

NYSP Framework for Community Engagement and Neighbourhood Management – Summary of consultation responses

Background

A consultation exercise was carried out on the principles, standards and workstreams for a Community Engagement and Neighbourhood Management Framework. The consultation ran from 12 November 2008 to 4 February 2009. The draft Framework document was sent to a range of partners and was also available on the NYSP website, including an Easy Read version. Presentations were also made at a variety of partnership meetings. 42 responses were received.

The Implementation Group reviewed the responses and have amended the draft Framework and associated documents as a result.

The following is a summary of responses received. Where possible, comments have been grouped and prominence has been given to common themes and suggestions which were received from several respondents.

List of consultation respondents

Adult and Community Services Directorate, NYCC Age Concern Scarborough & District Army in Yorkshire and Humberside. Coast & Moors Voluntary Action Craven Community Lives Task Group Craven and Harrogate Learning Disability Partnership Board Craven LSP Groundwork Hambleton District Council Hambleton and Richmondshire Learning Disability Partnership Board Hambleton and Richmondshire Mental Health Forum Harrogate and Area CVS Harrogate and District NHS Foundation Trust Harrogate Community Lives Task Group Harrogate LSP Harrogate Public Involvement Group	North York Moors National Park North Yorkshire County Council (Safe and Sustainable Overview and Scrutiny Committee) North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue North Yorkshire Police Authority North Yorkshire Probation Area NYFVO – feedback from workshop Older People’s Partnership Board Richmondshire District Council Ripon CVS Rural Action Yorkshire Ryedale District Council Ryedale Voluntary Action Scarborough Borough Council Scarborough CDRP Selby District Crossroads - Caring for Carers Ltd Selby District Council
--	---

<p>Harrogate Self Advocates Consulting Group Highways Agency Job Centre plus Linda Porritt, Adult & Community Services, NYCC Natural England Northallerton and District Voluntary Services Association</p>	<p>Shanna Carrell, Adult and Community Services, NYCC Sylvia Merritt, Craven The Workcrafts Company Voice of Ripon project, Age Concern</p>
---	--

Summary of responses received and planned action

We asked	You said	What we will do
<p>Do you support the development of a North Yorkshire Framework for Community Engagement and Neighbourhood Management?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The vast majority of responses were supportive of the development of a Framework. Only one respondent was against the development of the Framework, asserting that it will replicate existing systems and work.</p>	<p>Take forward our plans for a Framework</p>
<p>Are the definitions of community engagement, neighbourhood management, community and neighbourhood appropriate for North Yorkshire?</p>	<p>Yes, with certain reservations.</p> <p>Most respondents did think that the definitions were appropriate.</p> <p>However, there were several respondents who felt that the definition of neighbourhood management was an urban model which would not have wide application across the county. One respondent felt that it was not a well used and understood approach in North Yorkshire. It was considered that the definition would benefit from examples to illustrate the broad range of multi-agency working models</p>	<p>We will more clearly explain the concept of neighbourhood management within the Framework to show the</p>

	<p>which could be included in the term 'neighbourhood management'. It was stressed that one size doesn't fit all.</p> <p>Several respondents made suggestions for the improvement of the definition of community engagement, particularly in relation to social inclusion and community development. It was felt that it was not just a means to improve public services.</p> <p>Several respondents wished to see more reference to the differences between community engagement and neighbourhood management.</p>	<p>broad range of models possible.</p> <p>We will put more emphasis in the document on social inclusion issues and the benefits to communities as well as service improvement.</p> <p>Neighbourhood management and community engagement are not the same and we will clarify this in the Framework. However, the aim of the Framework is to improve all work carried out by NYSP partners which aims to involve the community. As such both neighbourhood management and community engagement are important components which need to be seen as parts of a common approach.</p>
<p>Are the proposed principles and standards for</p>	<p>Yes, with reservations.</p> <p>There was majority agreement that the proposed principles and standards are appropriate. However there were a large number of suggestions for improvements</p>	

<p>community engagement and neighbourhood management appropriate for North Yorkshire?</p> <p>Are there any others that should be added?</p>	<p>which can be grouped as follows:</p> <p>LSPs Respondents wanted clearer links to the work of the district LSPs as the key partnership structures for local engagement.</p> <p>Existing Structures Several respondents felt that more emphasis should be put on using existing structures, in particular, drawing on the voluntary sector's ability to involve the traditionally 'hard to engage' groups.</p> <p>The role of communities A few respondents raised issues relating to the role of communities in the engagement process. They wanted to see more emphasis on the capacity of such groups to speak for themselves, with advocacy where needed. There should be recognition that engagement is two-way, and communities may instigate the 'engagement' themselves and contribute to the development of the processes.</p> <p>Engagement activities Several respondents felt that the principles and standards should recognise the following:</p>	<p>The key role of the district LSPs will be reflected in the Framework and form the base for much of the locally based work in the Action Plan which will accompany it. This will be more clearly stated within the principles.</p> <p>Changes will be made to the standards to reflect these comments.</p> <p>Changes will be made to the principles and standards to reflect these comments.</p> <p>Changes will be made to the principles and</p>
---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of including ‘soft’ information (e.g. ‘voice’). • More recognition of the fact that it can take a significant amount of time and it needs to be a continuous mainstream activity. • Recognition that it needs realistic resourcing of existing expertise within the public, business and third sectors. • It should be done at the most appropriate level for the communities in question, not for the convenience of service providers. It must also be flexible, depending on the issues at hand. • Need to ask specific questions and consult on things relevant to members of the group and their lives. • The importance of feedback and the central importance of research. • Greater commitment to evaluating and learning from community engagement. • Reference to the barriers to engagement and how to identify and remove barriers. • Acknowledgement of the rurality of the patch and the accessibility issues that this brings. <p>Other suggestions for inclusion Respondents felt that the following should be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that elected Members need to be central to the process. The framework requires a statement in support of how elected members engage & how their leadership role contributes. <p>Other suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two organisations suggested check the proposed principles and standards against the Scottish National Standards for Community Engagement. 	standards to reflect these comments. <p>An additional principle will be added to reflect the role of community representatives, including elected Members.</p> <p>The principles and standards will be checked against the Scottish National Standards for Community Engagement to ensure that there are no obvious omissions.</p>
--	---	--

