2002/3 baseline, with respect to each of the following four populations |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   | The measure works by looking at a cohort of young people who have received a substantive outcome (Reprimand, Final Warning or Court Disposal) during the period Oct to Dec 2005. They are split into the above 4 categories in accordance with their disposal and then the system tracks forward 12 months and looks to see if any of those young people have re-offended during that 12 month period. A percentage is then given against each of the 4 categories indicating the percentage of young people that have re-offended. |
| 6  |   | Pre-court  | %  | 2002/3                                    | 33.7                               | 32                              | 30.4                            | 28.9                            | 27.5  |              |                                  |              |                                  |                | TBA                              | TBA                | NA                      | NA       | Too early to Assess   |   |
| 7  |   | First Tier Penalties   | %  | 2002/3                                    | 47.2                               | 44                              | 42.6                            | 40.5                            | TBA   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                | TBA                              | TBA                | NA                      | NA       | Too early to Assess   |   |
| 8  |   | Community Penalties  | %  | 2002/3                                    | 70.9                               | 67.4                            | 64                              | 60.8                            | TBA   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                | TBA                              | TBA                | NA                      | NA       | Too early to Assess   |   |
| 9  |   | Custodial Sentences  | %  | 2002/3                                    | 60                                 | 57                              | 54.2                            | 51.5                            | TBA   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                | TBA                              | TBA                | NA                      | NA       | Too early to Assess   |   |
| 10   |   | Reduce the number of PPOs who reoffend   |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   |   |
| 11   |   | Reduce the number of re-convictions of an identified cohort of PPOs by 15% per year. (Cohort size to be at least 30)   | TBA  | Baseline data will be available in May 07 | TBA                                | TBA                             | TBA                             | TBA                             | TBA   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                | TBA                              | TBA                | NA                      | NA       | Too early to Assess   | Negotiation is underway to agree on a cohort of at least 30 PPOs from across Coventry. Once this has been established offending behaviour over the previous 12 months will be base lined. These are expected to be finalised by Mar 07  |
| 12   |   | Reduce the Number of adult offenders who re-offend   |  |   |                                    |                                 |                                 |                                 |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   | Negotiations are ongoing between the Probation District Manager and the Probation service to agree indicators and reporting. These are expected to be finalised by Mar 07   |
| 13   |   | Successful completions of orders and licenses- The proportion of Orders and Licenses that terminate successfully (PM4)   | Proportion of orders that terminate successfully | TBA                                       | TBA                                |                                 |                                 | Available May 07                |   |              |                                  |              |                                  |                |                                  |                    |                         |          |   |   |
| 14   |   | Successful completions of Drug Rehabilitation Requirements / Drug Treatment and Testing orders. (PT10)   | Satisfactorily Completions                       | 2005/6                                    | 21                                 | 26                              | 41                              | Available May 07                | TBA   |              |                                  |              | 2005/6                           | 21             | 11 months to Jan 07              | 10                 |                         |          |   |   |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units                      | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / City Avg | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |   |        | 2004-5 Update |          | 2005-6 Update |          | 2006-7 Update |          | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments  |  |
|--|---|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---|--------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
|  |   |   |                            |                         |                     | 2005-6                             | 2006-7 | 2007-8  | 2008-9 | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | 2005/06 Cal 21- 33       | 2006/07 Cal 22- 40 |                         |   |  |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |   |   |                            |                         |                     |                                    |        |   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                          |                    |                         |   |  |
| <b>COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>  |   |   |                            |                         |                     |                                    |        |   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                          |                    |                         |   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by 2010 there will be less crime and anti-social behaviour and people will feel safer, these improvements will be felt fastest in our priority neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be more effective support for people who misuse alcohol and drugs</li> </ul> |   |   |                            |                         |                     |                                    |        |   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                          |                    |                         |   |  |
| 1  | 8   | 9   | 13                         | 14                      | 15                  | 21                                 | 22     | 23  | 24     | 25            | 26       | 32            | 33       | 39            | 40       | 46                       | 47                 | 48                      | 49  |  |
| 15   |   | Successful completions of Offending behaviour programmes. Accredited programmes successful completions(PT11)  | Satisfactorily Completions | TBA                     | TBA                 |                                    |        | Available May 07  |        |               |          |               |          |               |          |                          |                    |                         |   |  |
| 16   |   | Offenders placed into employment which is retained for four weeks. (PM6)  | No of people               | TBA                     | TBA                 |                                    | 99     | Available May 07  |        |               |          |               |          | Jan-07        | 102      |                          |                    |                         |   |  |
| 17   | LPSA Priority Area 4- Community Safety Target 8- Violent crime and Criminal damage  | Number of wounding offences (specifically section 47, section 18, section 20 offences) in Coventry as recorded by West Midlands police                    | Number of offences         | 2003-4                  | 4700                | 4153                               | 3904   | 3670  |        |               |          | 2005-6        | 4502     |               |          | 349.0                    | NA                 | Too early to Assess     |   |  |
| 18   |   | Number of criminal damage to vehicle offences in Coventry as recorded by West Midlands police   | Number of offences         | 2003-4                  | 3254                | 2754                               | 2534   | 2331  |        |               |          | 2005-6        | 3720     |               |          | 966.0                    | NA                 | Too early to Assess     |   |  |
| 19   | LPSA Priority Area 4- Community Safety Target 10 Improve the confidence of Domestic Violence and Abuse (DVA) victims in the Criminal Justice System | Number of individuals reporting being a victim of DVA to the police   | No Of individuals          | 2004-5                  | 4,431               |                                    |        | 13,603 (3 year cum figure)  |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     |   |  |
| 20   |   | Number of detections of DVA perpetrators as recorded by the police  | Number of detections       | 2004-5                  | 1,037               |                                    |        | 3,184 (3 year cum figure)   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     |   |  |
| 21   |   | Number of convictions of DVA perpetrators as recorded by the CPS  | Number of convictions      | 2004-5                  | 132                 |                                    |        | 405 (3 year cum figure)   |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     |   |  |
| 22   | To build respect in communities and to reduce anti-social behaviour   | Increase the percentage of people who feel very well informed or fairly well informed about efforts by the local council to tackle anti-social behaviour. | %                          | 2006/7                  | 18                  |                                    |        | The target is to improve on the baseline, details will be available when the results of the household survey are published in spring 2007 |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     | Baseline data will be provided from the Respect unit using Best Value Survey. Annual updates will be provided through new questions in the annual household survey. The questions asked in the 2 surveys may not match exactly. The Household survey data will be available in teh Spring when we can confirm improvement targets |  |
| 23   |   | Increase percentage of people who feel that parents in their local area take responsibility for the behaviour of their children                           | %                          | 2006/7                  | 50                  |                                    |        | The target is to improve on the baseline, details will be available when the results of the household survey are published in spring 2007 |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     | Baseline data will be provided from the Respect unit using Best Value Survey. Annual updates will be provided through new questions in the annual household survey. The questions asked in the 2 surveys may not match exactly. The Household survey data will be available in teh Spring when we can confirm improvement targets |  |
| 24   |   | Increased percentage of people who feel that people in their area treat them with respect and consideration   | %                          | 2006/7                  | 41                  |                                    |        | The target is to improve on the baseline, details will be available when the results of the household survey are published in spring 2007 |        |               |          |               |          |               |          | NA                       | NA                 | Too early to Assess     | Baseline data will be provided from the Respect unit using Best Value Survey. Annual updates will be provided through new questions in the annual household survey. The questions asked in the 2 surveys may not match exactly. The Household survey data will be available in teh Spring when we can confirm improvement targets |  |



Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units    | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / City Avg | Performance Targets (City Average) |              |   |              | 2004-5 Update |          | 2005-6 Update |          | 2006-7 Update              |                     | Target v Actual Variance     |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments   |
|--|--|---|----------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
|  |  |   |          |                         |                     | 2005-6                             | 2006-7       | 2007-8  | 2008-9       | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data               | City Avg            | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i> |                         |  |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |  |   |          |                         |                     |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| <b>COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>  |  |   |          |                         |                     |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by 2010 there will be less crime and anti-social behaviour and people will feel safer, these improvements will be felt fastest in our priority neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be more effective support for people who misuse alcohol and drugs</li> </ul> |  |   |          |                         |                     |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9   | 13       | 14                      | 15                  | 21                                 | 22           | 23  | 24           | 25            | 26       | 32            | 33       | 39                         | 40                  | 46                           | 47                           | 48                      | 49   |
| 25   |  | Reduce peoples perceptions of ASB (derived from responses to the 7 individual asb strands)      | %        | 2006/7                  |                     |                                    |              | The target is to improve on the baseline, details will be available when the results of the household survey are published in spring 2007 |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     | NA                           | NA                           | Too early to Assess     | Baseline data will be provided from the Respect unit using Best Value Survey. Annual updates will be provided through new questions in the annual household survey. The questions asked in the 2 surveys may not match exactly. The Household survey data will be available in teh Spring when we can confirm improvement targets  |
| 26   |  | Noisy neighbours and loud parties   |          |                         | 17                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 27   |  | Teenagers hanging around the street   |          |                         | 52                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 28   |  | Rubbish and litter lying around   |          |                         | 42                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 29   |  | People being drunk or rowdy in public places.   |          |                         | 25                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 30   |  | Abandoned or burnt out cars   |          |                         | 10                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 31   |  | Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles                         |          |                         | 30                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 32   |  | People using drugs, People dealing drugs  |          |                         | 24                  |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 33   |  | Residents surveyed who have experienced some major or minor problems with anti-social behaviour | %        | 2004                    | 78.5                | Monitor Only                       | Monitor Only | 75  | Monitor Only | Dec-04        | 78.5     | 2005-6        | 76.5     | Data available 2007        | Data available 2007 | NA                           | NA                           | Green                   | Next CRES survey not due till March / April 2007   |
| 34   |  | Provision of an intensive family support project  | projects | 2005                    | 1                   | 1                                  | 1            | 1   | 1            | 2005          | 1.0      | 2005-6        | 2        | Q'S 1 & 2 2006             | 1                   | 1.0                          | 0.0                          | Green                   | The target is to have 1 project in place by 2008-2009. The Family Focus Program that is currently in place is being expanded and revamped to deal more effectively with families who are engaged in 'Anti-Social' behaviour in the communities they live in.   |
| 35   | To reduce crime and the harm caused by illegal drugs . | Reduce public perceptions of local drug dealing and drug use as a problem                       |          |                         |                     |                                    |              |   |              |               |          |               |          |                            |                     |                              |                              |                         |  |
| 36   |  | Residents surveyed who feel that the presence of drug users is a problem in their area          | %        | 2004-5                  | 4                   | Monitor only                       | Monitor only | Monitor only  | Monitor only | 2004-5        | 5        | 2005-6        | 6        | Waves 6 - 9 to August 2006 | 1                   | NA                           | NA                           | Green                   | The latest survey results cover April & May 2006; however there has been a change in the wording of the question asked in the survey; the question no longer separates drug dealers and drug users, but combines the two. Furthermore instead of asking about the "Presence of drug dealers" and the "Presence of drug users" - gives the option of "People using or dealing drugs" amongst a number of other options (16 different options in total). |
| 37   |  | Residents surveyed who feel that people dealing drugs is a problem in their neighbourhood       | %        | 2004                    | 20.1                | Monitor only                       | Monitor only | 14.3  | Monitor only | 2004-5        | 20       | 2005-6        | 15.3     | Data available 2007        | Data available 2007 | NA                           | NA                           | Green                   | Next CRES survey not due till March / April 2007   |
| 38   |  | Residents surveyed who feel that people using drugs is a problem in their neighbourhood         | %        | 2004                    | 22.5                | Monitor only                       | Monitor only | 16  | Monitor only | 2004-5        | 23       | 2005-6        | 17.1     | Data available 2007        | Data available 2007 | NA                           | NA                           | Green                   | Next CRES survey not due till March / April 2007   |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator   | Units  | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |              |              |              | 2004-5 Update                         |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |                              | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |  |
|--|--|---|--------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
|  |  |   |        |                         | City Avg                           | 2005-6       | 2006-7       | 2007-8       | 2008-9                                | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data                 | City Avg                 | 2005/06 Cal 21- 33 |                         |                     | 2006/07 Cal 22- 40   |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |  |   |        |                         |                                    |              |              |              |                                       |              |               |              |               |                              |                          |                    |                         |                     |  |
| <b>COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES:</b>  |  |   |        |                         |                                    |              |              |              |                                       |              |               |              |               |                              |                          |                    |                         |                     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• by 2010 there will be less crime and anti-social behaviour and people will feel safer, these improvements will be felt fastest in our priority neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• by 2010 there will be more effective support for people who misuse alcohol and drugs</li> </ul> |  |   |        |                         |                                    |              |              |              |                                       |              |               |              |               |                              |                          |                    |                         |                     |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9   | 13     | 14                      | 15                                 | 21           | 22           | 23           | 24                                    | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39                           | 40                       | 46                 | 47                      | 48                  | 49   |
| 39   |  | Residents surveyed who feel that the presence of drug dealers is a problem in their area  | %      | 2004-5                  | 6                                  | Monitor only | Monitor only | Monitor only | Monitor only                          | 2004-5       | 5             | 2005-6       | 5             | Waves 6 - 9 (to August 2006) | 1                        | NA                 | NA                      | Green               | The latest survey results cover April & May 2006; however there has been a change in the wording of the question asked in the survey; the question no longer separates drug dealers and drug users, but combines the two. Furthermore instead of asking about the "Presence of drug dealers" and the "Presence of drug users" - gives the option of "People using or dealing drugs" amongst a number of other options (16 different options in total). |
| 40   |  | Increase the Number of problem drug users in treatment by 100% (based upon 1998 baseline)   | Number | 2003-4                  | 903                                | 1136         | 1300         | 1470         | Not Available                         | 2004-5       | 988           | 2005-6       | 1222          | April - August 2006          | 1081                     | 86.0               | -219.0                  | Green               | Based on local data to the end of August 06 we have achieved 78% of the target, which means we are optimistic we will achieve the required 1300 in treatment by the end of the year.   |
| 41   |  | Increase year on year the proportion of problem drug users sustaining or successfully completing treatment programmes from a minimum of 45% | %      | 2003-4                  | 75                                 | 56           | 79           | 85           | Not Available                         | 2004-5       | 51            | 2005-6       | 1222          | April - August 2006          | 64%                      | 1166.0             | -78.4                   | Red                 | Retention rates have slowly improved in 05/06 and have continued to improve, but remain below target.  |
| 42   | Reassure the public, reducing the fear of crime  | Residents surveyed who feel safe in and around their neighbourhood during the day   | %      | 2003                    | 91.6                               | Monitor only | Monitor only | 93           | Monitor only                          | 2004-5       | 93.7          | 2005-6       | 91.7          | Data available 2007          | Data available 2007      | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Next CRES survey not due till March / April 2007   |
| 43   |  | Residents surveyed who feel safe in and around their neighbourhood during the night   | %      | 2003                    | 71.6                               | Monitor only | Monitor only | 79           | Monitor only                          | 2004-5       | 76.7          | 2005-6       | 78.0          | Data available 2007          | Data available 2007      | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Next CRES survey not due till March / April 2007   |
| 44   | LPSA Priority area 4- Community Safety Target 9 Reducing dwelling fires and incidents of arson | Number of accidental fires in the dwellings   | Fires  | 3 year average 2004-5   | 341                                | 339          | 321          | 312          | 312 (3 year average agreed with ODPM) | 2004-5       | 341           | 2005-6       | 323           | Q'S 1 & 2 2006               | 144.0                    | -16.0              | -177.0                  | Amber               | The number of accidental fires is steadily decreasing in line with targets. However the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the city is not decreasing   |
| 45   | To increase domestic fire safety and reduce arson (LAA outcome)                                | Number of vehicle arson fires.  | Fires  | 3 year average 2004-5   | 533                                | 529          | 445          | 378          | 378 (3 year average agreed with ODPM) | 2004-5       | 533           | 2005-6       | 453           | Q'S 1 & 2 2006               | 133.0                    | -76.0              | -312.0                  | Amber               | The number of arsons is steadily decreasing in line with targets. However the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the city is not decreasing   |
| 46   |  | Number of arson fires in buildings other than dwellings   | Fires  | 3 year average 2004-5   | 128                                | 125          | 110          | 93           | 93 (3 year average agreed with ODPM)  | 2004-5       | 128           | 2005-6       | 127           | Q'S 1 & 2 2006               | 37.0                     | 2.0                | -73.0                   | Amber               | The number of arsons has shown a slight rise however this may be seasonal and the target still achievable. The gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the   |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome | Performance Measure / Indicator | Units | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |        | 2004-5 Update |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |              | Target v Actual Variance |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments |                              |
|---|-------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
|   |             |                                 |       |                         | Baseline / City Avg                | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9        | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> |                         |          | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i> |
| SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.   |             |                                 |       |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                              |                         |          |                              |
| CULTURAL PARTNERSHIP OUTCOME:<br><i>by 2010 more people will be participating in cultural and sporting opportunities and that participation will have increased more quickly in priority neighbourhoods and communities</i> |             |                                 |       |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                              |                         |          |                              |
| 1   | 8           | 9                               | 13    | 14                      | 15                                 | 21     | 22     | 23     | 24            | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39           | 40                       | 46                           | 47                      | 48       | 49                           |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units                              | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |              |                                  |                                  | 2004-5 Update                    |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |                     | Target v Actual Variance |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |  |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
|  |  |  |                                    |                         | City Avg                           | 2005-6       | 2006-7                           | 2007-8                           | 2008-9                           | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data        | City Avg                 | 2005/06 Cal 21- 33 |                         |                     | 2006/07 Cal 22- 40   |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |  |  |                                    |                         |                                    |              |                                  |                                  |                                  |              |               |              |               |                     |                          |                    |                         |                     |  |
