1.	Meeting:	CABINET
2.	Date:	9th November 2011
3.	Title:	Targeting and coordinating resources to the most deprived areas
4.	Directorate:	Commissioning, Policy and Performance

5. Summary

The Corporate Plan priority 'making sure no community is left behind' is key to our work in tackling deprivation. In recent months there has been much discussion on how the Council and partners are addressing the challenges of our most deprived areas. This has been highlighted following the recent publication of the Indices of Deprivation results which reveal that deprivation has deteriorated in many parts of Rotherham.

This short paper sets out a range of options to consider in helping to target deprivation. It highlights the need to do things differently whilst also building upon previous approaches, both locally and further afield, to ensure lessons are learned.

6. Recommendations

That the Cabinet:

- **Consider the approach to targeting and coordinating resources into the most deprived areas**

- **Assess the number of targeted areas which require a sustained, long term partnership approach**

- **Approve that a Cabinet Member and an SLT lead officer are assigned to each targeted area to ensure ownership, leadership and to make things happen at a local level**

- **Note the potential future implications on area assembly and partnership working and consider whether it is timely to move away from a standard borough wide approach to a more targeted approach for allocating resources to areas of greatest need**

- **Commission finance to identify a baseline position of total spend and resources in each of the areas, including partner contributions**

- **Approve that a further report is presented to the LSP Chief Executive Group setting out areas where partners are able to influence services in the targeted areas**

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Background

Over recent years the Council has undertaken a number of regeneration and intensive neighbourhood management approaches including Single Regeneration Budget, neighbourhood renewal, Local Ambition and pilot projects such as Chesterhill. Many of these initiatives have been as a result of additional, external grants provided by central government. The economic outlook and funding position for the public sector is now very different so it is timely to reassess the Council's resources and how it is able to redirect mainstream activities to areas of greatest need.

It is evident that a fresh approach is needed in ensuring that the Council and partners are helping to protect and target the most vulnerable individuals and the communities they live in. The Rotherham Babies analysis in 2010 highlighted the significant differences in life chances and expectancy between different areas of the borough. This position is not acceptable, we need to learn from the lessons of previous approaches to tackling the effects of deprivation and consider what different approaches are needed.

A scrutiny review has been commissioned exploring the impact of previous regeneration initiatives across Rotherham which will help to inform this work.

7.2 Indices of Multiple Deprivation Report

The Indices of Deprivation 2010 illustrates the scale and nature of deprivation affecting Rotherham. Crucially, the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2010 shows that deprivation has increased since the 2007 Index and the gap between the most and least deprived areas has grown wider.

The IMD 2007 ranked Rotherham as the 68th most deprived district but the position deteriorated to 53rd out of 326 districts in the IMD 2010. Health, Employment and Education remain the most challenging domains or themes of deprivation affecting the Borough. There has been a general deterioration in terms of Health and Employment since the IMD 2007, and in Education for those in the most deprived areas.

A particular concern is that the increase in deprivation in Rotherham has been concentrated in the most deprived areas. There is an urgent need to target mainstream resources to avert any further deterioration. There are 11 neighbourhoods defined by Super Output Area (SOA) or SOA clusters, where deprivation is particularly high (amongst the most deprived 10% of England):

- East Herringthorpe (2 SOAs)
- Canklow
- Eastwood (3 SOAs)
- Town Centre
- East Dene (4 SOAs)
- Dalton & Thrybergh (4 SOAs)
- Ferham & Masbrough (3 SOAs)
- Maltby South East (3 SOAs)
- Dinnington Central
- Aston North
- Rawmarsh East

These above areas contain 15% of the Borough's population and Central Rotherham remains the focus with three quarters of the most deprived SOAs. Most of these areas can be categorised as either council estates, multi-ethnic terraced areas or coalfield communities.

