



PARTNERSHIP ASSESSMENT SCORECARD

Board Meeting: 21 June 2007

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the Community Planning Partnership (CPP) Board on the results of the Partnership Assessment Scorecard (PAS) 2007.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Following the successful pilot of the Scorecard developed under the auspices of Communities Scotland to facilitate the integration of Social Inclusion Partnerships with Community Planning, the Rocket Science consultancy was commissioned to develop a bespoke PAS to allow the effectiveness of partnership working through Community Planning in East Ayrshire to be measured.
- 2.2 The results of the PAS are utilised to inform the preparation of workplans and annual performance reports for Community Planning and the Regeneration Outcome Agreement.
- 2.3 In addition, the PAS allows Community Planning Partners to monitor their progress in fulfilling their statutory duty under the Local Government in Scotland Act, 2003 to participate in the Community Planning process.
- 2.4 Furthermore, through the facility to produce detailed action plans, it has the potential to support Partner organisations in identifying and addressing training needs in relation to working within a Community Planning framework.
- 2.5 The first PAS exercise was carried out in March 2006 and informed the Joint Officers' Group (JOG) Workplan for 2006/07.

3. PARTNERSHIP ASSESSMENT SCORECARD IMPLEMENTATION 2007

- 3.1 In January 2007, the identified Managers within relevant Partner organisations reviewed and revised, as appropriate, the nominated 'Scorer Group' for their organisation. As in 2006, this process in respect of Community Planning Structures was managed by the Community Planning and Partnership Unit.
- 3.2 The PAS was scored by all 'Scorer Groups', including the CPP Board as part of the Partnership Strategic Group, between 1 March and 4 April 2007.
- 3.3 A total of 432 individuals within the identified 'Scorer Groups' had an opportunity to participate in the PAS 2007, with 254 (59%) participants completing and returning the scorecard, including 41 (16%) participants who were new scorers this year.
- 3.4 The response rates for the 2007 PAS exercise and a comparison with the response rates for the previous year are as follows:

| Partner/Group | 2006 Response Rates | 2007 Response Rates |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Partnership - Strategic | 65% | 74% |
| Partnership -Operational | 76% | 85% |
| East Ayrshire Council | 56% | 66% |
| NHS Ayrshire and Arran | 32% | 27% |
| Community Health Partnership | 100% | 100% |
| Strathclyde Police | 100% | 100% |
| Strathclyde Fire and Rescue | 80% | 100% |
| Scottish Enterprise Ayrshire | 100% | 100% |

4. PARTNERSHIP ASSESSMENT SCORECARD RESULTS

4.1 Attached for information are the following:

- Appendix 1 - Combined Results for all 'Scorer Groups' 2006 and 2007;
- Appendix 2 - Top level results by 'Scorer Group', detailing 2006 and 2007 results for comparison; and
- Appendix 3 - 'Scorer Group' information, including number of scorers.

4.2 Partners have access to more detailed analysis in respect of their organisations' scores through their identified 'Scorer Group' Managers and have been requested to consider this information, and implement an action plan, as appropriate.

PAS 2006 – Agreed Priorities

4.3 Following the PAS exercise in 2006, the issues detailed below were identified as priorities to be addressed through the Joint Officers' Group (JOG) Workplan:

- Awareness of local people
- Awareness of Partners' operational staff.

Awareness of Local People

4.4 'Awareness of local people' was addressed through a range of mechanisms, most notably, the Community Planning website; the Celebration of Community Planning, including the Showcase events; a newsletter to every household in East Ayrshire; and promotional material in the local press.

4.5 From Appendix 1, it can be noted that the aggregated score in this regard has increased from 2.4 to 2.6. However, JOG members have considered that since the score remains relatively low, awareness of local people should continue to be an issue to be progressed through the JOG Workplan in 2007/08.

Awareness of Partners' Operational Staff

4.6 To increase the awareness of Partners' operational staff, the Community Planning Workbook was devised and utilised within the team meeting setting across the Partner organisations. In addition, the Community Planning website provided a resource for staff in terms of awareness raising and provision of information.

