

Evaluation of local strategic partnerships

Report of a survey of all English LSPs

February 2003

This survey has been co-commissioned by three research units of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (LRGRU, NRU and RAE) and the Department for Transport

Contents

Introduction	1
Basic information about the development of LSPs	3
Number and status of local strategic partnerships	3
Local authority areas covered	5
Legal status	7
Origins	7
Membership	8
Number of members	8
Membership by organisation and sector	10
Local authority representation	12
Chair arrangements	13
Partnership structure and relationships with other partnerships	14
Partnership structure	14
Associated partnerships	16
Reducing the number of partnerships	17
Establishment of new partnerships	19
Resources	20
Staffing	20
Financial resources	22
Activities	24
Activities over the past year	24
Planned activities	24
Priorities	26
The Community Strategy and the Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy	27
Performance management	29
Issues and dilemmas	30
Overview	30
Priorities for action research	35
Benefits of LSPs	37
Appendix 1 NRF and non-NRF tables	39
Appendix 2 Questionnaire	49

List of tables

Table 1 Number and status of LSPs _____	4
Table 2 LSPs by status and region _____	4
Table 3 Local authority areas covered by the partnership _____	6
Table 4 Number of local authority areas covered by the partnership _____	6
Table 5 Legal status _____	7
Table 6 Origins _____	7
Table 7 Number of members _____	9
Table 8 Organisations included within LSPs _____	11
Table 9 Local authority representation in LSPs _____	12
Table 10 Chair arrangements _____	13
Table 11 Partnership structure _____	15
Table 12 Associated partnerships _____	16
Table 13 Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships _____	18
Table 14 Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet _____	18
Table 15 Establishment of new partnerships _____	19
Table 16 Support arrangements _____	20
Table 17 Staff resources _____	21
Table 18 Financial resources _____	23
Table 19 Activities _____	25
Table 20 Priorities _____	26
Table 21A Developing the Community Strategy / Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy ____	28
Table 21B Implementing and monitoring the Community Strategy / Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy _____	28
Table 22 Work on performance management _____	29
Table 23 Issues and dilemmas _____	31
Table 24 Interest in taking part in the action research _____	35
Table 25 Issues for action research _____	36
Table 26 Benefits of LSPs _____	38

Appendix 1: NRF and non-NRF tables

Table 7A Number of members (NRF areas) _____	40
Table 7B Number of members (non-NRF areas) _____	40
Table 9A Local authority representation in LSPs (NRF areas) _____	41
Table 9B Local authority representation in LSPs (non-NRF areas) _____	41
Table 13A Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships (NRF areas) _____	42
Table 13B Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships (non-NRF areas) _____	42
Table 14A Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet (NRF areas) _____	43
Table 14B Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet (non-NRF areas) _____	43
Table 17A Staff resources (NRF areas) _____	44
Table 17B Staff resources (non-NRF areas) _____	44
Table 19A Activities (NRF areas) _____	45
Table 19B Activities (non-NRF areas) _____	46
Table 20A Priorities (NRF areas) _____	47
Table 20B Priorities (non-NRF areas) _____	48

Introduction

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Department for Transport (DfT) are undertaking a long-term evaluation and action research programme of local strategic partnerships. The programme is in two parts:

Part 1 – Feasibility study, formative evaluation and action research (March 2002 – March 2005)

Part 2 – Summative evaluation (preliminarily scheduled to be commissioned in 2005).

Part 1 has been let to a consortium from the Universities of Warwick, West of England, and Liverpool John Moores with OPM (Office for Public Management).

The initial Feasibility Study was conducted between March and September 2002. The main purposes were:

- To ascertain LSP and stakeholders' views in selecting issues and intervention strategies for attention in the action research and formative evaluation
- To gather baseline information
- To decide on locations and themes for subsequent case studies and action research.

As part of the Feasibility Study, OPM undertook a survey of all English LSPs. The aims were:

- To gather data on the status of local strategic partnership working, as a baseline against which progress can be measured later in the study
- To compile a database of LSP contacts to whom information can be disseminated as the study progresses
- To help in selecting locations for evaluation case studies
- To get a better understanding of the issues that local partners face and which it would be useful to pursue in the action research
- To provide (through wide dissemination of the survey results) local, regional and central stakeholders with a current picture of the nature and key issues facing all English LSPs.

The survey was undertaken in June 2002, and the findings of this report apply to this date.

Considerable care was taken to ensure that the survey was sent to the officially designated LSP co-ordinator – often, but not always, a local authority officer. However, in all cases the survey was completed on behalf of the LSP rather than any other organisation that person represented. Where we could not identify an appropriate LSP contact the questionnaire was sent to the local authority in lieu.

Questionnaires were sent out to 384 LSP contacts (to cover all principal local authority areas), by email with a postal follow up. In total 237 completed questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 62%. In order to achieve optimal understanding of the overall state of development of LSPs, we telephoned all those who did not return a questionnaire to establish the status of their LSP. Eventually all except 17 were contacted.

A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix 2. Many respondents also sent us supporting information about their plans, structures and performance indicators; this material will inform our thinking and may be used in the preparation of working papers on specific issues, but is not reported on here in any depth. We have anonymised findings and treated all information sent to us as confidential to the research team.

Basic information about the development of LSPs

Number and status of local strategic partnerships

The postal survey and telephone follow-up obtained information on the status of LSPs in 367 local authority areas, giving the overall picture shown in table 1. The overwhelming majority of local authority areas now have an LSP. In all we contacted 87 LSPs in NRF¹ areas, 204 other locally agreed LSPs, 35 partnerships with the characteristics of an LSP, 39 areas where discussions on forming an LSP are in progress and one area with no plans to form an LSP.

We received 237 completed questionnaires. These included 57 partnerships eligible for Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) which have undergone an accreditation process with the Government Office, 127 partnerships in non-NRF areas which have been agreed locally as the LSP and/or which will become the LSP, and 23 partnerships which have the characteristics of an LSP (they include the main local stakeholders and have a remit that spans a range of issues) but which have not been formally agreed locally as the LSP. These 207 responses form the base for the majority of the analysis (although the percentages are all expressed in relation to the number of responses to that particular question, which varies). In 30 localities there is no LSP but discussions on holding one are in progress; these respondents in general did not answer any further questions and have been excluded from the base for the analysis (except where they answered questions about the issues facing them or their plans; these answers have been included).

Table 2 shows the overall breakdown of LSPs by status and by region, including all 366 LSPs (in 367 local authority areas) which we were able to contact.

¹ There are 88 local authorities eligible for NRF but only 87 LSPs in NRF areas. One of the LSPs in the SW region spans two local authority areas, both eligible for NRF; we contacted both local authorities by telephone, each is counted as a 'contact' but we have only counted the LSP itself once in the numbers above and in table 2

Table 1 Number and status of LSPs

	Returned questionnaires		All contacts ¹	
	N	% of all responses	N	% of all responses
Partnership eligible for NRF which has undergone an accreditation process with the GO	57	24%	87 ²	24%
Partnership which has been agreed locally as the LSP and/or which will become the LSP (in areas not eligible for NRF)	127	54%	204	56%
Partnership which includes the main local stakeholders and with a remit that spans a range of issues, but not formally agreed to be the LSP (in areas not eligible for NRF)	23	10%	35	10%
No LSP – but discussions on forming a LSP are in progress	30	13%	39	11%
No LSP – and no plans to form a LSP	0	0%	1	0%
Total responses	237	100%	367²	100%

Notes:

1. Comprising returned questionnaires plus findings gathered briefly by telephone for LSPs that did not complete a questionnaire.
2. There are 88 local authorities eligible for NRF but only 87 LSPs in NRF areas. One of the LSPs in the SW region spans two local authority areas, both eligible for NRF; we contacted both local authorities by telephone, each is counted as a 'contact' but we have only counted the LSP itself once amongst the LSPs in NRF areas in tables 1 and 2.

Table 2 LSPs by status and region

	Number of LSPs per region										Total
	NW	NE	YH	WM	EM	E	SW	SE	L		
Partnership eligible for NRF which has undergone an accreditation process with the GO	21	14	9	7	7	2	3 ¹	4	20	87 ¹	
Partnership which has been agreed locally as the LSP and/or which will become the LSP (in areas not eligible for NRF)	16	6	10	19	19	37	33	53	11	204	
Partnership which includes the main local stakeholders and with a remit that spans a range of issues, but not formally agreed to be the LSP (in areas not eligible for NRF)	3	4	1	5	5	7	5	5	0	35	
No LSP – but discussions on forming an LSP are in progress	2	0	2	4	8	4	7	11	1	39	
No LSP – and no plans to form an LSP	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Total LSPs or local authorities contacted	42	24	22	36	39	50	49¹	73	32	367¹	
Responses to questionnaire survey	25	14	16	19	29	30	33	50	21	237	

Note: see note 2 to table 1

Local authority areas covered

Respondents were asked about the number and type of local authority areas covered by the LSP (Table 3). 175 LSPs (89% of responses to this question) cover a single local authority area (a district, unitary authority or metropolitan borough); 13 cover an administrative county but exclude the areas of unitary authorities within the county, 4 cover an entire geographical county, while 5 cover two or more neighbouring unitary authorities or districts or part of a county.

While nearly 90% of partnerships cover just one local authority area, the survey base includes 26 LSPs covering more than one local authority, the largest covering 12 districts (Table 4).

Table 3 Local authority areas covered by the partnership

	NRF LSPs		Non NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single unitary authority, district, London or metropolitan borough	55	98%	120	85%	175	89%
Administrative county excluding unitary authorities located within it	0	0%	13	9%	13	7%
Geographical county including any unitary authorities located within it*	0	0%	4	3%	4	2%
Two or more neighbouring districts/unitary authorities or part of a county	1	2%	4	3%	5	3%
Total responses	56	100%	141	100%	197	100%
Non response	1		9		10	
Base	57		150		207	

Note: * Includes counties where there are no unitary authorities

Table 4 Number of local authority areas covered by the partnership

Number of local authority areas	NRF LSPs		Non NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	51	94%	117	84%	168	87%
2	3	6%	3	2%	6	3%
2.5	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
3	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
4	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
5	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
6	0	0%	3	2%	3	2%
7	0	0%	4	3%	4	2%
8	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
11	0	0%	3	2%	3	2%
12	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
Total responses	54	100%	140	100%	194	100%
Non response	3		10		13	
Base	57		150		207	

Legal status

The majority of LSPs are informal partnerships with no formal legal status (75% of responses), or have not yet decided their legal status (20%). Only 5 (3%) are companies limited by guarantee.

