

# **Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership**

## **Performance Management Framework**

### **Review at May 2005**

#### **Background**

This is the second annual performance management framework assessment that our LSP has undertaken.

The model used is the same as last year, namely the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit model but with some important modifications. In March 2005 we received new guidance, which contained two significant changes. The first is in respect of the scoring system (green, amber/green, amber/red and red) and the second is the requirement to self assess ourselves against floor targets that our LSP has never adopted as formal targets.

This having been said, none of the targets adopted by the Board, the Forums and the Partnership as a whole are inconsistent with floor targets.

#### **The Process**

The three parts of the process are:

1. Reviewing Delivery
2. Reviewing Partnership Working
3. Improvement Planning

All three were completed last year but as the guidance states that Partnership Working should only be reviewed every other year, it has not been done this time.

#### **A Performance Culture**

Recent guidance from the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit has stressed the need to embed a performance culture. Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership has long been aware of the need for action as opposed to planning. Throughout the year under review, the Board has insisted that at each Board Meeting, they receive a paper on performance in one or more of the five themes.

There is, of course, an acknowledgement that processes must be in place to facilitate delivery, particularly in respect of cementing partnership working. But there must be a balance between process and delivery.

## Performance and Targets

Delivery has been reviewed against the mandatory themes namely:

1. Health
2. Housing
3. Learning
4. Jobs
5. Crime
6. Partnership Improvement
7. Last Year's Improvement Plan

The Executive Group of the LSP has assessed, using the traffic light system, the first five of these. The sixth and seventh have been carried out by the Neighbourhood Renewal Advisor who was responsible for last year's review of Partnership Working.

All targets have been set to be stretching. We have chosen not to choose targets which we know we can achieve. We trust that the Government Office and Neighbourhood Renewal Unit judgement on our performance will acknowledge this.

## Traffic Light Assessment and Scores

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Traffic Light</b>
Health	2	Amber/Red
Housing	3	Amber/Green
Learning	2	Amber/Red
Jobs	3	Amber/Green
Crime	3	Amber/Green
Partnership Improvement	3	Amber/Red
Improvement Plan	2	Amber/Green
<b>Overall</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>Amber/Green</b>

## Reviewing Delivery

## Progress on HEALTH

### Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership : Performance Monitoring Framework

Review at April 2005

<b>Lead Person (s)</b> Dr Alistair Lipp, Director of Public Health (GYPCT)	<b>Review Date :</b>  APRIL 2005
<b>Other Partners/People Involved</b> Great Yarmouth PCT, Education Action Zone	<b>LSP Group(s)</b> e.g. theme sub-groups Great Yarmouth Partnership for Health Social Forum

<b>Strategic objective: Improve the health of the people of Great Yarmouth by reducing health inequalities across the Borough</b>							
- Below, capture how this strategic objective is broken down into individual targets							
<b>Target</b>	Base-line	Target for the year	Actual	Next Milestone and date	NRF? Y/N	<b>What is the LSP activity to meet target?</b>	<b>Scores</b>  Outcomes Plausibility
Life Expectancy						<b>NRF Contribution</b>	<b>0 = 2</b>

Males	(1994/96) 73.9	75.0	(2001/03) 75.9	(2010) 76.5	Y	<p><b>Physical Activity Referral project initially funded by NRF- has now mainstreamed by PCT</b></p> <p><b>Community Dietician included weight reduction programme initially funded by NRF has now mainstreamed by PCT</b></p> <p><b>Health and Resource Centres - revenue support funding from NRF.</b> Cobholm and Lichfield Centre is operating and runs various health sessions / activities eg smoking cessation, diabetes literature day, MS society St James Centre due to open in September 2005</p> <p><b>Mental Health for Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Migrant Workers: Research funded by NRF will help to identify barriers to use of the service</b> to increase the uptake of primary services in these groups; at present these groups are heavily using Acute Services indicating that mental health issues are not treated in the earlier stages.</p>	<u><b>P = 3</b></u>
-------	-------------------	------	-------------------	----------------	---	--	---------------------

						<p><b>Mental Health Link Nurses – small amount of NRF funding</b> for this project has dramatically reduced the number of people being seen by secondary (acute) services.</p> <p><b>Supported Activity for Individuals with Mental Health Problems:</b> capital funding from NRF has been used to provide improved facilities / activities for individuals with mental health issues.</p> <p><b>Drug and Alcohol Worker – see crime below</b></p> <p>Given that income, housing and education are all determinants of health, all LSP activity will ultimately have a bearing on life expectancy.</p>	
Smoking Quitters per 10,000	(2000)	(2002/03)	(2003/04)	(2005/06)	<b>N</b>	Development and expansion of NHS smoking cessation services particularly targeting the GP practices and other venues in more disadvantaged wards. Particular focus on supporting pregnant women to give up smoking. Better use of data recorded on GP computer systems to allow calculation of smoking prevalence rates in different wards in Gt. Yarmouth. This will allow better targeting and monitoring in priority neighbourhoods. Also working with acute services to capture more accurate data on smoking in pregnancy and to develop more effective cessation support for pregnant women who smoke.	<b>O = 4</b>
	0	15	59	77			<b>P = 4</b>
Under 75 Mortality per 100,000	(1993)	(2001)	(2002)	(2010)	<b>N</b>	Implementation of Health Promotion aspects of Diabetes, CHD & Older People's NSFs through: -Ongoing development of Smoking cessation services. -Development of a multi-agency Sports & Physical Activity Steering group as a working group of Partnership for Health which has prioritised : Improvement of the Exercise Referral Scheme's protocols and evaluation methods to provide evidence of effectiveness. -Development of Local Exercise Activity Pilot (LEAP) to improve access to and take up of physical activity opportunities and the development of Weight Management Programme which is currently being piloted in 3 practices. . -Development of a community nutrition programme targeting more socially disadvantaged communities – a cooking skills programme has been piloted and a nutrition and oral health resource has been developed for use in pre-school settings	<b>O = 2</b>
	154	122	116	87			<b>P = 4</b>

Teenage	(1998)	(2004)	(2002)	(2010)			
---------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--	--	--

Pregnancy per 1000	62.6	53.2	65.8	31.3	<p><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>NRF Contribution</b>  Family Planning Lead Nurse funded by NRF has <b>co-ordinated activity , increased accessibility of service for young people.</b></p> <p><b>Family Planning Outreach Worker funded by NRF :</b> Working in schools and other outreach venues to provide increased access to contraceptive advice – awaiting data for use of service.</p> <p><b>Young Peoples Health Centre, partly capital funded by NRF</b> is to be constructed during 2005/06 and will provided a range of services to young people including a Sexual Health Clinic which will also cover family planning issues.</p> <p><b>GFS Platform</b> provides support to young women with children, providing education in areas around sexual health. <b>NRF funding has been provided</b> to enable the organisation to develop a Business Plan to help them work towards long term sustainability.</p> <p>Local multi-agency partnership set up as working group of Partnership for Health – Teenage Pregnancy Advisory Group(TPAG) which feeds into the County Teenage Pregnancy Partnership Board  TPAG developed local Teenage Pregnancy Strategy &amp; action plan to deliver improved services/support for young people.  Review of family planning services undertaken, which, has resulted in an increase in the number of sessions available and changed opening times to improve access for young people.  Outreach programme funded by NRF being developed to support core service  Multi-disciplinary school-based services piloted in a local high school and now being rolled out to others over next 2 years  Development of one-stop sexual health centre for young people in priority neighbourhood funded through NRF.  Working to improve Sex and Relationship Education provision in schools through joint work between PCT, Young Women’s Project, Healthy Schools Programme and County PSHE adviser  Same as for the main teenage pregnancy rate. The activity is focussed on the wards with the highest teenage pregnancy rates. Small numbers means that the year-to-year figures vary greatly. Variation for 1992-94 was 9 times.</p>	<p><b>O = 2</b>  <b>P = 4</b></p>
--------------------	------	------	------	------	---	---------------------------------------

Cervical Screening % uptake	(2000) 84%	(2003) 80%	(2004) 77.8	(2005) 80	<b>N</b>	There is a falling trend in cervical screening uptake. Current trend will mean that the target uptake rate will not be reached. We have reviewed the cervical screening service and are testing out a range of options to improve uptake in the most deprived wards.	<b>O = 2</b>
<b>Evidence;</b> Smoking Cessation Services, Teenage Pregnancy Unit, National Clinical Health Outcomes Database. NRF Monitoring and Outcome Reports							

## Reviewing Delivery

## Barriers and Priorities for HEALTH

**Total Score for  
this section**

**O = 12  
P = 19**

**Strategic Objective: Health Improvement**

**Date of Review May 2005**

### **Barriers**

As we commented last year, a major difficulty with assessing our performance in this area is the fact that it takes about two years to collect and prepare statistics. This makes it impossible to gauge the effectiveness of the interventions we have made over the last year. Floor target data is similarly out of date.

