

# Review of Area Panels



As presented to the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel on 9 April 2015



**Walsall Council**



## Foreword

*Area Panels are an important part of the engagement of our communities by the local authority and utilised effectively will help to bring decision making closer to the residents of the borough.*

*There is broad agreement that Area Panels are not consistent across the borough. Area Panels can engage in a meaningful manner with residents but, on the other hand, many residents have no idea of their existence. In engaging with partners during consultation, the working group found differing views and levels of engagement that partners wished to be involved in. However, it was clear that all partners wished to work with the local authority to achieve a better and more engaged Walsall.*

*The findings demonstrate that 'one size fits all' approach is intangible. A level of autonomy is required for each Area Panel to decide how best to engage with residents and partners to ensure that work toward priorities is right for that particular area.*

*Pilot projects, engagement days, partnership working and a more holistic approach to delivering council services are areas where real improvements can be made with effective panel. The need for devolving decision making to Area Panels is an important aspect that members agreed should be explored and followed through where possible.*

*In all aspects of the discussion the issue of a decreasing financial resource from the Council and Partners was ever present. It is without doubt the case that the aim of achieving a more engaged, locally autonomous and effective area management model will not be possible without meaningful financial investment from the centre, both for the work of the panels themselves and for developing the capacity of the community, voluntary and faith sector that will be instrumental in making the aim a reality.*

*In commending the report to the scrutiny committee I would like to thank the elected members for their time, effort and input and I would also like to acknowledge the input of partners and officer contributors who were a crucial component of the work of the group. Finally I would take the opportunity in thanking the working groups support officers for their hard work in facilitating the meetings and putting together the report in such a short period of time.*



**Councillor Aftab Nawaz**

**Lead Member, Area Partnership Working Group**

# Contents

<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE NUMBER</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	
Terms of Reference	4
Membership	4
Witnesses	5
Report Format	5
<b>Context</b>	6
<b>Should Area Panels take responsibility for budgets?</b>	7
<b>Should Area Panels increase the role for holding the council and its partners to account?</b>	10
<b>How should Area Panels engage local communities to ensure they become part of the solution?</b>	12
<b>Conclusion</b>	15
<b>Recommendations</b>	17
<b>Appendices</b>	19
1. Working Group initiation document	
2. All Party Parliamentary Group on Faith and Society Covenant for Engagement	22

## Introduction

The Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel (the Panel) identified the opportunity to review Area Panels at its meeting on 6 January 2015.

To complete this task a small working group was established.

## Terms of Reference

Draft terms of reference were discussed and agreed by a meeting of the working group that took place on 16 February 2015.

The full version of the Working Groups terms of reference can be found at Appendix 1 to this report.

The Working Group was supported predominantly by two Officers:

Kate Bowers	Interim Head of Communities and Partnerships
Craig Goodall	Committee Business and Governance Manager

## Membership

Due to the cross cutting nature of the topic the Panel decided to invite Members from other scrutiny and performance panels to participate in the working group. To this end invitations were sent to all scrutiny panels.

The working group was made up of the following Councillors:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Panel Representing</b>
Aftab Nawaz (Lead Member)	Neighbourhoods
Dennis Anson	Regeneration
Rose Burley	Social Care and Health
Allah Ditta	Neighbourhoods
Shaun Fitzpatrick	Neighbourhoods
Tina Jukes	Children's Services
Ian Shires	Neighbourhoods
Chris Towe	Neighbourhoods

## Methodology

The Working Group has held 6 meetings during its investigations taking into account the views of 13 witnesses.

