

# Local Strategic Partnership

## Review report

---

Review number     1  
Review date        11 June to 23 July 2008  
Reporting Adviser   Philip Braide

---

## **Background**

This is an evaluation of the collaborative capacity of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) known as Plymouth 2020.

## **Methodology**

A group of eight professionals drawn from inside and outside the LSP undertook the evaluation. Those professionals from outside the LSP included a Principal Education Adviser and two Senior Education Advisers from the Department of Children's Service (Lifelong Learning), Operations Manager of the Chamber of Commerce & Industry and a Principal Auditor from Plymouth City Council. Those inside the LSP included the LSP Manager, a Researcher (Plymouth University) and a Community Representative. Data and evidence was collected by semi-structured interview either face-to-face or over the telephone and through document analysis.

Interviews were conducted with members of the LSP Board and Executive including councillors, the Chief Executive of Plymouth City Council, chairs of the four theme groups and other representatives of stakeholders. Documents regarding the LSP's publicity and business were also analysed.

A case study of the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund was undertaken to show key activity of the LSP. Each section of the report concludes with an evaluation of NRF work.

Over 200 hours was spent gathering, synthesising and evaluating information. From this the team of evaluators has drawn together corporate judgements based on a framework for the evaluation of collaborations. The judgements and commentary are contained in this report.

## **Context**

LSPs were promoted by government to focus on development in key areas, attracting funding through neighbourhood renewal grant. "The Local Strategic Partnership (Plymouth 2020 Partnership) is a city wide partnership for Plymouth. It brings together key representatives from each of the public, private, community and voluntary sectors to work together to make Plymouth a successful city."

The aims of the LSP are contained within the Sustainable Community Strategy which looks ahead to 2020. These long term priorities are determined as best addressed through partnership working rather than by a single organisation working alone.

The shared strategic objectives are:

### Healthy

- Improving health and well being
- Promoting inclusive communities

#### Wealthy

- Developing a prosperous economy
- Developing an effective transport system

#### Safe and Strong

- Promoting community safety
- Maintaining a clean and sustainable environment

#### Wise

- Raising educational achievement
- Stimulating culture and leisure activities.

The medium term delivery plan includes the Local Area Agreement (LAA) which sets out starting points and targets for improvement over a three year period, focusing on priorities. Plymouth City Council is the accountable body for the LAA and is responsible for ensuring that it is produced to the right standard and involves the right people.

### Context of the collaboration grade 2

## Components of Effectiveness

### 1. Shared Purpose

*This section of the report looks at whether or not the collaboration has clear vision, aims and objectives; the fundamental building blocks of any collaboration. The key question is to what extent all the partners “buy-in” to the vision and how well it is understood by customers/clients. This section inquires into how vision, aims and objectives inform plans that have specific outcomes and are effectively managed. It then follows that the collaboration must have clarity of roles and responsibilities and efficient communication channels.*

The vision of Plymouth as a vibrant waterfront city is articulated by all. There is a broad consensus that the vision is known. Although the vision is clear perceptions vary according to the role of the person. A recently appointed board member is clear about the vision. Other members of the collaboration and those slightly outside the key groups are less clear. Communication of vision is problematic outside the LSP.

Theme group strategic co-ordinators know the aims and objectives of their theme groups and are clear about their role however there is no comprehensive understanding of the delivery of programmes to the stakeholders. The view of some interviewed is that the collaboration is more about process than delivery. Some community representatives say they are clear about the role they play, others less so. Members representing the voluntary sector feel more disadvantaged and not valued by the LSP.

There is some misunderstanding about the role of the Executive group and its relationship with the theme groups. The Executive group is described as too big and lacking in focus.

Many respondents are unclear about the different roles of the Board and Executive. There is a significant view that the Executive group lacks an operational clarity of purpose and for some respondents it is difficult to establish what it does. Additional confusion lies around whether the right people are involved.