We have made representations to the Eastern Region Public Health Observatory about the inadequacy of the data but they share our concerns and are similarly frustrated that we do not have more recent figures. They have communicated their dissatisfaction to the Department of Health.

The Under 75 Mortality Rate also shows a year on year deterioration but Great Yarmouth Primary Care Trust's shared statistician has demonstrated that the long-term trend is still downward and is extrapolated to hit the 2010 target

### **Improvement Plan 2005**

#### ***Reducing Teenage conception rates***

- Young persons Sexual Health Centre opened by January 2006
- Young persons Sexual Health Centre accessed by young people (under 20 years old) in target areas- 1500 attendances in first year.
- ***Improving Life Expectancy***

**Possible Solutions**

Alternative source(s) of data. Continue dialogue with ERPHO.

- Improve reporting systems to provide local statistical trends on Floor Target areas by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2006
- Agree new targets for healthy schools initiative by April 2006

***Cross-cutting initiatives***

- Provide evidence that health data is being used by other service providers

## Reviewing Delivery

## Progress on HOUSING

<b>Lead Person (s)</b> Denis Gilbert Head of Housing Management (GYBC) Alan Warnes GYBC Renewal Manager Steven Ford GYBC Needs Manager	<b>Review Date :</b> APRIL 2005
<b>Other Partners/People Involved</b> David Frowde, Head of Architectural Services (GYBC), Norfolk Social Services Dept, Supporting People, Homeselect Partner Landlords, Advice and Voluntary agencies throughout the LSP under the aegis of the Homelessness Strategy and other Forums	<b>LSP Group(s)</b> e.g. theme sub-groups Social Forum/Housing Action Group

<b>Strategic objective: Achieving the Decent Homes Targets</b> - Below, capture how this strategic objective is broken down into individual targets							
<b>Target</b>	Base-line	Target for the year	Actual	Next Milestone and date	NRF? Y/N	<b>What is the LSP activity to meet target?</b>	<b>Scores</b> Outcomes Plausibility
<b>Target</b> Social housing not meeting the decent homes standard	2580 (4/2001)	1720 (3/2004)	1298 (2003/04)	1420 (3/2006)	Y	<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b> 222 High Efficiency Central Heating boilers funded by NRF have been installed to date Loft Insulation top-ups funded by NRF have been installed in 152 dwellings NRF funding has facilitated the adoption of a Heat Leasing scheme which has resulted in 56 of these heating systems being installed	<b>O = 5</b> P = 5
Private housing made fit	1990	60			N	<b>Borough Council</b> – Capital allocation for private sector housing renewal	<b>O = 3</b>

(Housing Act 1989)	(1999)	2003/04)	56 (2004/05)	60 (2004/05)			<b>P = 3</b>
Private Housing in dis-repair Improvements	4278 (1993)	210 (2003/04)	207 (2004/05)	210 (2004/05)	Y	<b>Borough Council – Capital allocation for private sector housing renewal</b>	<b>O = 3</b>
						<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b> <b>A HandyMan Scheme funded by NRF during 2002-03 resulted in 111 vulnerable people in private housing helped with repairs.</b> <b>Private Sector Renewals:</b> Procedures/ form for accessing grants improved <b>by NRF funding</b> an additional Renewals Officer	<b>P = 3</b>
Private Housing -improving vulnerable households to meet Decent Homes Standard				20 (2005/06)	N	<b>Borough Council – Capital allocation for private sector housing renewal.</b> Specific targets can be established based on the findings from the private sector house condition survey (Aug 05).	<b>O = 3</b>
							<b>P = 3</b>
Private housing improvements, including emergency repairs, security etc.				400 (2005/06)	Y	<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b> <b>Safe at Home – security (for further info see crime below)</b>	
To have no families or pregnant women temporarily housed in bed and breakfast accommodation under the terms of the Housing Act 1996 Part V11 for a period of six weeks or more	3 (4/03)	0 (4/04)	0 (3/05)	0 (4/06)		<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b> <b>NRF Homelessness Resources project:</b> During 2003 / 04, 20 houses for temporary accommodation were provided with carpets, white goods and disabled access. <b>In addition, NRF</b> provided 75 families and homeless people with rent in advance and/or deposits <b>Homelessness Prevention:</b> A borough council based project providing advice, assistance and representation to applicants to help prevent homelessness – awaiting data on this project	<b>O = 5</b>
							<b>P = 5</b>

<b>Evidence</b> : CPA decent homes standard diagnostic judgement - Audit Commission Ocella database held at GYBC; OHMS Housing Revenue Account Business Plan		
--	--	--

NRF Monitoring and Outcome Reports

## Reviewing Delivery

## Barriers and Priorities for HOUSING

**Total Score for  
this section**

**O = 16  
P = 18**

**Strategic Objective: Housing**

**Date of Review April 2005**

### **Barriers**

It should be noted that the nil figure quoted for bed and breakfast stays over six weeks (both target and actual) is based on the standard local authority responsibility definition and means of measurement. Social Services and the voluntary sector are aware of stays of longer than six weeks.

### **Action for Improvement**

Measures show good improvements with the exception of private housing. The marginal shortfall is due to the diversion of funds to Disabled Living Grants. In order to align targets with partner organisations, the two private housing targets will be changed to "Vulnerable Households to Meet the Decent Homes Standard" and "Private Housing Improvements including Emergency Repairs, Handyperson Provision, Security Measures and

<b>Possible Solutions</b>	Yare Care Alarm Systems”. It should be noted that the nil figure quoted for bed and breakfast stays over six weeks (both target and actual) is based on the standard local authority responsibility definition and means of measurement. Social Services and the voluntary sector are aware of stays of longer than six weeks.
---------------------------	---

## Reviewing Delivery

## Progress on LEARNING

### Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership : Performance Monitoring Framework

#### Review at April 2005

Lead Person (s) Joint Responsibility of Members the Learning Forum	Review Date : April 2005
Other Partners : EAZ, LSC, LEA, Learning Community etc.	LSP Group(s) Learning Forum

<b>Strategic objective: Increase Skills and Qualifications</b>							
- Below, capture how this strategic objective is broken down into individual targets							
Target	Base-line	Target for the year	Actual	Next Milestone and date	NRF? Y/N	What is the LSP activity to meet target?	Scores Outcomes Plausibility
% of pupils achieving 5+ A*-C GCSE	<u>01/02</u> 43.7	<u>03/04</u> 48.5	43.6	<u>04/05</u> 51.3	<b>Y</b>	<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b>  <b>NRF has been used to fund an Ormiston Children and Families Trust project</b> designed to reduce the number of children excluded from school by developing community based family support work for vulnerable families with a child with social, emotional and	<b>O = 2</b>
5+ A*-C GCSE (NRF Areas)		34.4	32.5	32.3			<b>P = 3</b>