4.7 From Appendix 1, it can be noted that the aggregated score in relation to this issue has increased from 3.0 to 3.1. At the JOG Planning Session of 27 March 2007, it was agreed that mainstreaming of Community Planning, for which a high level of

awareness by staff is a necessity, is a continuing priority issue. Awareness raising has, therefore, been included in the 2007/08 JOG Workplan.

PAS 2007 – Issues for Consideration

4.8 Highlighted below are the issues, which received an aggregated score of 3.3 or less in the PAS 2007 exercise.

| Sub-Topic | Topic | Score |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Joint Monitoring Framework | Impact | 3.3 |
| Joint Resourcing | Ownership & Commitment | 3.3 |
| Effective Structures and Processes | Structures & Processes | 3.3 |
| Awareness of Key Stakeholders | Awareness | 3.2 |
| Understanding the needs of different groups | Community Engagement | 3.2 |
| Awareness of Partners' Operational Staff | Awareness | 3.1 |
| Providing training and support | Community Engagement | 3.1 |
| Sharing Information | Structures & Processes | 3.1 |
| Community influence: CPP decisions | Community Engagement | 3.0 |
| Staff Roles | Ownership & Commitment | 3.0 |
| Engaging with communities on strategies and plans | Community Engagement | 2.9 |
| Awareness of Local People | Awareness | 2.6 |

4.9 At its meeting on 22 May 2007, JOG members considered which of the issues detailed above they would wish to address as a Community Planning Partnership. Members agreed that the priority issues to be addressed in 2007/08 would be to further address:

- Awareness of Local People;
- Awareness of Partners' Operational Staff; and to promote

- Community Influence: CPP decisions; and
- Engaging with communities on strategies and plans.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 The CPP Board is asked to:

- i) note the progress in relation to the Partnership Assessment Scorecard;
- ii) note that JOG representatives agreed to consider the more detailed analysis of the results for their respective organisations, implement action plans, as appropriate, and report progress to a future JOG meeting;
- iii) consider how to progress issues to be addressed through the JOG workplan, as detailed at 4.9; in particular, consider the issue of community influence on CPP decision making; and
- iv) otherwise, note the content of the report.

Gwen Barker
Community Planning and Partnership Manager
28 May 2007

Partnership Assessment Scorecard - Combined Results 2006 and 2007

| Sub-topic | Topic | 2006 Average Score | 2007 Average Score | Difference | Performance |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------|
| Awareness of Decision Makers | Awareness | 3.9 | 4.0 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Personal Awareness | Awareness | 3.8 | 3.8 | 0.0 | No change |
| Evidence: difference made | Impact | 3.6 | 3.8 | 0.2 | Increase |
| The right members - Representation | Structures & Processes | 3.6 | 3.8 | 0.2 | Increase |
| Awareness of Partners' Strategic Staff | Awareness | 3.5 | 3.7 | 0.2 | Increase |
| Making a difference | Impact | 3.6 | 3.7 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Reporting back to communities | Community Engagement | 3.5 | 3.6 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Delivering the right services for communities | Community Engagement | 3.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | No change |
| Structures and opportunities | Community Engagement | 3.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | No change |
| Measuring the impact of services to communities | Impact | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Shared Vision | Ownership & Commitment | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Understand how to contribute | Structures & Processes | 3.4 | 3.5 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Delivery | Ownership & Commitment | 3.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | No change |
| Ownership | Ownership & Commitment | 3.3 | 3.4 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Communication | Structures & Processes | 3.3 | 3.4 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Targeting additional mainstream financial resources | Structures & Processes | 3.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | No change |
| Joint Monitoring Framework | Impact | 3.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | No change |
| Joint Resourcing | Ownership & Commitment | 3.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | No change |
| Effective structures and processes | Structures & Processes | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Awareness of Key Stakeholders | Awareness | 3.4 | 3.2 | -0.2 | Decrease |
| Understanding the needs of different groups | Community Engagement | 3.3 | 3.2 | -0.1 | Decrease |
| Awareness of Partners' Operational Staff | Awareness | 3.0 | 3.1 | 0.1 | Increase |
| Providing training and support | Community Engagement | 3.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 | No change |
| Sharing Information | Structures & Processes | 3.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 | No change |
| Community influence: CPP decisions | Community Engagement | 3.1 | 3.0 | -0.1 | Decrease |
| Staff Roles | Ownership & Commitment | 3.1 | 3.0 | -0.1 | Decrease |
| Engaging with communities on strategies and plans | Community Engagement | 2.9 | 2.9 | 0.0 | No change |
| Awareness of Local People | Awareness | 2.4 | 2.6 | 0.2 | Increase |