At Executive and Board level there are too many people and it is unclear what their contribution is or whether objectives are known. At Executive it was stated, "we represent our organisations but not our themes". There is felt to be too much duplication at Board and Executive level and that these groups are PCC dominated. People can be at meetings as passengers, in essence just there to keep an eye on things. There needs to be a change in expectation about the contributions made and a clear accountability on them. Some people send deputies with no decision-making authority, which is considered to be a waste of time by others.

The majority of partners fulfil their roles in the collaboration although there appears to be little accountability at Board or the Executive level for the 2020 outcomes. Some officers within Plymouth City Council find it hard to understand the link to the LSP particularly in relationship to their day job.

Barriers to progress include inconsistent communication and the use of complex language. There is a lack of consistency at present and although communication channels are in place they lack effectiveness. Communication at Board level however is good and fit for purpose. Although internal communication is not well targeted it is effective enough between groups.

Overall communication with external partners is weak and internal communication is not well targeted and often seen as burdensome. Different groups communicate differently and use different formats, creating confusion. Communication beyond the theme groups and particularly with the private sector is far less effective and is an area for improvement. Community and voluntary sectors feel less well provided for and jargon is a specific barrier to understanding. The communication process must better reflect the acceptance of Plymouth as a multicultural city.

Theme groups are establishing their remit increasingly effectively. Key individuals have been hand picked for their role. Lead roles appear to be with the right individuals although the community and voluntary sector are the only group where members were voted for. There is currently a lack of sharing of good practice between the groups and supporting papers are better understood if they are closely linked to a person's main role.

In some cases there were views expressed that the collaboration was too big. The roles of individuals at different levels remain unclear and are undertaken differently. There is insufficient induction for new people. A typical view expressed by a member of the wealthy sector was that no planned induction into his group was arranged and he had to do his own research.

The Council is the accountable body and the partnership has been created to distribute the way aims, objectives and plans are approached. At present not all sectors feel equally valued and the lack of engagement of the voluntary sector is considered to be of most concern.

There is lack of clarity over the relationship between Plymouth 2020 vision and planning to achieve the shorter-term LAA targets. Planning for the long-term vision is complex and too easily confused with LAA plans. The LAA is well known and has clear targets.

The revised 2008/11 LAA represents a framework by which partnership performance against a range of locally and nationally agreed targets is assessed. The targets link to a new government National Indicator Set (NIS) of 198 indicators and the LAA identifies challenging targets for their improvement, with a cash reward for delivering on 'stretched' targets (previously known as Local Public Service Agreements).

Planning within each theme group is underway but there is no single plan and work between groups is in its infancy.

### **Case Study**

All those interviewed felt that there were clear aims and objectives and purpose to the panel. Most people also felt that there was a strong, shared vision about narrowing the gap between the most deprived neighbourhoods and tackling inequality. Three years ago the panel was set up to commission projects but there was a significant underspend. Following this, Terms of Reference were created and the panel given responsibility for the overall management of the NRF. The change in Terms of Reference ensured clear lines of responsibility for decisions to fund projects and the Council's External Programmes Team managed the process on a daily basis. The four LSP Theme Leads were responsible for bringing project proposals to the table. The 'back office' team of staff, the External Programmes Team, spent time making sure that funded projects met the original NRF Floor Target Action Plans. There is strong agreement amongst panel members that in the last two years this was extremely effective way of working. Communication between partners appeared to be excellent with Theme Leads meeting regularly in between meetings to discuss projects. Theme Leads were also in regular contact with projects and with the External Programmes Team. One area of weakness was that panel members were unaware of any reporting mechanisms to the wider LSP with the Chair saying that 'nothing ever went back to the Executive' from the panel. None of those interviewed appear to be aware of any future plans to enable the Theme Leads to continue to meet in this way, One Theme Lead said it had been recommended that they continue to meet but that this had been ignored.