% of pupils achieving Level 4 at KS2 in English Maths	65.6 57.6	76.4 74.2	60.9 68.9	75.6 76.8	behavioural problems.  <b>NRF has part-funded the Full Service School project being piloted by the former EAZ.</b> This involves a holistic approach to working with pupils who have educational / behavioural issues. We are currently awaiting a report showing impact on educational attainment  <b>NRF has part-funded the provision of training for Classroom Assistants.</b> Classroom Assistants are then able to receive Challenging Education Training. Challenging Education is a teaching model which encourages children to become independent learners, within a structured support system within the classroom. A report provided showed an increase in KS2 and GSCE results and a reduction in exclusions in schools participation in 2002.  <b>NRF has funded the SHARE programme</b> which involves Courses / activities enabling parents to support their children's Learning  <b>NRF has funded Out of Hours Activity:</b> Homework clubs, catch-up classes and activity such as theatre, sports etc	
English (NRF Schools) Maths (NRF Schools)		71.7 70.3	58.1 60.5	73.7 74.9		

						<p><b>NRF has funded the provision of Nurture Groups.</b> Provided at middle school level Nurture Groups are designed for pupils who have missed positive, early experiences that promote good social/learning development or who have particular needs that can not be met within the context of the normal classroom.</p> <p><b>NRF has funded the P3 (previously called Campus Yarmouth) project.</b> This provides an alternative learning route for students and includes vocational studies and other skills (eg first aid, Duke of Edinburgh Awards) in addition to 5 GCSE courses. In 2004, 44% pupils achieved a 200+ point score (equivalent of 5 GCSEs A-C), 47% pupils on the course had Special Educational Needs( SEN).</p> <p><b>NRF has funded the provision of a Parents Room at St Georges First and Nursery School:</b> This room is used for activities with parents and other community groups</p> <p><b>Nurturing in Northgate St Andrews:</b> The school has a strong commitment to the principle of Nurture Groups which were taking place in inappropriate surrounding. <b>NRF has funded a semi-permanent building</b> to house the group, it is hope to also provide wrap-around care in building. The building will open shortly</p>	
Increase post 16 staying –on rate	68.6 (2000)	73.5+ (2004)	76.4	76.4+	Y	<p><b>NRF Contribution</b></p> <p><b>Please see P3 Campus Yarmouth (above):</b> Between 2001 – 2004, Staying on rates of 94% were achieved (college, modern apprenticeship, or armed forces), this is approx 26% higher than local rate.</p>	<p><b>O = 3</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>P = 5</b></p>
Increase number of those entering employment with qualifications (%)	6.1 (2000)	8.3+ (2004)	8.0	8.3+	Y	<p><b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b></p> <p><b>All above are contributing to this</b></p>	<p><b>O = 3</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>P = 3</b></p>

Action Plan Priority 3 % yr 11 students remaining in Post 16 Learning	78.7 (2000)	N/A	86.4	86.4+ (2005)	Y	<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b> <b>See Campus Yarmouth (above):</b> 01-04 –66% remained at College	<b>O = 5</b>
Action Plan Priority 4 % Yr 11 students entering work based learning	10.1 (2000)	N/A	10.0	10.6	Y	<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b> <b>See Campus Yarmouth (above):</b> 01-04 –24% entered a modern apprenticeship	<b>O = 2</b> <b>P = 3</b>
<b>Evidence</b> Norfolk County Council Children’s Services Learning and Skills Council (Norfolk) NRF Monitoring and Outcome Reports							

## Reviewing Delivery

## Barriers and Priorities for Learning

**Total Score for this section**

**O = 15**

**P = 18**

### Strategic Objective: Increase Skills and Qualifications

Date of Review April 2005

#### Barriers

The issues around actual performance on these main KS2 , GCSE and Post 16 staying on rate targets, are varied and complex and it would be foolish to try to sum up the issues here, in one sentence, and it would be unfair on local schools and Colleges to not involve them in this assessment. Recent national research on the NEET (not in training , education, employment) group of young people (see DfeS web site Research Brief number RB628) , show the same issues around relative deprivation, school attendance and parental attainment and support that have been known about for some time in the long term studies on staying on rates. It is one thing knowing the issues, but there are no " magic wand" solutions or they would already be in place. !

JA / and RP will both be talking to high schools in the area at a (CRASH) meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> May and this document will be shared with them and further update provided.

.

#### Action for Improvement

GCSE achievement has been disappointing in the 2003/4, reversing what had been an improving trend up to this point.

The total remaining in learning (those staying in full-time education or entering work based learning, on the other hand has risen once more to an all time high for Great Yarmouth. The payment of Education Maintenance Allowances (may have) inclined young people to full time education; perhaps at the expense of numbers following full time work based vocational training. (need documentary evidence if this statement remains). Research shows EMAs also have a positive effect in allowing students from lower income families to stay in full time learning of any type and this has to be seen as a positive.

LSC will be closely reviewing the range of the WBL offer in the Eastern area and will work with all 35 WBL providers to fill gaps in the offer of full time Apprenticeship programmes.

Needs to be a full evaluation of impact of the EAZ and the extent to which changes as a result of this initiative. were embedded.

**Possible Solutions**

**Need to be discussed with Childrens Services and learning providers including schools.**

**LSC will be working with Children's Services and Connections on Post 14 review and development of a Local learning Plan.**

**Already close and positive working of Colleges in the area**

## Reviewing Delivery

## Progress on ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership : Performance Monitoring Framework Review at April 2005

<b>Lead Person (s)</b> Peter Wright, Economic Development Officer, Great Yarmouth Borough Council ,	<b>Review Date : April 2005</b>
Great Yarmouth Economic Forum, Great Yarmouth Marketing Initiative, Great Yarmouth Learning Partnership, Norfolk Learning & Skills Council, Norfolk and Waveney Enterprise Services.	<b>LSP Group(s)</b> Economic Forum Income Maximisation Working Group

	<b>Strategic objective:</b>						
	<b>The development of sustainable economic activity to create socially inclusive wealth</b>						
	- Below, capture how this strategic objective is broken down into individual targets						
<b>Target</b>	Base-line	Target for the year	Actual	Next Milestone and date	NRF? Y/N	<b>What is the LSP activity to meet target?</b>	<b>Scores</b> <b>Outcomes</b> <b>Plausibility</b>
Raise % of working age persons in	67.6	72	72.5	73.5	Y	<b><u>NRF Contribution</u></b>	<b>0 5</b>

employment	(2/02)			(2005)	<p><b>NRF Revenue and capital funding to support the two Resources Centres:</b> St. James is to have one or two managed workspaces (this has not been finalised). Cobholm and Lichfield has a childcare facility enabling parents to work. It also acts as a base for UK Online which offers training in computer skills and has run two open days for people wanting to run their own business. <b>NRF has also been provided</b> for a feasibility study for a further resource centre in the Claydon/ Magdalen area.</p> <p><b>NRF has funded the provision of Wrap-around childcare at Greenacre First &amp; Middle School</b> enabling parents to access better opportunities for employment</p> <p><b>NRF has funded some New Entrepreneur Scholarships: During 2002/03</b> 5 places were paid for in this business start up / training scheme, 4 previously unemployed, 1 single parent</p> <p><b>Acorn Grants: Matched funding from NRF</b> has enabled funding from the County Council's scheme for small projects to contribute to improving employability of local people e.g in training, social enterprise, volunteering etc</p>	<b>P 3</b>
------------	--------	--	--	--------	---	------------