All areas of high deprivation present a long term challenge with deep seated problems, often affecting the same families across generations, notably:

- Poor health including mental health, and high rates of disability
- Low educational attainment and low adult skills
- High levels of long term unemployment and sickness
- High crime and ASB affecting some areas
- Poor quality housing and environmental problems in some areas

The mix of issues affecting areas varies so support needs to be tailored to local needs. A common factor affecting areas of high deprivation is the need to raise aspirations and develop community capacity

7.3   Learning from local and national strategies

An evaluation of the national strategy for neighbourhood renewal, published last year, identified the following factors as having the most powerful effect on the probability of a neighbourhood improving:

- housing tenure
- skill levels
- population churn
- economic performance in the wider sub-regional economy
- accessibility to lower skilled jobs

The policy implications identified by the evaluation included an additional flexible pot of money is needed to bring partners together and provide flexibility, but resources should be carefully targeted and not spread too thinly. Mechanisms to ensure a continuing and increasing emphasis on deprived neighbourhoods by mainstream providers must be a priority over the long term.

In Rotherham, the Chesterhill Intensive Neighbourhood Management pilot was a success in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour through targeted levels of community engagement and involvement. There is considerable learning which can be mainstreamed and delivered to other vulnerable neighbourhoods, for example:

- Creation of 'vulnerable trigger lists' which identify the most vulnerable families and individuals
- The need for high visibility and presence on a regular basis
- Evening high visibility walkabouts past 10pm
- Delivering regular intensive 'neighbourhood pride' weeks in targeted zones

The Local Ambition Programme – an intensive neighbourhood management initiative operating in Canklow, Ferham and East Herringthorpe – ended in March 2011. Whilst this initiative was short lived it did deliver a number of improvements in the chosen areas and included significant involvement with the community.

Among the key learning points and conclusions identified in the programme's evaluation reports, were the following:

- There is a need for high visibility presence in vulnerable neighbourhoods, on a continuous basis, across a range of agencies, especially those with enforcement powers
- Service providers need to ensure appropriate allocation of resources in the most vulnerable neighbourhoods
- The way in which services are delivered should be appropriate for the area, avoiding blanket approaches
- Residents need to not only feel informed about work being done in the area, but also need to feel that they can have an input and help tailor it to the needs of the community

The work in addressing EU migration issues in Eastwood including waste, private sector housing, child neglect and human trafficking has also highlighted the need for stronger, more coordinated partnership activity at all levels. It has also been essential in having a strong interest from Cabinet and SLT to ensure that issues, when escalated, can be dealt with promptly.

7.4 Recommended approach for each targeted area

Building upon the lessons learned from previous approaches, there are a number of critical success factors to be applied for each target area.

- **Strong Community involvement and ownership**
  Nothing can be successful without the involvement and buy in from each community. It is essential that all agencies work in partnership with the local communities. Each target area must invest time and resources to help inform communities, encourage their involvement and ultimately develop their ability to take ownership of the issues rather than being reliant on the public sector. There needs to be involvement of all sectors: private, public and the third sector. Involvement via on line methods should also be explored rather than just focussing on face to face or public meetings.

- **Leadership across all levels of the partnership**
  A member and senior lead officer from the Council or partner agency is needed to ensure that issues are tackled. They need to have the ability to influence and move issues forward and will enable staff to escalate concerns when barriers exist. The political leadership and involvement of elected members is also essential.

- **Coordination role**
  It is critical to have a small operational team who can help coordinate activity, engage with the local community and get them involved in the solutions. This team needs to be full time working closely with all providers – public, private and third sector – who work in the targeted area. They are responsible for helping to achieve a number of quick wins in the areas and also help to focus on the longer term plans for the area. Daily or weekly tasking and sharing of intelligence and data will be key to ensuring this coordination role is effective.

- **Visibility in the area**
  A high degree of visibility is needed across all agencies. Regular walkabouts are one mechanism which help to involve local residents and also to ensure responsive action is taken to local issues. It is also important for a high visible presence of staff working in these areas, often in the evening when issues arise.

