

Finance Committee

Prevention

Submission from Partnership & Development Team, Glasgow City Council

Response

What are the main barriers to change and how do we address them in order to accelerate the rate of progress?

One of the main barriers has been the planning, integration and sharing of budgets across public bodies and their voluntary and community partners. Whilst CPP Partners are now much more collaborative in identifying and agreeing joint priorities and outcomes, implementing the level of collaboration needed to take forward identifying and agreeing joint budgets to underpin these has been more of a challenge. Where we have managed to do this we are now looking at “scaling up”.

Barriers remain, with organisations, understandably, still tend to prioritise allocation of resources around their own priorities and strategies, There are constraints on the scope for staff at all levels to try out different approaches with Partners and communities.

Organisations now largely acknowledge the longer term benefits, and potential for savings, of diverting resources toward more preventative activities.

However, they often struggle to divert significant resources toward these activities. There are a number of reasons for this including e.g. they may have statutory duties to provide particular types and levels of existing services (which may be tied to performance targets), or they may be committed to existing performance targets, which their governing body has approved, and for which they are accountable. In addition, it may be difficult to align budget cycles. It remains easier to agree joint resources on capital projects or on short term pathfinders or pilots, that long term commitment to joint budgeting.

Effective data sharing continues to be problematic in some areas of work. Its absence can be a barrier to change and inhibit the type and range of creative solutions that CPP Partners could adopt to addressing a range of challenges.

We have made some progress, including finding “work arounds” e.g. in the ‘One Glasgow’ Re-offending work stream.

In addition, there is still a lack of clarity about what financial models could be put in place to establish how any resources or savings freed up further down the line (as a result of re-profiling activities into earlier intervention) could then be re-invested back into the system to further improve statutory services or introduce more innovative services. This is further complicated when two or more different organisations are involved in delivering services to communities. To be more specific, there are unresolved issues regarding who makes the extra additional investment, on the one hand, as opposed to who benefits longer term from the expected outcomes any reduction in demand for services and potential cost saving? In other words, who gets to benefit from the saving? How can we develop a fair and balanced model to apportion and share what are essentially “joint” savings? If one partner simply “banks” the savings for themselves, what incentive is there for other partners to continue, or ideally expand, such a collaborative approach. We need to find a model which addresses this issue if we want to “scale up” such initiatives.

To try to remove these barriers and accelerate progress, in Glasgow we have progressed with a ‘joint resourcing’ exercise around three of our SOA priorities – alcohol, youth employment and homelessness. CPP Partners have sought to establish what exactly we are individually and collectively investing around these themes across the board (both in financial terms and specific types of services). We have matched this against the evidence of demand for services as it currently stands to assess whether the level and type of services provided actually meets the current demand. An assessment of the level and type of preventative approaches has also been undertaken around these themes. The next phase for these types of activity will be to establish how we can learn from this to better plan and integrate future budgets and resources around our joint priorities.

Within a community context, we have tested out a participatory or community budgeting approach in the city by running a number of pilot exercises over the past 18 months or so. The Council and its CPP Partners have looked at a small number of different approaches to Community Budgeting and have also looked at the types and levels of budgets that could be used to facilitate progress. The aim is to increase community involvement in genuine and significant budget planning and decision making around resources, thus supporting genuine community empowerment.

How do we ensure that the necessary culture change and greater levels of integration takes place?

There are a number of practical ways to improve cultural change and also greater integration between different agencies. Firstly, CPPs should encourage greater secondment opportunities between agencies and also the formation of multi-agency teams around specific projects or to deliver upon specific outcomes. In Glasgow, we have achieved significant results by encouraging different CPP Partners to take the

lead on priorities and outcomes that sit outside their natural core business. E.g. Fire & Rescue leading on an employability and community justice project in the Gorbals.

Another area where Partners in Glasgow have invested in is around the relationship between statutory public Partners and Third Sector Partners. The existence of the Third Sector Interface and the development of the Glasgow Third Sector Forum have been instrumental in improving relationships and providing clarity about the role of the Third Sector in the Community planning process. Specifically, the Forum provides a vehicle to engage with other CPP Partners about the specific contribution that Third Sector organisations can make to delivering against shared outcomes, including taking the lead around particular types of activity on behalf of the Partnership.

Capacity Building and support for Community Representatives across the Partnership is also an important tool to help improve the involvement and contribution of residents and community groups on Partnerships. This is vitally important as they can provide a legitimacy and grass roots community viewpoint in relation to service development, delivery and transformation. Greater empowerment of residents and community groups can hopefully lead to higher levels of involvement and confidence within Communities, establishing them as equal partners within the CPP process.

The Community Empowerment Act also has the potential to encourage greater integration of agencies and staff around our shared CPP Priorities. It also provides a potential mechanism for Communities and groups to become more involved (and on an equal footing) with decision making and resource allocation.

What opportunities does digital technology provide in reforming the delivery of public services towards prevention?

Digital technology has a central role in improving the planning and development of public services and specifically prevention. It can facilitate greater data sharing and integration that can lead to better insight around an issue, potentially leading to the development of more innovative solutions. Secondly, it can improve community involvement and empowerment through the development of digital solutions that particular members of the community might find more engaging and informative.

Technology can provide a platform to share data around particular issues and outcomes and can enable the greater visualisation and analysis of data that can potentially lead to greater insight into an issue – for example it can provide an open platform for researchers to identify and make connections between different issues. By joining together different data, it can be used to predict where, when and how

situations may arise which can help organisations to plan and respond, including making earlier interventions and the more efficient deployment of resources.

From a community perspective, better technology, fostering an open data ethos, and the greater sharing and analysis of data can improve community involvement and understanding. In Glasgow, we have developed a number of examples building on the recent Future City Demonstrator programme, where community specific projects have been advanced. Community residents have been active in helping CPP partners to build up asset maps within local communities which can be used by both residents and services to better understand local areas and also potential approaches to service delivery. The use of on-line tools such as phone apps, have made such solutions much more accessible to the general public.

How should Community Planning be developed to support service integration and the focus on prevention?

Some of the legislative changes within the Community Empowerment Act can provide an opportunity for CPPs to support integration and a subsequent focus on prevention. A greater focus on locality planning between all partners including residents can support this at a neighbourhood level. CPPs should therefore be encouraged to develop inclusive locality plans that recognise all of the potential assets at the disposal of the Partnership including the talent, energy and commitment of local residents themselves as well as the budgets and resources of statutory agencies and voluntary sector partners.

In Glasgow, the Partnership is developing a local 'Thriving Places' approach to locality planning across nine initial neighbourhoods, utilising all of the available assets in each community to develop local plans that address a number of local issues. These issues have been identified in Partnership between statutory agencies, third sector partners and residents themselves, as have potential solutions such as different ways of working and use of resources. Often, the issues identified have aligned directly with the prevention and early intervention agendas such as how to improve the experiences and opportunities for young school children or how to support older people in communities to prevent further isolation and mental health issues.

As outlined on page 2 of this response, CPPs should be encouraged to adopt a joint resourcing approach to budget planning around an agreed and shared set of joint outcomes.

What are the implications for the provision of public services if the decisive shift to prevention does not take place?

The most likely implications will include not being able to deliver against our stated outcomes and including a reduction in the level and standard of services for residents. The likelihood is that there will be more frequent difficult decisions to make around whether to invest in one particular type of service rather than another.

There could be more continued cost shunting within and between organisations in order to try to maintain core services and to balance books which won't provide the space to develop the types of innovative and new services required to underpin the preventative approach to public service development.