					<p><b>NRF has been used to part-fund a Community Economic Regeneration Co-ordinator.</b> As a result, three jobs have been created as well as support offered to a range of organisations / networks.</p> <p><b>NRF to support the UK Online project.</b> This has provided computer training which assists with employability.</p> <p><b>Disability Resources Centre: NRF has provided</b> Capital funding for the centre which will include the delivery of services related advice / training (whether in the centre or externally) to get people back into the world of work and to help employers understand their needs.</p> <p><b>In additions NRF projects themselves have created jobs</b> eg the Resource Centres above which will have a total of 9 jobs, the childcare service running out of the Cobholm and Lichfield Centre employs 34 people. Ranger / PCSO services have employed over 20 people in this capacity, although some of these jobs (possibly 7) may end in 2005/06. Other posts have been funded such as Community Development Workers.</p> <p>Promotion: GYMI attended three events in oil and gas assisting 16 companies in Singapore, Houston and London.  Liaison: The EDU carried out 37 company visits and received over 200 enquiries.  Nursery Units: The Borough has 39 units to encourage small businesses.  Beacon Innovation Centre: Approaching three years old, 100% let, 17 - 25 companies, 120+ employees, 70 new jobs.  InteGREAT: £16m investment in town centre, heritage and seafront.  EastPort: Major approvals received from DoT and DTI, project progressing well.  URC: Bid approved March 05.  The Working Neighbourhoods Pilot, focussing on Regent ward, will provide intensive help to address barriersto work. The co-location with the Learning Store in King Street will provide an easy point of access to these services.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Increase average gross weekly pay	399 (2002)	425	417 (2003)	discontinue		EAZ: Work related learning continues part NRF funded. Protrain: Now developed into a county-wide project to encourage young engineers. Skills for Energy: New project with EEEgr and the Sector Skills Council to ensure the right skills for the future. Resource Centres: Local access to training and advice to increase employability. Learning Store: Town centre facility to provide better access to learning. (Work in progress). Community Learning Resource Centre: Local learning resource based at Great Yarmouth College.	<b>O 1</b> <b>P 3</b>
Average total income £ per annum)	N/A	N/A	16,600 (2003)	17,500 (2005)		New target developed using different data source.	
Increase number of VAT registrations per 10,000 population (stock)	250 (2001)	253	254 (2003)	255 (2005)		Norfolk Business Start-Up: County-wide scheme. 43 local recipients. Business Byte/E-Business Byte: 17 local grants to encourage the use of new technology by new businesses. NWES: Survival rate of businesses receiving assistance from this enterprise agency is 73% after three years. Beacon Innovation Centre: Incubation of up to 15 new companies over time.	<b>O 5</b> <b>P 3</b>
<b>Evidence - Annual Area Labour Force Survey; Annual New Earnings Survey (Discontinued); Annual Survey of Personal Incomes, Inland Revenue</b> VAT Stock per 10,000 – Office for National Statistics NRF Monitoring and Outcome Reports							

## Reviewing Delivery

## Barriers and Priorities for ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

<p><b>Total Score for this section</b></p> <p><b>O = 11</b></p> <p><b>P = 9</b></p>
---

<b>Strategic Objective:</b>	<b>Date of Review</b>
-----------------------------	-----------------------

**Barriers**

There have been difficulties in collecting gross weekly pay data and the survey we have been using has been discontinued. The delayed publication of the Regional Economic Strategy in Dec.04 combined with the uncertainties over major projects such as the URC and Eastport have made strategy formulation difficult in this period.

**Action for Improvement**

*Review of Improvement Plan for 2004*

Targets for 2004	Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic Forum to review and finalise new strategy</li> </ul>	Not achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lobby for infrastructure improvements including the construction of Eastport</li> </ul>	Achieved progress with DTI and Department of Transport
Establishment of Urban Regeneration	Bid approved by ODPM

**Possible Solutions**

A new source of earnings data has been identified which will give information specific to Great Yarmouth

The Strategy should be a framework rather than a detailed plan.

Company	
• Development of social enterprise in Great Yarmouth	Report on progress due in July 05
• Encouragement of energy sector diversification – work ongoing, progression	Achieved

**Improvement Plan 2005 – *provisional for discussion***

- Complete a new Economic Strategy by Oct 2005
- Create targets for the evaluation of the impact of the URC
- Progress the Eastport proposals to full UK/EU approval during 2005
- Build social cohesion by through social enterprise and ILM schemes
- Create links with the Education Forum to ensure business needs re skills are addressed.
- Promote innovation investment and diversification in the energy industry.
- Explore greater business engagement in the LSP through the business broker concept and with the Chamber of commerce and other relevant agencies.

## Reviewing Delivery

## Progress on CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION

<b>Lead Person (s)</b> Area Commander C/Supt R Adcock Responsible Authorities Group -CDRP	<b>Review Date :</b>  APRIL 2005
<b>Other Partners/People Involved</b> Great Yarmouth Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership	<b>LSP Group(s)</b> e.g. theme sub-groups Social Forum

<b>Strategic objective: Crime and Disorder Reduction</b>							
- Below, capture how this strategic objective is broken down into individual targets							
<b>Target</b>	Base-line	Target for the year	Actual	Next Milestone and date	NRF ? Y/N	<b>What is the LSP activity to meet target?</b>	<b>Scores (see pp 11-12) Outcomes Plausibility</b>
Tackle the supply of Class A drugs						2 High Profile Operations – Abolish and Citadel resulted in 20 + people being arrested and sentenced by the court. Intelligence and comments from the community support the fact that the availability of drugs within the Borough has not returned to levels experienced before the policing operations.  The Tactical Unit (Police) continues to target street level dealing.  The introduction of the Prolific and Other Priority Offender (PPO) Scheme and the Drugs Intervention Programme has placed greater emphasis on breaking offending cycles by providing support for individuals in relation to treatment and other resettlement pathways.  A more meaningful target in relation to substance misuse for 05/06 is the number of offenders entering treatment via the Criminal Justice System. This target is part of the PMF for the PPO Scheme.	<b>O = 5</b>
Maintain the no of supply offences (BVP1129) at 2003/04 levels	11 (2002/03)	30	31	Dis-continue			<b>P = 3</b>
Increase year on year the proportion of problematic drug users in treatment from the priority neighbourhoods	-----						
To reduce domestic	608		316	300		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target offenders through implementation of the National</li> </ul>	<b>O = 5</b>

burglary target by 10% in 2004/05	(2002/03)	5704/05)	(2004/05)	005/06)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intelligence Model (NIM)</li> <li>Full implementation of the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Scheme</li> <li>Target hardening</li> <li>Installation of Alleygates</li> <li>Safe at Home Scheme</li> <li>Victim Support Pack</li> <li>Thumb print scheme</li> <li>Home Watch</li> <li>Property marking</li> <li>Visual Audits</li> <li>High visibility patrols</li> <li>Media awareness &amp; education</li> <li>Mobile trailer (crime prevention message)</li> </ul>	<b>P 5</b>
To reduce vehicle crime target by 20% in 2004/05	1457 (2002/03)	1392 (2004/05)	853	810 (2005/06)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target offenders via NIM</li> <li>Engagement with Prolific and Other Priority Offender Scheme</li> <li>Property on display letter scheme</li> <li>Property marking</li> <li>Vehicle Watch Scheme</li> <li>Promotion of secure tax disc holders</li> <li>Audible car park awareness signs</li> <li>Leaflet drops</li> <li>Posters</li> <li>Home Watch</li> <li>Media campaigns</li> <li>Mobile trailer (crime prevention message)</li> <li>High visibility patrols</li> </ul>	<b>O 5</b>
							<b>P 5</b>
To prevent an increase in the level of violent crime in 2004/05 as compared with 2003/04	2119 (2002/03)	2178 (2004/05)	2515 (2004/05)	2440 (2005/06)		<p><b>Night Time Economy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi agency Nightsafe Scheme</li> <li>Revised Public Order Strategy to identify and target problem areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Domestic Violence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dedicated Domestic Violence Unit (Police)</li> <li>Advocacy Worker to support victims</li> <li>Data Sharing Project co-ordinated by Leeway Women's Aid</li> </ul>	<b>O 3</b>
							<b>P 3</b>

**Evidence - Norfolk Constabulary – Great Yarmouth Police**  
Iquanta Database

## Reviewing Delivery

## Barriers and Priorities for Crime and Disorder Reduction

**Total Score for  
this section**

**O = 18**

**P = 16**

**Strategic Objective:**

**Date of Review**

**Barriers**

The drug measure is not considered meaningful as it influenced by long term and the level to which policing operations are targeted. The PPO PMF uses offenders entering treatment via the criminal justice system and retention in treatment as indicator.

Alignment of priorities and targets.

All partners having a full understanding of the CDRP Strategy for 2005-2008 and signing up to it.