### **Overall shared purpose grade 3**

## **2. Learning, innovation and enquiry of collaborations**

*Learning, innovation and enquiry comments specifically on planning. The section considers how rigorous and realistic the collaborative planning systems are and how they lead to successful and focused outcomes to show how the partnership establishes the balance between service provision and client/customer-centred*

*outcomes or impact, the use of appropriate benchmarks and milestones as well as the intelligent application of data. Linked to this to how embedded are staff performance management systems and the links to high quality training. Combined these features decide the rigor of self-evaluation.*

The theme groups have strategic plans for the immediate future although no action plans have been seen by the reviewing group. Safe and Strong have good plans for late night Plymouth. Wealthy were still writing their plan at the time of interviewing and members could not say where they were in terms of their plan. Wealthy have a complex structure, sectors meet separately and report to the Chair of the Board.

Members of these groups are clear that they are about strategy, not delivery. Wealthy and Wise are linking together, growing trust to develop collaborative work.

Although strategies exist, there are no action plans that focus on outcomes, have explicitly defined quantified performance criteria or timescales. For example the plans outlined in the Securing the Future for Generations Ahead document list success in broad terms such as “Residents think that parks and open spaces have improved” or “more local people go onto higher education from school” but none of the statements are quantified or have milestones to measure success over time. Planning does not yet go beyond each individual theme group.

The performance monitoring process lacks ownership across the partnership as participants have little knowledge of any self-evaluation process. There was some self-evaluation in the NRF programme. Performance criteria are based on achieving targets and little assessment exists as to the impact of partnership working on outcomes.

Partnership data collection and data sharing has improved significantly from 2004/05. Plymouth 2020 has built relationships with a range of data providers across the city. The identification of appropriate responsible data officers for each organisation has been critical in improving data sharing. The collection of data for the Plymouth Informed Website ([www.plymouth-informed.org.uk](http://www.plymouth-informed.org.uk)), currently managed by Plymouth City Council, has been improved through Plymouth 2020 Partnership.

Building on these protocols, and existing relationships, data analysts for many of the partnership organisations now meet regularly through the newly formed Plymouth Analyst Network (PAN). At this forum data officers across the city are able to make each other aware of forthcoming work, opportunities for partnership working and also act as a signposting facility to those who are seeking data within the city.

Plymouth 2020 Partnership is represented in this meeting and often uses it as a mechanism for identifying and discussing forthcoming data requirements and securing agreement for partnership data provision.

There remains however, a lack of consistency in the use of data across the organisation. Data is focussed on the short term and longer-term objectives are bereft of quantifiable measures. Data systems are not matched to the relevant group and this does not enable

them to focus on long term / medium term outcomes. Allied to this there is a lack of understanding of data. The Quality of Life Indicators supporting the Sustainable Community Strategy, although published, have not been incorporated into the business of the LSP.

While Plymouth 2020 Partnership has developed a range of mechanisms for data collection and increased data sharing within the partnership a number of issues remain to be overcome. One key barrier to data sharing is the lack of common geography between all providers. In Plymouth, a local neighbourhood geography was developed in 2001 and implemented by Plymouth City Council, Primary Care Trust and Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, among others. However, the introduction of a conflicting super output areas (SOAs) geography, following the release of the 2001 census results, means that some data providers are not able to produce data at a geographical level that complements Plymouth's neighbourhoods.

Both nationally and locally, issues of data collection have arisen around the collection of equality data. For example, identifying the differential impact that interventions have on people of different race, faith and belief, sexuality, age, gender can be challenging. There is currently a national statutory responsibility to address this challenge. Plymouth has taken steps towards addressing this challenge, in particular Plymouth City Council's Social Inclusion Unit, working through Plymouth 2020 Partnership have commissioned a citywide BME Cataloguing Study.