| <b>ENVIRONMENT THEME GROUP OUTCOMES:</b>   |  |  |                                    |                         |                                    |              |                                  |                                  |                                  |              |               |              |               |                     |                          |                    |                         |                     |  |
| * 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 |  |  |                                    |                         |                                    |              |                                  |                                  |                                  |              |               |              |               |                     |                          |                    |                         |                     |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9  | 13                                 | 14                      | 15                                 | 21           | 22                               | 23                               | 24                               | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39                  | 40                       | 46                 | 47                      | 48                  | 49   |
| 1  | Improve the quality of the local environment by reducing the gap in aspects of liveability between the worst wards/ neighbourhoods and the district as a whole with a particular focus on reducing level of litter and detritus. | Reduction by 2008 in levels of litter and detritus using BV199 at district level<br><br>Fewer areas of land surveyed have unacceptable levels of litter (and fall below the government standard of grade b' light littering and detritus)                          | % of sites surveyed below standard | 2003-4                  | 37.6                               | 23.0         | 27.0                             | 25.0                             | 15.0                             | 2004-5       | 37.0          | 2005-06      | 33.0          | Available 2007      | Available 2007           | 10.0               | NA                      | Red                 | This indicator shows that the levels of cleanliness have improved slightly over last 3 years – last year 33.0% of land surveyed fell below Grade B, compared with 37.6% in 2003/04. The level of data collected for Best Value and service improvement purposes does not provide the detail required to measure whether the gap between 'priority neighbourhoods'/black & minority ethnic communities' and the 'rest of the city' is narrowing and this is being reviewed. |
| 5  | Lead the delivery of cleaner, safer, and greener public spaces and improvement of the quality of the built environment in deprived areas and across the country, with measurable improvement by 2008.(NRU Key Outcome)           | More people are satisfied with road maintenance and road repairs   | %                                  | Dec-05                  | 42.3                               | Monitor only | Monitor only                     | 43.3                             |                                  |              |               | Dec-05       | 42.3          | Available 2007      | Available 2007           | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Surveyed for the first time in CRES Household Survey 2005, this will form a baseline against which changes can be assessed. Targets will be confirmed in Spring, when next survey results are due  |
| 6  | To have cleaner greener safer communities (laa outcome)  | More people are satisfied with street lighting   | %                                  | Dec-05                  | 51.3                               | Monitor only | Monitor only                     | 52.3                             |                                  |              |               | Dec-05       | 51.3          | Available 2007      | Available 2007           | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Surveyed for the first time in CRES Household Survey 2005, this will form a baseline against which changes can be assessed. Targets will be confirmed in Spring, when next survey results are due  |
| 7  | to improve the quality of life of people in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods and ensure service providers are more responsive to neighbourhood needs and improve their delivery.(laa outcome)                               | More people are satisfied with quality of parks and open spaces (how well they are maintained and looked after)  | %                                  | Dec-05                  | 61.5                               | Monitor only | Monitor only                     | 62.5                             |                                  |              |               | Dec-05       | 61.5          | Available 2007      | Available 2007           | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Surveyed for the first time in CRES Household Survey 2005, this will form a baseline against which changes can be assessed. Targets will be confirmed in Spring, when next survey results are due  |
| 8  |  | More people satisfied with access to parks and open spaces (how easy they are to get to and use)   | %                                  | Dec-05                  | 54.4                               | Monitor only | Monitor only                     | 55.4                             |                                  |              |               | Dec-05       | 54.4          | Available 2007      | Available 2007           | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Surveyed for the first time in CRES Household Survey 2005, this will form a baseline against which changes can be assessed. Targets will be confirmed in Spring, when next survey results are due  |
| 10   |  | City parks attain national standards (Longford & memorial parks)   | Number                             | 2004-5                  | 0                                  | 0            | 2 parks attain Green Flag status | 4 parks attain Green Flag status | 5 parks attain Green Flag status | 2004-5       | 0             | 2005/06      | 0             | Data available 2007 | data available 2007      | 0.0                | NA                      | Green               |  |
| 12   | Reduce waste to landfill and increase recycling  | Reduction in the percentage of municipal waste landfilled  | %                                  | 2004-5                  | 7.81                               | 7.70         | 7.43                             | 7.57                             | 7.57                             | 2004-5       | 7.81          | 2005/06      | 7.30          | 6 Monthly Figures   | 7.19                     | 0.40               | 0.24                    | Green               | This indicator uses the definition and figures for BVPI 82d(i) - the percentage of household waste arising which has been landfilled.  |
| 13   |  | Increase in the percentage of municipal waste recycled   | %                                  | 2004-5                  | 16.59                              | 19.30        | 23.72                            | 28.48                            | 28.48                            | 2004-5       | 16.59         | 2005/06      | 18.09         | 6 Monthly Figures   | 25.34                    | 1.21               | -1.62                   | Green               | This indicator uses the definition and figures for BVPI 82a&b - the percentage of household waste arising which has been sent by the Authority for recycling or composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion. (for which DEFRA set statutory targets)  |
| 14   | LSPA 2 Indicators Priority Area 3 - Environment, Make the City Clean & Green Target 6 - Cleanliness of neighbourhoods  | The percentage of 'Other Highways' that fall below a Grade B for cleanliness, using grades based on those set out in the Code of Practice for Litter and Refuse, as measured by BVPI 199a  | %                                  | 2004-5                  | 45                                 |              |                                  | 29                               |                                  | 2004-5       | 45            | 2005-6       | 51            | Available 2007      | Available 2007           |                    |                         | Too early to Assess | The reduction including the enhancement is 16%.  |
| 15   |  | The percentage of 'High Density Housing' sites that fall below a Grade B for cleanliness, using grades based on those set out in the Code of Practice for Litter and Refuse, as measured by BVPI 199a  | %                                  | 2004-5                  | 51                                 |              |                                  | 27                               |                                  | 2004-5       | 51            | 2005-6       | 50            | Available 2007      | Available 2007           |                    |                         | Too early to Assess | The reduction including the enhancement is 24%.  |
| 16   |  | The percentage of relevant land and highways as defined under EPA 1990 Part IV section 86 that is assessed as falling below a Grade B for cleanliness, using grades based on those set out in the Code of Practice for Litter and Refuse, as measured by BVPI 199a | %                                  | 2004-5                  | 37                                 |              |                                  | 25                               |                                  | 2004-5       | 37            | 2005-6       | 33            | Available 2007      | Available 2007           |                    |                         | Too early to Assess | The reduction including the enhancement is 12%.  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome  | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units  | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |        | 2004-5 Update |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |                | Target v Actual Variance |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |  |
|--|--|--|--------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
|  |  |  |        |                         | City Avg                           | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9        | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data   | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Cal 21- 33</i> |                         |                     | 2006/07<br><i>Cal 22- 40</i>                                 |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |  |  |        |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |                |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| <b>ENVIRONMENT THEME GROUP OUTCOMES:</b>   |  |  |        |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |                |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| • 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 |  |  |        |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |                |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| 1  | 8  | 9  | 13     | 14                      | 15                                 | 21     | 22     | 23     | 24            | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39             | 40                       | 46                           | 47                      | 48                  | 49   |
| 17   | LSPA 2 Indicators Priority Area 3 - Environment, Make the City Clean & Green Target 7 - Increased recycling of non-biodegradable waste | This target will be measured against the authority's performance for BVPI 82a (ii) (total tonnage of household waste arisings that have been sent by the Authority for recycling), minus the biodegradable element, namely paper (100%) and textiles (50%) | Tonnes | 2004-5                  | 6,230                              |        |        | 8,000  |               | 2004-5       | 6,230         |              |               | Available 2007 | Available 2007           |                              |                         | Too early to Assess | The total enhanced increase in tonnage will be 1,500 tonnes. |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome | Performance Measure / Indicator | Units | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |        | 2004-5 Update |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |              | Target v Actual Variance |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments |                              |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
|  |             |                                 |       |                         | City Avg                           | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9        | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> |                         |          | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i> |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |             |                                 |       |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                              |                         |          |                              |
| <b>Equalities and Communities Theme Groups:</b><br>• by 2010 Coventry will be a more inclusive and cohesive city<br>• by 2010 there will be more equal opportunities for people from different backgrounds in Coventry |             |                                 |       |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |              |                          |                              |                         |          |                              |
| 1  | 8           | 9                               | 13    | 14                      | 15                                 | 21     | 22     | 23     | 24            | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39           | 40                       | 46                           | 47                      | 48       | 49                           |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units            | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average) |        |        |        | 2004-5 Update |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |                         | Target v Actual Variance |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |  |
|---|---|--|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
|   |   |  |                  |                         | City Avg                           | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9        | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data            | City Avg                 | 2005/06<br><i>Cal 21- 33</i> |                         |                     | 2006/07<br><i>Cal 22- 40</i>                             |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>  |   |  |                  |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |                         |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| <b>HOUSING THEME (Housing Strategy Group) Outcome: • by 2010 the quality of housing in Coventry will have improved</b>  |   |  |                  |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |                         |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing in Coventry will be more suited to people's needs and aspirations with a better mix of the type and tenure of housing in neighborhoods</li> <li>• Housing advice services will have improved</li> <li>• These improvements will be more rapid in our priority Neighborhoods and communities</li> </ul> |   |  |                  |                         |                                    |        |        |        |               |              |               |              |               |                         |                          |                              |                         |                     |  |
| 1   | 8   | 9  | 13               | 14                      | 15                                 | 21     | 22     | 23     | 24            | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39                      | 40                       | 46                           | 47                      | 48                  | 49   |
| 1   | As part of an overall housing strategy for the district ensure that all social housing is made decent by 2010, unless a later deadline is agreed by DCLG as part of the decent homes programme. | More social housing meets the decent homes standard. Non decency targets to deliver Decent homes by 2010 which are agreed with Governmnet Offices and monitored at district level against trajectories reported in LA BPSA and RSL RSRs. | %                | Mar-05                  | 72.0%                              | 82.0%  | 87.0%  | 92.0%  | 97.0%         | 2005         | 72%           | Mar 2006     | 82%           | Data available Oct 2007 | Data available Oct 2007  | 0.0                          | NA                      | Green               | Targets have now been agreed by the Housing Theme group. |
| 9   | Increase Investment (New Growth Points Funding)   | Increase housing supply in a sustainable way. Complete an average of 900 houses a year, at least 60% of which are built on brownfield sites  | Completed houses | 2005-6                  | 847.0                              |        | 900    | 900    | 900           |              |               |              |               |                         |                          | NA                           | NA                      | Too early to Assess |  |

Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row   | LAA Outcome   | Performance Measure / Indicator  | Units   | Baseline / Outturn Date | Performance Targets (City Average)                                  |              |              |   | 2004-5 Update |              | 2005-6 Update |              | 2006-7 Update |                       | Target v Actual Variance                 |                    | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments            |   |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|---|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
|   |   |  |   |                         | City Avg  | 2005-6       | 2006-7       | 2007-8  | 2008-9        | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data | City Avg      | Date of Data          | City Avg                                 | 2005/06 Col 21- 33 |                         |                     | 2006/07 Col 22- 40  |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>  |   |  |   |                         |   |              |              |   |               |              |               |              |               |                       |  |                    |                         |                     |   |
| <b>Neighbourhoods Theme (Neighbourhood Management Partnership) Outcome :</b>  |   |  |   |                         |   |              |              |   |               |              |               |              |               |                       |  |                    |                         |                     |   |
| by 2010 people will feel more able to influence the quality of local public services and facilities and they will have seen improvements most quickly for priority neighbourhoods and communities |   |  |   |                         |   |              |              |   |               |              |               |              |               |                       |  |                    |                         |                     |   |
| 1   | 8   | 9  | 13  | 14                      | 15  | 21           | 22           | 23  | 24            | 25           | 26            | 32           | 33            | 39                    | 40                                       | 46                 | 47                      | 48                  | 49  |
| 1   | To increase the capacity of local communities so that people are empowered to participate in local decision-making and are able to influence service delivery.(LAA outcome)   | Retain existing community activists involved in decision-making structures   | People  | Oct-05                  | 12  | 12           | 12           | 12  | 12            | Oct-05       | 12            | Jul-06       | 16            | Oct-06                | 16                                       | 4.0                | 4.0                     | Green               |   |
| 2   | Empower local people to have a greater choice and influence over local decision making and a greater role in public service delivery.   | Number of groups influencing decision-making by taking part in community empowerment network activities  | Average of Groups represented over 12 months of workshops | 2004/5                  | 74  | 60           | 60           | 60  | 60            | 2004/5       | 74            | Jul-06       | 108           | Oct-06                | 58<br>6 Month Figures Only               | 48.0               | NA                      | Green               | 2006-07 updated figures are for first SIX months  |
| 3   |   | Perception amongst community activists that they can and are influencing decisions in the Coventry partnership, its theme groups and neighbourhood working groups, etc :   |   |                         |   |              |              |   |               |              |               |              |               |                       |  |                    |                         |                     |   |
| 4   |   | A) extent to which activists feel they are made to feel part of the mechanism  | Average score out of 10                                   | Oct-05                  | 6.8   | 6.00         | 6.00         | 6.00  | 7.00          | Oct-05       | 6.8           | Jul-06       | 6.8           | Data available 2007   | Data available 2007                      | 0.8                | NA                      | Green               | Based on eight CEN Rep. responses so far  |
| 5   |   | B) extent to which activists feel they are given sufficient information to play a meaningful part in decisions   | Average score out of 10                                   | Oct-05                  | 6.4   | 6.00         | 6.00         | 6.00  | 7.00          | Oct-05       | 6.4           | Jul-06       | 6.3           | Data available 2007   | Data available 2007                      | 0.3                | NA                      | Green               | Based on eight CEN Rep. responses so far  |
| 6   |   | C) extent to which activists feel satisfied that they can and are playing a meaningful part in decisions   | Average score out of 10                                   | Oct-05                  | 6.6   | 6.00         | 6.00         | 6.00  | 7.00          | Oct-05       | 6.6           | Jul-06       | 6.8           | Data available 2007   | Data available 2007                      | 0.8                | NA                      | Green               | Based on eight CEN Rep. responses so far  |
| 7   |   | Percentage of residents who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area   | %   | 2003                    | 29.7  |              |              | 24  |               | 2004         | 24.5          | 2005         | 21.6          | Data available 2007   | Data available 2007                      | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess |   |
| 8   |   | An increase in the number of people recorded as or reporting that they have engaged in formal volunteering on an average of at least two hours per week over the past year | TBA   | TBA                     | Will be available in Spring 2007 from new Household survey question |              |              | Target will be to set depending on Baseline survey result |               |              |               |              |               | TBA                   | TBA                                      | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | An indicator is being piloted in the household survey. The results will be available in Spring when we will agree if it can form the basis of a useful indicator  |
| 9   |   | More people surveyed think their neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together   | %   | 2003                    | 84.0  | Monitor Only | Monitor Only | 91.0  | Monitor Only  | Dec-04       | 89.4          | Dec-05       | 90.4          | Data available Apr 07 | Data available April 07 Household Survey | NA                 | NA                      | Green               |   |
| 10  |   | More people surveyed feel that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds and communities can live together harmoniously                          | %   | 04/05 Benchmark year    | 88.0  | Monitor Only | Monitor Only | 75.0  | Monitor Only  | Dec-04       | 88.0          | Sep-05       | 92.0          | Aug-06                | 95.0                                     | NA                 | NA                      | Green               |   |
| 11  | Improved quality of life for people in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods;service providers more responsive to neighbourhood needs; and improved service delivery  | Percentage of residents (in areas receiving SSFC funding elements) reporting an increase in satisfaction with their neighbourhoods   | %   | Dec-06                  | Data Available Jan 2007   |              |              | Target will be to improve on baseline                     |               |              |               |              |               | TBA                   | TBA                                      | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | The indicator is being developed based on work in neighbourhood element, neighbourhood management, CEN NDC and household surveys.   |
| 12  | To have cleaner greener safer communities (LAA outcome)<br>To improve the quality of life of people in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods and ensure service providers are more responsive to neighbourhood needs and improve their delivery.(LAA outcome) | More people satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live  | %   | 2003                    | 76.1  | Monitor only | Monitor only | 82  | Monitor only  | Dec-04       | 82.2          | Dec-05       | 81.2          | Available 2007        | Available 2007                           | NA                 | NA                      | Too early to Assess | Satisfaction levels increasing and 'gap' narrowing.<br>NOTE ON TARGETS<br>Household surveys are used to track the views of people across the city . They are particularly useful in monitoring the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the city. The Partnership has chosen not to set targets for survey indicators based on perceptions which are sensitive to external factors such as local media reports. The indicators are however traffic lighted |