Table 5 Legal status

	NRF LSPs		Non NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Company limited by guarantee	2	4%	3	2%	5	3%
Informal partnership	47	82%	103	72%	150	75%
Not decided	5	9%	35	24%	40	20%
Other – unsure of status	2	4%	0	0%	2	1%
Other – unincorporated	1	2%	0	0%	1	1%
Other – informal & is accountable to ltd co.	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
Other – aims to become limited company	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%
Total responses	57	100%	143	100%	200	100%
Non response	0		7		7	
Base	57		150		207	

Origins

A slight majority of LSPs (58% of responses) started as a new LSP within the past two years, while 40% developed out of another partnership or an informal grouping. Amongst partnerships in NRF areas a higher percentage (61%) had developed out of another partnership. Several respondents mentioned government guidelines and the presence of NRF funding as a spur to setting up the LSP.

Table 6 Origins

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Started as new LSP in 2000-2002	20	37%	95	66%	115	58%
Developed out of another partnership(s)	33	61%	47	32%	80	40%
Unclear/other	1	2%	3	2%	4	2%
Total responses	54	100%	145	100%	199	100%
Non response	3		5		8	
Base	57		150		207	

Membership

The concept of 'membership' of a partnership is complex and open to different interpretations. For some partnerships the 'members' are the organisations (or other partnerships) represented, for others the term is interpreted in terms of the individuals who attend meetings; for some the concept is still being formulated. Some partnerships distinguish between an inner core (for instance the Board) and a wider membership; for some the wider membership is fixed, for others it is open to all. It was not possible to harmonise the use of the term and accordingly all the numerical data on membership has to be treated with some caution.

Number of members

78% of respondents to this question distinguished between 'core' and 'non-core' members (table 7). However, many of these did not specify the number of non-core members. Hence it is not possible to calculate a meaningful total of core plus non-core members.

The mean number of core members is 20, while the mean number of non-core members is 80. The mean in each case is affected by a few LSPs with a large number of members (five LSPs have more than 40 core members, and four have more than 200 non-core members). Accordingly the median (middle value when answers are ranked) and modal (most common) values are much smaller.

For those LSPs who do not distinguish between categories of member, the mean number of members is 41. As in the case of core members, the mean is affected by a few LSPs with a very large number of members and the median and modal values are much smaller than this. 29% of LSPs in this group have 20 members or fewer, while 14% have more than 50 members and 7% have more than 100.

Tables 7a and 7b in Appendix 1 give information separately for LSPs in NRF and non-NRF areas. The average number of both core and non-core members is higher in NRF areas. Comparatively fewer NRF LSPs have less than 20 core members, and more have between 20 and 50 core members. 30% of NRF LSPs have more than 100 non-core members compared with only 8% of non NRF LSPs.

Table 7 Number of members

Number of members	Core members		Non-core members		Members (core / non-core unspecified)	
	No of LSPs	%	No of LSPs	%	No of LSPs	%
1 to 5	3	2%	11	14%	0	0%
6 to 10	24	17%	3	4%	2	5%
11 to 15	35	25%	3	4%	3	7%
16 to 20	35	25%	2	3%	7	17%
21-30	29	21%	7	9%	10	24%
31-40	10	7%	5	6%	9	22%
41-50	4	3%	18	23%	4	10%
51 to 100	0	0%	19	24%	3	7%
101 to 200	0	0%	8	10%	2	5%
201 +	1	1%	4	5%	1	2%
Total responses	141	100%	80	100%	41	100%
Mean	20		80		41	
Median	16		50		28	
Mode	9 & 14		50		16, 26 & 39	
Total responses:181						
Non response: 26						
Base: 207						

Notes:

1. It is not possible to calculate a meaningful total of 'core' plus 'non-core' members. This is because many respondents who made a distinction between core and non-core members did not specify the number of non-core members; it is not possible to determine in these cases whether the number of non-core members is indefinite, or zero.
2. Number of members is given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 7A and 7B in Appendix 1.

Membership by organisation and sector

Table 8 gives details of which organisations are members of LSPs. The numbers and percentages refer to the number of LSPs which include the organisation in question, while the mean refers to the number of members per LSP from each organisation or organisational category.

The 'other/unspecified' category includes both non-core members (for LSPs which make a distinction between core and non-core members) and all members for LSPs which do not make a distinction. The 'all members' column includes responses given under either of the other two columns, so it includes core members, non-core members and members of LSPs which do not differentiate. This is complex, but it enables us to see which organisations are playing a central role in LSPs as core members, as well as the overall pattern of membership.

Amongst public sector organisations, almost all LSPs include the police/police authority and the health sector (usually the primary care trust). Further and higher education institutions and Learning and Skills Councils are also well represented. Beyond this, membership is very varied; The Employment Service, Benefits Agency or Jobcentre Plus are represented in about 60% of LSPs, as is the regional Government Office. 45% of respondents include 'other partnerships' amongst their membership (a partnership would have been included in this public sector grouping if it included a mixture of public and other sectors but was predominantly public sector). All these organisations and partnerships however, apart from the health sector and police, are represented much less frequently amongst core members.

The private sector is most commonly represented by the Chamber of Commerce or another business umbrella group; individual businesses, transport operators and other predominantly private sector partnerships are also represented in some LSPs.

Representation amongst the community and voluntary sectors is disparate. These sectors are most often represented by one or more umbrella groups (core members in 86% of LSPs which have core members), less frequently by individual voluntary or community sector organisations, although this may reflect the fact that such organisations were included under other more specific categories. Other membership includes communities of interest (for instance children's and young people's groups, faith organisations, environmental groups and BME representative organisations). Registered Social Landlords are also frequently included.

In terms of the number of individuals from different types of organisation, local authorities have the largest average number of members. Table 9 provides more detail of local authority representation.

Table 8 Organisations included within LSPs

	Core members			Other members or unspecified			All members	
	Number of LSPs	% of LSPs	Mean number of members	Number of LSPs	% of LSPs	Mean number of members	Number of LSPs	% of LSPs
Public sector								
Local authorities	148	100%	4	93	75%	11	194	100%
Police Force or Police Authority	138	93%	1	80	65%	2	187	96%
Primary Care Trust/ Group	138	93%	1	80	65%	2	186	96%
Higher/further education institutions	87	59%	1	78	63%	2	144	74%
Learning & Skills Council	81	55%	1	69	56%	1	141	73%
Regional Government Office	56	38%	1	71	57%	1	118	61%
Employment Service/Benefits Agency	55	37%	1	68	55%	1	115	59%
Other Partnerships	40	27%	2	54	44%	4	88	45%
Regional Development Agency	40	27%	1	52	42%	1	86	44%
ConneXions	19	13%	1	51	41%	1	67	35%
Strategic Health Authority	30	20%	1	33	27%	1	60	31%
Other health sector	21	14%	1	45	36%	4	59	30%
Probation Service	11	7%	1	23	19%	1	33	17%
Environment Agency	23	16%	1	37	30%	2	56	29%
Fire Service	15	10%	1	21	17%	1	35	18%
Other/ Unspecified	22	15%	1	9	7%	17	31	16%
Primary and Secondary Schools	12	8%	1	15	12%	2	25	13%
Small Business Services	6	4%	1	6	5%	1	9	5%
Housing Corporation	4	3%	1	2	2%	1	6	3%
Armed forces	2	1%	1	1	1%	1	2	1%
Private Sector								
Chamber of Commerce	84	57%	1	62	50%	1	133	69%
Other business umbrella group	58	39%	1	56	45%	2	109	56%
Individual businesses	45	30%	3	50	40%	5	85	44%
Transport Operators	14	9%	1	26	21%	2	38	20%
Other partnerships	17	11%	1	10	8%	2	26	13%
Other/unspecified	4	3%	2	9	7%	5	12	6%
Unions	2	1%	1	4	3%	1	6	3%
Voluntary and community sectors								
Umbrella group	128	86%	1	77	62%	2	180	93%
Individual organisation	58	39%	2	57	46%	7	100	52%
Faith Organisations	42	28%	1	57	46%	2	90	46%
Other Partnerships	74	50%	3	13	10%	2	82	42%
Children and Young Peoples Groups	0	0%	0	12	10%	1	80	41%
Housing Association/ RSLs	40	27%	1	45	36%	2	75	39%
BME representative organisations	44	30%	1	36	29%	2	73	38%
Residents Groups	33	22%	2	33	27%	5	63	32%
Environmental Groups	14	9%	1	18	15%	1	31	16%
Other/ unspecified	16	11%	3	15	12%	91	26	13%
Total responses	148	100%		124	100%		194	100%

Notes

1. 'Mean' column refers to the average number of members (i.e. people) per LSP from each organisation
2. 'All members' does not equal the total of 'core members' and 'other members' as some LSPs have both types of member from some organisations but are only counted once in the third column.

Local authority representation

Local authorities are more often represented by elected councillors than by officers. A small number of respondents stated that the officers are not regarded as full members but are simply there to support the councillors.

The average (mean) number of representatives is 4 councillors and 4 officers, although the most common (modal) membership is 2 councillors and 1 officer. A few LSPs have very large numbers of both councillors and officers (one metropolitan borough having 62 councillors and 69 officers as members).

Table 9 Local authority representation in LSPs

Number of members	Councillors		Officers	
	N	%	N	%
None	4	2%	3	2%
1	30	15%	46	31%
2	45	23%	33	22%
3	41	21%	15	10%
4	25	13%	13	9%
5	9	5%	7	5%
6	9	5%	5	3%
7	5	3%	2	1%
8	8	4%	5	3%
9	0	0%	2	1%
10	7	4%	3	2%
10+	8	4%	12	8%
To be decided	4	2%	4	3%
Total responses	195	100%	150	100%
Non response	12		57	
Mean	4		4	
Median	3		2	
Mode	2		1	
Base	207		207	

Note: Local authority representation in LSPs is given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 9A and 9B in Appendix 1.

Chair arrangements

Approximately four fifths of responding LSPs are formally chaired. Almost all 'chairs' serve in their capacity as representatives of their organisation; 62% are local authority councillors – generally the leader or mayor – and 19% are local authority officers, 8% come from elsewhere in the public sector and 10% from the private sector. In a few LSPs the chair rotates. It is more common to have a politician as chair, and less common to have a local authority officer, amongst NRF LSPs than amongst non-NRF ones. A larger proportion of NRF LSPs than non NRF LSPs have chosen a chair.

