

**Special Session on 9 July**

1. At the meeting of the Partnership on 19 March consideration was given to the work programme for 2013/14 and it was agreed to hold a special session as part of the meeting on 9 July to take stock of the changing landscape in which the Partnership is operating. A key challenge question was “Is it business as usual?”
2. During the discussion a number of key changes were mentioned, and these are listed below as part of an outline programme for the 9 July meeting, along with suggested speakers.
3. It is proposed to try to complete the routine business scheduled for 9 July during the first half hour, i.e. 9.30 – 10.00, leaving a 2 hour slot to consider the following:-

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Speaker/Comments</b>
(i)	NHS Reform – abolition of PCTs, establishment of CCGs etc, transfer of Public Health function to SBC, role of Regional Offender Health Unit, and the relationship between SSP and the Health & Wellbeing Board.	Peter Kelly (plus CCG rep?) We already have a formal agreement in relation to the joint governance of key decisions in relation to drug and alcohol services between SSP and the Health & Wellbeing Board. Other issues can be subject to joint governance (as used to be the case for YOS issues when the Children’s Trust Board was operating), an obvious example being domestic violence, which spans the roles of both Partnerships and also the LSCB, as reflected in the protocol with the LSCB agreed at our March meeting).
(ii)	New structures in Cleveland Police and how the Safer Stockton Partnership can most effectively relate to them.	Ch. Supt Gordon Lang The Partnership has previously been briefed on the outline of the new ‘framework’ structure, based on 4 force-wide commands (Neighbourhoods, Crime, Operations and ‘The Hub’) but the detail of how SSP (and other Community Safety Partnerships - CSPs) can best relate to the new structure is not yet fully designed, let alone understood. A key question will be about lead roles for priority issues within the next Community Safety Plan, 2014-2017.

(iii)	Emerging role of the PCC	Barry Coppinger or his nominee Although the Partnership has had sight of the initial Police & Crime Plan for Cleveland, it has been made clear that it will be a 'living document', subject to amendments. Given that the PCC and his Officers have been faced with a series of challenges in their first six months, including appointment of a Chief of Staff, appointment of a Chief Constable, decision on the budget and precept for 2013/14, preparation of the Plan, and management of funding streams transferred from CSPs, YOTs, DAATs and the Home Office, and in a context where the Home Office claims that it is unable to provide details of how these funding streams were allocated in 2012/13, it can reasonably be expected that 2013/14 will see further changes being planned to come into effect in 2014/15).
(iv)	The impact of Public Sector cuts and other major changes	Mike Batty, Lucia Saiger, Steve McCarten All public agencies face continuing cuts, with the arguable exceptions of the NHS and Public Health. The impact on Cleveland Police will be covered in sessions (ii) and (iii), so it is proposed that this session focuses on SBC, DTV Probation Trust and CFB, plus other major changes such as the 'marketisation' of Probation.
(v)	The impact of cuts on the third sector	Catalyst rep, John Bentley The public sector cuts are likely to 'knock on' to the voluntary and community sector.

4. If these sessions are held to about 10 minutes each (which implies brief summaries of the key issues, supported by briefing papers setting out the key facts, and background papers such as the Partnership constitution and a diagram showing relevant sub-structures)), then an hour will be available for general discussion.
5. One of the key 'givens' for the dialogue is that the Partnership has already committed to undertaking mass public consultation during August to October this year, with a view to identifying priorities for our next three-year Community Safety Plan covering the period April 2014 to March 2017.
6. This programme is a challenging one, and it is unlikely that it will be possible to emerge with a definitive set of conclusions which will remain unchallenged for a further two to three years, given the rate of change generally, the likelihood of a further round of public

sector cuts as the Treasury's fiscal policies are undone by the continuing standstill in the UK economy, the current uncertainties about legislative change (e.g. Minimum Unit Pricing for alcohol, the proposals for radical changes to Probation etc), and the General Election planned for May 2015.

7. Some of the fundamental questions to be considered include:-

- (a) is there value in continuing to meet as a formal Partnership? In raising this question, I am assuming that there is still a consensus that we achieve more by working together than by working separately, and that it is therefore an issue of how best to organise ourselves for this purpose;
- (b) are we making the best use of the resources available to us at a time of reducing funding and structural re-organisation?; and
- (c) is there a case for moving away from the current pattern of four Community Safety Partnerships across Cleveland to a reduced number, either two or one? Anyone wishing to make such a case needs to develop some proposals in relation to what any 'new model' may look like, including purpose/terms of reference, membership, frequency of meetings, chairing arrangements, and how it would relate to other Borough-based structures etc, so that it can be assessed in relation to the status quo.

Mike Batty  
Head of Community Protection