

# **Overview and Scrutiny Policy Advisory Group**

## **Community and Learning Partnerships**

### **Final Report**



## Contents

	Page Number
Chairman's Foreword	3
Setting the Scene	4
Conclusions and Recommendations	4
Scope of the Work	6
Methods of Investigation	7
Membership	8
Findings	9
Implications	14
Acknowledgements	14
List of Appendices / Background Papers	15

## **Chairman's Foreword**

As a member of the Children and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee I was pleased to be appointed to and made Chairman of the Policy Advisory Group (PAG) on Community and Learning Partnerships (C&LPs).

The C&LPs have been developing in Staffordshire since 2006, and are the vehicle through which the County Council is delivering two separate but linked central government agendas around services for children – 'Sure Start' and 'Extended Schools'. The principle aim behind both Children's Centres and Extended Services is to raise the achievement levels and the aspirations of children, young people, and their families. Raising aspiration and achievement, particularly among the most vulnerable in our communities is a top priority of the Council, so it is clearly important for that Members are assured that the C&LPs are operating effectively and making an impact in communities.

During the course of our work we have spoken to a number of officers working on the front line to deliver these services. We were also lucky enough to have the opportunity to visit Silkmore Children's Centre to see services in action and meet with some of the individuals making use of them. Overall, I am pleased to report that we have been impressed with the services we have heard about and agree that the partnership arrangements are an efficient way of delivering the core offer for extended schools and Children's Centres.

However, prior to reaching our final conclusions we were informed about a wider review of the C&LPs which had been commissioned by the County Council from the Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services (C4EO). It does not make sense for the two review process to be carried out at the same time; therefore we decided that our recommendations should be designed to feed into the wider review. We will seek feedback when the review is concluded regarding how the issues we raised were investigated.

Finally, I would like to thank all those officers who have supported us in undertaking this work and the Members of the PAG for their hard work.

**County Councillor Ivan Jennings**  
**Chairman**  
**Community and Learning Partnerships Policy Advisory**  
**Group**



## **1. Setting the Scene**

- 1.1 At the beginning of 2009/10 the Children and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee undertook a workshop session where Members identified issues that they wished to scrutinise during the year. At the session Members identified the provision of 'extended services' in schools as an issue for scrutiny. As such, a proposal was put forward to the Corporate Review Committee in August 2009 that a Policy Advisory Group (PAG) should be appointed to review the Community and Learning Partnerships (C&LPs), as the vehicle through which the County Council has delivered the extended schools core offer.
- 1.2 The PAG commenced its work in January 2010 with the intention of completing and making their report to the Lead Cabinet Member for Children and Young People in May 2010. However, in April the Chair was informed that the Children, Young People and Families Directorate (CYPFD) had commissioned the Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services (C4EO) to undertake a detailed review of the work of the C&LPs over the last four years. The Centre, which is funded by central government, draws in expertise from across the sector and works to identify and coordinate local, regional and national evidence of 'what works' to create a single and comprehensive picture of effective practice. The Centre then works with Local Authorities to help them improve services. They will be working with Staffordshire for a total of fifty days.
- 1.3 In order to make the best use of resources and avoid duplication the PAG decided to draw its work to a close in April, with a view to preparing a final report to feed into and influence the scope of the wider review to be undertaken by C4EO. The PAG would normally have made a report to the Corporate Review Committee for them to agree the recommendations. However, in order to ensure that the work could be passed on to C4EO in time to influence the review the Chair of Corporate Review Committee agreed that this report would go directly to the Cabinet Member on completion. A further report will be made to the Corporate Review Committee on completion of the work of C4EO.

## **2. Conclusions and Recommendations (Executive Summary)**

- 2.1 Overall we were impressed by the services that the C&LPs are delivering and the dedication of the staff involved. We agree that the partnership arrangements are an efficient way of delivering the core offer for extended schools and Children's Centres and recognise that this has been acknowledged at regional and national level. However, there is always room for improvement; therefore this report sets out a small number of comments and recommendations for immediate consideration by the Cabinet Member, and details issues which we would like C4EO to investigate further.
- 2.2 Governance of the C&LPS – The Management Advisory Group (MAG)**
- 2.2.1 One of our initial queries centred on how the specific C&LPs clusters (i.e. the groups of schools included in a C&LP) had been identified. It was explained to us that the system was based on 'pyramids' of schools, i.e. a high school and its feeder middle, primary, infant or first schools. However, we received evidence

that some Members had identified clusters where the arrangements did not seem logical, and where we felt there was a risk of duplicating the delivery of services. Therefore, we **recommend** that, as this model is developed to support Families First and locality working more widely, the appropriateness of cluster arrangements is kept under review.

2.2.2 The importance of having the right organisations and individuals fully engaged in the management of the C&LPs emerged as a critical factor in their success. Therefore, we **recommend** that C4EO investigates the impact that the specific make-up of the individual C&LPs has had on their performance.