## Witnesses

The Working Group met and discussed issues or received evidence relating to welfare reforms with the following witnesses:

Phil Griffin	Executive Director, Walsall Clinical Commissioning Group
Councillor Ian Robertson	Chair, Health and Wellbeing Board
Lyndon Parkes	Service Manager, Walsall Housing Group
Wendy Powell	Director for Transformation, Caldmore Accord Housing
Inspector Mandy McPhee	West Midlands Police
Mark Holden	Head of Clean and Green, Walsall Council
John Roseblade	Group Manager (Highways and Environment), Walsall Council
Barbara Watt	Director of Public Health, Walsall Council
Davina Lytton	Chief Executive, Age UK, Walsall
Alex Boys	Age UK, Walsall
Claire Foulkes	Citizens Advice Bureau
John Barnett	Walsall Multi-faith Forum
Mark Harland	Community Church

## Report Format

This report is a broad summary of the working groups findings and conclusion.

## Context

Area Partnerships were created in 2010 by Walsall Partnership. This created a model for neighbourhood management across the borough on two levels. One Member led through public facing meetings. The other, Officer led through 'tasking' meetings with partners.

Member led meetings have provided a focus for discussions to identify and address community issues. They have subsequently affected local service delivery in response and/or made decisions on funding applications from groups and organisations able to deliver a possible solution. In addition Members have acted as the focal point and decision making body for participatory budgeting.

At the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel meeting on 6 January 2015 Cabinet invited the Panel to establish a working group to consider how devolution to area panels could be developed.

Cabinet's priorities for Area Panels are:

- Effective delivery;
- More community involvement in matters affecting local neighbourhoods;
- A stronger role for community organisations.

As part of their review Scrutiny Members decided to tackle three key questions. They were:

1. Should Area Panels take responsibility for budgets?
  - a. Should Area Panels take responsibility for managing mainstream budgets?
  - b. Should Area Panels commission work to deliver area priorities?
  - c. Should Area Panels influence mainstream service design?
2. Should Area Panels increase the role for holding the council and its partners to account?
3. How should Area Panels engage local communities to ensure they become part of the solution?

This report will seek to address the working group's point of view towards the three questions above.

## **Should Area Panels take responsibility for budgets?**

One of the key questions Members wished to investigate was whether Area Panels should take responsibility for budgets? The working group recognised that there were different ways that responsibility could be given so broke the question down into three:

- a. Should Area Panels take responsibility for managing mainstream budgets?
- b. Should Area Panels commission work to deliver area priorities?
- c. Should Area Panels influence mainstream service design?

The financial situation of the Council and the need to save tens of millions pounds moving forward was recognised as a barrier to Area Panels managing mainstream budgets. Resources were reducing so the expectation was that there would be increased requirements for organisational efficiency controlled by the corporate centre. On the other hand Members considered the idea that potentially Area Panels, with their enhanced local knowledge, could improve service delivery and make money go further in these tough economic climates.

The working group discussed the possibility of Area Panels taking responsibility for budgets with representatives of Clean and Green, Highways and Transportation, Public Health Services and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board from Walsall Council. The working group also spoke with partner organisations about the same issue, namely Walsall Clinical Commissioning Group, Walsall Housing Group, Caldmore Accord and West Midlands Police.

## **Should Area Panels take responsibility for managing mainstream budgets?**

The working group discussed this issue and found that, at the current time, it would be very challenging for Area Panels to take responsibility for mainstream budgets as a whole.

There was little evidence of other Local Authorities implementing mainstream budget disaggregation in the current economic climate. City of York Council are in the process of exploring mechanisms for some budget devolution, however, Birmingham City Council, whilst currently undertaking consultation on community governance moving forward are exploring integrated services rather than budgetary control at a local level.

At the Council, services, such as those operated by Clean and Green, were organised on a borough wide level to achieve maximum efficiency. In Highways, road maintenance was undertaken on a strict needs basis. In addition to this the Council had a long term contract with Lafarge Tarmac to undertake the work. Public Health commissioned service based on needs identified in the Joint Strategic Needs

Assessment. There was some scope to influence the operation of some services, such as street cleansing, but it was accepted that this would come at a loss of borough wide efficiency.

