

Evaluation of Local Strategic Partnerships

Mapping approaches to integrating performance indicators across local strategic partnerships

Case Study 9 – Manchester LSP
September 2003

Contents

Introduction	1
The Community Strategy	1
Performance managing the strategy	1
The Crime and Disorder Partnership	4
Sources	7
Further information	7

Introduction

The public consultation process on the development of the Manchester Local Strategic Partnership (MLSP) and the Manchester Community Strategy (2002-2012) (MCS) was launched on 19 June 2001. The final draft of the MCS was launched at the inaugural meeting of the Manchester Conference – the overarching partnership of the MLSP in January 2002, where delegates from a range of organisations came together to confirm the direction, themes, and priorities of the MCS and the structure of the MLSP.

Key elements of the MLSP's approach to performance management to date include:

- Establishing a clear relationship between CS priorities and the thematic groups charged with taking them forward
- The formation of a performance management group, which has helped to build capacity within the LSP and sub partnerships
- Considerable progress within the crime and disorder partnership where an integrated intelligence led approach to managing performance is being developed

The Community Strategy

The Manchester Community Strategy outlines seven key priorities: competing in a global economy, investing in children, young people and families, housing and sustainable development, making Manchester safer, tackling health inequalities, creating a modern transport infrastructure and enhancing the cultural base. Under each theme, the MCS lists information about the current position and key priorities for development.

Each theme is being developed by a thematic partnership, which is responsible for progressing key elements of the MCS and developing robust action plans for delivery. Some of the thematic partnerships are very mature and have made considerable progress. Others are newly formed and have further work to do to advance their strategies and develop performance management arrangements.

At the time of drafting, Manchester does not yet have a finalised Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy. The Support and Delivery Group of the LSP will agree Manchester's draft Neighbourhood Renewal Action Plan on 27th June. This action plan is Manchester's response to a Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and will be available after this date.

Performance managing the strategy

The LSP has a performance management group, with membership drawn from each of the thematic partnerships. The Council drives and supports the group, whose remit is to:

- Develop and implement a performance management framework
- Develop a multi agency performance management system

- Develop a robust evidence base
- Develop multi-agency processes to measure perceptions of local people
- Develop and monitor Community Strategy indicators
- Monitor the PSA
- Support the delivery of the NR Action Plan
- Communicate performance against Community Strategy and other targets to the LSP.

The first piece of work that the performance management group carried out was to set the key indicators in the Community Strategy.

Manchester Community Strategy Indicators

The Vision

- The number of people living in the City

Competing in a Global Economy

- Residents in employment
- Local unemployment rate

Investing in Children, Young People and Families

- School leavers achieving 5 A*-C GCSEs
- 16 year olds entering full-time education or structured work place learning
- People aged 17 or over who have successfully applied for higher education

Extending Housing Quality and Choice

- Empty properties in the privately-built housing stock
- Proportion of household waste recycled

Making Manchester Safer

- Recorded crimes per 1000 of population
- Percentage of residents feeling fairly or very safe alone after dark in their local area

Tackling Health Inequalities

- Life expectancy
- Deaths from coronary heart disease and stroke - in people less than 75 years old - per 1000 of population
- Deaths from respiratory disease per 1000 of population

Creating a Modern Transport Infrastructure

- Peak hour journeys to the city centre by means other than private car
- Number of days on which air pollution reaches moderate or worse for any of the four pollutants identified by Government
- Vehicle-related accidents

Enhancing the Cultural Base

- Visits to cultural and recreational facilities
- residents using cultural and recreational facilities; and
- overnight visitors to the City

Where mature sub partnerships already existed, these were asked to suggest suitable indicators for inclusion in the Community Strategy. Where sub partnerships did not exist or where their strategies did not yet include measures, indicators were proposed by the Performance Management group. The final set also included a number of LPSA targets, and indicators that tracked critical and widely recognised gaps in provision.

A number of new indicators were developed that were not existing BVPIs or national PSA measures. These included: the number of people living in the city, 16 year olds entering full time education or structured workplace learning, people aged 17 or over who have successfully applied for higher education, visits to cultural and recreational facilities, and over-night visitors to the city.

The performance management group is reported to be working well. They hold six-weekly meetings to exchange information on actions and performance. The meetings are seen to be a good opportunity for the newer partnerships to learn more about performance management systems and indicators from the more mature partnerships. The group now needs to work on developing a more challenging approach to performance management – using management information to hold each other to account for performance.

Reporting to the LSP is on a flexible basis rather than on a rigid timeframe – depending on the issues that partners consider important. Most data is collected annually therefore there is annual reporting of progress against targets in the Community Strategy. More detailed data collection for lower level strategy targets is managed by thematic partnerships.

Although it is recognised that there is a need to streamline the way different agencies are collecting, analysing and disseminating information, it is clear that the key challenge is not just about building a complex ICT system. Rather, the most important step is to continue to develop partners' appreciation of the value of performance management and their understanding of the indicators and targets that have been selected.

In moving forward, effort will focus around ensuring that the sub partnerships are working effectively and have suitable performance management systems in place, before attempts are made to link these up into a full multi agency performance management framework for the whole LSP.

Manchester is keen to ensure that the LSP does not become another silo – in this case, a cross-cutting one. A firm focus on local areas is seen as a critical way of avoiding this. The partnership regards performance management as an on-going, developmental cycle. There is a recognised need to collect, analyse and report on high quality information and to make continual efforts to improve the quality of this information.

The Crime and Disorder Partnership

The Crime and Disorder Partnership in Manchester is considered to be particularly well developed and highly performance managed. The partnership comprises 7 sub divisional partnerships covering the city, 29 local action partnerships, case intervention groups, and ten citywide theme groups. In total, approximately 1000 people are involved in the partnership structure.