### **Case Study**

Long serving panel members interviewed agreed that during the first year there was a lack of financial and performance management. Systems were tightened leading to two final years where the overall management of the programme was more effective. Paperwork was praised for being clear, focusing on project progress and giving accurate financial information. Those interviewed felt they had learned an immense amount about other theme groups, leading to some innovative, crosscutting projects. Many people mentioned the level of 'challenge' at meetings. Each Theme Lead was questioned in depth about how their projects would give the widest possible benefit across all themes. The only performance indicator used was whether or not the money was spent. Some felt there was too much emphasis on getting the money spent to the detriment of focussing on the vision. This was hindered by the changing agenda of the government when floor targets were dropped for the LAA targets.

The External Programmes Team was responsible for project monitoring and gathering data on outcomes. However these were only reported to the panel where there was poor project performance. One major concern is that learning that took place regarding spending on the basis of sound quantifiable evidence has been lost and the Transitional Working Neighbourhoods Funding has been spent on the basis of self-interest within the LSP Executive.

### **Overall learning, innovation and enquiry grade 4**

### **3. Trust**

*Trust comments on how the diverse partnership works together resolving conflicts and disagreements through formal and informal agreements, protocols, governance and Service*

*Level Agreements. The section considers how the collaboration respects diversity ensuring that all views and opinions are heard and valued. Lastly there is a consideration of how well the collaboration recognises success, shares and celebrates its achievements. This judges how well the collaboration holds together through the ups-and-downs of its existence.*

The LSP allows PCC to work in an influencing role with other partners. Council officers feel they are engaged in partnership working however some external partners do not agree with this sentiment. The private sector questions the balance of PCC membership against its own. The third sector feel they are only included because they have to be.

Although the LSP was set up formally it has led to improved informal trust between some key partners. Development of informal trust at senior leader level has also had significant beneficial effects. Informal trust between members is strong and successfully promotes a better city wide approach.

There is significant commitment from the Police who see the LSP as an added value partnership. For example informal links established between police and minority ethnic community leaders through LSP involvement has improved relationships.

Formal trust arrangements such as SLAs, protocols, governance and agreements, are in place but not always followed. Terms of reference are agreed but not referred to which contributes to the lack of clarity over the role of different organisational layers within the LSP. There are differences of opinion around the effectiveness of formal and informal trust. Informal trust is apparent where partners have willingly given time for collaboration in order to make the partnership work. This additional time cost commitment is increasingly dependent on achieving positive outcomes. Sometimes Council processes are cited as a potential barrier to progress as they are seen to slow activity down.

Good networking has developed strong informal trust within theme groups. Breakfast meetings are seen as valuable and have enabled Chairs of theme groups to develop cohesion. Informal trust has developed and strengthened for individuals through these meetings.

The imbalance of membership, particularly the number of public sector representatives is an issue for some, the third sector feeling they are tolerated rather than engaged with. There is a range of views amongst third sector members, some feel they are fully engaged, some feel disenfranchised, whilst others do not see the LSP as an important priority. There is recognition within the LSP Board and Executive that third sector partners feel more distant. A view expressed by third sector representative is that communication remains mono cultural.

Although there has been a celebration of success it is limited to the NRF. The LSP showcase forum was well received by respondents and the newsletter mentioned positively.

### **Case Study**

Those interviewed said that there was the same level of engagement by all partners. The NRF Project Manager ensured that council departments became engaged. Several people

mentioned the 'good focused agenda' and the 'lively debates'. The meetings were 'well run bringing people together those who were committed to the work, people with the right knowledge and understanding of the issues'. Several people mentioned that there was real challenge at the meetings and that all projects were thoroughly scrutinised. The External Programmes Team was responsible for carrying out thorough project appraisals and visited every project to ensure it had the capacity to deliver the outcomes. The Finance Department also provided advice to individual projects about how they were expected to report and audit requirements this was appreciated by project managers. It was felt by all those interviewed that good work was completed in particular, people got to know each other well owing to the frequency of the meetings. This enabled the development of good relationships, which carried on outside meetings leading to projects being developed between themes. The success of the NRF programme has been shared with a major LSP event in May 2008, a 'Successes Booklet' and a regular newsletter.