Coventry Partnership Outcomes and Targets

Coventry Community Plan Spreadsheet : LAA Simple View

This report contains the Refreshed 2007/8 LAA Indicators

| Row  | LAA Outcome | Performance Measure / Indicator                                   | Units | Baseline / Outturn Date | Baseline / | Performance Targets (City Average) |              |              |              | 2004-5 Update |          | 2005-6 Update |          | 2006-7 Update |          | Target v Actual Variance     |                              | Traffic Light Judgement | Comments  |
|--|-------------|---|-------|-------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
|  |             |   |       |                         | City Avg   | 2005-6                             | 2006-7       | 2007-8       | 2008-9       | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | Date of Data  | City Avg | 2005/06<br><i>Col 21- 33</i> | 2006/07<br><i>Col 22- 40</i> |                         |   |
| <b>SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES BLOCK.</b>   |             |   |       |                         |            |                                    |              |              |              |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |   |
| <b>Neighbourhoods Theme (Neighbourhood Management Partnership) Outcome :</b>   |             |   |       |                         |            |                                    |              |              |              |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |   |
| <i>by 2010 people will feel more able to influence the quality of local public services and facilities and they will have seen improvements most quickly for priority neighbourhoods and communities</i> |             |   |       |                         |            |                                    |              |              |              |               |          |               |          |               |          |                              |                              |                         |   |
| 1  | 8           | 9   | 13    | 14                      | 15         | 21                                 | 22           | 23           | 24           | 25            | 26       | 32            | 33       | 39            | 40       | 46                           | 47                           | 48                      | 49  |
| 13   |             | More people satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live | %     | 2004/05                 | 88         | Monitor only                       | Monitor only | Monitor only | Monitor only | 2004/5        | 88       | 2005/06       | 92       | May - August  | 92       | NA                           | NA                           | Green                   | The satisfaction level has increased, more residents interviewed were satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live |