Table 10 Chair arrangements

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		Total LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Local Authority Councillor						
Leader or Mayor	35	69%	41	41%	76	51%
Other councillor	2	4%	14	14%	16	11%
Local Authority Officer						
Chief Executive	2	4%	19	19%	21	14%
Other officer	2	4%	5	5%	7	5%
Other public sector	2	4%	10	10%	12	8%
Private Sector	5	10%	10	10%	15	10%
Community and voluntary sector	2	4%	0	0%	2	1%
Faith community	1	2%	0	0%	1	1%
Sub total	51	100%	99	100%	150	100%
Individual serving in their own right						
Individual serving in their own right	3		3		6	
Rotating	6		0		6	
Not yet agreed	5		29		34	
Total responses						
Total responses	56		130		186	
Non-responses						
Non-responses	1		20		21	
Base						
Base	57		150		207	

Note: even though respondents named a chair they still sometimes indicated that a chair had not yet been agreed, it was a rotating chair or an individual serving in their own right, so the categories are not mutually exclusive and there is an element of double counting in total responses. Percentages in the table are expressed in relation to those responses which specified the organisation and, where relevant, job title of the chair.

Partnership structure and relationships with other partnerships

Partnership structure

Most LSPs have quite complex structures. These vary, however a typical structure includes a board, thematic groups or sub-partnerships (often themselves with sub-groups), a support group and a wider consultative forum.

74% of LSPs responding to this question have a core executive or board. Most have some form of sub-structure, although the designation and function of these groups varies widely; they include operational sub-groups, area or neighbourhood forums, analytical or technical support groups, and formal sub-partnerships (Table 11).

The sub-partnerships or sub-groups often relate to the themes of the Community Strategy, and themselves frequently have further sub-groups or satellite partnerships (in other instances key partnerships are linked in via public sector agencies on the board). Some LSPs have sub-groups relating to communities of interest or geographical communities. Others have sub-groups with a cross-cutting remit (for instance community involvement, social exclusion, equalities) in addition to their thematic groups. The number of sub-partnerships varies – five or six is typical where sub-groups focus on a policy theme although some LSPs have double this number.

The most complex structures are seen where there is two-tier working. In one two-tier area, the county level partnership has five thematic sub-partnerships, while each of the district LSPs also has thematic sub-groups intended to communicate with the corresponding structure at county level. However, in this county the policy field has been divided in different ways in different districts, so that the remit of these sub-groups is different in each of the partnerships in the county. It is not surprising that issues relating to two-tier working are high on the list of LSPs' concerns in two-tier areas.

Almost half of LSPs also have a wider forum. In some cases there are several such layers – for instance one locality has a structure that may be thought of as concentric circles (board, a development group comprising the chief executives of the public sector organisations and selected representatives of other sectors, a partnership forum comprising all member organisations and sub-partnerships, and a community conference).

More LSPs in NRF areas have sub-structures than do LSPs in non-NRF areas; for instance 89% have a core executive compared with 68% of non-NRF LSPs, a pattern repeated across the range of sub-structures.

Table 11 Partnership structure

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		Total LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Core executive or board	49	89%	94	68%	143	74%
Operational sub group	32	58%	53	38%	85	44%
Wider forum	32	58%	60	43%	92	47%
Area forums	23	42%	29	21%	52	27%
Analytical/technical support groups	36	65%	58	42%	94	48%
Sub-partnerships	41	75%	75	54%	116	60%
Other	16	29%	13	9%	29	15%
None	2	4%	10	7%	12	6%
Total responses	55	100%	139	100%	194	100%
Non responses	2		11		13	
Base	57		150		207	

Note: These categories are not mutually exclusive

Associated partnerships

Almost all LSPs have formal links with other, issue-based, partnerships (only 26 respondents stated that they had no such links). These links include sub-partnerships established by the LSP to fill a gap or bring together under one umbrella partnerships undertaking related work, independent partnerships affiliated to the LSP, and existing partnerships subsumed within the LSP. (Links comprising overlapping membership alone were not included.) In total the 178 LSPs responding to this question identified links with 980 sub partnerships, an average of between 5 and 6 each.

The pattern of links varies enormously; the most common links are with Crime and Disorder or Community Safety Partnerships, Local Learning Partnerships, Health Improvement Partnerships or HAZs, SRB partnerships and LA 21 Partnerships. Perhaps more surprising is that large numbers of LSPs appear to have no formal links with some of these partnerships, although in some cases this may reflect two-tier working and the fact that not all partnerships will be relevant to all local authority areas.

In general, NRF LSPs have more links with other partnerships than do non-NRF LSPs.

Table 12 Associated partnerships

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community Legal Services	16	30%	28	23%	44	25%
ConneXions	20	37%	30	24%	50	28%
Crime and Disorder / Community Safety	43	80%	99	80%	142	80%
Drug action Team	25	46%	35	28%	60	34%
Early Years	25	46%	26	21%	51	29%
Education Action Zone	17	31%	6	5%	23	13%
Employment Action Zone	6	11%	2	2%	8	4%
Health Action Zone /Health Improvement	27	50%	48	39%	75	42%
Local Agenda 21 Partnership	21	39%	46	37%	67	38%
Local Learning Partnerships	35	65%	54	44%	89	50%
Local Transport Plan Partnerships	10	19%	25	20%	35	20%
Neighbourhood based partnerships	25	46%	32	26%	52	29%
New Deal for Communities	13	24%	3	2%	16	9%
SRB Partnerships	35	65%	34	27%	69	39%
Sub-regional or regional partnerships	17	31%	23	19%	40	22%
Sure Start	22	41%	24	19%	46	26%
Youth Offending Team	22	41%	25	20%	47	26%
Other Partnerships	20	37%	46	37%	66	37%
No sub partnerships	6	11%	20	16%	26	15%
Total sub partnerships	399		586		980	
Total responses	54	100%	124	100%	178	100%
Non response	3		26		29	
Base	57		150		207	

Note: not all partnerships will be relevant to all local authority types.

Reducing the number of partnerships

One of the government's aims in encouraging the establishment of LSPs is the rationalisation of the plethora of existing partnerships which exists in most areas. Rationalisation can include increasing the number of partnerships to fill gaps as well as reducing the number, and may also be about the activities that partnerships undertake – for instance sharing data and information systems. LSPs' activity in rationalisation was explored in a number of questions.

We asked whether any pre-existing partnerships had been abolished or ceased to meet regularly as a result of the establishment of the LSP. A majority of respondents to this question (76%) have not yet reduced the number of pre-existing partnerships, while very few have abolished more than one. In those LSPs which responded to this question a total of 51 pre-existing partnerships had been abolished and 18 had ceased to meet regularly. In NRF areas 38% of LSPs responding to this question have reduced the number of pre-existing partnerships compared with 19% in non-NRF areas and 24% overall. However this may give a misleading picture of the level of activity: rationalisation of existing partnerships was raised as an issue by many LSPs in their responses to other questions, and it is clear from the information we were given on structures and associated partnerships that the approach being taken is often (perhaps as a first step) to bring existing partnerships together under an umbrella grouping – often following the themes of the Community Strategy (Table 13).

The most common type of partnership that has been abolished is a non-statutory general one – in many cases apparently subsumed within or the precursor of the LSP. Regeneration and health are other foci of rationalisation. Environmental and educational partnerships seem more often to fall into abeyance than to be formally abolished (Table 14). It should be noted that the response rate to this question was low so results should be treated with caution.

Table 13 Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships

	Number of LSPs			
	Where pre-existing partnerships have been abolished		Where pre-existing partnerships have ceased to meet regularly	
	N	%	N	%
Number of partnerships abolished or ceased to meet				
1 partnership	28	14%	5	3%
2 partnerships	7	4%	3	2%
3 partnerships	3	2%	1	1%
4 partnerships	0	0%	1	1%
Total LSPs where pre-existing partnerships have been abolished or ceased to meet	38	19%	10	5%
None abolished or ceased to meet	148	76%		
Total responses	195	100%		
Non response	12			
Base	207			

Note

1. It is possible for an LSP to contain both pre-existing partnerships that have been abolished and partnerships that have ceased to meet.
2. Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships is given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 13A and 13B in Appendix 1.

Table 14 Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet

	Pre-existing partnerships			
	Abolished		Ceased to meet regularly	
	N	%	N	%
Health	9	18%	2	14%
Education and life long learning	1	2%	2	14%
Crime and disorder	6	12%	1	7%
Economic	2	4%	0	0%
Regeneration	10	20%	2	14%
Environment	3	6%	4	29%
Community Development	1	2%	0	0%
Transport	1	2%	0	0%
Employment	1	2%	1	7%
Other / general	16	32%	2	14%
Total specified	50	100%	14	100%
Not specified	1		4	
Total number of pre-existing partnerships abolished or ceasing to meet (base)	51		18	
Total responses (LSPs)	38		10	

Notes:

1. Base refers to the number of pre-existing partnerships being abolished or ceasing to meet (Table 13); not specified refers to the number of pre-existing partnerships abolished or ceasing to meet where respondents did not specify their type; responses refers to the number of LSPs stating that pre-existing partnerships had been abolished or ceased to meet (Table 13)
2. Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet is given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 14A and 14B in Appendix 1.

Establishment of new partnerships

Only 52 respondents stated that new partnerships had been formed as a result of the LSP, and the majority of these had formed only one or two new partnerships. In total these 52 LSPs had created more than 116 new partnerships (more than the 69 partnerships we were told had been abolished or had ceased to meet). The new partnerships mostly fall into one of three categories – thematic (63%), locality (24%) and community of interest (9%). The thematic partnerships appear either to be umbrella partnerships covering a broad theme, or more tightly focussed ones presumably established to fill identified gaps; sometimes we were told that these partnerships built on previous partnership arrangements. It should be noted that there was a very high non-response rate to this question so the results should be treated with some caution.

Table 15 Establishment of new partnerships

Number of new partnerships formed	NRF LSPs		Number of LSPs Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	3	11%	11	29%	14	21%
1	11	39%	13	34%	24	36%
2	8	29%	5	13%	13	20%
3	1	4%	1	3%	2	3%
4	3	11%	2	5%	5	8%
5+	2	7%	6	16%	8	12%
Total responses	28	100%	38	100%	66	100%
Non response	29		112		141	
Mean	2		2		2	
Median	2		1		1	
Mode	1		1		1	
Base	57		150		207	

Resources

Staffing

The majority of LSPs have no support staff of their own (72% of overall responses to this question, 50% of NRF LSPs and 80% of non-NRF LSPs). 146 LSPs stated that their support was provided by the local authority (this is greater than the number which said they had no staff of their own, either because the local authority is providing additional support or perhaps because local authority staff are regarded as the LSP's own). 12 LSPs stated that they received staff support from other sources; these arrangements included jointly funded posts and different organisations supporting different functions.

Table 16 Support arrangements

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Own support staff	28	50%	27	19%	55	28%
No support staff of its own	28	50%	114	80%	142	72%
Support provided by						
local authority	32	57%	114	80%	146	74%
other	4	7%	8	6%	12	6%
Total responses	56	100%	142	100%	198	100%
Non-response	1		8		9	
Base	57		150		207	

Note: respondents might have ticked more than one response

Almost half of LSPs responding to this question have one full time equivalent (fte) staff member or less (including both the LSP's own staff and other staff) and three quarters have two fte staff members or less, although almost one in ten are comparatively well resourced with five or more. The mean number of staff is 2.1, but this is affected by a small number of well resourced LSPs and the median and modal numbers are both about 1 (Table 17). NRF LSPs in general have more staff resources than non NRF LSPs, although even in NRF areas 25% of LSPs have one FTE staff member or less.