Taking responsibility for the budgets of partners was more challenging as they were separate organisations which the Council had no direct control of. In this instance the working group acknowledged that exerting influence over the priorities of partners was the best path to follow. Partners faced challenging financial circumstances too. It was anticipated that the Police would be required to manage annual budget reductions for the foreseeable future. Budget reductions further reduced opportunities for influence.

With the issues regarding reducing budgets and a likely need for centralised core services the working group wish to suggest that Cabinet undertake some investigation to establish the cost of delivering core-standard services and identifying surplus budgets for the potential allocation to Area Panels. Moreover the surplus budgets should be allocated to areas on a needs basis in line with the Marmot objectives.

### **Should Area Panels commission work to deliver area priorities?**

The working group considered the idea about whether or not Area Panels could commission work to deliver area priorities?

Commissioning services was linked strongly to control of budgets. If Area Panels had no money of their own to spend then they couldn't genuinely commission services. As it stood Area Panels could make recommendations to the Council and its partners about the work undertaken in an area but it was felt the level of influence on services was low.

The working group were advised of a new initiative engaging Area Panels in prioritising highways maintenance in their areas. A new scoring matrix to prioritise schemes was being developed and it was proposed that each Area Panel would be able to award points to potential highways maintenance schemes in their areas. Members were pleased with the idea and the potential influence being given to Area Panels but also noted that the Area Panel points were one factor amongst many.

### **Should Area Panels influence mainstream service design?**

As mentioned above Area Panels are able to make recommendations to the Council and its partners about the work undertaken in an area but it was felt the level of influence on services, particularly partners, was low.

Of those interviewed all were happy to attend Area Panels and provide Members the opportunity to comment on and shape upcoming plans and projects. All were happy to receive the views of Members and take them onboard. Despite this the working group felt that the level of influence Area Panels could exert was low. The working



group felt that, by the time plans and projects come to Area Panels, it was too late to genuinely influence them or even stop something happening.

The Council had operated a pilot to give Area Panels and local communities a greater say in service design through a participatory budgeting exercise regarding verge parking. Whilst this project had successfully delivered a series of parking spaces across the borough, and attracted additional funding from partners to pay for additional spaces, Members noted a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the scheme. This pilot scheme was designed to test the process and as such was implemented with limited budgets. This required each Area Panel to select only one area for a new verge parking scheme. This resulted in a solution that met the needs of a minority leaving a majority of local residents disappointed as their hopes of additional parking spaces were unfulfilled. Members accepted that in order to address the issues facing those in most need any future local decision making powers and responsibilities would come with this challenge.

### **Moving forward**

With the issues regarding reducing budgets and a likely need for centralised core services the working group wish to suggest that Cabinet undertake some investigation to establish the cost of delivering core-standard services and identifying surplus budgets for the potential allocation to Area Panels. Moreover the surplus budgets should be allocated to areas on a needs basis in line with the Marmot objectives.

The working group also recommend that Cabinet undertake a review of existing resources supporting ward activity to identify any cross over and potential for more efficient use of resources.

In terms of priority setting the working group felt that it would be better if Area Panels could play a greater role 'upstream' with the priority setting of the Council and its partners at an area level.

## **Should Area Panels increase the role for holding the council and its partners to account?**

The second key question the working group investigated was should Area Panels increase the role for holding the council and its partners to account?

The working group considered the current position and recognised that there were many good examples of Area Panels holding the council and its partners to account. For example, the Willenhall and Short Heath Area Panel has held local housing providers to account about the quality of local housing stock. The Walsall South Area Panel has previously invited local schools to meetings to discuss their performance. However, Members were conscious that these opportunities were reliant on the partners concerned agreeing to attend the meeting. To their credit, the key local partners were always willing to attend and contribute at Area Panel meetings.

