



# **Self-Assessment Review Document for Strategic Partnerships**

## **PtP self-assessment review**

### **How will our partnerships benefit from this?**

Progress through Partnership (PtP) aims to support Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) and their thematic partnerships and delivery groups to increase their capacity to respond to the needs of their community and jointly deliver outcomes expressed in the relevant strategic documents for their area.

One of the ways that PtP does this is to offer a central fund that LSPs can draw upon for bespoke work to build the capacity of their partnership. In 2008/09 this fund will offer £4000 to every LSP in the region.

Completing the self assessment is a pre-requisite to accessing this fund, and capacity building activities will be expected to relate to the needs identified.

The PtP self assessment aims to help partnerships assess their own development needs. It also provides a monitoring mechanism for the development of LSPs in the region and helps PtP target its regional support activities.

PtP is built on the principal of peer led support and we feel it is important that partnerships take the lead role in assessing their own development needs.

### **Assessment themes**

The assessment asks a series of questions based on the following five themes.

- Governance
- Vision and Strategy
- Leadership
- Performance Management
- Delivery and Impact

The purpose of the free text boxes in the assessment are to:

- identify your partnerships strengths and progress so that these can be recognised and celebrated and help PtP share good practice across the region
- identify your current challenges to help you develop plans to address these and help PtP map common need in the region

Referring to both any previous assessment you have completed and the definitions below he self-assessment then asks partnerships to rate their current position using a traffic light system.

## ***SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008***

### Traffic light definitions

The following criteria should be used for the traffic light system used in this self assessment:

Green	The LSP is satisfied with its performance in this area, or has plans of action that are being implanted that the LSPs is confident will address any shortcomings within the next 12 months
Amber	LSP is aware of underperformance and is developing plans to address any shortcomings.
Red	LSP has not yet developed plans to address shortcomings in this area
Gray	The LSP does not think that that the issues identified in the question is the responsibility of their LSP

### **How confidential is this information?**

The information will only be used for the purpose of the PtP programme unless specific consent is given to the sharing of this information with wider audiences.

The information will be used in a non attributable format to map how LSPs are developing within the region.