**Overall trust grade 2**

#### **4. Leadership and Management**

*This section comments on the style of leadership and management. It considers the efficacy of communication channels, networking, negotiating, conflict resolution and risk taking as well as the motivation of partners. It highlights the distribution of leadership throughout the collaboration particularly to deliver efficient services and to sustain the collaboration. It includes reflection on how realistic planning for sustainability is a significant feature of the collaboration.*

The LSP was set up with cross party agreement and it is likely to continue should political change occur. The senior council leadership view is of 'gradually leaving the partnership to work for itself' even though it is centred on the council which is the accountable body. By giving up control for influence the council is encouraging greater innovation and risk taking within the partnership. This improves the potential for sustainability.

Most theme groups see this as a welcome development however some comments from the wealthy group suggest the LSP is too risk averse. It is claimed that risk aversion prevents action, 'leaving creative types disengaged'. It was felt there is a need to encourage creativity towards longer-term goals and currently the partnership was not aspirational enough. There remains a perception of a cumbersome decision making framework.

There is a good level of delegated leadership. Theme group Chairpersons have been well chosen from a range of organisations providing distributed leadership. Although strategic plans are partly in place, the partnership does not use the extensive leadership and facilitative skills available, to translate them into operational actions at the lower levels of the organisation. The LSP is also seen by some of the partners as reactive to challenges set by GOSW rather than its own local agenda.

Administrative support given to the LSP is good. Administrative staff are to some extent disenfranchised, as LAA short termism has overtaken long-term priorities. Progress towards

longer-term vision is inadequate and this is a barrier to the LSP Manager championing the Plymouth 2020 vision. Through expediency to respond to short-term goals the role of the LSP has to some extent been marginalised. Entrenched attitudes towards the council are perpetuating the perception that council officers and the council's systems are not able to respond to the new partnership environment.

### Case Study

Many of those interviewed mentioned how well run the meetings were, in particular how good the Chair and Vice-Chair were at running meetings. This was achieved partly through pre-meeting planning sessions with the Chair, Vice-Chair and NRF Project Manager in which they examined the agenda to anticipate any difficulties that might require additional information. The style of the meetings was relaxed and open and everyone felt able to contribute. It was felt by most people that the panel acted as a group of equals, 'everyone was a leader', 'everyone did their best'. One person felt that the theme leads acted like a group of 'elders', with other people acting in an advisory capacity. One person mentioned that there was no hierarchy but a consensus was reached with good humour, even when people disagreed. Most people felt that the theme leads responded well to new ideas and were not precious about projects if an alternative proposal came to the table.

Several people mentioned that in the last year a lot of work was done to mainstream projects resulting in 75% of projects carrying on after the end of NRF.

## Overall leadership and management grade 2

### 5. Impact

*This section considers how the collaboration uses the resources available to it i.e. how resources are pooled, distributed and deployed for the purposes of collaboration namely the seamless provision of services to customers/client. It shows how economies of scale and the principles of best value are applied within the collaboration to achieve collaborative advantage. It summarises the moral imperative that sustains the collaboration, as only five areas of focus were possible. The areas relating to customer focus did not fall within the remit of this particular evaluation. There are limits to this section.*

It is difficult to differentiate between LSP and Council resources. Time is identified as the only pooled resource where employers pay for staff to attend meetings and lead projects. Grant funding for LSP projects is unclear particularly now that NRF has ended. A third sector strategy was commissioned in June 2007 for the partnership to establish an understanding of the importance of the sector in supporting the social inclusion agenda and in service delivery. As yet this has not impacted on the work of the LSP.

There are insufficient examples beyond the NRF of pooled resources to make a judgement on the impact of funding on the partnership. There has been no investment in the infrastructure for theme groups however there are examples of pooling of resources to establish the mainstreaming of NRF initiatives. The Safe and Strong theme have been involved in pooling resources to deliver Headcams and CCTV enhancements. Further steps in this direction are underway through the adoption of shared risk between PCC and the Police.