2.2.3 We also **recommend** that C4EO investigates the role of County Councillors on MAGs both in terms of analysing the impact that their active membership or lack of engagement has had over the last four years; and in terms of considering how member engagement can be improved in whatever model carries on this work from 2011. In the meantime, we **recommend** that the Cabinet Member, with support from the Chair of this PAG, immediately undertakes a campaign to encourage all Members to become involved with the C&LPs in their areas.

2.2.4 We **recommend** that C4EO reviews the following aspects of the recruitment and retention of the C&LP Coordinators:

- what processes are there in place to ensure that the right mix of skills is employed across the C&LPs in a specific area; and
- what processes are there in place to enable officers to share / benefit from each other's skills and experience and/or be supported by each other.

2.2.5 Finally, we **recommend** that C4EO review the arrangements in place to support MAG Chairmen to develop the skills to manage the partnership effectively.

## 2.3 Business Planning and Wider Stakeholder Engagement

2.3.1 Effective business planning by MAGs is crucial to ensure that the most appropriate services for the area are being commissioned by the C&LPs. These services should: meet the specific needs of the community; not duplicate services which are already on offer; wherever possible meet cross-cutting elements of the core offer; and represent value for money. There are a number of issues around business planning we **recommend** that C4EO consider.

- The business planning processes which officers from various C&LPs outlined were broadly similar. However, there were some differences in terms of which stakeholders were engaged and by what method. It is absolutely critical that service users are given an opportunity to influence service delivery so we would ask C4EO to consider which mechanisms for business planning have been most effective at engaging service users.
- C4EO should seek evidence that the output from consultation exercises was reflected in the business plans which were eventually ratified by the MAGs.
- We received evidence from one Councillor regarding his concerns that a clear link between some of the projects supported by his C&LP and the C&LP objectives could not be evidenced. We would ask C4EO to review a sample of projects to assess how well they have met C&LP objectives, and to assess what improvements to business planning could be made to ensure that all

work funded in the future is appropriate. We would like to see any future arrangements set out robust mechanisms for dealing with concerns raised by individual MAG members about specific projects.

- We were not clear about the process for making any in-year changes to the business plans and wish to see this clarified.

## 2.4 Performance Management / Demonstrating Impact

2.4.1 We recognise that it is challenging to gather data which demonstrates the specific impact of the services which the C&LPs deliver. However, It is important for *any* service delivered with public money to be able to demonstrate that it is achieving its objectives and qualitative or ‘anecdotal’ evidence does need to be supported with quantitative data. Therefore, we would make two linked **recommendations** with regard to performance management:

- that C4EO make it a key priority to work with officers to gather hard evidence demonstrating the impact of the C&LPs over the last four years; and
- that a framework is developed to ensure that future partnership working to deliver these services can clearly measure the effectiveness of the expenditure and that the investment is achieving the outcomes for which it is intended.

## 2.5 Sustainability – Social Enterprise

2.5.1 We heard from officers working in Leek about a Social Enterprise Model which they have developed and which seems to be an effective approach to securing the sustainability of the services which have been delivered by the C&LPs.

2.5.2 We **recommend** that C4EO look closely at this model and at the achievements so far in the Moorlands and provide guidance to the County Council regarding how this model might be used elsewhere. C4EO also need to review the Directorate’s wider plans for sustainability beyond 2011, in particular the plans to utilize the C&LP infrastructure to deliver the Families First project

## 3. Scope of the Work

3.1 The scope of this PAG was:

- to develop an understanding of how the County Council is delivering the ‘core offer’ through the C&LPs, and how the partnerships contribute to the achievement of the County Council’s strategic priorities;
- to identify areas of best practice (in terms of structure, governance, performance management, delivery mechanisms, and value for money) in order that it can be shared across the County.; and
- to develop recommendations that will enhance the performance of the C&LPs and, ultimately, deliver better services for children, young people and their parents and carers.

3.2 Prior to making our recommendations we set out to:

- Establish why the County Council chose to deliver the core offer for extended schools and children's centres via the C&LPs.
- Review the performance management arrangements the C&LPs have in place, in particular looking at how the C&LPs ensure that they deliver and measure value for money (review the impact measures used and how the C&LPs assess the impact of investment).
- Review the governance arrangements, contracts and business plans (and business planning and prioritisation arrangements) that the C&LPs have in place.
- Compare the various different structures and delivery mechanisms which have been established.
- Investigate the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement, in particular how representative the Management Advisory Groups are and how well they engage with children and young people (seeking views from children and young people and their parents and carers regarding the partnerships). Investigating how the C&LPs interact with other forms of community engagement.
- Investigate Elected Member (including County, District and Borough, and Parish Councillor) involvement in the C&LPs.
- Consider the relationship between the C&LPs and the District Children's Trusts

## 4. Methods of Investigation

4.1 The scrutiny process supporting the preparation of this report involved meetings as follows:

### 14<sup>th</sup> January 2010

Members met to:

- agree their terms of reference and process for carrying out the review (as set out in paragraph 3 above); and
- consider an initial briefing from the Assistant Director, Integrated Services, setting out:
  - why, how and when C&LPs were established;
  - the governance and finance arrangements;
  - the services delivered by C&LPs; and
  - potential future developments.