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<b>1. Governance</b>				
<b>Questions to ask when assessing the effectiveness of the LSP's governance arrangements</b>	<b>Strengths – where we are doing well and what we have achieved since April 2007</b>	<b>Our current challenges</b>	<b>Rating at last review</b>	<b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
1.1 Has the LSP developed relevant governance protocols, which include roles and responsibilities, a code of behaviour and agreed financial and performance management arrangements to and accountability to stakeholders and the wider community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance Protocol between SCC and SP agreed and adopted in July 2007.</li> <li>• Development of the SP Delivery Board from the previous LAA Programme Board.</li> <li>• Core Terms of Reference between SP and its 'partnerships family' adopted.</li> <li>• LAA Performance Management Framework in place.</li> <li>• SCC Governance Review (corporate, neighbourhood &amp; Partnership) being undertaken by the Solicitor to the Council in light on the LGPIH Act 2007.</li> <li>• Improved co-ordination and liaison between partner agencies/partnerships.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying a Compact Champion within SCC. Work is underway.</li> <li>• Harmonisation of Community Engagement Frameworks across partners.</li> <li>• Accountability to stakeholders needs strengthening.</li> </ul>		
1.2 Has the LSP considered its relationship with all elected members in their representational and scrutiny roles and resolved any misunderstandings and/or difficulties?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New majority administration elected May 2008. Special Cabinet briefing held 15<sup>th</sup> July 2007 to discuss approach to partnership working in light of the new LSP Statutory Guidance.</li> <li>• Cabinet Members agreed to be embedded into in the leadership of the LSP and its 'partnership family' through chairing, co-chairing or vice-chairing.</li> <li>• Quarterly monitoring reports on the LSP and its 'partnership family' to be presented to Cabinet and Council.</li> <li>• Scrutiny pilot undertaken through the PtP Programme. Outputs have influenced the newly adopted Scrutiny Inquiry Model which secures effective partner engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCC Governance Review (corporate, neighbourhood &amp; partnership) being undertaken by the Solicitor to the Council in light on the LGPIH Act 2007 might come up with proposals or recommendations that need to be implemented within the current partnership framework.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<p>1.8 Do LSP structures, processes and membership take account of the diversity of the local community and demonstrate full involvement from across the community?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Our Shared Future’ report on Southampton undertaken by Professor Ted Cante, Commission on Integration &amp; Cohesion.</li> <li>• Institute of Community Cohesion (ICoCo) commissioned to produce a report identifying the actions needed to realise Strategic Objective 1 (People proud of their city &amp; making a positive contribution) strand of the City of Southampton Strategy.</li> <li>• Communities &amp; Renewal Partnership identified as the lead partnership for developing the Action Plan for Strategic Objective 1.</li> <li>• SCC currently reviewing its’ Neighbourhood Partnerships structures.</li> <li>• LAA ‘Statement of Community Involvement’ developed and agreed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities &amp; Renewal Partnership agreed (23<sup>rd</sup> Sept 2008) to take action on those areas in the Action Plan that mirror recommendations from ICoCo and the Commission and will contribute to PSA 21, namely:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Mapping communities to identify tensions and opportunities.</li> <li>➢ Reviewing the current council policy on translations.</li> <li>➢ Carrying out a brief audit of opportunities for cross-cultural and inter-faith engagement.</li> <li>➢ Delivering a campaign to recruit under-represented groups to positions such as school governors, magistrates and other positions in public life such as special constables.</li> <li>➢ Delivering more basic literacy skills programmes in the city in partnership with Learning Links.</li> <li>➢ Strengthening the citizenship agenda with children and parents through pre-school, school and extended schools activities.</li> <li>➢ Progressing the suggestion of a “Welcome to the City” event for University students.</li> <li>➢ Working with the Southampton City Brand group to promote good news stories to celebrate the success of local people and communities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Current review of the SP Strategy Board.</li> </ul>		
<p>1.10 Is relevant secretariat and other support available to ensure the LSP structures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secured LAA Programme Management capacity through the SP Delivery Board.</li> <li>• Secured a Business Student placement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAA Programme Manager left in June 2008 and has currently not been replaced.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<p>work effectively? Please provide details of numbers of staff and any funding for secretariat.</p>	<p>through LSC funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Held a workshop with SCC’s Policy Co-ordination Team and Partnership Managers to develop a robust corporate management approach to city partnership working.</li> <li>• The Partnership Managers Group meetings have been formalised to a monthly cycle.</li> <li>• The Strategic Partnerships Manager is implementing regular 1-1 ‘touch-base’ meetings with individual Partnership Managers (11 in total).</li> <li>• Current staff for the LSP comprises Strategic Partnerships Manager (funded by SCC) and a Support Officer (funded by LAA pump-priming grant).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Student placement ended on the 19<sup>th</sup> September and has not been replaced due to lack of funding.</li> <li>• Broader SCC review of policy, performance and partnerships co-ordination and delivery being undertaken. Recommendations expected in October 2008 which might impact on the current staffing capacity provided.</li> </ul>		
<p>1.12 Has the LSP developed effective, shared, risk management systems?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAA Performance Management Framework adopted.</li> <li>• Robust quarterly monitoring for LAA targets in place. Risk-based Exception Reporting process implemented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing an Integrated Partnership Performance Management Framework.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>1. Governance Summary – To be completed after the detailed self-assessment (or by drawing on the findings of previous assessments)</b></p>				
<p>To be rated as ‘Green’ the LSP should have in place clear aims and objectives and Terms of Reference which include protocols defining roles and responsibilities. Effective structures and processes should be in place to facilitate cross agency working and to optimise opportunities for joined up/inclusive working at all levels including front-line staff. Individuals and organisations involved in the LSP have a full understanding of their respective roles, responsibilities and accountabilities. The LSP will have considered its relationship with all elected members in their representational and scrutiny roles and resolved any misunderstandings and/or difficulties.</p>				
<p align="center"><b>Overall Strengths.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Overall challenges</b></p>			<p align="center"><b>Rating at last review (Red/Amber/Green)</b></p>

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

		<b>Where we are now?</b> <b>Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embedded a robust LAA Performance Management Framework.</li> <li>• Clear steer from Cabinet re expectations of partnership working and Member engagement.</li> <li>• Scrutiny Pilot undertaken.</li> <li>• SCC Governance Review currently in progress.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing the (as yet unknown) recommendations from both the SCC Governance Review and the broader SCC review of policy, performance and partnerships co-ordination and delivery.</li> <li>• Developing an Integrated Partnership Performance Management Framework.</li> <li>• Implementing the (as yet unknown) recommendations from the SP Strategy Board review.</li> </ul>	