<p>What would your top three priority workstreams be?</p> <p>These could be from the suggestions listed or any new ones you would like to suggest.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="499 188 1688 571"> <tr> <td>Local Information System / data hub / neighbourhood profiles:</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint locality engagement structures:</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint mechanisms for engaging with communities of interest and minority groups:</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint local problem solving</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint consultations and engagement database</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data Analysis Group</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint toolkit and training</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint citizens' panel</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint commissioning / coordination of the place survey</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table> <p>Suggested additional workstreams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a shared understanding of community engagement and its value amongst NYSP partners and encourage district based LSPs and the NYSP to undertake a simple audit of local activity and capacity. • Evaluate what is working and share this learning through NYSP partners. <p>A variety of other suggestions were made as to how workstreams might be best progressed including utilising existing groups and using existing best practice in relation to toolkits and databases.</p>	Local Information System / data hub / neighbourhood profiles:	18	Joint locality engagement structures:	18	Joint mechanisms for engaging with communities of interest and minority groups:	11	Joint local problem solving	7	Joint consultations and engagement database	6	Data Analysis Group	4	Joint toolkit and training	2	Joint citizens' panel	1	Joint commissioning / coordination of the place survey	0	<p>The preference expressed for the suggested workstreams reflects the priority given in the consultation document. An action plan will be developed to accompany the Framework which will aim to progress the workstreams.</p> <p>We will include this in the action plan to implement the Framework.</p> <p>We will include this in the action plan to implement the Framework.</p> <p>These will be included in work to implement the Framework.</p>
Local Information System / data hub / neighbourhood profiles:	18																			
Joint locality engagement structures:	18																			
Joint mechanisms for engaging with communities of interest and minority groups:	11																			
Joint local problem solving	7																			
Joint consultations and engagement database	6																			
Data Analysis Group	4																			
Joint toolkit and training	2																			
Joint citizens' panel	1																			
Joint commissioning / coordination of the place survey	0																			
<p>Do you have any other comments to make about the Framework?</p>	<p>Resources</p> <p>A number of respondents were concerned about the potential costs of actions under the Framework. There was also a comment that resources would need to be prioritised to areas of most need.</p>	<p>There are particular workstreams, such as the Local Information System (LIS) and joint consultation databases which have a</p>																		

	<p>Language and understanding A number of concerns and suggestions were raised about the language of the document, respondents feeling that it should be simplified and examples given. Various specific suggestions were made and other documents recommended for reference.</p>	<p>particular funding requirement and through the NYSP Executive partner organisations must decide what they are willing or able to commit to these. However, much of the Framework relates to changing methods of working, better networking and joining up existing structures, all of which have the potential to save resources. The Implementation Group will monitor and review the impact of the Framework and make recommendations to the NYSP Executive.</p> <p>The Framework has a number of potential audiences which can make the choice of language problematic. However changes will be made to simplify the language. Examples will be included to illustrate specific points where possible. Where it is felt that meaning is made</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Joint working Several respondents had specific concerns about joint working arrangements which are already in place, ensuring that these are acknowledged and incorporated and that good practice is shared.</p> <p>Differences between organisations Concerns were expressed around different service providers being able to agree on issues such as engagement structures and definitions of 'areas' and 'neighbourhoods'. There was also a concern about the different communication routes in different areas.</p>	<p>clearer the suggestions for wording changes will be adopted. Other recommended documentation will be considered.</p> <p>We will include this in the action plan to implement the Framework.</p> <p>We will ensure that the Framework acknowledges that one size does not fit all and that structures and boundaries and communication routes need to reflect local need. It is up to partner organisations to ensure that, having agreed to the principles in the Framework, constructive negotiation results in agreement on these issues. It is understood that this may not be simple but better locality working is an important objective for all partner organisations.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>The need for commitment within organisations Several respondents raised the need to ensure cultural change and commitment at district LSP level and throughout partner organisations.</p> <p>Action planning There were a number of comments relating to the need for an action plan, nominated officers, and monitoring and review of effectiveness and performance.</p> <p>Legislative drivers Several respondents felt that there should be more acknowledgement of the relevant legislation within the Framework, and the need to meet key statutory engagement duties</p> <p>Advice around best practice for community engagement and neighbourhood management A number of comments related to implementation of the Framework and offered advice about practical aspects of work to involve communities.</p>	<p>We will include this in the action plan to implement the Framework.</p> <p>An action plan will be developed and organisational leads identified. The Implementation Group will monitor and review progress and report back to the NYSP Executive. Local work will be progressed and monitored through the district LSPs. This will be made clear in the Framework document.</p> <p>The Framework will be amended to include acknowledgement of the relevant legislation.</p> <p>We will include within the Action Plan measures to ensure that practical advice and ‘tips’ are shared and local practice</p>
--	---	---

		benefits from the experience of all partner organisations.
--	--	--