

**Minutes of Management Group meeting
24 July 2008**

Present:	Andrew Flack Michael Foote Jonathan Guest Prem Singh - Chair Andy Thomas Matthew Allbones George Cowcher Roger Baddley Andy Pidluznyj	Derby City Council Derby City Council Derby City Council Derby City Primary Care Trust Derby Community Safety Partnership Derby Council for Voluntary Service Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service Jobcentre Plus
Advisors:	Helen Osler Garry Bryant	Derby City Partnership Government Office for the East Midlands
In attendance:	Martyn Marples	Derby City Council – Item 3

Item	Issue	Action
1	Introductions	
	Apologies were received from Keith Burn, Ray Cowlshaw, Hugh Hastie, Don McLure, Ray Rippingale, Chief Supt Jack Russell.	
2	Minutes of the meeting on 19 June and matters arising	
	<p>Accuracy</p> <p>The minutes were accepted as an accurate record.</p> <p>Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting on 19 June 2008</p> <p>Item 2.7 Andrew clarified that Derby City Council would not pursue Beacon status for its approach to children in poverty as the work is still at a very early stage.</p> <p>Item 2.8 Helen said that further discussion had been held with East Midlands Business to clarify how they could better engage with Derby businesses. They had agreed that this is a key piece of work for the company this year.</p> <p>Item 6 Helen informed the group that further refinement of the allocation of LPSA2 rewards would be worked up by the Council's Resource Department.</p> <p>Item 9 As recommended by Management Group, the name of the new performance group will be Performance Support Group.</p> <p>All other actions were complete or on the agenda.</p>	<p>Don McLure / Martyn Marples</p>

3	Future allocation of the Area Based Grant - ABG	
	<p>Martyn presented the report on how the Area Based Grant could be allocated from April 2009. He explained the need to understand how the money is being spent at present and how it contributes to achieving LAA targets – this work still needs to be done. Some core principles should be around freeing up some of the ABG for re-allocation and re-commissioning while at the same time drawing in partners’ mainstream funding to match the grant. It should be borne in mind that almost all the ABG is allocated currently to services within the Council.</p> <p>He outlined a range of options, each of which could flow from the previous one, but suggested that some funding streams within the ABG could be excluded from any future process of re-allocation. These included the Transitional Fund that has replaced Neighbourhood Renewal Fund and is reducing to nil by March 2010, funding allocated to targets where no baseline has yet been set and Supporting People, as it will be included in the ABG for the first time in April 2009.</p> <p>In general, members were not keen to see any individual streams – apart from Transitional Fund which ends anyway - being excluded from a core set of principles that would guide the allocation of the ABG. It was acknowledged however that there may be practical implications for example with Supporting People in the first year because so much of that is tied up in external contracts. However, it was agreed that all streams should have the same principles applied.</p> <p>Reference was made in the options proposed in Martyn’s paper to core Council services which might maintain their current allocation – members questioned what core services both in the Council and other organisations might be, a query that remained unanswered.</p> <p>Prem suggested that the first principle should be to maximise the use of what are limited resources by aligning the ABG with mainstream to grow the ability of the ABG to achieve better outcomes. He added however that if transferring grants to core activity meant transferring current deficits, then he felt that partners would not be keen to sign up to that.</p> <p>Andrew suggested that we need to identify whether all indicators currently have funding to help them achieve targets. We must also remember that every organisation undertakes a wide range of activity outside the LAA. He also stressed that match funding could not be a requirement as some services just receive their ABG fund and nothing else. Finally, he suggested that no funding should be diverted from the delivery of services to LAA support but that we should move staff around to undertake the work that is needed. On the last point, Jonathan suggested that we need to keep an open mind until evidence has been provided through a business case of what capacity is needed.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>The following approach was agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • match funding for use of the ABG should be sought but not 	

	<p>required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Transitional Fund should be excluded from the new approach but no other exclusions were agreed • the level of support to the LAA would need to be evidenced through a business case • taking the above into consideration, Martyn should produce for September Management Group a detailed plan on what the options in his paper might mean in practice. 	<p>Helen Osler</p> <p>Martyn Marples</p>
4	National Challenge to schools	
	<p>Andrew presented a brief report on the National Challenge that any school with less than 30% of pupils achieving 5 A* - C GCSEs including maths and English would be closed by 2010. This means 638 schools nationally including Noel Baker, Merrill, Da Vinci, Bemrose and Sinfin in Derby.</p> <p>Plans had to be in place for these schools by the end of this term and schools risk rated – Noel Baker is low, Merrill and Da Vinci medium and Bemrose and Sinfin high risk. The two latter are already the focus of plans for academy status which is one of the alternatives to closure in the Government's plans. Other options are two schools under one governing body, National Challenge Trust status, amalgamate with another school or close.</p> <p>Key barriers for these schools include high levels of mobility among pupils, low levels of attainment on entry, low levels of parental engagement, low levels of aspiration.</p> <p>Andrew stressed the importance of partnership input to support the issues faced by the children and the schools – intervention is needed on many levels. Andrew warned that the Department for Children, Schools and Families wishes to see a target for the schools included in the first refresh of the LAA.</p> <p>Prem asked whether there was a privatisation agenda in the Challenge. Andrew agreed that many academies are backed by private companies – although in the city Derby College is the sponsor. He added that any new school development in the future would go out to open tender and therefore there was the strong possibility of private sector involvement.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>Partners accepted the need to work closely with City for Children and Young People on this agenda.</p>	<p>All</p>
5	Empowerment White Paper – Communities in Control	
	<p>Helen introduced the summary of the new Government White Paper – Communities in Control: Real People, Real Power - that had been published in July. The Paper identifies ways to pass power to local communities and citizens giving them more control over local decisions. The Paper is based on the new relationships between national and local government and between local government and local people. Statutory</p>	

	<p>guidance on Strong and Prosperous Communities had also been published alongside the White Paper, covering the main elements of the new relationship – LSPs creating a shared vision, duty to involve placed on partners, LAAs setting out local priorities, a new National Indicator set and independent Comprehensive Area Assessments to chart achievement of outcomes. Andy added that while the White Paper had some positive elements, local people and the delivery of services are still way apart. He felt there was growing confusion about the respective roles of Local Authorities, LSPs and civic leadership.</p> <p>Members agreed the need to link the White Paper with the statutory guidance mentioned as well as with other publications such as the Policing Green Paper, Employment Green Paper and the NHS Constitution and read across to identify the key headlines for all partners. Prem felt that we may wish to be more aspirational than any of the individual documents might require.</p> <p>Agreed: Helen and Andy to work with the Council and other partners to produce a paper that reflects key linkages in a range of recent publications.</p>	<p>Helen Osler / Andy Thomas</p>
6	Any other business	
	<p>Prem asked if Management Group would agree to fruit and other healthy snacks at future meetings instead of biscuits. This was accepted.</p>	<p>Helen Osler</p>
7	Date, time and venue of next meeting	
	<p>Thursday 28 August, 3.30pm – 5.30pm, 7th Floor, St Peter’s House, Gower Street – with fruit!!</p>	