Table 17 Staff resources

(Full time equivalent, including full time and part time staff)

	Own staff		Other staff		All staff	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0.1 to 0.5	18	19%	25	27%	41	24%
0.6 to 1	33	34%	22	24%	43	25%
1.1 to 2	25	26%	24	26%	46	27%
2.1 to 3	10	10%	9	10%	15	9%
3.1 to 4	5	5%	3	3%	10	6%
4.1 to 5	1	1%	4	4%	5	3%
5.1 +	5	5%	6	6%	13	8%
Total responses	97	100%	93	100%	173	100%
Non-response	110		114		34	
Mean	1.9		2		2.1	
Median	1		1		1.2	
Mode	1		1		1	
Base	207		207		207	

Notes:

- Staff resources are given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 17A and 17B in Appendix 1
- The 'all staff' column is not the sum of the 'own staff' and 'other staff' columns but is a separate variable calculated for each responding LSP; similarly since some respondents had both 'own staff' and ' other staff' the total number of respondents in the 'all staff' column does not equal the sum of the total respondents in the other two columns.

Financial resources

LSPs were asked whether they had a cash budget for administration or programmes. Table 18 shows the financial resources available in the current financial year. (The potential for different respondent interpretations of 'administration' or 'programme' should be noted).

Partnerships eligible for NRF, in addition to their NRF funds also have access to funds from other sources – on average over £100,000 (as an example, a sum may derive from ABI initiative funding which may be used as match funding for NRF). In contrast 72% of non-NRF LSPs responding have no budget, the average sum available is under £50,000 and only 2 have more than £100,000 a year.

Table 18 Financial resources

	Funds for the financial year 2002/3	N	%
NRF Partnerships			
<i>NRF Funds</i>	0 – £50,000	5	19%
	£50,001 – £100,000	4	15%
	£100,001 – £500,000	2	7%
	£500,001 – £1 million	1	4%
	£1 million +	11	41%
	Unspecified	4	15%
Total responses		27	100%
Non response		30	
Mean	£1,358,224		
Median	£600,000		
Mode	£15,000 & £50,000		
Base		57	
<i>Non NRF Funds</i>	0 – £50,000	6	21%
	£50,001 – £100,000	8	29%
	£100,001 – £200,000	5	18%
	£200,001 +	4	14%
	Unspecified	5	18%
Total responses		28	100%
Non response		29	
Mean	£109,587		
Median	£100,000		
Mode	£100,000		
Base		57	
Non-NRF Partnerships			
	No budget	99	72%
	0 – £10,000	11	8%
	£10,001 – £25,000	9	7%
	£25,001 – £50,000	6	4%
	£50,001 – £100,000	7	5%
	£100,001 +	2	1%
	Unspecified	3	2%
Total responses		137	100%
Non response		13	
Mean	£46,110		
Median	£20,000		
Mode	£10,000		
Base		150	

Activities

Table 19 shows the main activities which have been occupying LSPs in 2001-2002 and those planned for 2002-2003. Note that these questions (unlike later questions on issues, dilemmas and benefits) were pre-coded and respondents were allowed to tick as many activities as they wished, so the result gives no indication of the time spent on each activity.

Activities over the past year

Over the past year most LSPs have been establishing themselves, and the most frequently mentioned activities have been consolidating membership (mentioned by 84% of respondents) and developing partnership structures (75%); working towards accreditation has been a focus of activity for NRF partnerships. Planning and co-ordination activities were also frequently mentioned – 62% of respondents have been working on developing a Community Strategy, 47% on developing shared objectives, and 31% on developing a Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy. Far fewer are yet at the stage of developing shared data and information systems or working on PIs and evaluation. Rationalisation and coordination is another emerging theme, with more partnerships working on the rationalisation of processes (36%) and supporting or coordinating the work of sub partnerships (26%) than on rationalising sub partnerships or plans (11% and 12% respectively). Fewer LSPs have yet started to work on delivery, although a significant number (38%) are developing joint projects. LSPs in NRF areas have been more actively engaged in planning, performance management and delivery than have LSPs in non-NRF areas (Tables 19a and 19b in appendix 1).

Planned activities

Looking at activities planned for 2002-3 the balance shifts significantly. Fewer respondents anticipate spending time on establishing the partnership (although this is still expected to occupy the majority), and more are turning their attention to planning, coordination and delivery. The most frequently mentioned activity is community engagement (83% of responses), followed by developing a Community Strategy (74%) and rationalisation of processes (68%). For NRF LSPs, delivering on floor targets and targets in the Community Strategy, work on shared data systems, PIs and evaluation, developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan and co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners were also frequently mentioned.

Table 19 Activities

Activities	Past Year		Planned for 2002/3	
	Numbers of mentions by LSPs	% of LSPs mentioning	Numbers of mentions by LSPs	% of LSPs mentioning
Partnership development				
Consolidating membership	149	84%	124	61%
Developing partnership structures	133	75%	120	59%
Community engagement	80	45%	167	83%
Working towards accreditation	63	36%	58	29%
Inclusion of specific communities of interest	41	23%	100	50%
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	17	10%	63	31%
Planning				
Developing Community Strategy	110	62%	149	74%
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	83	47%	124	61%
Developing LNRS	55	31%	62	31%
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	37	21%	85	42%
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	35	20%	125	62%
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	24	14%	113	56%
Developing a Local Transport Plan	13	7%	15	7%
Coordination and rationalisation				
Rationalisation of processes	63	36%	138	68%
Supporting/coordinating the work of sub partnerships	46	26%	130	64%
Rationalisation of plans	22	12%	110	54%
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	20	11%	113	56%
Co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	18	10%	113	56%
Delivery				
Developing joint projects	67	38%	123	61%
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Strategy	24	14%	121	60%
Delivering on floor targets	23	13%	65	32%
Neighbourhood Renewal Fund	3	2%	3	1%
Other	14	8%	13	6%
Total responses	177	100%	202	100%
Non response	30		35	
Base	207		237	

Notes:

1. Percentages are based on the number of LSPs, not the number of activities
2. The base is different for 'past year' and 'planned' as some newly formed LSPs only answered in relation to planned activities
3. Activities are given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 19A and 19B in Appendix 1.

Priorities

Table 20 shows which planned activities respondents consider the most important (respondents were asked to indicate their top five priorities, in order of importance). The top priority for most respondents is developing the Community Strategy which ranks first both in number of mentions as a priority and in frequency of occurrence as number one priority. Community engagement, delivering the Community Strategy targets, developing partnership structures and developing and agreeing shared objectives were also relatively frequently mentioned as amongst the top five priorities. The picture is similar for the frequency of occurrence of activities as top priority.

Table 20 Priorities

	Number of LSPs prioritising the activity		Frequency of occurrence as number one priority	
	N	%	N	%
Partnership development				
Community engagement	94	54%	19	12%
Developing partnership structures	69	40%	20	12%
Consolidating membership	41	24%	14	9%
Working towards accreditation	25	14%	4	2%
Inclusion of specific communities of interest	21	12%	0	0%
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	15	9%	1	1%
Planning				
Developing Community Strategy	104	60%	53	32%
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	61	35%	14	9%
Developing LNRS	40	23%	9	5%
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	30	17%	1	1%
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	28	16%	2	1%
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	24	14%	4	2%
Developing a Local Transport Plan	5	3%	0	0%
Co-ordination and rationalisation				
Rationalisation of processes	54	31%	4	2%
Co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	50	29%	7	4%
Supporting/coordinating the work of sub partnerships	43	25%	3	2%
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	39	22%	1	1%
Rationalisation of plans	22	13%	2	1%
Delivery				
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Strategy	72	41%	24	15%
Developing joint projects	49	28%	5	3%
Delivering on floor targets	23	13%	0	0%
Neighbourhood renewal fund	2	1%	1	1%
Total responses	174	100%	164	100%
Non response	63		73	
Base	237		237	

Notes

1. 10 respondents did not rank their priorities therefore their top priority cannot be distinguished
2. Total 'frequency of occurrence as number one priority' exceeds 'total responses' because some respondents indicated more than one joint number one priority
3. Priorities are given separately for NRF and non-NRF areas in Tables 20A and 20B in Appendix 1.

The Community Strategy and the Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy

In localities where work is already underway on preparing a Community Strategy² the majority of LSPs responding have been fully involved (78%) or consulted (17%); only 4% have not been involved at all. The vast majority of LSPs expect to be involved in monitoring and/or in implementation (Tables 21a and 21b).

In those localities where there is a Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (LNRS), 84% of LSPs responding have been fully involved in its development and 13% consulted; only 3% have not been involved at all. More LSPs expect to be involved in monitoring or implementing the LNRS than have been involved in developing it. These figures refer to all LSPs with LNRSs – a total of 70. In NRF areas, 91% of LSPs have been fully involved in developing the LNRS and 9% consulted.

The level of involvement is generally higher in NRF areas than in non-NRF areas.

² In the survey we used the words 'Community Plan'; here we have used the term 'Community Strategy' to accord with current usage

Table 21A Developing the Community Strategy / Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community Strategy						
Fully involved	48	87%	87	74%	135	78%
Partnership being consulted	5	9%	25	21%	30	17%
Not involved	2	4%	5	4%	7	4%
All localities with a Community Strategy	55	100%	117	100%	172	100%
No Community Strategy	2		26		28	
Total responses	57		143		200	
Non-response	0		7		7	
Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy						
Fully involved	52	91%	7	54%	59	84%
Partnership being consulted	5	9%	4	31%	9	13%
Not involved	0	0%	2	15%	2	3%
All localities with a LNRS	57	100%	13	100%	70	100%
No LNRS	0		125		125	
Total responses	57		138		195	
Non-response	0		12		12	
Base	57		150		207	

Table 21B Implementing and monitoring the Community Strategy / Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community Strategy						
Monitoring	54	98%	110	84%	164	88%
Implementing	46	84%	124	95%	170	91%
Total responses	55	100%	131	100%	186	100%
Non response	2		19		21	
Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy						
Monitoring	54	98%	16	89%	70	96%
Implementing	46	84%	15	83%	61	84%
Total responses	55	100%	18	100%	73	100%
Non response	2		132		134	
Base	57		150		207	

Note: Percentages for development of the Community Strategy/LNRS (table 21a) and implementation and monitoring (table 21b) are calculated using different respondent bases; these were two separate questions in the survey, the pattern of response/non response was different and it is possible for an LSP to be involved in implementation and monitoring but not development (or vice versa). However, more non-NRF LSPs appear to be involved in implementing and monitoring the LNRS (table 21b) than have one (table 21a); this may be a response error.