**Action for Improvement**

More Challenging crime targets:

**Police targets**

Burglary – reduce by 5% on 04/05 figures

Vehicle crime – reduce by 5% on 04/05 figures

Violent crime – reduce injury violence by 3%

**CDRP targets**

Reduce violent crime, (wounding) by 26 offences,(from 1085 to 1059) and no increase in common assault (567) – inc domestic violence

Criminal Damage – reduce by 116 offences (2940 to 2824)

Reduce all crime by fully implementing the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Scheme – targets those committing crime and those having greatest impact in the local community  
Reassure the public tackling ASB using the full range of options available. Targets are set out within the SSCF template

**Actions****Increase links with other LSP Forums:**

Arrange 4 meetings with Learning and Skills Forum particularly around the rehabilitation of offenders.

Arrange 4 meetings with Environment Forum re tackling enviro crime as per the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act

Work with the CEN to increase community engagement and involvement in reducing crime and increasing public confidence

Work with statutory and voluntary agencies to align targets and develop shared understanding and accountability

Briefings to all agencies to launch and promote new strategy



The following tables have been used as a basis for the traffic light assessment of the five main delivery themes. They have the advantage over the NRU tables above in that they contain three columns of actual data, namely baseline, latest actual at the time the last PMF was completed and current latest actual. As such they provide trend and “direction of travel” information. In concluding the traffic light assessment, floor target data was considered at the same time as performance against the targets adopted by our LSP.

**Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership  
Achievement Against Targets (2004/5)**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual per Last PMF</b>	<b>Last Target</b>	<b>Latest Actual</b>	<b>Next Target</b>
<b>Health</b>						
Life Expectancy Males	73.9	75.0	74.3	75.3	75.9	76.5
	94-96		1998/00	1999/01	2001/3	20010
Smoking Quitters per 10,000	0	15	42	54	59	77
	2000	2002/3	2002/3	2003/4	2003/4	2005/6
Under 75 Mortality per 100,000	154	122	104	87	116	87
	1993	2001	2001	2010	2002	2010
Teenage Pregnancy per 1000	62.6	53.2	48.1	31.3	65.8	31.3
	1998	2004	2001	2010	2002	2010
Cervical Screening % uptake	84	80	80	80	77.8	80
	2000	2003	2003	2004	2004	2005

## **Achievement Against Health Targets**

### **Sources of Data**

Smoking Cessation Services, Teenage Pregnancy Unit, National Clinical Health Outcomes Database.

### **Performance**

As we commented last year, a major difficulty with assessing our performance in this area is the fact that it takes about two years to collect and prepare statistics. This makes it impossible to gauge the effectiveness of the interventions we have made over the last year. Floor target data is similarly out of date.

We have made representations to the Eastern Region Public Health Observatory about the inadequacy of the data but they share our concerns and are similarly frustrated that we do not have more recent figures. They have communicated their dissatisfaction to the Department of Health.

Of the five measures, Male Life Expectancy and smoking quitters are showing good progress according to the latest available numbers. Teenage pregnancy figures and screening uptake percentages have worsened however.

The Under 75 Mortality Rate also shows a year on year deterioration but Great Yarmouth Primary Care Trust's shared statistician has demonstrated that the long-term trend is still downward and is extrapolated to hit the 2010 target.

### **Traffic Light**

Performance has been self-assessed as Amber/Red.

**Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership  
Achievement Against Targets (2004/5)**

Measure	Baseline	Target	Actual per PMF	Latest Target	Latest Actual	Next Target
---------	----------	--------	-------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------

**Housing**

Social Housing not meeting  
Decency Standard

2580	1720	1769	1420	1298	1420
Apr 01	Mar 04	Mar 04	Mar 06	Mar 04	Mar 06

Private Housing Made Fit

1990 unfit	60	37	60	56	discontinue
1999	2003/4	2003/4	2004/5	2004/5	

Private Housing Improvements

4278 in	210	209	210	207	discontinue
disrepair					
1999	2003/4	2003/4	2004/5	2004/5	

Private Housing Vulnerable Household  
to Meet Decent Homes Stnd

					60
					2005/6

Private Housing Improvements inc.  
Emergency repairs, security etc.

					400
					2005/6

Bed & Breakfast over Six Weeks

3	0	0	0	0	0
Apr 03	Apr 04	Apr 04	Apr 05	Mar 05	Mar 06

## **Performance Against Housing Targets**

### **Sources of Data**

CPA decent homes standard diagnostic judgement – Audit Commission

Ocella database held at GYBC

OHMS

Housing Revenue Account Business Plan

### **Performance**

Measures show good improvements with the exception of private housing. The marginal shortfall is due to the diversion of funds to Disabled Living Grants.

In order to align targets with partner organisations, the two private housing targets will be changed to “Vulnerable Households to Meet the Decent Homes Standard” and “Private Housing Improvements including Emergency Repairs, Handyperson Provision, Security Measures and Yare Care Alarm Systems”.

It should be noted that the nil figure quoted for bed and breakfast stays over six weeks (both target and actual) is based on the standard local authority responsibility definition and means of measurement. Social Services and the voluntary sector are aware of stays of longer than six weeks.

### **Traffic Light**

Performance has been self-assessed as Amber/Green

**Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership  
Achievement Against Targets (2004/5)**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Latest Actual at Apr 2004</b>	<b>Target set at Apr 2004</b>	<b>Latest Actual</b>	<b>Next Target at Apr 2005</b>
<b><u>Learning</u></b>						
5+ A* -C GCSE %	43.7	49.5	46.8	48.5	43.6	51.3
	2001/2	2002/3	2002/3	2003/4	2003/4	2004/5
5+ A* -C GCSE % (NRF Schools)		38.9	32.4	34.4	32.5	32.3
Level 4 KS2 achievement %						
English	65.6	74.8	71.7	76.4	60.9	75.6
Maths	57.6	75.0	65.1	74.2	68.9	76.8
English(NRF Schools)		69.7	63.0	71.7	58.1	73.7
Maths(NRF Schools)		70.9	58.1	70.3	60.5	74.9
	2001/2	667.3	2002/3	2003/4	2003/4	2004/5
Post 16 Staying-on rate %						
	68.6	68.6+	73.5	73.5+	76.4	76.4+
	2000	2002	2002	2004	2004	2005
Entering employment with training %						
	6.1	6.1+	8.3	8.3+	8.0	8.3+
	2000	2002	2002	2004	2004	2005
Action Plan Priority 3						
% Year 11 Students remaining in Post 16 Learning	78.7	78.7+	84.1	N/A	86.4	86.4+
	2000	2002	2002	N/A	2004	2005

Action Plan Priority 4  
% Year 11 Students entering  
Work Based Learning

---

10.1	10.1+	10.6	N/A	10.0	10.6
2000	2002	2002	N/A	2004	2005

## **Achievement Against Learning Targets**

### **Sources of Data**

Norfolk County Council Children's Services  
Learning and Skills Council (Norfolk)

### **Performance**

GCSE achievement has been disappointing in the 2003/4, reversing what had been an improving trend up to this point. The total remaining in learning (those staying in full-time education or entering work based learning, on the other hand has risen once more to an all time high for Great Yarmouth. The payment of Education Maintenance Allowances has inclined young people to full time education; perhaps at the expense of numbers following work based vocational training.

### **Traffic Light**

Performance has been self-assessed as Amber/Red

**Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership  
Achievement Against Targets (2004/5)**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual per PMF</b>	<b>Target 2004</b>	<b>Latest Actual</b>	<b>Next Target</b>
<b>Jobs</b>						
Working age in employment %	67.6	69	71.4	72	72.5	73.5
	Feb 02	2003	Feb 03	2004	Feb 04	2005
Gross weekly pay (£)	399	415	417	425	417	discontinue
	Norfolk 02	2003	2003	2004	2003	
Average total income (£ per annum)					16,600	17,500
					2003	2005
VAT stock per 10,000	250	251	251	253	254	255
	end 2001	end 2002	end 2002	end 2004	end 2003	2005

## **Achievement Against Jobs (Economic Development) Targets**

### **Sources of Data**

Annual Area Labour Force Survey

Annual New Earnings Survey (Discontinued)

Annual Survey of Personal Incomes, Inland Revenue

VAT Stock per 10,000 – Office for National Statistics

### **Performance**

Working age in employment has shown a steady improvement.

