DRAFT COMMUNITY PLANNING INDICATORS

AUDIT SCOTLAND

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING INDICATORS

PROGRESS NOTE June 2004

INTRODUCTION

The Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 gives powers to the Accounts Commission to *'facilitate the drawing of conclusions about the discharge of those bodies' functions under Part 2 (community planning) of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003'*

The Commission has worked with other key stakeholders in the Community Planning Task Force to promote the development of community planning. The Task Force identified the need to develop a community planning performance framework, of which the development of a focussed set of key indicators was identified as a key part. Specifically, the Community Planning Task Force recommended that the Accounts Commission *'develop and test meaningful and consistent performance indicators which are relevant to all partners'*.

The Commission has agreed to undertake work to develop proposals for such indicators which will be the subject of consultation before the Commission reaches a decision on taking these forward.

OVERALL FRAMEWORK

We are developing a framework in consultation with Community Planning Partnerships and other stakeholders, that builds on what exists, picking up on the key priorities in Community Plans and making use of existing indicators as far as possible.

In order to gain an holistic view of community planning, a number of different mechanisms will be used – community planning indicators, the new Audit of Best Value and, in the early years, targeted work focusing on key community planning processes – which taken together form the overall assessment framework.

The effects of community planning will be apparent only over the medium to long term, and this framework will provide valuable information and assurance about how partnership working is being addressed across Scotland and the difference that the process is making. It is important that the framework links with the work of other audit and inspection regimes. Work being taken forward with the Regeneration Outcome agreements, a key part of the SIP integration process, will also inform this process.

PROGRESS TO DATE

The following work is being undertaken as part of the development of proposals from CPIs:

➤ Analysis of the key themes in all the Scottish community plans
➤ Analysis of the indicators currently in use or for planned use as described in community plans
➤ Identification and collation of national and UK-wide existing cross cutting indicator sets
➤ Matching of the local and national indicators against community plan themes and Scottish Executive high level priorities
➤ Developing an outline model for a CPI structure and reporting arrangements
➤ Ongoing extensive consultation with key stakeholders including the CoSLA Community Planning Officers Network, the Scottish Executive, Communities Scotland and individual councils.

POTENTIAL MODEL

The consultation undertaken so far has determined our current thinking in relation to a potential model for community planning indicators, based on 4 strands:

1. A National Set or 'Core set' of existing high level impact indicators related to the 5 Scottish Executive

priorities of Health, Jobs, Transport, Crime and Education, which are collected and reported nationally on an annual basis.

The core set would be flexible, consisting of a number of high level impact measures listed against each of the 5 Scottish Executive priorities, with choice for partnerships to select a number of indicators (2 or 3) from each heading to reflect local issues as described in their Community Plan.

For example, under the priority of Health, one partnership may choose teenage pregnancy and delayed discharge as indicators for their area whilst another may choose drugs & alcohol misuse and coronary heart disease depending on the key problems in their area.

2. **A Local Set or 'Menu'** of existing tried and tested indicators grouped by community plan themes, from which partnerships select indicators to support their community plan priorities. These indicators would be reported by each partnership according to their local arrangements.

3. **A Statement of Intent** would be submitted alongside the core indicators detailing which core and menu indicators have been selected, the rationale for selection and local arrangements for reporting the menu indicators.

4. We are also proposing to undertake a **Review** of the progress of partnership working and community engagement. The development of this project is at an early stage but would cover the building blocks of partnership working and community engagement necessary to secure future service improvement. We are discussing this proposal with the CoSLA Network and the Scottish Executive.

CONSULTATION PROCESS

Consultation on the above model and the specific indicators to be included within it remains ongoing.

As part of our commitment to consultation, we will keep all stakeholders informed of progress on a continuing basis and ensure that people know how to contact us to feed back their comments. We plan to communicate and invite comments throughout the process of developing proposals for the Accounts Commission by:

➢ continued discussions with individual councils as partnership representatives
➢ periodic Progress Notes issued widely and posted on the Community Planning Implementation Group website (http://www.communityplanning.org.uk)
➢ circulation via email to all members of the CoSLA Community Planning Officers Network, Scottish Executive and Communities Scotland representatives, any information or proposals being considered
➢ a small informal Reference Group of practitioners with experience of developing indicators for their partnership to act as a sounding board for specific indicators
➢ consultation with SOLACE and other key stakeholder groups

INVITATION TO COMMENT

If you have any comments regarding the developments so far, views on indicator content or how we plan to keep everyone involved, please let me know.

