

Bucks Strategic Partnership

Local Delivery Workshop

11th November 2009



part of the **LGA** group

1 Introduction

1.1 Bucks Strategic Partnership held a workshop on 11th November 2009 to begin a conversation which will lead to agreement about a strategic approach to joint local delivery. The aim is to achieve a multi-agency approach that meets the whole needs of the place (as set out in the suite of community strategies) through appropriate and effective integration of services and community engagement and participation.

1.2A good amount of joint local delivery is already in evidence in Buckinghamshire. Examples include:

- Multi Agency Tackling Disadvantage project in Castlefield
- Thames Valley Police Neighbourhood Policing
- Review of public sector property holdings
- Building Capacity projects in Chesham
- Buckingham Centre
- BCC/PCT local delivery of services for children
- BCC/DCs – Environmental Health and Trading Standards
- MKBF&R – Home Safety Check.

1.3 Partners want to build on these examples and to explore approaches to joint planning and delivery, and joint access to services.

1.4 Dean Taylor, Strategic Director Business and Customer Transformation, Buckinghamshire County Council opened the workshop by outlining the vision, challenges and potential benefits of developing more effective local delivery models. To support the discussion the IDeA provided examples of local delivery models from other areas in the country. These included the Gateway model in Kent, approaches to neighbourhood management in Wiltshire and Salford and targeted approaches aimed at tackling disadvantage in London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

2 Establishing Principles

2.1 Working in six groups participants discussed the principles that should apply as partners seek to take forward the work on joint local delivery. There was a good degree of consensus on the broad principles, although the language and the examples used to explore and explain particular principles were different in each group. The principles most commonly identified were:

- Flexibility
 - Not one size fits all
 - Not local for local sake
- Efficiency (balanced with need).
 - Putting total local budget and assets to effective use
- Customer focus

- A 'no wrong door' approach, good customer insight and engagement
- Keep it simple
 - Important to build on existing projects
 - start small e.g. with pilots and evaluate before wider implementation
- Build Trust between partners based on transparency and a commitment by all organisations
 - This will need agreement on degree of sovereignty that partners are prepared to cede.

3 Discussion of key themes

3.1 Three key themes were discussed by the six groups during the remainder of workshop. The themes were:

- Customer Services
- Joined up services
- Resident- led engagement.

The themes reflected areas for future potential collaboration and also areas where there were some existing examples from within Buckinghamshire.

3.2 In discussing the themes participants considered a number of issues including:

- Clarity of goals
- Responsibilities
- What the approaches to service delivery might be
- What arrangements might be tested through pilots
- Questions to be resolved and information needs
- Communication flows between partners.

Customer services

3.3 The discussion on customer services raised a number of issues that will need to be addressed as the conversation between partners is progressed over the next year. The view was expressed that the building based approach highlighted in the Kent Gateway model was not the only way forward. Further, it would be important to begin to develop at an early stage some agreement of the services that would be in scope in taking any such project forward.

3.4 A Single common assessment across a range of services was raised as an example of the type of approach to improving customer services that might be beneficial to residents and achievable within Buckinghamshire. It was also felt

that this type of approach would enable key service areas such as Children's Services and Adult Social Care to explore synergies.

3.5 Participants recognised that approaches to customer services needed to be built on a good understanding of customer need and that partners needed to share knowledge about communities and to focus in on what matters to residents.

3.6 Participants recognised that there were a number of challenges. Among these was the need to manage expectations. A key context for the discussion was the expected reduction in public sector finances. Participants thought that initiatives around customer services might need to be designed to deliver the *same* level of service, but at a reduced cost.

3.7 Partners highlighted that approaches to customer services that involved co-location, a single web and/or phone interface and potentially a common branding could have implications for the public accountability of individual organisations and the extent of this shift and its implications would need to be understood.

Joined-up services

3.8 The discussion on joined-up services covered some of the same ground as the customer services debate. The focus on customers and their needs was placed at the heart of the discussion. Common assessment procedures were again raised as an area where services could make progress in joining up. End of life care was highlighted as a specific example where work could begin to re-design the service to provide a more joined up and customer focused approach. Other areas highlighted included benefits services, support to the unemployed, health and social care and environmental services (e.g. refuse collection rounds).

3.9 The message from participants was that partners seek should move quickly to integrate their services more effectively. However, challenges were also identified. These included recognising and dealing with the cultural issues associated with integrating workforces and systems from different organisations. Partners also recognised that for greater integration to take place there would need to be greater transparency between partners and the further move away from the silo working which was still evident in Buckinghamshire.

Resident-led engagement

3.10 The discussion on resident-led engagement highlighted the need for partners to be smarter in how they combined to engage with communities and share information. In line with the expected tighter financial situation partners

recognised the need to focus on community needs rather than wants. Partners also thought that it was important to exploit social networking and other developments as a means to improving the coverage of their engagement.