## Annex 3 Pooled LAA Funding

### Proposed pooled funding

| Funding Stream(s)                             | Previously pooled Y/N | Amount £ 07/08<br>Capital | Amount £07/08<br>Revenue |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Automatically pooled funding                  |                       |                           |                          |
| <b>CYP</b>                                    |                       |                           |                          |
| Positive Activities for Young People          | N                     |                           | 369,441                  |
| School Improvement Partners                   | N                     |                           | 88,459                   |
| Children's Services Grant                     | N                     |                           | 1,338,912                |
| Secondary Central Coordination                | Y                     |                           | 199,562                  |
| Secondary Behaviour and Attendance            | Y                     |                           | 68,300                   |
| School Travel Advisors                        | N                     |                           | 35,000                   |
| Children's Fund                               | Y                     |                           | 947,592                  |
| Primary Strategy Central Coordination         | Y                     |                           | 151,955                  |
| Neighbourhood Support Fund                    | N                     |                           | 226,602                  |
| School Development Grant – centrally retained | N                     |                           | 1,725,869                |
| Neighbourhood Renewal Fund                    | Y                     |                           | 1,519,634                |
| <b>Sub total</b>                              |                       | <b>0</b>                  | <b>6,671,326</b>         |
| <b>SSC</b>                                    |                       |                           |                          |
| Neighbourhood Element                         | Y                     |                           | 581,000                  |
| Building Safer Communities                    | Y                     | 134,760                   | 364,350                  |
| Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinator             | Y                     |                           | 25,000                   |
| Waste Performance and Efficiency              | N                     |                           | 652,834                  |
| Neighbourhood Renewal Fund                    | Y                     |                           | 1,390,818                |
| <b>Sub total</b>                              |                       | <b>134,760</b>            | <b>3,014,002</b>         |
| <b>HCOP</b>                                   |                       |                           |                          |
| Neighbourhood Renewal Fund                    | Y                     |                           | 713,551                  |

|   |   |                |                   |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Sub total</b>                          |   | <b>0</b>       | <b>713,551</b>    |
|   |   |                |                   |
| <b>EED</b>                                |   |                |                   |
| LEGI                                      | Y | 475,000        | 4,409,000         |
| Neighbourhood Renewal Fund                | Y |                | 1,665,547         |
| <b>Sub total</b>                          |   | <b>475,000</b> | <b>6,074,547</b>  |
|   |   |                |                   |
| <b>Total Automatically Pooled Funding</b> |   | <b>609,760</b> | <b>16,473,426</b> |
|   |   |                |                   |
| Other pooled funding through LAA          |   |                |                   |
|   |   |                |                   |
| <b>CYP</b>                                |   |                |                   |
| General Sure Start                        | Y |                | 4,780,000         |
| Sure Start Local Programmes               | Y |                | 2,475,000         |
| Connexions                                | N |                | 3,342,925         |
| Extended Schools                          | N |                | 448,569           |
| Teenage Pregnancy                         | N |                | 274,000           |
| <b>Sub total</b>                          |   | <b>0</b>       | <b>11,320,494</b> |
|   |   |                |                   |
| <b>SSC</b>                                |   |                |                   |
| Drugs Partnership Support Grant           | Y |                | 72,000            |
| <b>Sub total</b>                          |   | <b>0</b>       | <b>72,000</b>     |
|   |   |                |                   |
| <b>Total Other Pooled Funding</b>         |   | <b>0</b>       | <b>11,392,494</b> |

## Proposed Aligned Funding

| Funding Stream(s)                                   | Previously pooled Y/N | Amount £ 07/08<br>Capital | Amount £07/08<br>Revenue |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Aligned funding</b>                              |                       |                           |                          |
| <b>CYP</b>  |                       |                           |                          |
| CAMHS   | N                     |                           | 634,000                  |
| Youth Justice Grants (YJB, CPS, SRB)                | N                     |                           | 1,799,000                |
| Standards Fund (non-devolved)                       | N                     |                           | NYQ                      |
| Capital Funding                                     |                       |                           |                          |
| Modernisation                                       | N                     | 4,065,000                 |                          |
| New Pupil Places                                    | N                     | 918,000                   |                          |
| Access Initiative                                   | N                     | 499,000                   |                          |
| Sure Start  | N                     | 0                         |                          |
| Children's Centre                                   | N                     | 1,700,000                 |                          |
| PE and Sports                                       | N                     | 0                         |                          |
| Devolved Capital                                    | N                     | 4,641,000                 |                          |
| Targeted Capital                                    | N                     | 1,976,000                 |                          |
| <b>Sub total</b>                                    |                       | <b>13,799,000</b>         | <b>2,433,000</b>         |
| <b>SSC</b>  |                       |                           |                          |
| Police Authority – Basic Command Unit               | N                     |                           | 426,000                  |
| <b>Sub total</b>                                    |                       | <b>0</b>                  | <b>426,000</b>           |
| <b>HCOP</b>   |                       |                           |                          |
| Access and Systems Capacity Grant                   | N                     |                           | 3,343,000                |
| Mental Health Grant                                 | N                     |                           | 824,000                  |
| Carers Grant  | N                     |                           | 1,189,000                |
| Preserved Rights Grants                             | N                     |                           | 1,320,000                |
| Residential Allowance Grant                         | N                     |                           | 0                        |
| Delayed Discharges Grant                            | N                     |                           | 614,000                  |
| Supporting People (commissioned from all providers) | N                     |                           | 3,191,000                |
| Human Resource Development Strategy                 | N                     |                           | 304,000                  |

|  |   |                   |                   |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| National Training Strategy                       | N |                   | 656,000           |
| Preventative Technology                          | N |                   | 308,000           |
| <b>Sub total</b>                                 |   | <b>0</b>          | <b>11,749,000</b> |
|  |   |                   |                   |
| <b>Economic Development and Enterprise Block</b> |   | <b>0</b>          | <b>0</b>          |
|  |   |                   |                   |
| <b>Total Aligned Funding</b>                     |   | <b>13,799,000</b> | <b>14,608,000</b> |
|  |   |                   |                   |

## APPENDIX 2

### OUTCOME OF COVENTRY PARTNERSHIP BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT

9<sup>th</sup> January 2007

#### 1. **Introduction**

- 1.1 On 9<sup>th</sup> January 2007, members of the Coventry Partnership Board came together with Leaders and Advisors from Theme Groups, to conduct their annual self assessment.
- 1.2 The Coventry Partnership is subject to 12 monthly assessments by GOWM. In order to respond to this they have put in place a local self assessment process.
- 1.3 The self assessment process provides an opportunity for the Partnership Board and all of its associated theme groups to review their current position in relation to:
- progress towards delivery of targets and outcomes;
  - plausibility that activities are the right ones;
  - success in narrowing the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the city; and
  - impact upon communities of interest.
- 1.4 A number of recent local and national policy developments have implications for the Coventry Partnership. The Local Government White Paper *Strong and Prosperous Communities* published at the end of October 2006, includes a number of points that could provide opportunities and choices for how Coventry Partnership wants to position itself. These include:
- **Place shaping** – a new strategic framework with duties on named partners to prepare sustainable community strategies, the LAA (as the delivery plan) and local development frameworks
  - **Empowering communities** – increasing citizens' influence in decision making through standards and charters, neighbourhood management and community ownership
  - **Community cohesion** – discussed as **core business** for partnerships
  - **Stronger community leadership role for councils** – more visible and accountable with more councillor involvement in, but not control of , LSPs.

#### 2. **Theme Group Self Assessments**

- 2.1 There were a number of generic issues arising from the self assessments and these included:
- the need to strengthen links between theme groups and community of interest partnership boards;
  - the relationship between the Local Area Agreement and other national, regional and local strategies;
  - relationships between theme groups, particularly on cross cutting issues;
  - role, remit and membership of theme groups, following a number of national and local changes;
  - performance management arrangements;

- the role of CEN regarding involvement of the wider community sector in delivering Community Plan outcomes;
- the need for a better understanding of changing populations and transience within priority neighbourhoods;
- the need to strengthen private sector involvement in delivering community plan outcomes; and
- the lack of capacity to proactively publicise the achievements of the Coventry Partnership.

2.2 In addition to the above, there were a number of theme specific issues and learning and research opportunities identified.

### 3. Partnership Board Self Assessment

3.1 In September 2006, Carol Hayden, a Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor working on behalf of the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, was commissioned to undertake a review of the Coventry Partnership, as part of the Board self assessment process. Carol was asked to consider the fitness for purpose of the Coventry Partnership structures and processes with a focus upon:

- the extent to which partnership working was perceived to be inclusive and adding value; and
- recommending how the Partnership should develop to position itself to respond effectively to existing local and emerging national changes.