Performance management

LSPs are starting to make progress with performance monitoring and management, but most have not got very far. 19% of respondents have agreed a list of performance indicators against which to assess their progress. 39 LSPs (62% of those who responded to this part of the question) are using the Audit Commission's Quality of Life indicators – mostly amongst other indicators. Amongst those LSPs which have not agreed a list of PIs, 62% are considering PIs and 23% are considering or already have in place alternative performance management arrangements. 26% have not yet started to consider performance management. NRF LSPs appear to have made more progress in performance management than non-NRF LSPs.

Table 22 Work on performance management

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Agreed PIs?						
Yes	21	37%	18	13%	39	19%
No	36	63%	126	88%	162	81%
Responses	57	100%	144	100%	201	100%
Use of Audit Commission Quality of Life indicators?						
Yes – some or all and no others	2	8%	2	5%	4	6%
Yes – amongst others	14	58%	21	54%	35	56%
No	8	33%	16	41%	24	38%
Responses	24	100%	39	100%	63	100%
If no agreed PIs, considering performance management?						
Considering performance indicators	33	83%	66	55%	99	62%
Considering or have alternative performance management	11	28%	25	21%	36	23%
There has been no consideration of performance management	3	8%	38	32%	41	26%
Responses	40	100%	120	100%	160	100%
Base	57		150		207	

Notes:

1. Respondents could have ticked more than one box with reference to 'considering performance management'.
2. Responses do not differentiate between 'internal LSP' and 'LSP contextual' indicator use.

Issues and dilemmas

There was considerable overlap in responses to two separate survey questions relating to 'internal' and 'external' issues and dilemmas facing the LSP. Accordingly this section summarises findings together.

Overview

The issues highlighted by LSPs can be grouped under five broad themes:

- stakeholder engagement, including community engagement, business involvement, securing buy-in and involving all as equal partners, issues of accountability and establishing an appropriately balanced membership structure
- resources and capacity including staff resources, financial resources for the support of the partnership, funding for joint activities and training and development needs
- developing effective ways of working, which includes issues of structure, systems, processes and culture
- developing the LSP agenda including establishing a role and purpose, agreeing priorities, and ensuring effective delivery
- external issues, in particular accountabilities to central government and the conflicting pressures this gives rise to, but also the need to work with other partnerships and to manage stakeholder expectations.

The most frequently cited individual issue was 'developing wider and successful community engagement' (126 responses). Other common responses include securing buy-in, ownership and commitment of partners, establishing shared priorities, restructuring and reshaping ways of working, rationalisation and effective working across partnerships, both financial and other resource constraints, and relationships with central government.

Table 23 Issues and dilemmas

	'Internal'		'External'		'All'	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Stakeholder engagement						
Community engagement	56	30%	70	42%	126	67%
Buy-in, ownership, commitment	66	35%	30	18%	96	51%
Accountability – local democratic issues	33	18%	9	5%	42	22%
Business involvement	17	9%	7	4%	24	13%
Involving all as equal partners	22	12%	0	0%	22	12%
Establishing membership	13	7%	0	0%	13	7%
Resources and capacity						
Financial resources	31	17%	35	21%	66	35%
Staff resources, time constraints/capacity issues	50	27%	15	9%	65	34%
Joint funding, ability to redirect budgets	24	13%	16	10%	40	21%
Addressing training and development needs	14	8%	7	4%	21	11%
Ways of working						
Restructuring and reshaping ways of working	54	29%	18	11%	72	38%
Rationalisation and effective working across partnerships	35	19%	33	20%	68	36%
Performance monitoring and management	34	18%	12	7%	46	24%
Communication (internal and external)	22	12%	10	6%	32	17%
Two-tier working	13	7%	28	17%	41	22%
Working processes	15	8%	0	0%	15	8%
Reconciling different targets, systems, planning frameworks	12	6%	9	5%	21	11%
Cultural issues	12	6%	6	4%	18	10%
Developing the agenda						
Establishing shared priorities	47	25%	41	25%	88	47%
Ensuring effective delivery, demonstrating value	30	16%	22	13%	52	28%
Establishing a role and purpose	20	11%	8	5%	28	15%
Mainstreaming	11	6%	9	5%	20	11%
Other internal	39	21%	0	0%	39	21%
External						
Central government relationships			60	36%	60	32%
Managing and meeting expectations			15	9%	15	8%
Other external			53	32%	53	28%
Total responses	186	100%	166	100%	189	100%
Non response	51		71		48	
Base	237		237		237	

Note: The merged data (in the 'all' column) may include an element of double counting where a particular issue was mentioned twice by a participant because it has both internal and external aspects.

The main issues in depth

The following section is based on the full-text comments made by respondents.

Stakeholder engagement

The single most frequently mentioned issue was **community engagement**. This is both an internal and an external issue. It is partly about membership of the partnership – LSPs are struggling to find a balance between inclusivity and keeping numbers manageable. Ensuring that community representation within the partnership is effective is also an issue – for instance one LSP highlighted the need to establish support mechanisms for members of the community and voluntary sectors to enable them to make an effective input. It is also about finding new ways to engage with the wider community and engage geographic communities and communities of interest, especially the ‘hard to reach’. A relatively small number of LSPs mentioned the difficulty of involving the business community.

A related frequently mentioned issue was securing the **buy-in and commitment** of all partners. This is partly about handling changes in membership while ensuring continuity as the partnership evolves. But it is also about ‘partnership fatigue’ and partners giving priority to ‘the day job’ rather than the partnership – the difficulty of maintaining members’ interest and momentum, ensuring they stay committed, demonstrating value for the considerable time input required of them, and developing a sense of shared ownership. Specific mention was made of the difficulties of engaging with the voluntary sector, national agencies such as the Employment Service and Environment Agency, the health sector and police, and also local authority councillors.

Closely related to these themes is the issue of **accountability**, and particularly the interface between the LSP and local democracy. The role of elected members within LSPs is a thorny issue; some councillors feel a loss of power, in some localities councillors have yet to recognise and carry out their community leadership role, while some LSPs are struggling to find a way for elected members to carry out this leadership role without dominating the partnership. Both officers and members are having to come to terms with the changing role of the local authority. There is an issue of control and the balance of power – as one respondent put it ‘Does the LSP report to the Cabinet, or vice versa’? There are also questions about the legitimacy of the LSP as a non-elected body.

The set of responses we have grouped under the heading ‘**involving all as equal partners**’ cuts across these first three issues. Partnerships are trying to ensure that the Council does not dominate the partnership – that all partners feel they are shaping it, and all contribute. It is not clear how far problems are rooted in local authorities not leaving space for others to contribute, and how far they reflect a lack of commitment by other partners who are content to leave most of the work to the Council.

Resources and capacity

Lack of resources is a major issue, including the lack of a budget for administration and pressure on staff resources. This is an issue particularly in non-NRF areas, although even NRF partnerships worry about what will happen when NRF dries up. Managing a partnership is time

intensive, the burden usually falls on the local authority and many lack a specific budget for this. This issue is causing tensions amongst partners.

A number of respondents highlighted the difficulty of **funding joint action**. LSPs are starting to try to harmonise their budget making processes, redirect existing core budgets and pool resources but this is difficult in terms of both external constraints and political acceptability.

Capacity is not just a matter of the volume of resources. Also high on the agenda for a number of LSPs is the issue of addressing partners' **development** needs. This involves strengthening individual members' capacity to develop strategic thinking, and helping them to understand their role and the ways in which individual members can exert influence. A particular issue is the development needs of councillors, particularly in the duty of well-being elements of the Local Government Act 2000 and moving from a regime of 'control' to one of 'influence'.

Developing effective ways of working

Under this broad heading fall a large number of comments ranging from the general ('making a complex partnership work') to the specific.

Developing a workable **structure** is exercising many LSPs. A specific frequently-mentioned issue is the effective operation and integration of theme sub-partnerships, area partnerships and working groups.

Closely related to this is the issue of **streamlining existing partnerships** and ensuring effective working relationships across partnerships. Many LSPs are trying to rationalise existing partnerships and plans. For others, the issue is one of supporting and ensuring co-ordination while not taking over well established and successful groups. LSPs also raised issues about working with neighbouring LSPs and with sub-regional partnerships. The size of the task is illustrated by one LSP which has to engage with 75 other existing partnerships; simply identifying what local partnerships exist is seen as major task.

LSPs are developing new **working processes and systems** to prioritise and manage the workload and ensure effective communication within the partnership, and striving to ensure that meetings are effective at taking decisions and not just 'talking shops' while encouraging participation.

Establishing, agreeing upon and resourcing robust **performance management** systems to monitor the results and effectiveness of the partnership is a pressing issue for a significant number of LSPs. Reconciling different targets, systems, forms of accountability and planning frameworks was also mentioned.

Communication both internally and with the outside world is an issue for many LSPs. Many LSPs see the need to raise awareness of the role of the partnership and so generate wider support.

There are cultural as well as structural and process issues. Cultural differences between partners are impeding communication and joint working, and partners have different priorities, different ways of working and work at different paces. For most LSPs this is a matter of developing understanding and trust and dealing with conflict, while bringing about culture change in partner organisations is on the agenda for some.

There are particular problems in **two-tier areas**, including agreeing a division of responsibilities between county and district based partnerships, duplication of effort, overcoming a history of poor relationships and lack of co-terminosity of boundaries.

Developing the agenda

Establishing shared priorities, influencing the agendas of partners and agreeing action is exercising many LSPs. Some LSPs are still at the stage of developing a shared vision, others are dealing with the realignment of partners' service delivery plans. The main difficulty appears to be identifying and focussing on a limited number of priorities, as well as resolving conflicting priorities within a broad and complex agenda. Mention was made of the difficulty of getting individuals and organisations to give ground to support joint aims. A specific issue is the tension between the medium to long term aims of the LSP, and the mostly short term aims of elected members.

Many LSPs are trying to **establish a role and purpose**. This is hampered by a lack of clarity about the long term role of LSPs, their powers and resources. Others mention the need to **demonstrate that they are adding value**, and ensure that they deliver. **Mainstreaming** is seen as an issue especially in terms of the need to link partner activities and plans to the community planning process, and so influence changes in core service delivery.

External issues

The most frequently cited external issue (apart from community engagement, discussed above) is the relationship with **central government**. Though LSPs themselves are non-statutory and have no required PIs, several respondents expressed concern that individual partners' sectoral PIs can conflict with effective partnership working i.e. central government departments partly still hold individual organisations separately accountable and this creates tensions within the LSP. While LSPs are expected to be joined up, there is a perceived lack of joined up approaches in central government. There is concern about 'changing goal posts' and the 'difficulty of keeping up with new national initiatives and coping with re-organisations'. There is also concern at the speed by which government requires LSPs to react (to 'jump through hoops'), whilst they are still trying to establish themselves. Similarly there is sometimes a tension between national and community-determined priorities and targets.

