

HAMPSHIRE PPRN NETWORK  
New Forest District Council Committee Room 4  
19<sup>th</sup> January 2007 10 am

**Attendees**

Chris Tee, HCC;  
Bev Elliott, East Dorset  
Lisa Blair, East Hants  
Andy Rudd, Havant  
Julie Petty, Gosport  
Catherine Hegerty, Test Valley  
Sarah McClaren, Hart  
Heidi Marshall, IOW  
Janice Brill, Basingstoke  
Karen Witt, Southampton  
Dottie Dabrowska, NFDC

**Apologies**

Phil Rayner, Fareham  
Robert Chambers, East Hants  
Jackie Adams, Winchester

## **MINUTES**

### **1 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING, 15<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, GOSPORT**

The minutes were agreed. No issues arising outside of the agenda for the meeting.

### **2 THE STEERING GROUP - HOW CAN WE MAKE THIS WORK BETTER?**

There was a general discussion about the steering group. It was agreed that the steering group added value to the development of the PPRN agenda as it ensured that the topics and issues were up to date and relevant to the majority of authorities.

Due to timings and other commitments it is sometimes difficult to get more than 2 people to the steering group meetings and it was agreed that more volunteers were needed for the group to keep up the numbers and maintain the dynamics.

Karen Witt (Southampton), Chris Tee (HCC) and Heidi Marshall (IOW) all expressed an interest in getting more involved.

**ACTION:** Steering group meeting dates would be circulated more widely to the group

### **3 SERVICE PLANNING SURGERY**

Basingstoke and New Forest presented their service planning processes. There were then two separate workshops to address the key issues and problems for each authority.

### **Key learning for Basingstoke included:**

- At present there is a lot of information in the Plans, some of which is probably unnecessary and can be stripped out of hard copies. Suggestions included:
  - Moving towards a simple one page approach focusing on links to corporate priorities, a summary of the 'day job', key outcomes, PI's and headline budget
  - Making use of technology to provide an electronic service plan, hyperlinking to existing sources of electronic information (e.g. organisations charts, PI's, budgets) to avoid duplication
  - Include focus on key improvement
- In terms of process the timetable at Basingstoke is for completion of the Plans in the period January to March. This means they cannot realistically inform budget setting. Consideration should be given to running their review in parallel with the budget cycle. Growth aspirations can then be included so that Members responsible for budget setting can realise the impact of agreeing / not agreeing
- Different ideas were floated about how to ensure responsibility / accountability:
  - Portfolio Holder engaged in development of plans
  - Plans go to Scrutiny Committee, with the Head of Service and Portfolio Holder having to present
  - Scrutiny Member aligned to specific services, so they can get involved too
  - Report to Performance Board or equivalent on how service are doing on achieving key improvement results, and priority actions
  - Monthly meetings with the Head of Service and CX to look at risk, budgets, performance etc...
- Generally staff were engaged through workshops, team meetings and away days – this was considered critical in ensuring ownership
- There is scope for external challenge in service planning, from other councils or perhaps by engaging business partners or customers to give their views – could the PPRN take a more active peer review role?

### **Key learning for New Forest included:**

- Service plans need to be more outcome focussed – Hart, Winchester and IOW were already developing systems to achieve this.
- Services need to be more accountable if service plans are going to deliver improvements – many authorities have already implemented or implementing some level of performance board – good examples at IOW, Test Valley.
- Most performance boards are pitched at heads of service and senior management level, with some member involvement ie leader
- Many authorities have monthly meetings with senior management team to discuss key issues around performance – when performance improvement is being driven from the top it happens
- Some authorities were challenging service plans and reviews using critical friends – it was thought there was some potential to do this within the PPRN network

Some of the group were interested in potential joint working on software procurement – as budgets would be difficult issue for some Excelsis was a potential option. An offer has also been made by Corvu to discuss opportunities with the group.

Overall the surgery was felt to have been very useful. It was suggested that future meetings should open the 'surgery' to any performance management issues.

#### **ACTIONS:**

- All agreed they would be interested in taking/ providing opportunities as critical friends
- To consider the procurement options for the Network for next meeting, particularly Excelsis and Corvu
- Offer suggestions for a surgery to all authorities on any key issues arising for the next 2 meetings

#### **4 BVPI SURVEYS – OUTCOMES, POTENTIAL LEARNING AND ISSUES ARISING**

Marketing Means have offered to present the key findings to the authorities who used their services. It was suggested that the next PPRN meeting might be a useful forum to achieve this, as it would still provide some interest to those who were not involved.

NFDC also offered to collate the results for the general survey for the whole of Hampshire. The group agreed this would be a useful task.

Any decisions on learning could be taken once the analysis had been completed/ presented.

**ACTION:** All authorities to provide data to NFDC

#### **5 BVPI COLLATION – FEEDBACK AND POTENTIAL FOR FUTURE ACTIVITY**

Several authorities had used the data and found it very useful.

It was felt there was potential to make this data more up to date and regular through out the year. As not all indicators were relevant for more than annual collection it was agreed that the network would aim to agree a list of key indicators that would be useful for quarterly collection. Issues were raised about data quality, however, it was agreed that this information would have the caveat of being un-audited. Any significant anomalies could also be identified and clarified.

**ACTION:** Authorities would submit their top 20 indicators to Dottie for quarterly collation during 2007/08 to be discussed at the next meeting.

#### **6 THE WHITE PAPER**

There was a brief general discussion around the issues facing local government following the white paper. The group did not feel that there was anything significant it could contribute at this stage although it felt that the local performance dimension will be an important element of future activity.

It was suggested that the Local Area Agreement coordinator, Sue Sylvester, based at HCC, could be invited to the next meeting to outline the position so far and how the PPRN could get involved/ support the LAA

**ACTION:** Chris Tee to talk to Sue Sylvester about attending the next PPRN meeting

## **7 USE OF RESOURCES – GENERAL FEEDBACK FROM THE GROUP**

There was a general discussion around experiences and current position on VFM assessment. On the whole, experiences had been positive with the majority of assessments still underway. Outcomes of these assessments may form part of a future PPRN meeting.

Examples of other VFM activity underway includes:

Fareham:	Using their VFM framework – having meetings on assessments. Good progress being made
Basingstoke:	Undertaken efficiency peer review. View website for feedback
Hart:	Undertaking a service review programme based on both a customer and efficiency focus

## **8 UPDATES FROM OTHER MEETINGS:**

SPIN	Next meeting in Chichester
HIOWA	Director for Improvement, Vanda Leary, has been appointed. It is hoped that she will be available to attend a future PPRN meeting to outline her role and identify if there are any areas we can work together/ support each other.

## **9 AOB**

Test Valley is undertaking a Vulnerable People review. Please respond to Catherine Hegerty by email if you have any information on accessibility and barriers to access

NFDC has identified some discrepancies between the word and pdf versions of the BVPI guidance in particular with regard to BV66c and d. The Audit Commission have advised to view their PDF version and they will issue amendments in due course

IOW looking for examples of performance management strategies and frameworks  
The following example is from Basingstoke BC:

<http://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/E6B7D789-C4A2-4ECE-8EFE-DFE57BA9DCA9/0/PolicyandPerformanceManagementFrameworkOct2006Webversion.doc>

## **9 FUTURE MEETINGS:**

April/ May	Basingstoke – 25 <sup>th</sup> May 10am
Sept/ Oct	Havant – 12 <sup>th</sup> October 10am