The missing piece of the jigsaw, as seen by the working group, was a lack of influence. When undertaking the holding to account role as members of an Area Panel the working group often felt that the opportunity to truly influence the direction the council and its partners was taking was already lost. This frustrated Members as they wanted to play a stronger role in the direction the council and its partners took at an area level.

When speaking with partners it became clear that some had their own separate governance structures within which they preferred to be held to account. For example, the Police preferred to be held to account at an area level by the Local Police and Crime Board which included a representative from each Area Panel. There were similar independent governance structures in existence at whg.

This led the working group to conclude that the most effective way of holding the council and its partners to account was to contribute to priority setting. The idea is that this would ensure that each area panel's priorities were reflected across strategic partners. Whilst there is evidence of partners in other Local Authority Areas working to set priorities at a ward or area level this was often in relation to specific themes such as crime and grime, open spaces or housing. However, Members felt that local communities required and received wide ranging services and that their communities would be better served through Area Panels ability to influence a broader spectrum of provision. To this end the working group recommend that the Borough Management Team establish whether it will be possible to establish a mechanism for Area Panels to contribute to partnership wide target setting and monitoring at an area level.

It could be argued that this is happening, in part, already but the working group believe that the existing priorities in each Area Panels Area Plan are too broadly in line with the strategic priorities for the borough. The working group wish to recommend that Area Plan priorities become more focussed and specific to each area rather than be set broad priorities. Further to this Area Panels should increase their role in the drafting, approving and monitoring of Area Plans and their priorities with input from a wider range of partners.

The working group believe that the combination of these top down/bottom up changes will greatly increase the connectedness of the partnership approach, give Members and residents more ownership of their priorities and allow them to genuinely hold others to account for delivery of the chosen priorities.

Further to this Members recognised the importance of involving local communities in the drafting and influencing of Area Plans and their priorities. To this end the working group recommends that each Area Panel holds at least one annual consultation event to seek the views of local residents, businesses and the local voluntary and community sector on significant challenges facing the area. This information can be used to inform the Area Panel which Members and the local communities can comment on in draft form at a future Area Panel meeting prior to the Area Plans approval by Members. The delivery of the Area Plan will then form the focus of Area Panel meetings throughout the year through a series of themed meetings based on the priorities in the Area Plan.

## **How should Area Panels engage local communities to ensure they become part of the solution?**

During their investigations the working group was conscious that a key role of Area Panels is to engage with local communities. The working group believe that Area Panels could expand this role and better engage with the local voluntary and community sector to build local capacity.

### **Area Panel Meetings**

With regard to Area Panel meetings, the working group suggest that it would be of benefit for Area Panels to re-focus on their role and purpose. Area Panels should play a greater role in the drafting, approving and monitoring of Area Plans which should be specific and targeted in setting out priorities for the local area and ways in which they could be addressed.

It is suggested that meetings are themed around Area Plan priorities and that Area Panels shape activity taking place to achieve each priority. In doing so, Area Managers and partners would be expected to work together in terms of delivery of the local priorities and be prepared to provide regular updates at panel meetings. Further to this Area Panel meetings should hold meetings across the wards in their local patch. If particular priorities were specific to a certain area then the Area Panel meeting should take place in the relevant neighbourhood.

### *Engagement*

The working group suggested that Area Panels could do more to engage local communities at meetings. Attendance at meetings across the borough by members of the public is typically very low. Members believed that it was important to initiate something to improve this situation. It was hoped that involving local communities in the development of Area Plans would be one step towards greater engagement but it was clear that further ways to engage local people were still required.

Social media is ever more present in society and so Area Panels could make a greater use of social media tools. Not everybody is able to attend an Area Panel meeting and so it is suggested that social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter were good tools for engagement. Discussions on agenda items could be managed online in the build up to meetings and the views of local residents could then be fed into Area Panel meetings.

### *Strategic planning matters*

A further opportunity to engage local communities would be citing Area Panels as consultees for strategically significant planning matters in their areas. This would give Members and local people the opportunity to comment and shape important matters for their area.