The council recognises that it cannot drive the economic development of the city on its own and therefore has to work with partners who have defined roles and shared accountabilities. Recognition that agencies cannot deliver priorities alone appears to be clear but again there is little evidence outside NRF to support the impact of the LSP.

Theme groups scrutinise performance quarterly and concentrate on areas of underperformance however it is unclear as to what the success factors are. From the interviews undertaken the following aspects were noted. Safe & Strong sees a strength in the data available but too often it is inaccurate, late and lacks transparency. Wealthy does not have data, which appears to be a national problem. Healthy experiences a lack of precision in the data that is available. Wise do not have performance indicators beyond those of national government. There are no published milestones, which help to define the performance or progress towards the objectives of the LSP up to 2020.

Working Neighbourhoods Transitional Fund distribution has been decided without a transparent plan or clear approach to the management and placing of the work inside the LSP partnership.

**Overall impact grade 3**

### **Case Study**

All those interviewed felt that the projects funded by NRF had made a real difference to people's lives. The External Programmes Team collected data for each project – monthly reports, quarterly claims and annual progress reports.

The theme leads were in close contact with their projects and were aware of the impact they were having. Originally proposals had been drawn up using data from the index of deprivation and various existing strategies.

There is some published information on achievements in the Successes Booklet, which gives quantitative data. However, there was no systematic qualitative approach to evaluation across projects. At the start there was a requirement for match funding of projects so during that period there was some pooling of funds across partner organisations. After the requirement was dropped theme leads invested a lot of time into the programme, which was not externally funded. There was a belief that although the funding was the imperative for the panel to meet, it was a relatively small amount. The panel members were involved because they believed in the need to make a difference in deprived neighbourhoods.

### **6. Value for Money**

*Assessment of the value for money is made by considering how the needs and complexities in delivery are improving outcomes and services. A consideration is given to how confident the partners in the collaboration are that value for money criteria is assisting self improvement.*

The LSP appears to be at a critical point. The goodwill and commitment exercised by partners needs successful delivery of outcomes to keep engagement strong. Benefits need to be realised and disseminated to show impact and effectiveness. It is necessary to be seen to be successful and therefore important that the LSP badges its own projects clearly.

There is anxiety about the ending of NRF as it acted as an effective focus for project management and impact. The neighbourhood approach appears to be being lost as NRF ends and the focus dissipates. Without direct grant money action may prove to be limited. For the LSP to realise itself as an organisation of potential it is going to need strategic long term drivers beyond the immediacy of the LAA..

### **Case Study**

It was felt that in the last two years the financial management systems in place were extremely effective and that everyone was very conscious of the need to use the funding for the greatest impact. Theme leads were asked to put time into ensuring that their projects had outcomes across several themes. Many people mentioned that the panel greatly enhanced their ability to do their day jobs.

Panel members lack clarity as to how the strategy on tackling inequalities will be taken forward by the LSP now that NRF has gone. Several mentioned the Area Based Grant and said they felt some of this might be ring-fenced for partnership work. In particular it was felt that information about why the NRF panel was successful was never communicated up to the LSP Executive and lessons have not been learned.

### **7. Collaborative Advantage**

*This comments on how widespread the agreement is across the collaboration that the important issues facing the organisation cannot be tackled individually, "the moral imperative to tackle issues together".*

The principles of collaboration are not overtly known or incorporated in the articles and processes of the LSP but the concept of partnership appears to be shared and trust is evident. There is recognition of the moral imperative to tackle issues together particularly at Board level and in the council's senior leadership. At present the LSP is one based upon strategic direction and shared purpose however there is little evidence of significant outcomes at this point in time. There is a lack of published milestones beyond 2011 and progress towards achieving the long-term vision is at risk.