3.2 The review enabled the Partnership Board to look at:

- what's working well;
- what's not going so well;
- what's changing in public policy and partnership working; and
- how we might want to work differently in the future.

3.3 To inform these questions, the review included looking at:

- current partnership procedures and practices;
- current commissioning arrangements and the findings from other external evaluations;
- the current role of the Partnership Board in relation to the Local Area Agreement;
- the review of the Learning Plan and
- perceptions within the Partnership regarding inclusivity and added value.

3.4 Carol presented the key findings from this research to the workshop and the summary, key findings, conclusion and recommendations can be found in annex one.

3.5 There were a number of improvement areas arising from this research, in particular the lack of clarity that there is for theme group and board members in relation to the role and responsibilities of the various groups. In addition, the Partnership needed to agree how we identify Partnership priorities.

### 4. Group work

4.1 In order to maximise the time available, the focus for group work was to enable members of the Board to consider and agree revised roles and responsibilities for the Board, Operations Group, PIE and Theme Groups and to consider what would need to change in the way we work to make the new roles and responsibilities work.

4.2 To assist in this process draft proposals were used as a basis for discussion. In summary, these focused on the **Board** acting as the overarching strategic partnership for the City; the **Operations Group** being accountable to the Board for managing and co-ordinating the delivery of both the Local Area Agreement and the Community Plan; the **PIE Group** providing the research, evaluation, systems and information for the Operations Group to performance manage effectively; and finally the **Theme Groups** acting as strategic umbrellas, identifying priorities, action planning and co-ordinating delivery.

4.3 Prior to moving into groups the principles behind these roles were discussed and it was agreed that there was a need to consider a number of things including:

- how we identify priorities for action, where the partnership can influence and add value (ie. not what would happen anyway if the partnership didn't exist);



- where can the partnership make the most difference;
- how do we prioritise priorities;
- how do we ensure that we can influence mainstream service provision; and
- consideration of how much this all costs and the need to ensure value for money.

4.4 The meeting then split into 4 groups.

## 5. Feedback from Group Work

5.1 Role of the Partnership Board:

- Very important that the Board retains a similar composition in relation to representation from sectors.
- The Board should focus on creating the vision and their place shaping role.
- The Board should ensure that the strategic vision includes and reflects the breadth of voluntary/community and business involvement and contribution, as well as the public sector.
- Ensure that the Partnership Board is not disempowered by the new role of the Operations Group and the lines of accountability are clear, with ultimate accountability being to the Partnership Board.
- Support for the Board being more strategic and in particular, focusing on a key set of priorities where they can add value and make a significant difference. The Board to have a key role in identifying these priorities and gaps in provision.
- Need to clearly evidence added value of the Board.
- Board should have a lead role in communicating progress and achievements both internally & externally.
- Members of the Partnership Board should sign up to do 3 or 4 things within their own organisations to help deliver the Community Plan outcomes.
- The Board should support and challenge the work of regional and sub-regional partners.

5.2 Role of the Operations Group:

- Needs to be clear that this group is accountable to the Board for monitoring and managing performance of both the Community Plan and Local Area Agreement which may reduce the need for separate block groups.
- The group should consist of senior representatives of those organisations responsible for delivering targets contained within the Local Area Agreement and others as appropriate.
- This group should make delivery happen and have a clear role in influencing mainstream service delivery.
- The group is key in identifying strategic consequences of financial constraints and should seek to explore solutions in partnership.
- To understand each others budget setting processes and priorities, particularly to focus on employment fall out issues and whether we can make better use of external funding to mitigate the impact of any reduction in service provision that results.
- There needs to be clarity about the relationship between the Operations Group and Theme Groups in relation to prioritising action and similarly, theme groups and the board should be involved in deciding what key targets are in the LAA.
- Important that the group has an overview of programmes, performance and spend.
- Need to consider relationships with the council's new leadership role.

- The Operations Group needs to assist in joining up different reviews affecting local public sector agencies by getting the right regional Government Officers involved.

### 5.3 Role of the PIE Group:

- The Group will need to supply the Operations Group with the 'right' information to enable them to make informed decisions and properly understand performance.
- Performance management systems and information should be both qualitative and quantitative.
- PIE should seek to use a range of techniques for research.
- All research commissioned through PIE should be presented to the Board.
- Need to build on the flow of information between PIE and Theme Groups.
- City Council review should recognise the capacity issues that may arise for the PIE group to work effectively in this way.
- PIE to provide regular analysis of outcomes
- PIE to assist in rationalising duplications in reporting to different bodies and to co-ordinate and make best use of local research/analysis.

### 5.4 Role of Theme Groups:

- All theme groups are different and this should be acknowledged. Having identical terms of reference for all could increase a sense of lack of achievement in some groups which do not have the ability to fulfil this role
- There is room to revise the structures (but not destabilise) and make some positive value for money changes including exploring bringing together transport and sustainable development; and reviewing the agenda of the Learning & Training Theme Group to see if it could be shared between the Children & Young People's Partnership and the Jobs Strategy Group.
- Equalities & Communities Group should remain and use their role to strengthen links with Community of Interest Partnerships.
- Could some theme groups play more of a 'think tank' role? Should they all be permanent, or should some be set up to do specific pieces of work and then disbanded?
- Would chairs of theme groups still need to be represented on the Board if the role of the Operations Group changes?
- Terms of reference should apply to communities of interest partnership boards too.
- Need to develop description for roles within the partnership secretariat and chairs/advisors of theme groups.
- Need to tease out the linkages/overlaps between the Operations Group and the Leaders & Advisors Group and develop terms of reference which should include creating innovative solutions to cross-cutting issues on a time limited task and finish basis.

### 5.5 There were also a number of general issues/actions arising from the discussions that took place. These included:

- Membership (both people and organisations) would need to be reviewed on all groups to make this new structure work.
- The linkages would need to be very clear between the different groups and the members on each group.
- There is still a need to ensure that the work of the Partnership runs through organisations and doesn't just sit with the senior executives or front line practitioners.

- There would need to be a clear communication strategy around all of these changes to ensure that people were clear on both the need and the process for change.

5.6 Carol summarised the feedback session and indicated that there were 6 key themes emerging:

- Agreeing what issues the Partnership needs to concentrate on to add value (key priorities).
- Reviewing membership of groups to ensure there are the right people and the right organisations.
- Having absolute clarity about the linkages and relationships between the Board and the management of the Local Area Agreement, Community Plan and Neighbourhood Management.
- Reviewing and amending structures to ensure value for money and effective management and delivery of the Community Plan and Local Area Agreement.
- Ensuring that the performance management framework leads to streamlined reporting and joint commissioning to link spend to performance and outcomes.
- Needing to be really clear to all partners on the outcome of today and the actions that will be implemented over the next 12 months (communications).

## **6. Conclusion & Next Steps**

- 6.1 It is clear from the evaluation sheets that most people found the self assessment to be both interesting and useful.
- 6.2 The next stage of this work is the development of an improvement plan and in particular, the production of terms of reference for the Board/Operations Group and PIE Groups, to be presented to the Operations Group in February and the Board in March. The Partnership's commitment to learning and using an evidence based approach will underpin the improvement plan.
- 6.3 Implementation of the improvement plan will put the Coventry Partnership in a very good position not only to respond to the White Paper but to satisfy ourselves that the time we spend working together is both efficient and effective.

