

Gateshead Strategic Partnership Steering Group

Tuesday 6th September 2016

GSP review

Purpose of the report

1. This report seeks approval to undertake a review of the Gateshead Strategic Partnership to ensure it continues to be fit for purpose.

Background

2. Local Strategic Partnerships were created to bring together representatives from the local statutory, voluntary, community and private sectors to address local problems, allocate funding, and discuss strategies and initiatives.
3. The aim was to encourage joint working and community involvement, and prevent 'silo working' (i.e. different agencies that share aims working in isolation) with the general objective of ensuring resources are better allocated at a local level.
4. Following the review of partnership working in 2010/11, it was agreed that future approaches to partnership working should be business and action focused and make best use of partners' time and resource.
5. This review also agreed the following five reasons for working in partnership:
 - i. Strategy and Executive (prioritisation and overseeing delivery of Vision 2030 outcomes)
 - ii. Commissioning (Analysis; Plan; Deliver; Review) (focus on resources and resource allocation to deliver priorities)
 - iii. Delivery (across all partnership structures)
 - iv. Performance and contract management (monitoring progress, ensuring accountability)
 - v. Consultation, information sharing and engagement (an inclusive approach - the 'Gateshead Family').
6. There are statutory requirements which need to be adhered to:
 - i. The requirement for local authorities and partners to have a **Children's Trust Board** and the wider duty to cooperate to improve children's wellbeing, as set out in section 10 of the Children Act 2004, remains in force. *Note:* The withdrawal of statutory guidance (31 October 2010 by the Department for Education) gave local authorities the flexibility to ensure that their Children's Trust Board fit with local Health and Wellbeing Board arrangements to suit their local context.
 - ii. Section 13 of the Children Act 2004 requires each local authority to establish a **Local Safeguarding Children Board** (LSCB) for their area

- and specifies the organisations and individuals (other than the local authority) that must be represented on the Board, including those which the Secretary of State prescribes in regulations
- iii. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 requires the establishment of a **health and wellbeing board** for every upper tier local authority.
 - iv. The Care Act 2014 sets out a clear legal framework for how local authorities and other parts of the system should protect adults at risk of abuse or neglect – **Safeguarding Adults Board**.
 - v. **Community Safety Partnerships** (CSPs) were set up under Sections 5-7 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 to help to tackle crime and reduce reoffending. CSPs are made up of representatives from Police, Probation Service, Local Authority, Health, Fire and Rescue authorities.

Issues

7. All partners are in a different place to when the last review was undertaken (2010/11) but recognise that partnership working is still needed, especially in this time of reduced resource.
8. The current structure meets the statutory requirements but it is not to be said that these requirements cannot be met in other ways.
9. A number of meetings have been cancelled due to the number of apologies (not quorate) and a lack of business.
10. The Gateshead Local Safeguarding Children Board needs to consider the implications of the Wood Review (see Appendix 1) and the recent Ofsted inspection which concluded that it requires improvement to be good due to issues such as gaps in its membership, monitoring of services and lack of robustness in the analysis of its training.
11. These issues are leading to a number of different ‘reviews’ looking at different aspects of the GSP:
 - The **Children’s Trust Board** are using their next meeting on Wednesday 21st September at 2.00pm as a development session to look at how it moves ahead and the joint aspirations of the Board.
 - The **Community Safety Board** are looking at ways to rationalise the number of meetings and
 - the **Economy, Environment and Culture** board (EEC) requires re-examination to consider:
 - is the Board needed?
 - if the Board is needed what it can contribute to the ‘place shaping’ agenda
 - how to avoid duplication and repetition between the Board and other partnerships.

Proposal

12. To review the GSP in its entirety to ensure that it adds value for all partners and delivers better outcomes for Gateshead residents.

13. Appendix 2 starts to outline the scope of this review and a proposed timeline for the key activities of the review.

Recommendations

14. The Steering Group is asked to agree
 - I. to a full review of the GSP and sub groups
 - II. that Appendix 2 should be used as the basis for discussions with Partners of the GSP

Contact: Charlotte Wainwright, Gateshead Council

Tel: 433 2061

Response from Government to the Wood Inquiry

Local Safeguarding Children Boards

The Wood Review argues that strong, effective multi-agency arrangements are ones that are responsive to local circumstances and fully engage the right people.

The review found widespread agreement that the current system needs to change in favour of a new model that will ensure collective accountability across the system. This is the view that has emerged from extensive consultation with a wide range of individuals and organisations and with independent experts such as Lord Laming and Baroness Jay.

We agree with that current arrangements are inflexible and too often ineffective. Meetings take place involving large numbers of people, but decision-making leading to effective action on the ground can be all too often lacking.