The Crime and Disorder Partnership developed its first strategy in 1999. The current strategy reflects learning drawn from three years experience, results of the crime audit and extensive consultation with local people. The strategy has 10 crime and disorder priorities, each one of which has identified targets, actions, milestones and responsibilities associated with it. Not all the ten priorities will be given equal emphasis in each area of the city throughout the three years of the strategy. Local priorities are set by sub divisional partnerships within the overall framework.

The overall aims of the partnership are:**To reduce the level of crime in the city**

Target: Reduction of at least 10% in the number of crimes recorded over the next three years.

To reduce the fear of crime amongst residents and visitors

Target: Increase of at least 6% in the number of residents who feel safe out alone after dark over the next three years.

The key objectives are:**1. To reduce street violence**

Target Year 1: 5% reduction in violent offences committed in a public place.

Target Over 3 Years: 15% reduction in violent offences committed in a public place.

Measurement: Number of recorded crimes.

2. To reduce domestic violence

Target Year 1: 10% increase in reports of domestic violence.

Target Over 3 Years: 10% decrease in the number of repeat victims.

Measurement: Police recorded crime data. Repeat incident data from police and any other organisations holding this information

3. To reduce robbery

Target Year 1: 6% reduction in robberies.

Target Over 3 Years: 18% reduction in robberies.

Measurement: Number of recorded crimes.

4. To reduce residential burglary

Target Year 1: At least 5% reduction in burglaries (to 43.8 per thousand households).

Target Over 3 Years: At least 12.5% reduction in burglaries (to 41.3 per thousand households).

Measurement: Number of recorded crimes

5. To reduce vehicle crime

Target Year 1: 6% reduction (to 36.9 per thousand population).

Target Over 3 Years: 18.5% reduction (to 32.3 per thousand population).

Measurement: Number of recorded crimes.

7. To reduce drug related crime

Target Year 1: 2% reduction in acquisitive crime.

Target Over 3 Years: 6% reduction in acquisitive crime. 45% increase in number of drug users on treatment programmes.

Measurement: Recorded crime and data from treatment agencies

8. To reduce business crime

Target Year 1: To reduce crime against businesses in key centres of employment and crime hotspots by 5%.

To reduce business burglary by 2% citywide.

Target Over 3 Years: To reduce crime against businesses in key centres of employment and crime hotspots by 15%.

To reduce business burglary by 6% city wide.

Measurement: Basket of recorded crime figures from specific areas, and police crime figures citywide.

9. To reduce anti social behaviour

Target Over 3 Years: To increase the percentage of people who are satisfied that the work being done to reduce anti-social behaviour is effective.

Measurement: Baseline figures for anti-social behaviour agreed in year 1 using data from several sources.

For satisfaction levels, set baselines in Year 1 through perception survey, and improvement targets for years 2 and 3

At present, information used to measure performance in the partnership relies to a considerable extent on police crime and disorder statistics. However, despite the centrality of police data to the partnership's performance management, indicators and targets are considered to be shared in as much as the partnership has worked to create a sense of joint ownership of the outcomes and named partner agencies contribute to the actions that sit beneath each indicator.

Four of the partnership's targets use information on perceptions gathered from a residents' survey, which is carried out every two years. This is a face-to-face survey of 3300 people (100 per ward) that addresses, among other issues, questions around experience and perceptions of crime and disorder. Measures included in the survey are reflected in partnership targets around youth nuisance and racially motivated crime. The survey also informs decisions about resource allocation and service planning.

Following Audit Commission guidance, the partnership has been working to broaden the range of indicators to be used in the future. Those being considered initially are a basket of best value performance indicators already in existence, which relate to a range of council services. Examples include exclusions from school, offending rates among looked after children, youth service expenditure per head of population. Other organisations are being asked to contribute a similar set of indicators in order to enable the partnership to track the contribution of each partner agency to creating a safe and crime free local environment

Despite considerable effort, the partnership is not yet achieving the levels of crime reduction that it has been aiming for. Interestingly, the partnership has found significant difference between police data on reported crime rates and information gleaned from the public through surveys. For example, surveys reveal that the percentage of the population who report being a victim of burglary in the last year has fallen from 11% to 6%. However, police statistics show the situation to be static. Police recorded crime statistics have been rendered less useful by recent changes in crime definitions and recording practices

Relevant performance data is currently being held by a variety of different agencies and databases do not necessarily map on to City boundaries. To try to overcome this issue, the Partnership has agreed to back a police proposal to develop an integrated intelligence-led approach to managing performance that involves the creation of a shared ICT system for collecting, analysing, and reporting information. The police have accessed significant government start up funding and this approach will be tested over the next three years. The information gathering will be linked to a set of arrangements for allocating tasks and co-ordinating the activity that results from the regular reports generated through this new information-sharing model.

Sources

This case study is based on interviews with Michele Brookes, Team Leader, Corporate Performance, Research, and Intelligence, Manchester City Council, and Sheila Battersby, Crime and Disorder Team Leader. In addition, it draws upon a range of documents including: the Manchester Community Strategy 2002-2012, Manchester Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy 2002-2005 and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership performance reports.

Further information

For further information on Manchester Local Strategic Partnership's approach to performance management contact:

Michele Brookes
Team Leader
Corporate Performance, Research, and Intelligence Team
Chief Executives Department
Room 3020
Manchester City Council
M60 2LA
tel: 0161 234 3715
fax: 0161 234 1828

Sheila Battersby
Crime and Disorder Team Leader
Chief Executive's Department
Town Hall Extension (Room 3020)
Manchester M60 2LA

Tel: 0161 234 3368
Fax: 0161 234 3015