There have been difficulties in collecting gross weekly pay data and the survey we have been using has been discontinued. A new source of earnings data has been identified which will give information specific to Great Yarmouth.

VAT registrations, our measure of business activity, remains on an upward trend.

### **Traffic Light**

Performance has been self-assessed as Amber/Green

**Great Yarmouth Local Strategic Partnership  
Achievement Against Targets (2004/5)**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual per Last PMF</b>	<b>Last Target</b>	<b>Latest Actual</b>	<b>Next Target</b>
<b><u>Crime</u></b>						
Drug Offences (Supply of Class A)	11 2002/3	N/A N/A	30 2003/4	30 2004/5	31 2004/5	Discontinued
Drug Users Undergoing Treatment						To be confirmed
Burglaries	608 2002/3	634 2003/4	536 2003/4	570 2004/5	316 2004/5	300 2005/6
Vehicle Crime	1457 2002/3	1436 2003/4	1499 2003/4	1392 2004/5	853 2004/5	810 2005/6
Violent Crime	2119 2002/3	N/A N/A	2178 2003/4	2178 2004/5	2515 2004/5	2440 2005/6

## **Sources of Data**

Norfolk Constabulary – Great Yarmouth Police  
Iquanta Database

## **Performance**

The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership in Great Yarmouth is arguably the most effective and inclusive one in the county. Overall crime has shown a significant reduction with the result that some partners had indicated an expectation that a green traffic light was justified.

However, violent crime statistics have risen, in keeping with almost all areas in the country. Part of this is due to new definitions of violent crime, for example breach of an Anti Social Behaviour Order now constitutes a violent crime. Also, successful work has been done to get greater reporting of domestic violence.

It is impossible to establish the real as opposed to reported increase in violent crime, but there is no getting away from the fact that we must do more work in this area.

The drug related measure is not regarded by CDRP members as entirely meaningful or appropriate and will be changed. In many respects higher numbers of arrests and convictions for Class A supply would be a good thing. But on occasions surveillance is adjudged to be a better course of action and this will not lead to immediate arrests.

Discussions have commenced with the Drug and Alcohol Action Team to identify a treatment related drug measure.

## **Traffic Light**

Performance has been self-assessed as Amber/Green

**Section 2**



**REVIEW OF PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENTS**

## Reviewing Improvement Plan (Partnership)

Strategic

**Total Score for  
this section**

**9**

**Strategic Objective: Strategic**

**Date of Review June 2005**

### **Barriers**

Based on 2004 improvement plan – barriers that have not been overcome:

Not all parts of the partnership are identifying where similar issues have been addressed in other NRAs. This results in some areas of work still being based on the practises that have not succeeded in making changes in the past and an inward focus for the LSP

There has been some progression in engaging all partners in the LSP and the community strategy but there are still problems in engaging the County Council at appropriate levels. This must be a priority with new initiatives such as Local Area Agreements being led by county councils

The VCS has worked to build capacity to enable it to become more representative and this has been successful. This development should continue to engage with hard to reach groups and communities

### **Action for Improvement**

Active promotion of successful projects elsewhere

Continue to build the capacity of the VCS and communities

Introduce impact evaluation to enable forum members to find out and learn from the successful models developed within NRF projects

**Possible Solutions**

Continue to make information available to partners to make them aware of the evidence that exists elsewhere of what works – possibly a requirement that support staff are pro-active in finding information relevant to each forum and presenting it to the Chairs and the Executive .

High level negotiations to take place with the County Council about their role in the LSP and future roll out of initiatives such as LAA

Seek clarification from GO and ODPM about how these programmes are meant to link together

## Reviewing Improvement Plan (Partnership)

**Inclusive**

**Total Score for  
this section**

**8**

**Strategic Objective: Inclusive**

**Date of Review June 2005**

### **Barriers**

Based on 2004 improvement plan:  
The need to integrate impact assessment and evaluation is still not incorporated into the work of the partnership in particular the identification of budgets for impact assessment and evaluation  
Still a need to include social inclusion and equal opportunities in monitoring procedures and to develop scrutiny role for CEN  
Meetings still based on local authority practices and limited success in holding meetings in community buildings to enable forum members to see what is happening in the priority areas.  
Work to enable statutory and VCS to be made more aware of each others' roles and responsibilities started with the development day – then not progressed.

### **Action for Improvement**

**Executive to put impact assessment on a meeting agenda within the next 3 months**

**Set up meeting between CEN and other partners to discuss the scrutiny role**

**CEN to ask members for costs to use community based premises for meetings and Exec to agree a schedule of meetings, based on these costs or a negotiated use of premises as matched funding**

**Review meeting practises**

**Identify learning opportunities for promoting cross**

**Possible Solutions**

Prepare a plan to measure the impact of NRA projects and to inform LSP (Exec, forums, CEN) of findings and begin implementation

Set up a discussion forum between CEN and other partnership groups to discuss the scrutiny role

Identify budgets for paying for venue costs to hold meetings in communities – or negotiate other means of using community venues

Undertake review of meeting practises with all partners to see whether current processes meet their needs

Continue work to help statutory and VCS partners to understand each others' roles – possible job shadowing or mentoring programmes (including elected members)

**sector understanding**

## Reviewing Improvement Plan (Partnership)

## Action Focussed

**Total Score for  
this section**

**10**

**Strategic Objective: Action Focused**

**Date of Review June 2005**

### Barriers

Based on 2004 improvement plan – barriers that have not been overcome:

Still little evidence of cross sector working - some exceptions (e.g. PCT's work with local businesses) but not enough evidence of partners working on joint projects towards shared objectives

Lack of strategic engagement of how capacity building measures can be adopted by the small business sector. Social forum has some evidence of engagement with the private sector (as above) but no evidence of engagement of businesses in planning and decision making

### Action for Improvement

**Identify learning opportunities for promoting cross sector understanding**

**Continue to build the capacity of BME and other hard to reach communities**

**Develop plan to involve private sector – especially small and Medium Enterprises**

**Possible Solutions**

Review impact of sustainability criteria to ensure innovation is not excluded (3 – although the criteria have not been formally reviewed there is some evidence that NRF supported projects are bending mainstream funding priorities)

Engagement of public and VCS in cross sector working

Development of a plan to involve the private sector – specifically small businesses that might not be involved in large scale economic development initiatives



## Reviewing Improvement Plan (Partnership)

## Barriers Performance Managed

**Total Score for this section**

**5**

**Strategic Objective: Performance Managed**

**Date of Review June 2005**

### **Barriers**

Based on 2004 improvement plan – barriers that have not been overcome:

Little evidence exists of progression in this area.

Lack of resources available to the LSP to undertake this area of work

There does not appear to be a cycle of feedback, evaluation, planning and reviewing actions against targets, both to demonstrate effective use of NRF and to feed into annual performance management processes.

Individual delivery partners are managing data and monitoring processes, rather than the appropriate part of the partnership.

### **Action for Improvement**

LSP Exec to identify appropriate methods to collate and disseminate evidence

Forums need to identify appropriate evaluation processes

CEN to advise LSP on methods for engaging the community

**Possible Solutions**

Engage the wider partnership with the on-going process of collecting information and reviewing progress

Identify where new or existing resources can be used to develop this work

## Reviewing Improvement Plan

## Performance Managed

<b>Total Score for this section</b>
<b>5</b>

<b>Strategic Objective: Performance Managed</b>	<b>Date of Review June 2005</b>
---	---------------------------------

**Barriers**

Based on 2004 improvement plan – barriers that have not been overcome:

Little evidence exists of progression in this area.