Sara Roach  
Development Manager  
Coventry Partnership

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The different pieces of review fieldwork have provided some common messages about Coventry Partnership – what it does and how it works. Interviews and survey respondents have highlighted what is working well and what could be improved in the contexts of the Partnership adding value and being inclusive – the two key areas addressed by the review. Findings include:

### Adding value

#### *Networking and communication*

- There is a widespread and strongly held view that the Partnership has encouraged and developed **networking** across the city
- This has enabled **sharing of information** between agencies/sectors
- And improved **understanding about different agendas**
- The Council's leadership encourages **senior people** from other agencies to become and stay involved
- Coventry Partnership has thus promoted and embedded a **partnership culture and infrastructure** in the city
- This has helped **communication and joint work between agencies** outside of the formal Partnership meetings and theme groups
- The statutory sector also sees the Partnership as an important **forum for consultation with the voluntary and community sectors**.

#### *Role and priorities*

- Some members feel that the **networking/consultative role** is the main way in which the Partnership can add value
- But a more common view is that the Partnership needs to have a **more strategic role**
- This includes being clearer about its **focus and key priorities** – those issues where Coventry Partnership is needed to make a real difference
- Setting overall priorities would also help focus and clarify the roles of the **theme groups**.
- Which would help people on theme groups who said they needed a **better understanding** of the reasons for their involvement and how it linked to the overall purpose of Coventry Partnership i.e. the delivery of the Community Plan

#### *Decision making and action*

- There is a widely held view that the high levels of commitment and positive partnership relationships could be built upon to **take more joint action** so the Partnership could add value to what would be going on anyway

- The most important action for the Partnership to take (i.e. initiate/co-ordinate) is felt to be on **'the big issues'** that are important to Coventry and can't be handled by one or two organisations (e.g. mixed communities/housing strategy, environmental sustainability, tackling deprivation)
- This will require better **links to and between theme groups** and a willingness and ability to highlight **cross-cutting issues**
- A common concern is about **not knowing about how decisions are made** (there is a feeling issues are discussed at the Partnership but decisions are then made elsewhere)
- So on any issue being discussed it would help to **be clear about how a decision will be made, on what, and by whom**

### **Local Area Agreement**

- The survey showed that the majority of members think that it is very important to **link Coventry Partnership's activities to the LAA** – but in contrast only a few members feel they spend much time on this
- Some members described how the LAA could help the Partnership be more **action-focused and hold partners to account**
- The scoping work showed that members often saw the LAA as a 'council plus its statutory partners agreement' perhaps reflecting the way Coventry's pilot LAA subsumed the LPSA in existence at the time
- However the survey showed that members overwhelmingly think a priority for the Partnership should be to **influence mainstream services**
- In contrast, **allocation of NRF** per. se. was not such a high priority

### **Communication**

- Survey respondents felt that there should be both more **consultation and better communication** with local people
- In particular, members felt the Partnership should communicate in a more **accessible** way about its activities
- And take opportunities to **work with other partnerships** (e.g. in Warwickshire, with CSWP, with neighbourhood management)

## Inclusiveness

### *Individual involvement*

- Generally **people feel involved in the Partnership** and thought that it was easy to feel involved
- However a lot of respondents said that **better information** about the Partnership and **clearer agendas** would help them feel more involved
- Ideas for how **new members could be supported** included an induction programme and buddying or mentoring scheme

### *Ensuring diversity*

- There is widespread agreement that the most under-represented sector is the **business sector** which needs to be more involved in Partnership work
- A number of survey respondents also felt the **voluntary and/or community sectors** should be better represented
- In terms of diversity of people on the Partnership, the survey showed that significant numbers of members felt that **young people, BME groups and people living in deprived neighbourhoods** all needed to be better represented and that this would benefit the Partnership

Addressing these findings will put Coventry Partnership in a strong position to develop its role in the way envisaged for LSPs in the recent Local Government White Paper *Strong and Prosperous Communities*. The 'place shaping' agenda and the use of the LAA as the delivery plan for the Community Strategy will help in better linking resources to action on agreed priorities. The duty on named partners should enable partners to hold each other to account for joint action agreed through the Partnership.

Coventry Partnership's record in relation to inclusive participation places it well to respond to the increased emphasis in the White Paper on community and citizen empowerment. The arrangements currently being introduced to link more closely with the city's neighbourhood management agenda will also help in this respect, as will thinking about how to improve representation from all sectors and communities.

## RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSIONS

### Conclusions

Overall, the review shows that Coventry partnership is working well in encouraging close networking and useful information sharing between agencies and organisations in Coventry. This has built a culture of openness and trust and enables the statutory sector to use the Partnership to consult with the voluntary and community sectors on key issues for the city.

Generally people feel included in the Partnership and able to participate, although this could be further strengthened by support for new members and better information sharing between the different groups that make up the Partnership.

The Partnership could be more effective if it was clearer about its key priorities – those cross-cutting issues where the Partnership could add most value - and communicated these not only to its members on theme groups but more widely in Coventry.

This would support the Partnership in taking more 'decisions that will lead to action'. Although Coventry partnership is clearly not a decision making body in the way statutory agencies are – with statutory responsibilities and public accountability – it could do more to lead and influence collaborative decision making on joint action, and agree the implications for joint commissioning and/or aligning mainstream resources.

A major challenge for the Partnership is thus to build on its strong networking and information sharing culture to agree priorities and implement joint action to deliver the Community Strategy. This echoes the findings of the study that has been undertaken into the NRF Commissioning Process which recommends that Coventry Partnership should 'develop the understanding of commissioning & procurement as a system which can then be used to push the boundaries of change and improvement in delivering partnership priorities'.

Such a shift would also be consistent with the White Paper which requires councils to bring together the Sustainable Community Strategy with the LAA as its delivery plan. It is relevant to the theme groups as well as the Partnership Board and would enable better links to the LAA as well as to Neighbourhood Management – two other concerns raised through the review.

A clearer purpose and more strategic decision making could also help sectors which were thought to be underrepresented – such as the Business Community - to get involved. The Partnership also needs how to consider better involving BME groups, young people, and representatives from deprived neighbourhoods so that these groups' voices can influence real decision making.

## Recommendations

It is important that Coventry Partnership itself uses this review for its self-assessment and to inform actions it decides to take to build on its achievements and improve its effectiveness.

The recommendations below are therefore not meant to be prescriptive but offered as suggestions for ways forward that the Partnership may want to consider addressing the issues raised through the review.

- **Clarify roles and responsibilities** of the Partnership and its theme groups to deliver the Community Plan
- Agree five or six key 'things to do this year' to **provide more focus** for the Partnership and ensure it adds value by prioritising action that would not happen anyway
- Ensure that all meetings are organised in ways that **make clear the purpose of a discussion** and whether it is for information, influencing, decision making etc and where and when and how any related decision making will take place



- Develop arrangements (processes and structures) for the **Partnership to lead the LAA** as the delivery vehicle of the Sustainable Community Strategy (Community Plan)
- This would need to include a **realignment and /or streamlining of some of the theme groups** to develop a single 'strategic umbrella partnership' for each theme in Coventry
- And an **integrated performance management system** so that different agencies' and departments' plans would be linked to the LAA and the Community Strategy priorities
- Develop **joint commissioning** to ensure 'resources follow priorities' and that actions agreed are those most likely to deliver on LAA and NR targets and use these developments to inform the 2007 LAA refresh process
- Continue the work to enable **Neighbourhood Management** to both inform and deliver Coventry Partnership's priorities and agreed joint action
- Develop ideas for how to better **involve the Business sector**, particularly the 'newer Coventry businesses in financial, business and retail services.
- Review **BME and young people's involvement** with a view to increasing this
- Agree a package of **support measures for new members** of Coventry Partnership