### **Voluntary and community sector**

It is widely known that the budgets of all local authorities are going to diminish heavily over the course of the next five years. Simply, the Council will not be able to maintain current levels of service moving forward. In order to maintain some

important services it is hoped the local voluntary and community sector (VCS) could take on services the Council can no longer afford to run or help increase efficiency so that services can be maintained for the benefit of the local community. There is already good work taking place to engage with local communities in services by the Council such as litter picking exercises, snow champions and maintaining public rights of way. Whilst this is a good start it is clear that there is a need to further develop the role of local communities and the VCS in Council activities.

The working group met with a selection of VCS organisations. All were of the opinion that greater co-ordination and engagement with local VCS groups was required to unlock the potential of local groups. There was a consensus that Walsall Voluntary Action (WVA) had been ineffective in this role and that change was required in the way the VCS was supported.

As well as more co-ordination, VCS groups explained that more community development was required to increase capacity in the third sector. A way of increasing capacity would be for increased support to be provided to the VCS with funding applications and evaluation work. Volunteers wanted to use their energy for direct community work and bureaucracy was a barrier to expanding the VCS.

Further to this, the working group strongly believed that whilst the VCS is an under-utilised resource in Walsall it was not a panacea to the Council's funding problems. In order for the VCS to function adequately it would require long term sustainable funding. The working group believed that the VCS could operate more efficiently but recognised that it would need funding to succeed.

It is clear that if some services are to survive moving forward the VCS will need to play an increased role. With this in mind the working group believed that it would be beneficial for the Council to develop and implement a range of pilot projects in partnership with local communities and the VCS across the borough. This would give all sectors the opportunity to build relationships and test mechanisms for co-delivery in the future.

In addition to involvement in delivery VCS groups want to be involved in strategic planning and priority setting. The working group have already recommended the involvement of the VCS in developing Area Plans and so would also recommend that VCS groups are involved with strategic priority setting undertaken by the Council and its partners. This will help build strength in the VCS who, at the current time, only feel involved at an operational level.

The working group also met with faith groups. A great deal of good work is undertaken by faith groups across the borough and the working group believed that more should be done by the Council and its partners to work with local faith organisations. The faith groups involved in the working group discussions recognised that there were challenges around the mistrust between the faith sector and other organisations. It was suggested to the working group that the Council adopts the 'Covenant for Engagement' between local authorities and faith groups as set out of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Faith and Society. A copy of this covenant is included at Appendix 2 to this report.

After speaking to representatives the working group felt that the faith sector in particular was underutilised and the working group recommend that increased engagement take place in this area



## Conclusion

It is the working group's view that Area Panels are an important part of the Council and have a crucial link to local communities and their priorities. Whilst there has been a loss of direction for Area Panels over recent years, this can be renewed by increasing focus on developing and approving priorities within the area plans and by taking a more central role in monitoring performance against those priorities. . It is important that local residents, businesses and the voluntary and community sector are meaningfully involved with this work.

In terms of influencing priority setting with the Council and its partners the working group felt that it would be better if Area Panels could play a greater role 'upstream' with the priority setting at an area level. In addition to this the voluntary and community sector should play a greater role in strategic priority setting.

The financial situation of the Council and the need to save tens of millions pounds moving forward was recognised as a barrier to Area Panels managing mainstream budgets. Resources were reducing so the expectation was that there would be increased requirements for organisational efficiency controlled by the corporate centre. On the other hand the working group considered the idea that, potentially Area Panels with their enhanced local knowledge, could improve service delivery and make money go further in these tough economic climes.

In light of the impact of reducing budgets and the need to maintain centralised core services Members accepted the complex nature of establishing any surplus budgets for potential allocation to Area Panels. However, they felt that taking account of the complexity, an exercise to test the viability of such a model should be undertaken. Members also accepted that a model of this nature would need to be targeted at those communities and individuals in most need and that following the identification of any surplus budgets these should be allocated in line with the Marmott objectives,.