### **Case Study**

All those interviewed strongly recommended that there should be some sort of cross-theme group under the Local Area Agreement to look at delivering partnership work. One person summed it up as 'one of the best partnership groups that I have had to work with', another as a 'shining light' in the LSP.

**Overall collaborative advantage grade 3**

## Recommendations

- The immediate implementation of the recent communication strategy is necessary to bring about improved consistency, organisation and clarity for each of the groups and those further afield.
- Implement an induction programme for new members.
- Review and evaluate the effectiveness, purpose and impact of the Executive group particularly in the delivery of partnership work.
- Establish a common agreement and consistency around the use of data linked to the key areas of the sustainable community strategy across theme groups.
- Use the extensive leadership and facilitative skills available to the LSP, to translate strategic plans into operational actions at the lower levels of the organisation.
- Create benchmarks and milestones, which enable long term vision to be translated into short and medium term expectations and monitor progress.

**VALUE FOR MONEY - EFFECTIVENESS SET AGAINST COST****Components of Effectiveness**

<b>Context of the collaboration</b>	Very favourable	1	2	3	4	Very Unfavourable
<b>Outcomes achieved by constituent members of the collaboration:</b>						
<b>Shared purpose</b>						
i. Vision	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
ii. Aims and objectives	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iii. Defined roles for partners	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iv. Communication - internal	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
- external	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
v. Appropriate membership	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
vi. Planning	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
vii. Financial systems	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
<b>Learning, innovation &amp; enquiry</b>						
i. Planning & outcomes	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
ii. Customers & service provision	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iii. Self-evaluation (monitoring and evaluation)	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iv. Use of data	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
v. PM for staff	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
<b>Trust</b>						
i. SLAs, protocols, governance & agreements	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
ii. Conflict resolution – formal	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
- informal	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iii. Maintenance of engagement	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iv. Modification of principles and practice	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
v. Respect for diversity	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
vi. Dissemination of good practice	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
vii. Celebrating success	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
viii. Induction	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate

LSP\_ An Evaluation of the Collaboration \_report September 2008

Appendix 1  
Part 1

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	1	<b>2</b>	3	4	<b>Inadequate</b>
----------------	--------------------	---	----------	---	---	-------------------

<b>Leadership and management</b>							
i.	Leadership effectiveness	Outstanding	1	<b>2</b>	3	4	Inadequate
ii.	Collaboration skills	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
iii.	Operational success	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
iv.	Strategic thinking, innovation & flexibility	Outstanding	1	<b>2</b>	3	4	Inadequate
v.	Distributed leadership	Outstanding	1	<b>2</b>	3	4	Inadequate
vi.	Planning for sustainability	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
<b>Overall</b>		<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
<b>Impact</b>							
i.	Pooled resources	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
ii.	Economy of scale	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
iii.	Risk assessment	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
iv.	Best value principles	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
v.	Seamless services for customers/client/customers	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
vi.	Outcomes for customers / client/customers - Infrastructure	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
	- Learning & teaching	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate
vii.	Use of performance benchmarks	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
		Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
viii.	Planning informed by data	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
ix.	Principles of collaboration	Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate
<b>Overall</b>		<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
<b>Quality of outcomes provided, particularly stakeholders satisfaction.</b>		<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
<b>Previous evaluation score</b>		N/A					
<b>Change in performance since the last evaluation</b>		N/A					
<b><u>Effectiveness which stems from evaluations on the above aspects</u></b>							
<b>The overall effectiveness of the collaboration is:</b>		Outstanding	1	2	<b>3</b>	4	Inadequate

Key

Pink – no judgment made

<b><u>Unit costs</u></b>						
<b>The collaboration's expenditure cost / benefit:</b>	Very low	1	2	3	4	Very high
<b>Value for money</b>						
<b>The value for money provided by the collaboration is:</b>	Outstanding	1	2	3	4	Inadequate

Appendix 1: LSP Customer Survey Report: June 2008