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<b>2.Vision and Strategy</b>				
<b>Questions to ask when assessing the effectiveness of the LSP's vision and strategy</b>	<b>Strengths – where we are doing well and what we have achieved since April 2007</b>	<b>Our current challenges</b>	<b>Rating at last review</b>	<b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
2.1 Does the LSP have an ambitious, long-term vision for the future development of the area which promotes the distinctiveness of the place and particular localities within it and covers all aspects of community life which are important to local people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City of Southampton Strategy (our sustainable community strategy) was formally launched in September 2007.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Embedding the LDF Core Strategy, once approved, into the LSP and the sustainable community strategy.</li> <li>Communicating the City of Southampton Strategy priorities alongside the Council's new key priorities.</li> </ul>		
2.5 Are the LSP's vision, strategy and priorities reflected in partners' plans and strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All key sector partnerships and agencies formally signed-up to the City of Southampton Strategy (CoSS).</li> <li>CoSS is embedded in the Local Area Agreement and the emerging LDF Core Strategy.</li> <li>CoSS is being embedded into key sector/thematic strategies and plans when they are being refreshed, ie Safe City Partnership Plan, Children &amp; Young People's Partnership Plan, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to quality-check how embedded the CoSS is within partner strategies and action plans.</li> </ul>		
2.7 Are the LSP's strategies based on sound information and evidence of local needs as well as the opportunities and challenges facing the area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> </ul>		
2.11 Do LSP strategies identify desired outcomes and set out clear priorities for the short, medium and long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will need to start considering the CoSS refresh process for the 42 x 3-year (2010) milestones.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

term?				
2.15 Does the LSP take account of community identified need and empower communities to find solutions to community issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community representatives were engaged in the LAA refresh stakeholder conferences to identify and agree priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responding, as appropriate, to the Community Empowerment White Paper and the Sustainable Communities Act.</li> <li>Providing effective routes/mechanisms for community engagement.</li> </ul>		
<b>2. Vision and Strategy Summary – To be completed after the detailed self-assessment (or by drawing on the findings of previous assessments)</b>				
To be rated as 'Green' the LSP should have a clear, shared vision and purpose reflecting local priorities and which contains aspects that reflect the distinctive nature of the area it covers. It should have set itself relevant and robust objectives for improving quality of life of local people and have produced (or be currently working to produce), with the local community, a sustainable community strategy.				
				<b>Rating at last review (Red/Amber/Green)</b>
<b>Overall Strengths.</b>		<b>Overall challenges</b>		
				<b>Where we are now?</b>
				<b>Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong Vision and City of Southampton Strategy that is being embedded in well across partnerships and in strategies/plans.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective and sustained community engagement is a significant challenge.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<b>3. Leadership</b>				
<b>Questions to ask when assessing the effectiveness of the LSP's leadership</b>	<b>Strengths – where we are doing well and what we have achieved since April 2007</b>	<b>Our current challenges</b>	<b>Rating at last review</b>	<b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
3.3 Is there buy-in at the highest level – political and senior officer/manager – from all partner organisations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Leader of The Council is the chair of the proposed SP Policy Board which replaces the previous SP Strategy Board.</li> <li>The SP Delivery Board is chaired by the Chief Executive of Southampton City Council and comprises of chief executives or equivalent from key partner agencies.</li> <li>The Leader and Deputy Leader have a standing invite to attend the SP Delivery Board in an observer capacity.</li> <li>Cabinet Members are taking prominent leadership roles (chair, co-chair, vice chair) within the partnerships that align to their portfolios.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to audit the depth of partnership mainstreaming within partner organisations, ie are the relevant partnerships discussed at Corporate Management Teams, is there a significant commitment to partnership working statement in annual business plans, etc?</li> <li>Need to continually articulate and raise awareness of the added value of partnership working to all partners – public, private and community &amp; voluntary sectors.</li> </ul>		
3.5 Do partners provide leadership and champion the LSP within their own organisations and promote different ways of working and delivering services to meet LSP aspirations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP Delivery Board meets monthly and is working well with high level of commitment.</li> <li>The 'partnership family' is joining up well and reporting into the Delivery Board.</li> <li>Significant partner support to the Think Family initiative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure that the new SP Policy Board undertakes a significant championing role across the city.</li> </ul>		
3.7 Can the LSP make and sustain difficult decisions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes it can. An example being the LAA refresh and the identification and agreement of our 'up to 35' targets by partners.</li> <li>Stronger and Safer Communities Fund allocations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None that instantly spring to mind, but as the credit-crunch deepens and demands on services and resources increases, we could find that the LSP will increasingly be called upon to make difficult decisions.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<p>3.8 Are meetings well run, open and accessible; enabling conflicts to be aired and dealt with and issues to be resolved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting dates advertised a year in advance.</li> <li>• Meeting style is for short reports which seek partner actions and commitment.</li> <li>• Meetings are not open to the public, but behind closed doors with Chatham House rules being applied. This provides the right forum for full and frank exchanges to be undertaken.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Getting the balance right between action-orientated agenda items and reflective discussions.</li> </ul>		
<p>3.9 Has the LSP considered and agreed its policy towards the chairing of the LSP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implications of the statutory LSP Guidance considered. Outcome is that the Leader of The Council will chair the LSP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new chairing arrangements will be implemented in January 2009 when the new SP Policy Board holds its inaugural meeting.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>3. Leadership Summary – To be completed after the detailed self-assessment (or by drawing on the findings of previous assessments)</b></p>				
<p>To be rated as 'Green' there needs to be strategic and challenging leadership from all partners, which supports improvement and delivery of LSP objectives. This leadership should foster and promote good relationships amongst all participating individuals and organisations, including open communication across the partnership and with the wider community. It should also demonstrate that partners are embracing their community leadership role.</p>				
<p align="center"><b>Overall Strengths.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Overall challenges</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Rating at last review (Red/Amber/Green)</b></p>		
		<p align="center"><b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firm foundations in place through the SP Delivery Board (chaired by SCC Chief Executive) and its agreed role in 'holding partnerships to account for delivery'.</li> <li>• Role of Cabinet Members within the sector/thematic partnerships.</li> <li>• Chairing arrangements for the proposed SP Policy Board agreed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that whilst SCC is taking on a more prominent leadership role within the spirit of the statutory LSP Guidance, which is generally welcomed by partners, we need to ensure that it does not lead to accusations of dominance – whether actual or perceived.</li> </ul>			