The working group also concluded that a review of existing resources supporting ward activity was required in order to identify any cross over and duplication in case there was potential for efficiencies.

The working group also concluded that the voluntary and community sector in Walsall is an underutilised resource. The faith sector could be more widely engaged by the Council. The voluntary and community sector as a whole lacks co-ordination at a strategic level and further work needs to take place to build capacity in the voluntary and community sector. Despite being an underutilised resource the voluntary and community sector is not a panacea to the Councils funding problems. In order to function effectively the voluntary and community sector will require long term sustainable funding.

As part of building capacity in the voluntary and community sector, and as a potential means to preserve services, the working group concluded that the unique offer in each area could be tested through the development and implementation of pilot projects with the authority working with local communities and the voluntary sector. This would provide opportunity to build relationships and test mechanisms for delivery in partnership.





## Recommendations

1. That Cabinet be requested to consider a report detailing the feasibility of:
  - a) developing a formula for a needs based allocation of mainstream service budgets minus borough-wide core standard service costs.
  - b) establishing the cost of delivering core standard services and identify the availability of surplus budgets for allocation to Area Panels. Allocation of resources to Area Panels should be based on achieving the Marmot objectives.
  - c) establishing a mechanism for Area Panels to affect service delivery with a staged implementation.
2. That a review of existing resources supporting ward activity is undertaken to identify any cross over and duplication for potential more efficient use of resources.
3. That discussion takes place with the Borough Management Team to establish whether it will be possible to develop a mechanism for Area Panels to contribute to partnership wide target setting and monitoring of progress against service delivery at an area level.
4. That Cabinet request Executive Directors to identify a pilot project in each partnership area, relevant to each areas area plan priorities, to develop and test mechanisms for delivering in partnership with local communities and voluntary sector groups.
5. That Cabinet request the Executive Director of Regeneration with exploring whether Area Panels can be cited as consultees for any strategically significant planning matters affecting their areas.
6. Area Plan priorities should become more focussed.
7. That Area Panels increase their role in the drafting and approving Area Plan priorities and monitoring activity against these priorities with the assistance of partners.
8. That Area Panels focus on the development and delivery of a focussed Area Plan to engage residents. This should include themed meetings on Area Plan priorities and holding meetings in venues in each of the wards in each area where possible.
9. That Area Panels hold an annual consultation event, as a minimum, to seek the views of local residents, businesses and local voluntary and community sector on

any significant challenges facing the area in the coming year and to feedback progress on Area Panel activity in the previous year.

10. That greater co-ordination of the voluntary and community sector take place.
11. That the voluntary and community sector play a greater role in strategic priority setting for the Council and its partners.
12. That a greater emphasis is put on community development work by the Council.
13. Voluntary and community sector faith groups should be more widely engaged by the Council.
14. That Area Panels engage local communities more fully taking account of the broad range of engagement tools available, including social media tools.
15. That the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel monitor the outcome of the work undertaken to implement its recommendations in October 2015.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