Carol Calder
Audit Scotland
18 George Street
Edinburgh
0131 477 1234
ccalder@audit-scot.gov.uk

BELOW IS AN E-MAIL RECEIVED FROM CAROL CALDER FROM AUDIT SCOTLAND WHICH ACCOMPANIED THE CORE CPP INDICATORS:

Hi Everyone,

The first meeting of the Reference Group will be held on 30th July to discuss the long list of potential core CPIs. The Reference Group members are:

Catriona McKay – Communities Scotland
Garrick Smyth - CoSLA
Karen Cawte – Dumfries & Galloway Council
Jacqueline Marwick – East Lothian Council/Police
Jamie Reid – East Renfrewshire Council
Jenny Boag – Falkirk Council
Julie Brooks – Fife Council
Paul Graham - Perth & Kinross Council
Andrew Spowart – South Lanarkshire Council
Bob Lawrie – Scottish Enterprise

Representatives of the Fire Service and NHS are to be confirmed.

There were more volunteers than we could accommodate so we have kept the group small but undertaken to send all papers out to everyone in advance for comments. Therefore I attach a copy of the first draft list of indicators, from which we aim to choose the core set, for discussion on 30th July.

To explain a couple of conventions, the shaded boxes indicate multiple indicators of similar definition where we need to choose one, and the emboldened entries refer to those indicators to be included in Communities Scotland ROA Guide. We've attempted to provide some indication of the rationale behind the selection (where it may not be obvious!) and notes on known limitations, however these are necessarily condensed. Some data availability information is missing but we will be meeting a representative of the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics Unit to fill in some of the blanks. It should be noted that we haven't necessarily eliminated indicators on the basis that data isn't readily available if the indicator appears to be useful, so as to avoid falling into the trap of making the measureable important, rather than making the important measureable.

If you have any comments could you send them to me by Tuesday 27th July so that I can collate them and include them in the discussion on the 30th.

Many thanks,
Carol

BELOW IS BRIAN BARKER'S RESPONSE:

Carol

Thanks for the list of PIs to comment on in advance of Friday's meeting. I'd make the following comments:

- *What mechanism is there going to be to link local CPP priorities with PIs in the menu?*
- *If a link cannot be established is the expectation to report on a PI in the menu removed (because they PI wouldn't be reflecting a local priority)?*
- *Could some of the indicators be combined to form an index for some categories - e.g. rather than report on lots of different measures for health would it help to reduce that to a few indices produced by combining the different data sets that could result in measures such as: improvement in children's health, men's health, women's health and the elderly as separate categories? In that way we can focus on different sectors of the population rather than specific aspects of the lives of the whole population (the data is sliced and analysed in a different way that brings a much stronger focus on people)*
- *Who has responsibility for reporting the information from the PIs? I ask this because the vast majority of the data is reported by national bodies, so rather than have 32 partnership separately analyse the data it would be more efficient and less costly for one body to collate reporting for all the partnerships*

My priority would be for some sort of process check where auditing effort is focused on ensuring that partnerships have effective performance management processes in place. If a partnership has a robust performance management framework, and this is working well, the process of selecting and reporting on suitable PIs will happen naturally and be linked to the priorities for an area. We then avoid the problem that is often

encountered with the SPIs where organisations are required to report on PIs that they don't 'own' - the reporting takes places because it is demanded rather than because it is seen as useful by the partners.

In terms of comment on specific PIs I'm not sure that I can help with the short listing process because PIs that I would think of as useful for Argyll and Bute may not be applicable for a city setting (and vice versa). My focus for PI selection will be to encourage partners to debate the merits of different PIs in relation to local priorities - using the menu of indicators as an important prompt in that debate (as it's easier than starting with a blank sheet of paper).

I look forward to the feedback from Friday's meeting.

Take care
Brian Barker