We will introduce a stronger but more flexible statutory framework that will support local partners to work together more effectively to protect and safeguard children and young people, embedding improved multi-agency behaviours and practices. This framework will set out clear requirements for the key local partners, while allowing them freedom to determine how they organise themselves to meet those requirements and improve outcomes for children locally.

To ensure engagement of the key partners in a better coordinated, more consistent framework for protecting children, we will:

Place a new requirement on three key partners, namely local authorities, the police and the health service, to make arrangements for working together in a local area. This would not change the existing statutory functions or duties on any of the agencies individually, but it will require more robust and much clearer arrangements to promote effective joint working, in relation to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children.

To ensure these arrangements are multi-agency in their approach, we will:

In addition to the new duty on the three key agencies, place an expectation on schools and other relevant agencies involved in the protection of children, to co-operate with the new multi-agency arrangements.

The leaders from the three key sectors will be able to call on the support and co-operation of partner agencies, to form a clearer picture of how agencies are performing, and to make evidence-based decisions on how to achieve the best possible outcomes for children.

To simplify and strengthen the existing statutory framework around multi-agency working, we will:

Remove the requirement for local areas to have LSCBs with set memberships, often leading to large and unwieldy boards. Local areas that have strong and effective arrangements for multi-agency co-operation delivered through their LSCB will be able to retain them as long as they meet the new requirements. That means that the three key partners will take the decision to continue the arrangements because they see this as the most effective form of securing coordination. However they will be able to take advantage of much greater flexibility in developing arrangements that respond to local need and in which agencies are better invested. That flexibility will enable joint

identification of and response to existing and emerging needs and priorities and improve outcomes for children.

To ensure that local areas have robust arrangements in place for how the key sectors will work together, we will:

Bring forward legislation to underpin the new arrangements. We will support this with statutory guidance and we will work with the inspectorates to establish suitable review arrangements.

Require the three key sectors to establish governance arrangements and decide a range of issues, including the following:

- The area or region which should be covered under the joint arrangements;
- How they will involve and work with other agencies who have a key role in protecting children;
- A plan setting out details of the arrangements, which they will publish;
- Resourcing for the arrangements;
- How they will ensure a strong degree of independent scrutiny of the arrangements.

In cases where local arrangements do not work effectively, we will:

Provide for the Secretary of State to have power to intervene in situations where the three key agencies cannot reach an agreement on how they will work together, or where arrangements are otherwise seriously inadequate.

SCOPE

The Gateshead Strategic Partnership needs to be fit for purpose and enable efficient partnership working.

PROJECT AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Working with all Partners, the current arrangements will be reviewed and recommendations will be made.

The following areas are included in the review:

- The GSP Steering Group
- Children's Trust
- Community Safety Board
- Economy, Environment and Culture
- Health and Wellbeing Board
- Local Safeguarding Children Board
- Safeguarding Adults Board
- Sub groups such as the Crime Confidence & Anti-Social Behaviour Group, JSNA Steering Group, etc
- Community Involvement and consultation groups e.g. Diversity Forum, DESUIF, etc

KEY MILESTONES

1. Review the governance arrangements and structure of the GSP
 - Need to make the best use of all partners time a resource?
 - Look at all possible scenarios e.g.
 - A number of areas have removed their LSP altogether
 - Some have a reduced amount of Boards
 - Who should lead on the various partnerships?
 - Within any new structure how could we best retain the wider engagement with stakeholders and the 'Gateshead partnership family'?
2. Partnership Working
 - Test the five reasons for working in partnership
 - Is Vision 2030 still viable?
 - The development of a Sustainable Community Strategy is no longer a statutory requirement
 - the Gateshead Strategic Partnership agreed the need for a strategic plan to inform its priorities and to monitor progress
 - Should the partnership be looking further ahead, 2050?
 - What partnerships do we need? Why?
 - What would a commissioning partnership look like?
 - Any implications of Devolution will be included in this review when they are clear e.g. Transport.
3. Membership and meetings
 - Need to ensure that the right people are around the right tables
 - Do we need new organisation of partnership – are all boards and groups still appropriate?
 - How do you think the partnership could work together more cohesively?

- Fewer formal meetings but space to informally share ideas and shape future policy direction.
 - Duplication of Boards work programmes needs to be removed (links to accountability and responsibility)
 - Whilst Gateshead is the focus of the partnership working, the geography covered by the various partners and organisations will be considered.

4. Accountability

- Need to be clear on responsibility and contribution
 - Create a constructive environment to challenge and make decisions
 - How to embed the Achieving More Together approach throughout the ‘reviewed’ GSP to help deliver outcomes

OUTCOMES

A partnership that meets all statutory requirements and results in effective partnership working which ‘adds value’ and is delivering better outcomes for Gateshead’s residents and visitors.

All partners working towards the same vision and goals.

Business focused meetings which removes duplication to make good use of ALL partners time and resource.

APPROACH AND TIMESCALE