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<b>4. Performance Management</b>				
<b>Questions to ask when assessing the effectiveness of the LSP's performance management framework</b>	<b>Strengths – where we are doing well and what we have achieved since April 2007</b>	<b>Our current challenges</b>	<b>Rating at last review</b>	<b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
4.2 Are performance management frameworks for the community strategy, LAA and LDF and performance indicators aligned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, through the Corvu Performance Management System and refreshed LAA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing an Integrated Partnership Performance Management Framework to incorporate all sector/thematic partnership strategies and plans.</li> </ul>		
4.3 Does the performance management framework take account of the district/ neighbourhood/parish dimension?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority Neighbourhoods requiring targeted intervention are identified in Southampton's Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and LAA as appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst not an immediate challenge, we will need to consider whether the LNRS is to be incorporated into the CoSS when it is refreshed in the future.</li> </ul>		
4.4 Are the respective responsibilities of partner organisations for delivery on agreed actions clear?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear partner leads identified in the LAA and CoSS performance management arrangements.</li> <li>• Quarterly progress meetings undertaken with the 12 LAA stretch targets' lead officers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>		
4.7 Is performance information (against agreed targets in sustainable community strategy, LAA and LDF) collected, collated and analysed using a range of data sources, including data at neighbourhood level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>		
4.8 Do LSP partners provide constructive challenge to ensure progress towards LSP objectives is maintained?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, through the SP Delivery Board's quarterly performance monitoring meetings and facilitated workshops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<p>4.10 Does the LSP regularly review the plausibility of its plans and action programmes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, exception reporting process adopted by the SP Delivery Board.</li> <li>• New/refreshed strategies now require clear resource statements, timescales and measures to facilitate delivery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>		
<p>4.11 Does the LSP regularly review its performance as an effective partnership?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, through this PtP self-assessment.</li> <li>• 6 sector/thematic partnerships piloted a 'partnership health-check' contained within the adopted Local Government Partnering Framework.</li> <li>• Currently reviewing the role and membership of the SP Strategy Board in order to reshape it into a SP Policy Board.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embedding a partnership development culture within the LSP and its 'partnership family' through increased utilisation of the Local Government Partnering Framework and the annual health-check process.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>4. Performance Management Summary – To be completed after the detailed self-assessment (or by drawing on the findings of previous assessments)</b></p>				
<p>To be rated as 'Green' the LSP should have effective processes in place for translating objectives into the day-to-day actions of individual agencies and to actively manage performance so as to deliver the objectives of LSP plans, strategies; the LAA and LDF. The LSP should be monitoring reviewing and evaluating outcomes and learning from this information to refine and improve its activities and objectives.</p>				
<p align="center"><b>Overall Strengths.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Overall challenges</b></p>	<p align="right"><b>Rating at last review (Red/Amber/Green)</b></p>		
		<p align="right"><b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A robust performance management process has been implemented for the LAA and the CoSS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embedding a robust performance management culture across the 'partnership family'.</li> <li>• Developing an Integrated Partnership Performance Management Framework.</li> </ul>			