Partnership Assessment Scorecard - Scorer Group Results 2006 and 2007

| Topic No. | Sub-topic | Topic | Partnership (Overall) | | Partnership - Operational | | Partnership - Strategic | | EAC | | Fire | | Police | | CHP | | NHS | | SEA | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 |
| 1 | Personal Awareness | Awareness | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| 2 | Awareness of Partners' Strategic Staff | Awareness | 3.5 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.3 |
| 3 | Awareness of Partners' Operational Staff | Awareness | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| 4 | Awareness of Local People | Awareness | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| 5 | Awareness of Decision Makers | Awareness | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| 6 | Awareness of Key Stakeholders | Awareness | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 3.2 |
| 7 | Shared Vision | Ownership & Commitment | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| 8 | Staff Roles | Ownership & Commitment | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| 9 | Ownership | Ownership & Commitment | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| 10 | Delivery | Ownership & Commitment | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| 11 | Joint Resourcing | Ownership & Commitment | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| 12 | Understand how to contribute | Structures & Processes | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| 13 | Communication | Structures & Processes | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.2 |
| 14 | The right members - Representation | Structures & Processes | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.7 |
| 15 | Targeting additional mainstream financial resources | Structures & Processes | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| 16 | Sharing Information | Structures & Processes | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| 17 | Effective structures and processes | Structures & Processes | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| 18 | Structures and opportunities | Community Engagement | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| 19 | Providing training and support | Community Engagement | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| 20 | Engaging with communities on strategies and plans | Community Engagement | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 |
| 21 | Community influence: CPP decisions | Community Engagement | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 2.6 |
| 22 | Understanding the needs of different groups | Community Engagement | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| 23 | Delivering the right services for communities | Community Engagement | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
| 24 | Reporting back to communities | Community Engagement | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| 25 | Evidence: difference made | Impact | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| 26 | Joint Monitoring Framework | Impact | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| 27 | Measuring the impact of services to communities | Impact | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| 28 | Making a difference | Impact | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Total Score | | | 93.3 | 94.6 | 98.5 | 98.4 | 102.4 | 104.8 | 87.9 | 92.6 | 100.5 | 101.4 | 90.6 | 90.4 | 98.5 | 100.4 | 81.1 | 80.5 | 86.9 | 86.3 |

Partnership Assessment Scorecard - Scorer Groups 2007

| Abbreviation | Full Title | Scorer Detail | Number of Possible Scorers 2007 | Number of Actual Scorers 2007 | Number of Possible New Scorers 2007 | Number of Actual New Scorers 2007 |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| EAC | East Ayrshire Council | A representative sample (2%) of EAC staff, not routinely involved in Community Planning. | 131 | 86 | 8 | 6 |
| Partnership - Operational | Community Planning Partnership Operational Staff Group | Members of each thematic Community Plan Action Plan Working Group. | 74 | 63 | 28 | 22 |
| Partnership - Strategic | Community Planning Partnership Strategic Staff Group | Members of key Community Planning strategic groups, including Community Planning Partnership Board, Core Partners Group, Joint Officers Group, Coalfield Communities Federation, East Ayrshire (North) Communities Federation, and Research, Information and Performance Working Group. | 59 | 42 | 7 | 4 |
| Fire | Strathclyde Fire and Rescue | A representative sample (2%) of Strathclyde Fire and Rescue staff, not routinely involved in Community Planning. | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Police | Strathclyde Police | A representative sample (2%) of Strathclyde Police staff, not routinely involved in Community Planning. | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| CHP | Community Health Partnership | A representative sample (2%) of CHP staff, not routinely involved in Community Planning. | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| NHS | NHS Ayrshire and Arran | A representative sample (2%) of NHS Ayrshire and Arran staff, not routinely involved in Community Planning. | 143 | 38 | 4 | 1 |
| SEA | Scottish Enterprise Ayrshire | A representative sample (2%) of Scottish Enterprise Ayrshire staff, not routinely involved in Community Planning. | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 |