- **Resources to be flexibly deployed across all areas**

Partners need to be committed to shifting mainstream resources into areas of greatest need. No area is the same nor are the issues they face. Action must be coordinated across other agencies and staff working in these areas need a 'can do', pragmatic approach supported by sufficient authority to make things happen. This needs to be supported by a political commitment to reducing services into other less needy areas to a residual level 'core offer'.

- **Long term commitment**
  Tackling deprivation is not a short term fix. Whilst "quick wins" are essential in gaining involvement and trust of the community, there needs to be a long term commitment both in resources and leadership to these targeted areas. An improvement plan, based on in depth needs analysis and consultation, is needed for each area

- **Effective communication**
  Shifting resources to areas of greatest need will need careful handling both politically and with neighbouring areas. Regular communication of progress to residents, councillors and staff across partner agencies is crucial

Similar to the Local Ambition programme, a simple four stage approach for each area is recommended.

Four phase approach:

- 1. Needs assessment and understanding of the area

- 2. Development of targeted plan for the area - engagement

- 3. Making things happen - delivery

- 4. Evaluation and learning

7.4 Proposed corporate governance arrangements

There may be a need for some local governance arrangements so that local members are informed and in control of what is happening. In addition, closer alignment or changes to other local partnership structures may need to be made. Areas to explore include how area assemblies can support, the role of the neighbourhood action groups and other associated community groups.

There may be a case to look at using area partnership staff differently and moving away from a 'one size fits all' area assembly model. Partnership staff and partners could be refocused on some of the targeted neighbourhood neighbourhoods to ensure ownership, accountability and outcomes focus.

8. Finance

In excess of a billion pounds is spent by the public sector in Rotherham each year. The challenge is to assess how effective the Council and partners are able to redirect their resources into some of the most deprived communities. This is not about additional resources but about exploring more cost effective solutions and challenging and changing the way things are done in Rotherham.

It will be important to identify total spending resources committed to dealing with issues in an area to see how they can be used to better effect. This is about looking at what each partner

can directly resource and contribute to an area but also where additional resources may need to be provided to deliver longer term outcomes.

The role of the third sector may also be able to provide a pivotal role in delivery. It is not clear what the sector currently offers in each area but there is already a wealth of organisations, formal and informal organised, which can provide much needed early interventions and activities for some of the most vulnerable individuals and families.

Other revenue sources such as Lottery, European funding and voluntary sector infrastructure and advice services can also be explored and re-commissioned where needed.

One aspect to consider for each area is the creation of a small pot of money which can be accessed by community groups to help support specific initiatives. A few hundred pounds given to a community group can make a real difference and lasting impact on an area.

9.   Risks and Uncertainties

There is no single solution to these areas. Each one is unique, the issues are long term, deep rooted and complex. However there are many case studies where real progress has been made. Similarly, there are a number of barriers which regularly surface which impede partnership activity. Examples include:

- Data and information sharing – protocols already exist and strong leadership is needed to ensure safe and secure sharing where possible
- Lack of involvement by some agencies – some agencies historically have not been involved in some initiatives e.g. private sector, Department of Work and Pensions
- Spend in each area – current financial systems do not allow easy analysis of spend. Coordination across partners is key
- Political – the issue of universal versus targeted service provision is a continual debate. Careful handling with ward members, particularly in areas not chosen for targeted work.

10.   Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The Localism Bill will also be central to the work in communities. Proposed greater powers to local authorities and communities will focus attention at more local issues and there is the prospect that communities will be able to challenge service delivery at a local level.

Increasingly the council will be seen to facilitate work with the communities rather than always seen as the direct delivery of services. There are potential increased opportunities for the community to take the lead assisted by voluntary and community groups.

In addition, further refinement to performance management arrangements are ongoing to enable more accurate reporting and assessment of outcomes by area.

11.   Background Papers and Consultation

Consultation with operational staff and service directors involved in Local Ambition and Chesterhill
Local Ambition evaluation reports and Learning lessons from Chesterhill intensive management pilot

Contact Names :
Matthew Gladstone, Director of Commissioning, Policy and Performance, ext 22791.