- 3.11 A second strand of the discussions focused on the need to develop approaches to community facilitation which enabled residents and communities to address their own needs and solve problems as they arise. To achieve this it was recognised that there might be a need to invest in developing community capacity.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 In addition to this summary report, write-ups of the discussions at the event are attached at Appendix A, to assist in discussions at individual organisation/partnership level.
- 4.2 The event on 11 November was a first stage in the development of a strategic approach to local delivery. The issues raised in the discussions will need to be considered by partners individually. The Bucks Strategic Partnership will need to consider the outcomes of the initial discussions, including the emerging principles and develop the timeline and key milestones in taking this work forward.
- 4.3 The IDeA has agreed that it will provide support to district local strategic partnerships' as they consider their contribution to the local delivery agenda.

Eamon Lally
Improvement Manager, IDeA

Appendix A: Workshop notes, BSP Local Delivery Event, 11 Nov 09

Exercise 1: summary of principles

Flipchart write-up

- No wrong door
- Flexibility
- Future proofing
- Tackling disadvantage
- Balance of efficiency/ customer need
- Measurement
- Broad engagement
- Agree on sovereignty/ empowerment of local managers
- Customer led? / managing expectation
- Building on what exists
- Budgets/ Assets to put to best use – outputs/inputs balance
- Trust/ Transparent/ commitment from all partners
- Limiting priorities
- Simplification/ start small
- Not local for local sake/ relevant at local level
- Flexibility

Principles summary at end of event

- **Flexibility**
 - Not one size fits all
 - Not local for local sake
- **Efficiency** (balanced with need).
 - Putting total local budget / assets to effective use
- **Customer focus**
 - no wrong door, good insight and engagement
- **Keep it simple**
 - build on existing
 - start small
- **Trust/ transparency/all organisations commit**
 - needs commitment on sovereignty

BSP Local Delivery Event, 11 Nov 09; Write-up of flipcharts from Exercise 1; principles for local delivery

Table A1	Table A2	Table A3	Table B1	Table B2	Table B3
Commitment political / operational	1. Keep it simple	Focus on the prize	Against our agreed priorities.....	Some things better dealt with at a local level	Evidence based (listen to community needs)
Joint principles:	2. Use /adapt existing structure	Limit beaurocracy	No wrong door	Not local for locals sake	Focus on delivery – Scope for simplification
Principles applied to tackle loss of sovereignty e.g. always deliver jointly unless a good reason not to.	3. Clarity on what success looks like	Balance of outputs/inputs	Seamless services – SPOC and professional	Clear what outcome you want, clear priorities	Efficiencies – more outcomes for less tax
Need to give away sovereignty and power, but at a managerial / operational level - not at policy/ decision making level.	4. Informed by the local community	Recognise role of 3 rd sector	Future proofing	What is local the answer to? What problem are we trying to solve?	Evaluation/ challenge / change/ improve
Devolved power – comes with devolved responsibility.	5. No top down strategies	Recognise flexibility/ one size will not fit all.	Changing behaviour – engagement	Whose outcomes are they anyway?	Communication (of what's already available)
Shared resources – fairly.	6. Stick to the priorities (3) Value for money, respect, ??, learn – don't reinvent. Broker locally.	Transparency/ trust	Reducing inequality/ focus on the vulnerable	Relevant at local level	Community involvement (not always community led) Empowerment – mobilising resources – personal responsibility/ solutions.
Devolve power to people using services.	7. Think through the impact on other organisations	Financial reality (anticipated)	Appropriate channels – efficiency but customers needs	flexibility	Managing expectations
Principles have to be agreed. 1. Quality 2. Subsidiarity (costs attached?) 3. Cost effectiveness 4. Reflects need. 5. All internet access <u>or</u> all face to face where needed.	8. Better use of the assets/ budgets	Do we need new structures? Can we adapt/ change?	Measuring benefits improvements/ quality	response proportionate to need	
	9. Rooted in reality	Natural tendencies/ role of imagination	Harnessing contributions of VCS, parishes etc. Intermediaries	Start small	
	10. Know each other – Trust / relationships			Evaluate	
				Efficient	
				Be frank, open, transparent.	

BSP Local Delivery Event, 11 Nov 09; Write-up of flipcharts from Exercise 1; principles for local delivery

Customer Services

Summary

- Not just buildings based solution
- Better services or maintaining current levels?
- Education –self help – Reduce dependency
- Single Common Assessments
- Explore synergies ; children, vulnerable adults
- What's the problem? Who are the customers?
- Focus on customer need ; share knowledge ; what matters to the customers?
- Which services in scope?
- Brand? Bucks 101; all public service queries
- Accountability – less important?
- Manage expectations – join access and delivery

Write-Up from Table A1

Sheet 1:

- Managing expectation
- ↓Resources – Demands↑
- Maintain current levels by joining up? Or accept and re define a lower one?
- Customer education to self help and reduce dependence. (Especially care)
- Tough decisions on stopping or changing services (joint assessments)