Managing expectations is a clear concern, with a fear of raising expectations amongst the public for rapid change that cannot be met by an LSP with a long term agenda.

Priorities for action research

161 respondents were interested in taking part in the action research; only 8 stated that they were not interested while 27 did not know.

Table 24 Interest in taking part in the action research

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	48	84%	113	81%	161	82%
No	4	7%	4	3%	8	4%
Don't Know	5	9%	22	16%	27	14%
Total responses	57	100%	139	100%	196	100%
Non-response	0		11		11	
Base	57		150		207	

This survey is one of the key considerations in determining the Action Research themes. (However, the choice of themes has also been informed by a series of stakeholder workshops to gather other local, regional and central views, and the LSP representation on these workshops has been high.)

Respondents were asked which of the issues listed in their previous answers they would be interested in working on within an action learning set.

The most frequently mentioned set of issues come loosely under the heading 'effective partnership working' (76 mentions), but this heading includes a very broad range of issues, many rather unfocussed (Table 25).

Amongst those topics with a very clear focus the most frequently mentioned were community engagement (56 mentions), resourcing (37), performance measurement and management (31), rationalising and integrating partnerships (25) and two-tier working (22). Other coherent topics for which there might be enough interest to support a learning set were accountability, relationships with central government, and mainstreaming.

Table 25 Issues for action research

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Effective partnership working, of which:	22	54%	54	49%	76	50%
– developing a vision, setting objectives	0	0%	15	14%	15	10%
– communications	0	0%	10	9%	10	7%
– effective working processes	1	2%	12	11%	13	9%
Community engagement	9	22%	47	43%	56	37%
Resourcing	9	22%	28	25%	37	25%
Performance measurement and management	16	39%	15	14%	31	21%
Rationalising and integrating partnerships	5	12%	20	18%	25	17%
Two tier working	3	7%	19	17%	22	15%
Accountability/ local democracy	5	12%	13	12%	18	12%
Delivering results	5	12%	11	10%	16	11%
Relationship with central government	6	15%	7	6%	13	9%
Mainstreaming	7	17%	7	6%	14	9%
Ownership/commitment	2	5%	11	10%	13	9%
Other	16	39%	29	26%	45	30%
Total responses	41	100%	110	62%	151	100%
Non response	16		70		86	
Base	57		180		237	

Benefits of LSPs

Respondents were asked what benefits, if any, there had been from the partnership so far. We have organised responses in a continuum ranging from the less tangible (such as networking and relationship building) to outputs and improved outcomes (Table 26).

Many LSPs are at an early stage of development; for some it is too early to say what the benefits have been. However for many there have already been intangible benefits such as networking, relationship building and the development of trust. Simply bringing the partners together is seen as a benefit; in some areas there had not previously been a mechanism for bringing the sectors together, in others it appears that LSPs have widened the scope of partnership working to individuals and organisations not previously involved.

There is also evidence of enthusiasm, energy, joint ownership and commitment – despite the fact that a lack of commitment was raised as an issue by many. As one respondent commented, there has been ‘fresh and inspirational energy from all sectors’. A number of respondents mentioned that communication between partners had improved.

This is leading to a better understanding of other partners’ goals, constraints and environments, an appreciation of varying perspectives, a shared analysis of the problems facing the locality, an awareness of the connections between issues and the identification of common issues. This process is facilitated by the exchange of information – ranging from the sharing of best practice to the coordination of performance information and development of joint indicators.

Many LSPs have progressed further, to the alignment of objectives and joint working. Partnerships are developing a shared vision, shared objectives and agreed priorities. Benefits are beginning to be seen in terms of more ‘joined up’ working to jointly tackle complex problems, greater co-ordination, the development of a more strategic approach, and in some cases specific joint action and targeting of efforts on disadvantaged areas. Partnership working is specifically seen to assist the process of developing and implementing a Community Strategy.

Community engagement and empowerment – a key issue for many as noted above – is also seen as a benefit of the development of LSPs; community, voluntary and business sectors have gained direct access to public sector decision makers and have the opportunity to participate in decision making, while in some areas mechanisms such as the development of neighbourhood structures are giving a real voice to local communities.

Partnership working has also brought material benefits, both in terms of bidding for and securing external funding especially NRF and – less frequently mentioned – joint funding between partners.

LSPs are starting ‘to act as a catalyst for mapping and rationalising existing partnership activity’, and to ‘make sense of the plethora of partnerships and plans’.

Not surprisingly at this stage, the outputs and outcomes identified are almost all in the form of plans and the establishment of new structures, although four responses related to outcomes for service users with one LSP pointing to tangible results across a broad range of indicators.

NRF partnerships placed greater emphasis on understanding the agendas of other partners and identifying common issues, the alignment of objectives and joint working, community empowerment, and success in securing external funding, than did non-NRF partnerships. Non-NRF partnerships placed more emphasis on less tangible benefits such as networking, enthusiasm and joint ownership and information exchange.

Table 26 Benefits of LSPs

	NRF LSPs		Non-NRF LSPs		All LSPs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Networking, relationship building, involvement	11	21%	38	30%	49	28%
Enthusiasm, energy, joint ownership	5	9%	29	23%	34	19%
Improved communication	4	8%	7	6%	11	6%
Understanding agenda of other partners, identifying common issues	27	51%	41	33%	68	38%
Information exchange	2	4%	18	14%	20	11%
Alignment of objectives, joint working, of which:	45	85%	66	53%	111	62%
– alignment of objectives	13	25%	9	7%	22	12%
– joined up working	14	26%	23	18%	37	21%
– synergy, coordination	13	25%	23	18%	36	20%
– joint action	5	9%	11	9%	16	9%
Assists community planning	13	25%	19	15%	32	18%
Community engagement and empowerment	18	34%	15	12%	33	19%
Funding, of which:	13	25%	18	14%	31	17%
– success in securing external funding	12	23%	8	6%	20	11%
– joint funding	1	2%	10	8%	11	6%
Rationalising partnerships	6	11%	10	8%	16	9%
Improved outcomes	6	11%	13	10%	19	11%
Too early to say	0	0%	17	14%	17	10%
Other	19	36%	18	14%	37	21%
Total responses	53	100%	125	100%	178	100%
Non response	4		25		29	
Base	57		150		207	

Appendix 1: NRF and non-NRF tables

Table 7 A & B Number of members

Table 9 A & B Local authority representation in LSPs

Table 13 A & B Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships

Table 14 A & B Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet

Table 17 A & B Staff resources

Table 19 A & B Activities

Table 20 A & B Priorities

Table 7A Number of members (NRF areas)

Number of members	Core members		Non-core members		Members (core / non-core unspecified)	
	No of LSPs	%	No of LSPs	%	No of LSPs	%
1 to 5	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%
6 to 10	4	9%	2	7%	0	0%
11 to 15	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%
16 to 20	9	21%	0	0%	0	0%
21-30	15	35%	0	0%	6	55%
31-40	4	9%	2	7%	3	27%
41-50	4	9%	7	26%	1	9%
51 to 100	0	0%	6	22%	1	9%
101 to 200	0	0%	5	19%	0	0%
201 +	1	2%	3	11%	0	0%
Total responses	43	100%	27	100%	11	100%
Mean	28		138		32	
Median	23		60		29	
Mode	20 & 24		44 & 50		21, 26 & 39	
Non response: 3						
Base: 57						

Table 7B Number of members (non-NRF areas)

Number of members	Core members		Non-core members		Members (core / non-core unspecified)	
	No of LSPs	%	No of LSPs	%	No of LSPs	%
1 to 5	3	3%	9	17%	0	0%
6 to 10	20	20%	1	2%	2	7%
11 to 15	29	30%	3	6%	3	10%
16 to 20	26	27%	2	4%	7	23%
21-30	14	14%	7	13%	4	13%
31-40	6	6%	3	6%	6	20%
41-50	0	0%	11	21%	3	10%
51 to 100	0	0%	13	25%	2	7%
101 to 200	0	0%	3	6%	2	7%
201 +	0	0%	1	2%	1	3%
Total responses	98	100%	53	100%	30	100%
Mean	16		51		45	
Median	15		42		27	
Mode	12		50		16	
Non-response 23						
Base 150						

Notes

1. It is not possible to calculate a meaningful total of 'core' plus 'non-core' members. This is because many respondents who made a distinction between core and non-core members did not specify the number of non-core members; it is not possible to determine in these cases whether the number of non-core members is indefinite, or zero.
2. Number of members is given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 7 in the main report

Table 9A Local authority representation in LSPs (NRF areas)

Number of members	Councillors		Officers	
	N	%	N	%
None	0	0%	2	5%
1	6	11%	25	57%
2	10	18%	4	9%
3	13	24%	3	7%
4	6	11%	2	5%
5	7	13%	2	5%
6	4	7%	1	2%
7	3	5%	0	0%
8	1	2%	0	0%
9	0	0%	0	0%
10	3	5%	0	0%
10+	2	4%	5	11%
To be decided	0	0%	0	0%
Total responses	55	100%	44	100%
Non response	2		13	
Mean	5		5	
Median	3		1	
Mode	3		1	
Base	57		57	

Note: Local authority representation in LSPs is given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 9 in the main report

Table 9B Local authority representation in LSPs (non-NRF areas)

Number of members	Councillors		Officers	
	N	%	N	%
None	4	3%	1	1%
1	24	17%	21	20%
2	35	25%	29	27%
3	28	20%	12	11%
4	19	14%	11	10%
5	2	1%	5	5%
6	5	4%	4	4%
7	2	1%	2	2%
8	7	5%	5	5%
9	0	0%	2	2%
10	4	3%	3	3%
10+	6	4%	7	7%
To be decided	4	3%	4	4%
Total responses	140	100%	106	100%
Non response	10		44	
Mean	4		4	
Median	3		3	
Mode	2		2	
Base	150		150	

Note: Local authority representation in LSPs is given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 9 in the main report

Table 13A Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships (NRF areas)

	Number of LSPs			
	Where pre-existing partnerships have been abolished		Where pre-existing partnerships have ceased to meet regularly	
	N	%	N	%
Number of partnerships abolished or ceased to meet				
1 partnership	13	24%	3	5%
2 partnership	2	4%	0	0%
3 partnership	3	5%	0	0%
4 partnership	0	0%	0	0%
Total LSPs where pre-existing partnerships have been abolished or ceased to meet	18	33%	3	5%
None abolished or ceased to meet	34	62%		
Total responses	55	100%		
Non response	2			
Base	57			