Lack of resources available to the LSP to undertake this area of work

There does not appear to be a cycle of feedback, evaluation, planning and reviewing actions against targets, both to demonstrate effective use of NRF and to feed into annual performance management processes.

Individual delivery partners are managing data and monitoring processes, rather than the appropriate part of the partnership.

**Action for Improvement**

LSP Exec to identify appropriate methods to collate and disseminate evidence

Forums need to identify appropriate evaluation processes

CEN to advise LSP on methods for engaging the community

**Possible Solutions**

Engage the wider partnership with the on-going process of collecting information and reviewing progress

Identify where new or existing resources can be used to develop this work

## Reviewing Improvement Plan (Partnership)

**Efficient**

**Total Score for this section**

**4**

**Strategic Objective: Efficient**

**Date of Review June 2005**

### **Barriers**

Based on 2004 improvement plan – barriers that have not been overcome

Partners are unclear how the evidence required by government fits with the requirements of project managers to measure the impact that the activities they are supporting is having on the achievement of the overall targets.

Government focus on floor targets evidenced by specific national data sets have made it more difficult for the LSP to demonstrate progression and improvement.

There appears to be an overall lack of resources associated with the infrastructure of the LSP

### **Action for Improvement**

Identify resources required to underpin ICT needs, particularly with regard to including hard to reach communities and Small and Medium Enterprises.

Identify resources for monitoring and evaluation

Develop monitoring and evaluation plan

Clarify roles and remits with other partnerships – priority the County LSP

Identify liveability targets

**Possible Solutions**

Seek clarification from NRU about how these conflicting requirements can be resolved and implemented

Establish ways of collecting monitoring and evaluation data and feeding into a system that can be used to collate information for the next PMF

Identify 'liveability' targets and measures for 2006 PMF

## Reviewing Improvement Plan (Partnership)

## Learning

<b>Total Score for this section</b>
<b>3</b>

<b>Strategic Objective: Learning</b>	<b>Date of Review June 2005</b>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

**Barriers**

Based on 2004 improvement plan – barriers that have not been overcome

Partnership has continued its focus on delivery – with success in many areas. There is still a lack of recognition of the need for partners to reflect on how services can be improved in sustainable ways to make a long term difference to the service users. This leads to the identification of learning opportunities and there still appear to be gaps in this area

There appears to be little focus on learning from external sources and the initial partnership development actions have not been followed up

**Action for Improvement**

Undertake a development needs assessment for the LSP

Identify appropriate learning opportunities

PCT to provide feedback on ways of engaging local businesses to the economy panel

Identify learning opportunities associated with the liveability targets The improvement in business involvement has somewhat surprisingly occurred through actions on health. Businesses have been engaged through making offers that they could see were in their interests. This learning should

**Possible Solutions**

Exec to take over the remit for the learning inside the partnership and to develop a plan for continuing the work emerging from the development event held in 2004

The improvement in business involvement has occurred through actions on health. Businesses have been engaged through making offers that they could see were in their interests. This learning should be shared with the Economy panel.

be shared with the Economy panel.



Great Yarmouth Local Strategic  
Partnership  
Improvement Plan  
May 2005

## SECTION 3

## Improvement Plan for Delivery

<b>1.0 Crime</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<p>Deliver Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Action Plan and specifically in 2005/6:</p> <p>Reduce Burglary by 5%</p> <p>Reduce vehicle crime by 5%</p> <p>Reduce violent crime by 3%</p> <p>For each of the key crime areas there are action plans in the CDRP Plan. Audit data collected in 2000/1, crime analysis and indices of deprivation are used to target actions. Regent and Nelson wards will continue to be the focus of considerable multi agency activity in respect of crime, environmental and quality of life issues.</p> <p>Key to achieving the targets is implementation of the National Intelligence Model which identifies and tackles prolific offenders. This initiative has already yielded considerable benefits.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing but targets for 2006/7 will be reviewed in light of actual 2005/6 performance in quarter 1 2006/7.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contacts</li> </ul>	<p>John Hemsworth and Inspector Carol Congreve</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	<p>The Responsible Authorities Group (RAG) will monitor the action plans for each target area and will report to the LSP via the Strategic Support Officer. The CDRP action plans identify the lead agency for each initiative. The Community Safety Officer will support the delivery of the action plans.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support will be provided.</li> </ul>	<p>Mainstream funding, Home Office Basic Crime Unit, NRF, SRB, Arson Control Forum (ODPM)</p>

<b>2.0 Education</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	Implement and monitor December 2004 Action Plan.
▪ Date to be completed	Ongoing
▪ Key Contact	Chair of Learning Forum (election process is underway.
▪ Support needed	Research and data collection on Borough wide key data broken down between priority and other areas.
▪ How support will be provided	Norfolk Children's Services, Great Yarmouth Excellence Cluster, Connexions and Learning and Skills Council Norfolk to collaborate and carry out analysis and research to provide key data for the Borough and output areas within the Borough.
<b>3.0 Employment</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	A) Economic Forum to keep economic strategy under review. B) To continue to lobby for infrastructure improvements and in particular, the construction of Eastport. Significant hurdles have been cleared but there remain obstacles before it becomes a reality. C) Sub regional (Great Yarmouth and Waveney) Urban Regeneration Company to become fully operational. D) Development of social enterprise in Great Yarmouth E) Encouraging energy sector diversification into renewables while recognising that the sustainability of the gas industry and the development of an offshore wind industry will require complementary engineering and marine skills.
▪ Date to be completed	A) November 2005 B) Ongoing C) December 2005.

	D) Ongoing E) Round 2 offshore installation 2007/8 to 2010/1
▪ Key Contact	Peter Wright, Economic Development Officer
▪ Support needed	A) Input from core and co-opted members of the Economic Forum B) Concerted lobbying by Government Office EEDA and LSP partners C) New Board Members D) Dedicated field worker E) Enhancement and ongoing support for the Wider Energy Horizons initiative.
▪ How support will be provided	A) Time donated by partners and their staff. B) By maintaining a high profile at meetings of the partnership and those of the partners C) Local authorities to make staff resource available during period up to submission and finance provided by the four local authorities, EEDA and English Partnerships D) Funding through NWES E) Supply chain initiative co-ordinated by EEDA.
<b>4.0 Health</b>	
▪ Actions for Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the health of the people of Great Yarmouth by reducing health inequalities across the Borough. We acknowledge that the elimination of health inequalities as documented in detail in the Health Atlas, is not practicable. Health inequality will not be resolved without resolution of inequalities in virtually all other dimensions (housing, crime, employment, education etc.) as these dimensions all have an impact on health. The specific initiatives which will be delivered in some or all of the priority neighbourhoods will include teenage pregnancy and sexual health projects, family planning outreach, a young people's health centre, smoking cessation support, healthy eating advice, exercise referral scheme, healthy</li> </ul>

	<p>lifestyle programmes, local exercise activity pilots and weight management projects. Health is measured by life expectancy and percentage of the population self-reporting long-term illness and self-reporting their health as being "not good".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete the second Health and Resource Centre which will deliver inter alia, adult education classes, parent and carer baby and toddler group, quitting smoking classes, domestic violence advice, slimming and eating disorders advice, CAB sessions, a health clinic, MIND advisor access, learning enhancement classes, a child care centre and Patient and Public involvement Forum meetings.</li> <li>• Develop a primary drugs education project in more schools.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those initiatives funded by Neighbourhood Renewal Fund will be completed when NRF finishes.</li> <li>• The St James Health and Resource Centre to be operational by October 2005</li> <li>• December 2005</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contact</li> </ul>	<p>Dr Alistair Lipp, Director of Public Health, Great Yarmouth Primary Care Trust</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More up to date statistics to be provided by Government Office.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support will be provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Health, East of England Public Health Observatory and Government Office for the East of England to give priority to the more timely production and disaggregation of the data that they currently supply.</li> <li>• Mainstream funding from Department of Health via Great Yarmouth PCT and NRF.</li> <li>• The primary drugs education project will be incorporated into the Healthy Schools project. Great Yarmouth Primary Care Trust will be the host</li> </ul>