Sheet 2:

- Buildings (Kent) not the whole answer.
- Own home – access, net etc
- Info. Sharing protocols – No excuses? – commitment
- Stages of implementation require public to buy in/ be involved as well.
- Good communication vital – with public, - between us, - expectations.
- Balance between comprehensive response V cost / call centre

Sheet 3:

- Starting point – What is the issue we are solving?
- Who are the customers? One stop? Maybe, but not just a shop.
- Customer led, but is that a need based system.
- How to help rural areas
- Explore synergies (e.g. children's centres)

Write-Up from Table B1

- Single Brand e.g. Kent.
- Face to Face – flexible, accessible, transport in priority (need) areas
- Telephone – multi agency contact centre
- Online – joined up websites
- Brand – Customer driven / insight (pool) Businesses etc
- Which services are in scope?
- Workforce development – training cross agency. Eg FAQ
- Future proof via IT
- Bucks 101 – Channel shift
- Focus on what matters to the customer and fix them e.g. fear of crime

- Less is more – keep it simple
- Accountability dilemma
- Danger – disconnect between access and service – Expectations etc.

Joined up services

Summary

- Balance improvements and efficiency
- Build on what customers want – lead to change in agency delivery
- Co-location, with culture change
- Common assessments
- Involve all partners including the 3rd sector
- Pilot, engage front line staff
- Potential areas ; benefits, support to unemployed, health and social care, 18+, environmental services
- Start soon
- Home visits – sharing information?
- Partnership brand? No logos? Whose communities?
- Join up – ‘low hanging fruit’, - tricky issues – vulnerable groups
- Pump priming – NB reward fund
- N.B everyone still behaving as individual organisations.

Write-Up from Table A2

- **What** are we trying to do?
 - Quality of ? : improve
 - Cut out waste
 - Efficiency
 - Satisfaction: customer, staff
 - Manage expectation
 - Reality
 - Clarity of vision
- **How ?**
 - Commitment
 - Adaptive/ virtual
 - Same language
 - Co-location (beyond stat limit?)
 - Culture
 - Single signposting
 - Common Assessment
 - All agencies – voluntary sector
 - Not one size fits all – vary model
 - Framework for how to get there
 - Pilots – benefits/ employment, skills, health.social care, Connexions +
 - Get on with it – resilience
 - Ask your front line staff.
- **When?**
 - **now**

End of life care

Connexions

Healthy Living Centre, Ayls

Write-Up from Table B2

- Synergies between different services. Imam/ faith leader/ voluntary sector. Going into peoples homes. Reaching out
- Realistic on how much we can deliver.
- Multi tasking
- No logos Vs overall brand. The best channel. Initiatives
- Low-hanging fruit v wicked issues.
- Why has the pathfinder project stalled? Not v ambitious
- We haven't much money
- £ - Pump priming
- Are we brave enough – ABG's other pooled funding

- Moving from intellectual to emotional commitment
- Outcome analytics / needs based approach / pareto? focus
- Let go – ownership instilled
- How joined up are they?
- Strong strategic partnership

Resident-led engagement

Summary

- Different models already established – use these
- Can residents be facilitated to solve own problems? Maximise 3rd sector input
- Share engagements toolkits
- Support elected members' role
- How to measure success?
- Be clear on purpose and level /scope of engagement
- Focus on needs not wants
- Businesses are part of the community
- How do we use information gathered? Feedback?
- Use of technology? E.g. Facebook – Implications?
- May need to build community capacity to enable discussions.

Write-Up from Table A3

- Different models apply to different services
- Empower residents
- Clarify purpose/ expectation
- Organisation self awareness about their communities
- Sustainability
- Facilitate communities to solve their own problems
- Voluntary sector rooted in grass route communities/ opportunity to work together
- Genuine engagement to secure real outcomes
- Perception / communications
- Accountability
- Toolkit / equipping people to engage
- Role of elected members
- Engagement / consultation overload
- Map/ audit commission
- Involvement at the outset and through future stages
- Measure success by level of engagement secured – reach broader population not just those engaged with
- Who ,how ,why, in development +/- or delivery.

Write-Up from Table B3

- Different levels of engagement – inform/ consult/ empower
- Clarity of who we are targeting and why – facilitation role?, advocacy role?, service / problem –solving?
- Common shared messages from agencies and from communities / residents
- Hearing different voices (not just the loud ones) and who they are. e.g. residents, workers.
- Difference between wants and needs
- Businesses are residents as well (the wealth creators)
- Use existing mechanisms or develop existing mechanisms to widen representative views
- Must respond to views and feedback to residents/ communities collectively
- How to ensure messages are passed between agencies and feedback given- co-location a solution?
- Must manage expectations/ capacity
- Different ways to engage/ capacity issues e.g. social networking sites led by communities (cheaper than face to face) – “virtual engagement”
- Build community capacity first in some areas – Awareness raising, empowerment opportunities/ self help e.g. IT access