Table 13B Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships (non-NRF areas)

	Number of LSPs			
	Where pre-existing partnerships have been abolished		Where pre-existing partnerships have ceased to meet regularly	
	N	%	N	%
Number of partnerships abolished or ceased to meet				
1 partnership	15	11%	2	1%
2 partnership	5	4%	3	2%
3 partnership	0	0%	1	1%
4 partnership	0	0%	1	1%
Total LSPs where pre-existing partnerships have been abolished or ceased to meet	20	14%	7	5%
None abolished or ceased to meet	114	81%		
Total responses	140	100%		
Non response	10			
Base	150			

Note:

1. It is possible for an LSP to contain both pre-existing partnerships that have been abolished and partnerships that have ceased to meet.
2. Reduction in the number of pre-existing partnerships is given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 13 in the main report

Table 14A Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet (NRF areas)

	Pre-existing partnerships			
	Abolished		Ceased to meet regularly	
	N	%	N	%
Health	3	12%	0	0%
Education and life long learning	1	4%	1	33%
Crime and disorder	2	8%	0	0%
Economic	1	4%	0	0%
Regeneration	9	36%	1	33%
Environment	1	4%	0	0%
Community Development	0	0%	0	0%
Transport	1	4%	0	0%
Employment	1	4%	0	0%
Other /general	6	24%	1	33%
Total specified	25	100%	3	100%
Not specified	1		0	
Total number of pre-existing partnerships abolished or ceasing to meet (base)	26		3	
Responses (LSPs)	21			

Table 14B Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet (non-NRF areas)

	Pre-existing partnerships			
	Abolished		Ceased to meet regularly	
	N	%	N	%
Health	6	24%	2	18%
Education and life long learning	0	0%	1	9%
Crime and disorder	4	16%	1	9%
Economic	1	4%	0	0%
Regeneration	1	4%	1	9%
Environment	2	8%	4	36%
Community Development	1	4%	0	0%
Transport	0	0%	0	0%
Employment	0	0%	1	9%
Other /general	10	40%	1	9%
Total specified	25	100%	11	100%
Not specified	0		4	
Total number of pre-existing partnerships abolished or ceasing to meet (base)	25		15	
Responses (LSPs)	27			

Notes

1. Base refers to the number of pre-existing partnerships being abolished or ceasing to meet (Table 13); not specified refers to the number of pre-existing partnerships abolished or ceasing to meet where respondents did not specify their type; responses refers to the number of LSPs stating that pre-existing partnerships had been abolished or ceased to meet (Table 13)
2. Types of partnership being abolished or ceasing to meet is given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 14 in the main report

Table 17A Staff resources (NRF areas)

(full time equivalent, including fulltime and part time staff)

	Own staff		Other staff		All staff	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0.1 to 0.5	0	0%	4	14%	3	6%
0.6 to 1	12	33%	5	17%	10	19%
1.1 to 2	8	22%	9	31%	17	31%
2.1 to 3	8	22%	6	21%	9	17%
3.1 to 4	4	11%	0	0%	5	9%
4.1 to 5	1	3%	3	10%	3	6%
5.1 +	3	8%	2	7%	7	13%
Total responses	36	100%	29	100%	54	100%
Non-response	21		28		3	
Mean	2.5		2.7		3.1	
Median	2		2		2	
Mode	1		2 & 3		2	
Base	57		57		57	

Table 17B Staff resources (non-NRF areas)

(full time equivalent, including fulltime and part time staff)

	Own staff		Other staff		All staff	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0.1 to 0.5	18	30%	21	33%	38	32%
0.6 to 1	21	34%	17	27%	33	28%
1.1 to 2	17	28%	15	23%	29	24%
2.1 to 3	2	3%	3	5%	6	5%
3.1 to 4	1	2%	3	5%	5	4%
4.1 to 5	0	0%	1	2%	2	2%
5.1 +	2	3%	4	6%	6	5%
Total responses	61	100%	64	100%	119	100%
Non-response	89		86		31	26%
Mean	1.5		1.7		1.7	
Median	1		1		1	
Mode	1		1		1	
Base	150		150		150	

Note:

1. The 'all staff' column is not the sum of the 'own staff' and 'other staff' columns but is a separate variable calculated for each responding LSP; similarly since some respondents had both 'own staff' and ' other staff' the total number of respondents in the 'all staff' column does not equal the sum of the total respondents in the other two columns.
2. Staff resources are given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 17 in the main report.

Table 19A Activities (NRF areas)

Activities	Past Year		Planned for 2002/3	
	Number of mentions by LSPs	% of LSPs mentioning	Number of mentions by LSPs	% of LSPs mentioning
Partnership development				
Consolidating membership	48	84%	33	58%
Developing partnership structures	44	77%	38	67%
Community engagement	35	61%	55	96%
Working towards accreditation	56	98%	23	40%
Inclusion of specific communities of interest	18	32%	35	61%
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	14	25%	41	72%
Planning				
Developing Community Strategy	36	63%	43	75%
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	34	60%	35	61%
Developing LNRS	53	93%	40	70%
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	23	40%	35	61%
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	14	25%	43	75%
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	12	21%	43	75%
Developing a Local Transport Plan	11	19%	7	12%
Coordination and rationalisation				
Rationalisation of processes	20	35%	37	65%
Supporting/coordinating the work of sub partnerships	20	35%	38	67%
Rationalisation of plans	10	18%	31	54%
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	11	19%	32	56%
Co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	9	16%	41	72%
Delivery				
Developing joint projects	28	49%	35	61%
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Strategy	14	25%	41	72%
Delivering on floor targets	18	32%	45	79%
Neighbourhood Renewal Fund	3	5%	3	5%
Other	11	19%	10	18%
Total responses	57	100%	57	100%
Non response	0		0	
Base	57		57	

Notes:

1. Percentages are based on the number of LSPs, not the number of activities
2. The base is different for 'past year' and 'planned' as some newly formed LSPs only answered in relation to planned activities
3. Activities are given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 19 in the main report

Table 19B Activities (non-NRF areas)

Activities	Past Year		Planned for 2002/3	
	Number of mentions by LSPs	% of LSPs mentioning	Number of mentions by LSPs	% of LSPs mentioning
Partnership development				
Consolidating membership	101	84%	91	63%
Developing partnership structures	89	74%	82	57%
Community engagement	45	38%	112	77%
Working towards accreditation	7	6%	35	24%
Inclusion of specific communities of interest	23	19%	65	45%
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	3	3%	22	15%
Planning				
Developing Community Strategy	74	62%	106	73%
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	49	41%	89	61%
Developing LNRS	2	2%	22	15%
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	14	12%	50	34%
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	21	18%	82	57%
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	12	10%	70	48%
Developing a Local Transport Plan	2	2%	8	6%
Coordination and rationalisation				
Rationalisation of processes	43	36%	101	70%
Supporting/coordinating the work of sub partnerships	26	22%	92	63%
Rationalisation of plans	12	10%	79	54%
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	9	8%	81	56%
Co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	9	8%	72	50%
Delivery				
Developing joint projects	39	33%	88	61%
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Strategy	10	8%	80	55%
Delivering on floor targets	5	4%	20	14%
Neighbourhood Renewal Fund	0	0%	0	0%
Other	3	3%	3	2%
Total responses	120	100%	145	100%
Non response	30		35	
Base	150		180	

Notes:

1. Percentages are based on the number of LSPs, not the number of activities
2. The base is different for 'past year' and 'planned' as some newly formed LSPs only answered in relation to planned activities
3. Activities are given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 19 in the main report

Table 20A Priorities (NRF areas)

	Number of LSPs prioritising the activity		Frequency of occurrence as number one priority	
	N	%	N	%
Partnership development				
Community engagement	24	49%	3	7%
Developing partnership structures	18	37%	5	11%
Consolidating membership	8	16%	1	2%
Working towards accreditation	8	16%	2	5%
Inclusion of specific communities of interest	6	12%	0	0%
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	7	14%	0	0%
Planning				
Developing Community Strategy	26	53%	16	36%
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	9	18%	3	7%
Developing LNRS	28	57%	6	14%
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	13	27%	0	0%
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	6	12%	0	0%
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	9	18%	0	0%
Developing a Local Transport Plan	0	0%	0	0%
Co-ordination and rationalisation				
Rationalisation of processes	10	20%	1	2%
Co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	17	35%	2	5%
Supporting/coordinating the work of sub partnerships	5	10%	0	0%
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	7	14%	0	0%
Rationalisation of plans	5	10%	0	0%
Delivery				
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Strategy	22	45%	12	27%
Developing joint projects	8	16%	0	0%
Delivering on floor targets	17	35%	0	0%
Neighbourhood renewal fund	2	4%	1	2%
Total responses	49	100%	44	100%
Non response	8		13	
Base	57		57	

Notes

- 5 respondents did not rank their priorities therefore their top priority cannot be distinguished
- Total 'frequency of occurrence as number one priority' exceeds 'total responses' because some respondents indicated more than one joint number one priority
- Priorities are given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 20 in the main report

Table 20B Priorities (non-NRF areas)

	Number of LSPs prioritising the activity		Frequency of occurrence as number one priority	
	N	%	N	%
Partnership development				
Community engagement	70	56%	16	13%
Developing partnership structures	51	41%	15	13%
Consolidating membership	33	26%	13	11%
Working towards accreditation	17	14%	2	2%
Inclusion of specific communities of interest	15	12%	0	0%
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	8	6%	1	1%
Planning				
Developing Community Strategy	78	62%	37	31%
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	52	42%	11	9%
Developing LNRS	12	10%	3	3%
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	17	14%	1	1%
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	22	18%	2	2%
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	15	12%	4	3%
Developing a Local Transport Plan	5	4%	0	0%
Co-ordination and rationalisation				
Rationalisation of processes	44	35%	3	3%
Co-ordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	33	26%	5	4%
Supporting/coordinating the work of sub partnerships	38	30%	1	1%
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	32	26%	2	2%
Rationalisation of plans	17	14%	2	2%
Delivery				
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Strategy	50	40%	12	10%
Developing joint projects	41	33%	5	4%
Delivering on floor targets	6	5%	0	0%
Neighbourhood renewal fund	0	0%	0	0%
Total responses	125	100%	120	100%
Non response	55		60	
Base	180		180	

Notes

- 5 respondents did not rank their priorities therefore their top priority cannot be distinguished
- Total 'frequency of occurrence as number one priority' exceeds 'total responses' because some respondents indicated more than one joint number one priority
- Priorities are given for NRF and non-NRF areas combined in Table 20 in the main report

Appendix 2: stage 1 questionnaire

General instructions

Either print out the questionnaire and complete it by hand, or complete it electronically by putting an **X** in the appropriate box and filling in the requested information by typing in the grey boxes (which will expand to fit). If you are completing it by hand, write on the back of the paper if necessary.

