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**6. REVIEW OF CO-JOINING OF THE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD AND THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETINGS**

(CED)

1. **Summary**

1.1 This report reviews the Board’s feedback on the arrangements that have been piloted to co-join the meetings of the Local Strategic Partnership Board and Community Safety Partnership Board.

2. **Details**

2.1 At its meeting on 10 September 2014 the Local Strategic Board agreed to co-join its meetings with those of the Community Safety Partnership Board as an experiment. It was agreed to review the effectiveness of these experimental arrangements after a period of a year.

2.2 Since that time 4 meetings have taken place where the two Boards’ meetings have been co-joined. From the perspective of the Local Strategic Partnership Board these have focussed on:

a) Community Safety, including domestic abuse, family safeguarding, Thriving Families and Adults with Complex Needs;

b) Public Health – including physical activity strategy;

c) Housing – affordable housing, and housing needs and homelessness;

d) Deprivation – including index of multiple deprivation, health and social care hub proposals for South Oxhey and Adults with Complex Needs update.

2.3 The purpose of co-joining the meetings was:

a) to allow members who sat on both boards to reduce the time taken up with meetings,

b) to allow member organisations to nominate one person to sit on both boards,

c) and to allow members of different boards to be in attendance at the other board without voting rights, to enable broader discussion of interlinked agenda items.

2.4 During April 2016 a survey was undertaken of members of both boards to evaluate how these arrangements had been working. A total of 12 responses were received. The results of the survey are shown below.

2.5 **Satisfaction with the ‘co-joined meeting arrangement’**

2.5.1 33% of those that responded were very satisfied with the arrangement, 58% were satisfied, and 8% were dissatisfied.

2.5.2 The following comments were made on the co-joined arrangements:

* Agendas complementary, considerable overlap of membership form a personal perspective, more efficient use of time (travel)
* Enables participants to attend TRDC once, as opposed to twice. Two very different meetings – CSP Board more operational than LSP Board.
* Originally I wasn’t sure how this would work, but with the LSP meeting first, with the option to stay on for the CSP meeting, this has actually proved very useful in broadening local contacts and networking.
* It provides a very useful overview of local issues/priorities – and who’s doing what
* Reports need to be produced in a timely manner to enable Board members to read them before the meeting. This would enable more robust debate and consistent decision making.
* I think that this continues the view that items are either LSP or Community Safety – issues may cross over and it’s better to have all of the expertise and debate in one room. This could be strengthened by the creation of a single group that has clarity of purpose and then structure the meetings around this.

2.5.3 80% of respondents felt that the current arrangements for holding the Board meetings back to back should continue. 20% did not. The following comments were made in regard to this:

* It has been very hard for me to attend meetings in the last year due to organisational change and staff cuts – I need as few meetings as possible
* I feel that greater value could be generated from the meetings if it operated as a single entity with a clear purpose.

2.6 **Meeting Organisation**

2.6.1 100% of respondents felt that the meetings were structured in an organised and orderly way.

2.6.2 83% of respondents felt that they had the opportunity to include items on the Board agendas. 17% did not feel this. One comment suggested that an annual session for the group to decide what was important for the year’s agenda would help with this.

2.6.3 27% of respondents were very satisfied with the clarity of reports to the board, 64% were satisfied and 9% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Comments on this question included:

* Reports clear in terms of content, maybe not so clear in terms of what is wanted from / expected of people around the table;
* Given large number of presentations for LSP it would be useful if there was also a very short covering report on key points and any recommendations required.
* A bit more summarised rather than quite so much text – though very much appreciate the level of detail mostly.
* Always use a ‘key’ for acronyms, abbreviations, however common, there are just so many of them.
* Simpler more targeted reports – there is often a lot of detail, limited analysis or context. This is a very mixed groups so it should not be assumed that all attendees are fully familiar with the policy or other context to a report.

2.6.4 70% of respondents always received meetings agendas and papers 5 working days before the meeting. 30% did so sometimes.

2.6.5 80% felt that receiving agenda and papers five working days before the meeting was adequate. 20% did not. A suggestion of sending out papers 10 days in advance was made by one respondent.

2.6.6 89% felt they received the meeting minutes in sufficient time after the meeting. 11% did not.

2.6.7 100% of respondents were satisfied with minutes of the meeting.

2.6.8 100% of respondents were happy with notification of meeting dates and changes.

2.6.9 60% of respondents were very satisfied with the meeting environment, 30% satisfied and 10% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

2.7 **Overall satisfaction**

2.7.1 36% of respondents were very satisfied overall with the Local Strategic Partnership / Community Safety Partnership Board meetings. 64% were satisfied.

2.7.2 The following comments were made in relation to overall satisfaction:

* Maybe more contributions from around the table. Is the purpose of the meeting information sharing or something more.
* Rolling forward agenda would enable more planning to take place.

3. **Options/Reasons for Recommendation**

3.1 To agree arrangements going forward for the Local Strategic Partnership Board and Community Safety Partnership Board.

3.2 For the two boards to:

a) agree to continue with co-joined arrangements – the majority view of those that responded to the survey

and/or

b) consider a formal merging of the two boards into one entity.

4. **Policy/Budget Reference and Implications**

4.1 The recommendations in this report are within the Community Strategy 2012-18.

5. **Financial, Legal, Equal Opportunities, Staffing, Environmental, Customer Services Centre, Communications & Website, Risk Management and Health & Safety Implications**

5.1 None specific.

6. **Staffing Implications**

6.1 Maintaining the current co-joined arrangements would limit the demands placed on representatives from agencies to attend meetings and administrate the board meetings.

7. **Community Safety Implications**

7.1 Co-joined arrangements would continue to involve a broader range of agencies in the decisions of the Community Safety Partnership.

8. **Public Health implications**

8.1 Co-joined arrangements would continue to involve a broader range of agencies in the decisions occurring across health, social care, and community safety.

9. **Recommendation**

9.1 That the majority of views of the responses to the survey are noted and co-joined arrangements are made permanent.

9.2 That the two boards consider if they wish to reconsider the formal merging of the boards by revisiting the revised set of terms of reference.

9.3 That a rolling work programme is developed for the co-joined meetings and suggestions received from all members on future content.
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