<b>Work Group Name:</b>	Area Partnerships Working Group
<b>Panel:</b>	Neighbourhoods
<b>Municipal Year:</b>	2014/15
<b>Lead Member:</b>	Councillor A. Nawaz
<b>Lead Officer:</b>	Kate Bowers
<b>Support Officer:</b>	Craig Goodall
<b>Membership:</b>	D. Anson (Business, Employment and Local Economy Rep) R. Burley (Social Care and Health Rep) A. Ditta S. Fitzpatrick T. Jukes A. Nawaz I. Shires C. Towe
<b>Co-opted Members:</b>	None
<b>1. Context</b>	<p>Area Partnerships were created in 2010 by Walsall Partnership. This created a model for neighbourhood management across the borough on two levels. One Member led through public facing meetings. The other Officer led through ‘tasking’ meetings with partners.</p> <p>Member led meetings have provided a focus for discussions to identify and address community issues and they have subsequently affected local service delivery in response and/or made decisions on funding applications from groups and organisations able to deliver a possible solution. In addition Members have acted as the focal point and decision making body for participatory budgeting.</p> <p>At the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel meeting on 6 January 2015 Cabinet invited the Panel to establish a working group to consider how devolution to area panels could be developed.</p> <p>Cabinets priorities for Area Panels are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective delivery;</li> <li>• More community involvement in matters affecting local neighbourhoods;</li> <li>• A stronger role for community organisations.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Objectives</b>	<p>Following an invitation from Cabinet the working group will review the current duties and responsibilities undertaken by Area Panels and to explore how they could increase these to provide a more bespoke response to community issues and challenges and therefore ensure more effective delivery in the future. Members will look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should Area Panels take responsibility for budgets? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Should Area Panels take responsibility for managing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>mainstream budgets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Should Area Panels commission work to deliver area priorities?</li> <li>○ Should Area Panel influence mainstream service design?</li> <li>● Should Area Panels increase the role for holding the council and its partners to account?</li> <li>● How should Area Panels engage local communities to ensure they become part of the solution?</li> </ul>								
<b>3.</b>	<b>Scope</b>								
	The focus of the piece of work is exploring the potential range of duties and responsibilities and the Member led arrangements required at an area level to implement them.								
<b>4.</b>	<b>Equalities Implications</b>								
	Effort will be made by the working group to ensure that its findings and recommendations do not unfairly disadvantage and person on the grounds of their age, disability, gender, race, religion or belief and sexual orientation.								
<b>4.</b>	<b>Who else will you want to take part?</b>								
	<p>Other Council Services  Other local authorities, for example: Sheffield.  Walsall Voluntary Action  Walsall Housing Group  Police  Public Health  Health and Wellbeing Board  Clinical Commissioning Group  Other Voluntary and Community Organisations</p>								
<b>5.</b>	<b>Timescales &amp; Reporting Schedule</b>								
	<p>A final report and recommendations will be presented to the Neighbourhoods Scrutiny and Performance Panel on 9 April 2015.</p> <p>If the work needs to continue beyond the 2014/15 municipal year then the working group will consider making an interim report before the end of April 2015.</p>								
<b>6.</b>	<b>Risk factors</b>								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Risk</b></th> <th><b>Likelihood</b></th> <th><b>Measure to Resolve</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unable to complete piece of work within allocated timescale; in particular being able to speak to all required witnesses.</td> <td>High</td> <td> <p>Schedule of meetings organised</p> <p>Send a questionnaire to witnesses to reduce number of meetings.</p> <p>Possibility of calling a special</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Measure to Resolve</b>	Unable to complete piece of work within allocated timescale; in particular being able to speak to all required witnesses.	High	<p>Schedule of meetings organised</p> <p>Send a questionnaire to witnesses to reduce number of meetings.</p> <p>Possibility of calling a special</p>
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Measure to Resolve</b>							
Unable to complete piece of work within allocated timescale; in particular being able to speak to all required witnesses.	High	<p>Schedule of meetings organised</p> <p>Send a questionnaire to witnesses to reduce number of meetings.</p> <p>Possibility of calling a special</p>							

			Neighbourhoods SPP meeting if required.  Consider making an interim report if work needs to continue beyond 2014/15 municipal year.
--	--	--	---

Date Agreed:		Date Updated:	
--------------	--	---------------	--

**Timetable:**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Activity</b>
16 February	Scene setting and terms of reference
24 February	Should Area Panels increase their role for holding the council and its partners to account?  How should Area Panels engage with local communities to ensure they become part of the solution?
11 March	Meeting with health and housing partners.
16 March	Meeting with West Midlands Police and Council services.
23 March	Meeting with voluntary and community sector organisations.
31 March	Conclusions