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<b>5. Delivery and Impact</b>				
<b>Questions to ask when assessing the effectiveness of the LSP's delivery and impact</b>	<b>Strengths – where we are doing well and what we have achieved since April 2007</b>	<b>Our current challenges</b>	<b>Rating at last review</b>	<b>Where we are now?  Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b>
5.1 Can the LSP point to practical achievements – in terms of the priorities it has set out to deliver against – and the contribution its activities are making to improve the quality of life for local people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AIF Programme.</li> <li>Successful delivery and performance of the LAA stretch targets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> <li>Cultural shift towards outcomes required.</li> </ul>		
5.3 Has the LSP established appropriate mechanisms for receiving feedback from partners and communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is significant engagement of partners and community representatives within the membership of the SP and its 'partnership family'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harmonisation of Community Engagement Frameworks across partners.</li> <li>Review of The Compact.</li> </ul>		
5.4 Has the LSP facilitated development and agreement of the LAA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes and its subsequent refresh.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> </ul>		
5.5 Does the LSP facilitate cross-agency actions and joint working to deliver the sustainable community strategy, the LAA and other LSP priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes through its 'partnership family' around, for example, the Safe City Plan, Children &amp; Young People's Partnership Plan, the Think Family initiative, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-going facilitation and encouragement of joint cross-sectoral partnership working.</li> </ul>		
5.8 Are partner agencies commissioning services jointly, and/or locating services together within communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Children &amp; Young People's Trust has appointed a Joint Commissioning Manager whose role is to develop a Joint Commissioning Framework for the Trust.</li> <li>Work on joint commissioning is also being progressed by the Health &amp; Wellbeing Partnership.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring that any joint commissioning arrangements link up and add value to other systems, ie the CYP Trust model must complement the HWB Partnership model and vice-a-versa.</li> </ul>		

**SOUTHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP SELF-ASSESSMENT 2008**

<p>5.9 Are there examples which demonstrate where more has been achieved collectively by the LSP than would have been achieved by individual organisations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Brand Strategy being championed by Southampton City Brand.</li> <li>• The AIF Programme.</li> <li>• Potentially the Think Family initiative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>		
<p>5.10 Are there examples where barriers to achievement have been jointly identified and overcome by the LSP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchasing the Corvu Performance Management System in order to simplify the performance management requirements of partners around the LAA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5. Delivery and Impact Summary – To be completed after the detailed self-assessment (or by drawing on the findings of previous assessments)</b></p>				
<p>To be rated as 'Green' the LSP should have evidence which shows it is making good progress in delivering objectives and targets set out in plans, strategies and the LAA. It should be able to demonstrate a range of achievements, which are making a difference to the area, enhancing the quality of life for local people and improving service delivery.</p>				
<p align="center"><b>Overall Strengths.</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Overall challenges</b></p>	<p align="right"><b>Rating at last review (Red/Amber/Green)</b></p>		
		<p align="right"><b>Where we are now? Red, Amber, Green or Gray</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SP and its partnership family are definitely more focussed on delivery, whether it is the LAA or other targets and initiatives set out in their respective strategies and plans.</li> <li>• The SP Delivery Board is the co-ordinating engine-room for ensuring delivery and the sector/thematic partnerships are quite clear about their reporting responsibilities and accountability to it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harmonisation of Community Engagement Frameworks across partners.</li> </ul>			