Please respond to questions 1 and 2 EVEN IF THERE IS NO LSP IN YOUR LOCAL AUTHORITY AREA.

In the case of two-tier arrangements, the county council should ensure that a questionnaire has been completed in relation to any county-wide LSP, while districts should ensure that one has been completed in relation to district or sub-county partnerships. If there is a lead district please would they respond; if not please agree amongst yourselves which district will respond.

1 Details of the person completing this questionnaire

Name:

Organisation:

Job title:

Relationship to the LSP:

Email address:

Telephone number:

Postal address:

If you are not the most appropriate person to contact in future about the LSP, please tell us who is.

Name:

Email address:

2 In your local authority area, is there a local strategic partnership of any sort in existence or being established? (County councils should respond for county-wide partnerships, the lead district should respond for sub-county partnerships)

Please cross one

- Yes – a partnership eligible for Neighbourhood Renewal Fund which has undergone an accreditation process with the Government Office
- Yes – in areas not eligible for NRF, a partnership which has been agreed locally as the local strategic partnership and/or which will become the local strategic partnership
- Yes – a partnership which although not formally agreed to be the LSP includes the main local stakeholders and has a remit which spans a range of issues
- No – but discussions on forming an LSP are in progress
- No – there are no plans to form an LSP within the next one or two years. *Please tell us why not*

(If you answered 'no' to this question, you do not need to answer any further questions. Please return the questionnaire to the address on Page 11 with questions 1 and 2 completed. We may contact you at a later stage to see if the situation has changed.)

3 Name of the partnership *(please write in):*

4.1 Which of the following categories best describes the local authority area or areas covered by the partnership?

Please cross one

- single unitary authority or district
- administrative county excluding unitary authorities located within it
- geographical county including unitary authorities located within it
- two or more neighbouring districts/unitary authorities or part of a county
- other *(please specify)*

4.2 How many districts or unitary authority areas does the partnership cover?

Please write number:

5 Legal status of the partnership

Please cross one

- Company limited by guarantee
- Voluntary partnership
- Not decided
- Other (*please specify*):

6 What were the origins of the partnership?

Please cross one

- Started life as a new local strategic partnership in 2000 – 2002
- Developed out of or replaced another partnership or partnerships
- Other (*please explain*)

7 How many members does the LSP currently have? In this and the following questions, please define 'member' in the way that you use the term in your partnership. If appropriate, please distinguish between members of the core group (for instance the Central Board or Executive) and other members who are less closely or less regularly involved. You may find it easier to complete question 8 first, then return to this question.

Please write in numbers

- Core members (Central Board/Executive/Steering Group)
- Other members (approximate if exact number unavailable)
- Total members (only complete this box if no distinction is made between core and other members)
- Membership not yet agreed

If you had any difficulty with this question, please explain your difficulty here

8 Which of the following organisations are currently members of the partnership?
 (If your partnership does not distinguish between categories of member, put all in the "other" column)

Organisation	Core members (write number)	Other members (write number)
Local authorities (please list)		
Other public sector or quasi public sector organisations		
Strategic Health authority		
Primary Care Trust/group		
Other health sector		
Police Force or Police Authority		
Jobcentre Plus/ Employment Service/ Benefits Agency		
Higher/further education institutions		
Regional Government Office		
RDA		
Connexions		
Learning and Skills Council		
Other public sector, including partnerships (please list)		
Private sector		
Chamber of Commerce		
Other business umbrella group		
Transport operators		
Individual businesses		
Other private sector (please list)		
Voluntary and community sectors		
Voluntary sector (umbrella group)		
Voluntary sector (individual organisations)		
Housing associations/RSLs		
Faith organisations		

Residents groups		
BME representative organisations		
Other voluntary & community sector (<i>please list</i>)		
Other (<i>please list</i>)		
Total number of members		

Now please make sure you have completed question 7 if you skipped this earlier.

9 Of the local authority members of the partnership, how many of the representatives are elected councillors and how many are officers?

Please write in numbers

Councillors

Officers

10 Which person from which organisation chairs the partnership?

Job title:

Organisation:

- Individual serving in their own right, no relevant organisation or job title
- No permanent chair (rotating)
- Chair not yet agreed

11 Which of the following organisational structures exist within the partnership?
(Include both formal and informal arrangements)

Please cross all that apply

- Core executive or board (the central decision making body)
- Operational sub group (concerned with day to day issues)
- Wider forum e.g. community convention
- Area forums
- Analytical/technical support group(s) or working groups
- Sub-partnerships or associated partnerships
- Other (name):
- No sub-structures

12 If you have a diagram of the partnership structure, please attach or post this.

13 Are there any sub-partnerships or associated partnerships?

Include

*Sub-partnerships established by the LSP
Independent partnerships affiliated to the LSP
Partnerships subsumed within the LSP*

Do not include

Outside partnerships which are linked to the LSP by overlapping membership alone.

Cross all that apply

- No sub partnerships or associated partnerships

- Community Legal Services
- Connexions
- Crime and Disorder Partnership/ Community Safety Partnership
- Drug Action Team
- Early Years
- Education Action Zone(s)
- Employment Action Zone
- Health Action Zone or Health Improvement
- Local Agenda 21 Partnership
- Local Learning Partnerships
- Local Transport Plan partnership
- Neighbourhood based partnership(s)
- New Deal for Communities
- SRB Partnership(s)
- Sub-regional or regional partnership(s)
- Sure Start(s)
- Youth Offending Team
- Other partnerships

Please write name and briefly describe their role(s) if not self-evident from the name.

There is no need to list again partnerships already listed as members in your answer to question 8, but please cross this box if we need to refer to your answer to question 8

14 Have any pre-existing partnerships been abolished or ceased to meet regularly as a result of the establishment of the LSP?

Cross all that apply

- Yes – formally abolished
how many?
which ones?
- Yes – not abolished but ceased to meet regularly
how many?
which ones?
- No

15 Have any new partnerships been established as a result of the LSP?

- Yes
how many?
which ones?
- No

16.1 Does the partnership have its own support staff?

- No
please go to question 16.2
- Yes
please go to question 16.3

16.2 If no, which organisation provides support staff?

Please cross all that apply

- local authority
- other (*please name*)

Go to question 16.3

16.3 Approximately what staff resources are available to support the LSP? (include the LSP's own staff, and support staff provided by other organisations)

Write number of full time equivalents

- own staff: full time
- own staff: part time (fte)
- other staff: full time
- other staff: part time (fte)
-

17 Has the partnership got a cash budget for administration and/or programmes? If so, what is this?

- No budget
- NRF funds for financial year 2002/3 *please write amount £*
- Other (non-NRF) budget for financial year 2002/3 *please write amount £*

We would like information about your current and planned activities. Please answer questions 18.1 to 18.3 by completing the table below

18.1 What have been the main activities of the partnership over the past year (*Cross all that apply*):

18.2 What activities are planned for the coming year? (*Cross all that apply*):

18.3 Which of the planned activities listed in answer to question 18.2 do you consider to be the most important? (*Please number the top five activities, with 1 being the most important*):

<i>Activity</i>	18.1 Past year <i>Cross all that apply</i>	18.2 Planned for 2002/3 <i>Cross all that apply</i>	18.3 Most important in 2002/3 Number top 5
Consolidating membership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing partnership structures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Working towards accreditation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing Community Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Agreeing and delivering on LPSA targets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing a Local Transport Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing a Skills and Knowledge Plan for the partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Rationalisation of sub-partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Rationalisation of plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Rationalisation of processes (e.g. consultation, information exchange, meetings, performance management)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing and agreeing a set of shared objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Supporting/co-coordinating the work of sub partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Coordinating the mainstream plans and budgets of partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing shared data and information systems and protocols	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Working on PIs and/or evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delivering on targets as set out in the Community Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delivering on the floor targets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Developing joint projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Community engagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The inclusion of specific communities of interest	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Other (please list the most important ones)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

19 Has the partnership been involved in the development of the Community Strategy/Plan?

Please choose the statement which best describes the current situation

- The partnership is/was fully involved in developing the Community Plan
- The local authority has developed/is developing a Community Plan, and the partnership was/is being consulted
- There is a Community Plan, but the partnership has not been involved in its preparation
- Work has not yet started on the Community Plan in this local authority area

20 Has the partnership been involved in the development of a Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy?

Please choose the statement which best describes the current situation

- The partnership is/was fully involved in developing a Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
- The local authority has developed/is developing a Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, and the partnership was/is being consulted
- There is a Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy, but the partnership has not been involved in its preparation
- There is no Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy

21 Will the partnership be involved in monitoring and/ or implementing the Community Plan or Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy?

Please cross all that apply

- Yes – monitoring the Community Plan
- Yes – implementing the Community Plan

- Yes – monitoring the Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
- Yes – implementing the Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy

- No – not involved in any of these activities

22.1 Has the partnership agreed a list of performance indicators against which to assess its progress?

- Yes – go to question 22.2
- No – go to question 22.4

22.2 Are you using the Quality of Life indicators developed by the Audit Commission?

Please cross one

- Yes, using some or all of these and no others
- Yes, using these amongst others
- No

Go to question 22.3

22.3 Please attach or post a list of the indicators you are using. (Please go to Q23 next)

22.4 If you answered no to question 22.1, is the partnership considering possible performance indicators and/or does it have performance management arrangements of some kind?

Please cross all that apply

- Considering performance indicators
- Considering or have alternative performance management arrangements
- There has been no consideration of performance management

As part of this project, we will be setting up action learning programmes on a national and regional basis (as described in the research summary).

23 Would you be interested in taking part in one of the action learning programmes? By 'you' we mean the lead officer or anyone else knowledgeable about the partnership whom you think might be interested in taking part

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

The subjects for the action learning programmes will be drawn in part from this consultation. We are therefore interested in the issues and dilemmas that you are facing.

24 What are the key internal issues and dilemmas you face as a partnership? (i.e. issues related to how the partnership itself works)

(please list no more than five in order of importance)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

25 What are the key external issues and dilemmas you face as a partnership (i.e. issues related to the achievement of partnership objectives, including neighbourhood renewal and community planning)

(please list no more than five in order of importance)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

26 Which of the issues listed in question 24 or 25 would you be most interested in working on, within an action learning set?

(please list three)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

- 27** What benefits, if any, have there been from the partnership so far? These may include benefits for any individual, group or organisation.

(please list no more than five in order of importance)

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

- 28** Please add here any additional comments you would like to make.

Thank you very much for your time. Now please return this questionnaire to OPM by Friday June 14th:

by e-mail: survey@opm.co.uk, or

by fax 020 7837 5800, or

by post: Lisa Larsen, OPM, 252B Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8XG