	employer for the project worker.
<b>5.0 Housing (see also actions for improvement in Section 1)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<p>A) Bring social housing up to Decency Standards as set out in the Sustainable Communities Plan</p> <p>B) Bring private homes up to Decency Standards as set out in the Sustainable Communities Plan</p> <p>C) Maintain achievement of bed and breakfast targets at six week maximum for homeless families or where child expected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	<p>A) 2010</p> <p>B) 2004/5 target to be completed by March 2006.</p> <p>C) Ongoing</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contacts</li> </ul>	Penny Dimond, Denis Gilbert, Alan Warnes, Steven Ford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	Capital finance, loan finance, adequate resource to continue proactive prevention work and put in place sufficient alternatives to B&B.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support will be provided</li> </ul>	<p>A) Current budget projections and surveys indicate that GYBC will achieve decent homes to meet target. Undertaking a stock options appraisal will confirm that projection or otherwise. Other potential stock options will be examined. RSLs project that they will meet targets.</p> <p>B) Continued action will depend on GYBC's capital allocation together with the ability to draw in private sector to assist with loans.</p> <p>C) RSL, private sector and temporary accommodation. NRF and ODPM is currently helping to develop proactive homelessness prevention.</p>
<b>6.0 LSP Specific Themes</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	Reinforce "Reducing Inequality" and "Raising Ambition" as cross cutting themes

▪ Date to be completed	March 2006
▪ Key Contact	Tim Leonard, LSP Officer
▪ Support needed	Co-operation of all lead agencies
▪ How support will be provided	Advice from the theme Forums following inclusion on their respective agendas and the resulting discussion and debate

## SECTION 3

## Improvement Plan for Partnership

<b>1.0 Strategic</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the practice of identifying where similar issues have been addressed in other NRAs and other parts of the UK as part of the action planning process – use of <a href="http://www.regen.net">www.regen.net</a></li> <li>• Continue to build the capacity of the voluntary and community sector to enable it to become more representative. Work to be carried out through the Community Empowerment Network training programme.</li> <li>• Work to develop the role partners can make to the LSP and community strategy</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	Joint event for statutory and non-statutory partners in October 2004 but development programme will be ongoing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contact</li> </ul>	Tim Leonard, LSP Officer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	Mechanism for interested partners to discuss options and develop their own learning Agreed route to feed back this learning to the rest of the LSP and for the LSP to act on recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support will be provided</li> </ul>	Neighbourhood Renewal Advisors and funding for Skills and Knowledge Development Review existing resources and remit for Capacity Building work
<b>2.0 Inclusive</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify budgets for impact assessment and evaluation</li> <li>• Include social inclusion and equal opportunities criteria in existing monitoring procedures</li> <li>• Develop a scrutiny role for CEN regarding these issues</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review meeting structures</li> <li>• Statutory and Community and Voluntary sectors to be made aware of each others' roles and responsibilities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	Joint event for statutory and non-statutory partners in October 2004 but development programme will be ongoing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contact</li> </ul>	Tim Leonard, LSP Officer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	Access to information about existing monitoring & evaluation processes in other NR and New Deal areas Support for performance delivery projects to identify appropriate evaluation processes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support to be provided</li> </ul>	NRAs Partners with evaluation experience to contribute via a working group
<b>3.0 Action Focused</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and address areas of activity where one partner's approach could benefit from the perspective of others</li> <li>• Review the impact of the sustainability criteria on actions undertaken and revise to ensure that innovation is not excluded and that continuation funding is subject to a mutually agreed evaluation process. Also sustainability should include funding generated from funders outside the Borough and income earned through trading</li> <li>• Ensure that capacity building actions are reaching all excluded communities including BME groups</li> <li>• Identify how capacity building measures can be adopted by the small business sector</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	BME worker to be recruited under the Community Apprenticeship Programme for Minority Ethnic Groups initiative by October 2004

	March 2005 for other actions
▪ Key Contact	Tim Leonard, LSP Officer
▪ Support needed	Implementing evaluation and impact assessment procedures
▪ How support will be provided	Peer support Neighbourhood Renewal Advisors

### SECTION 3

### Improvement Plan for Partnership

<b>4.0 Performance Managed</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	Forums to identify appropriate evaluation processes to assess the performance of overall strategic objectives for which they are responsible  LSP Board to identify appropriate methods to collate evidence and disseminate to members and partners  CEN to advise LSP on appropriate methods for involving and engaging with the wider community, in particular the most excluded groups
▪ Date to be completed	March 2005
▪ Key Contact	Tim Leonard, LSP Officer
▪ Support needed	Knowledge and information regarding existing monitoring & evaluation processes undertaken elsewhere
▪ How support will be provided	Other NR staff NRAs

<b>5.0 Efficient</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<p>Identify resources requires to underpin ICT needs</p> <p>Identify resources for monitoring and evaluation – using existing knowledge and information collected by partners as well as external evaluators</p> <p>Build up a process of continuous improvement based on evidence of what works from data collected in this LSP and from elsewhere</p> <p>Clarify roles and remits with other partnerships – priority the County LSP</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	March 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contact</li> </ul>	Tim Leonard, LSP Officer
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	Learning and resource needs analysis of partners re ICT Monitoring and evaluation processes (as above)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support will be provided</li> </ul>	NRU
<b>6.0 Learning</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Action for Improvement</li> </ul>	<p>Undertake a development needs assessment for the LSP</p> <p>Identify appropriate learning opportunities (including partnership awaydays, visits to other partnerships, site visits to community groups, use of <a href="http://www.regen.net">www.regen.net</a> formal training, etc)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Date to be completed</li> </ul>	March 2005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Contact</li> </ul>	Nominated parson on the LSP Board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support needed</li> </ul>	Development needs assessment for partners

	<p>Identification of learning opportunities</p> <p>Lead roles on three learning strands for: Learning Forum, College in the Community, Skills and Knowledge Working Group</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How support will be provided</li> </ul>	<p>Neighbourhood Renewal Advisors, GO East</p>

## Priorities

1. Learning Forum to implement Learning Strategy and Action Plan and endeavour to collect and monitor against Great Yarmouth (as opposed to Norfolk wide) data.

**LEAD BODY: LEARNING FORUM**

**TIMING: SEPTEMBER 2005**

2. Reinforce cross cutting themes of reducing inequality and raising ambition.

**LEAD BODIES: THEME FORUMS**

**TIMING: JANUARY 2006**

3. Further improve representation of business/private sector.

**LEAD BODY: ECONOMIC FORUM**

**TIMING: DECEMBER 2005**

4. Continue work to improve inclusivity and reduce "silo" working. LSP development activity is overseen and owned by the Board.

The integration of the community and voluntary sector will be aided by implementation of the CEN/LSP protocol.

**LEAD BODY: THE BOARD**

**TIMING: ONGOING**

5. Develop impact evaluation systems and use to inform future actions.

**LEAD BODIES: THEME FORUMS AND THE BOARD**

**TIMING: DECEMBER 2005**

6. Set and monitor against the environmental targets agreed at the April 2005 Environmental Working Group which identified household waste recycling, street cleanliness, criminal damage in public areas, bathing water quality and domestic CO2 emissions.

**LEAD BODY: ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM**

**TIMING: JANUARY 2006**

7. Incorporate new 2005/6 Floor Targets into the performance management regime of the LSP.  
**LEAD BODY: THEME FORUMS AND THE BOARD** **TIMING: JANUARY 2006**
8. Develop partnership protocols with County Strategic Partnership and Norfolk County Council as a delivery partner  
**LEAD BODY: THE BOARD/EXECUTIVE** **TIMING: DECEMBER 2005**
9. Develop 'liveability' targets  
**LEAD BODIES: THEME FORUMS, THE BOARD, EXECUTIVE** **TIMING: MARCH 2006**
10. Develop appropriate monitoring and evaluation processes  
**LEAD BODIES: THEME FORUMS, THE BOARD, EXECUTIVE** **TIMING: DECEMBER 2005**