#### **4<sup>th</sup> March 2010**

Members met with:

Val Till – Double District Development Officer      Chase Valley C&LP  
Ruth Nottingham – C&LP Coordinator  
Ian Bond –MAG Chair

Kate Sharratt – Double District Development      Cheslyn Hay C&LP  
Officer  
Karen Bates –C&LP Coordinator  
Matthew Gould –MAG Chair

Members also received a breakdown of the C&LP administrative costs

#### **21<sup>st</sup> April 2010**

Members visited the Silkmore Children’s Centre (part of the Risingbrook C&LP), to see the services delivered and have an opportunity to speak to service users. They also met with:

Kate Sharratt – Double District Development      Rising Brook C&LP  
Officer  
Sarah Lloyd – C&LP Coordinator  
Gareth Morris – MAG Chair

Members then met with:

Barbara Hine – Double District Development      Leek C&LP  
Officer  
Craig Chorlton – C&LP Coordinator  
Kevin Allbutt – MAG representative

## **5. Membership**

The membership of the Policy Advisory Group was:

Mr I Jennings (Chairman)  
Mr D Billson  
Mr J Cooper  
Mrs D Cornes  
Mr P.E. Jones  
Mrs L Staples  
Mr J Wells (Vice Chairman)  
Rev. Preb. Metcalf (Co-opted Member of the Children and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee)  
Mrs Michelle Taylor (Co-opted Member of the Children and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Committee)

## 6. Findings

### 6.1 Why Community and Learning Partnerships?

- 6.1.1 We established early on in our review that the C&LPs were established in Staffordshire in response to two separate but linked central government agendas. 'Sure Start Local Programmes' were originally created in the most deprived wards across the Country during 2001 and 2002 to deliver a range of joined-up services (including health, childcare and employment advice) to families with children under 5. The national experience of these Sure Start Local Programmes led to the development of the Children's Centre 'core offer' of services and the phased roll out of Sure Start Children's Centres to every community by 2010/11.
- 6.1.2 In 2004-5 each top tier local authority was required to establish at least one 'Full Service Extended School' to provide a broadly similar core offer of support services for families with children aged 5-19. In subsequent years the County Council was gradually required to develop more Children's Centres so that by 2010/11 there would be one in each community and, by the same date, to ensure that all schools provided access to extended services.
- 6.1.3 The principle aim behind both Children's Centres and Extended Services was to raise the achievement levels and the aspirations of children, young people, their families and the wider community. Therefore, the County Council decided to approach the development of these services in a joined up way. Local clusters of schools, generally comprised of a 'pyramid' of schools (a high school and its feeder middle, primary, infant or first schools) were identified to develop extended services for their local community and be linked to an existing or planned Children's Centre. We did seek further clarification regarding how the clusters were divided up, as Members had identified some clusters where the arrangements did not seem logical, and where we felt there was a risk of duplicating the delivery of services. See appendix one for an illustrative example. We **recommend** that, as this model is developed to support Families First and locality working more widely, the appropriateness of cluster arrangements is kept under review.
- 6.1.4 In June 2005 the Secretary of State for Education required all authorities to write a strategy for the delivery of extended schools with strong links between extended schools and children's centres<sup>1</sup>. This reflected that Staffordshire had recognised the strategic direction towards what is now known as 'Integrated Service Delivery' somewhat ahead of the game. Staffordshire's lead in the field has been recognised nationally and cluster arrangements have now been adopted by most local authorities. Such clusters, often known as *Local Delivery Groupings* are integral to the latest guidance to Children's Trusts.
- 6.1.5 We were satisfied with the explanation provided to us regarding the reasons for establishing the C&LPs, and believe that the partnership arrangements are an efficient way of delivering the core offer for extended schools and children's centres. We were pleased that this has been acknowledged at regional and

---

<sup>1</sup> Extended schools: Access to opportunities and services for all, DFES (2005) Pages 4, 5 14 and 15

national level. We would comment, however, that C&LPs have developed differently across the County and that this had led to different degrees of success. It is important that best practice is shared across County and that all the partnerships aim to deliver to the standards of those which have been most successful.

## **6.2 Finance**

- 6.2.1 It was important for us to understand how the C&LPs are funded, as we were aware that this was a question which Elected Members more widely had been concerned about. We heard that each C&LP has a devolved budget which is funded via an external grant from the DCSF Sure Start budget and the School Standards fund. The finance is allocated to C&LPs via a mechanism based on the number of young people living in the area with a deprivation weighting factor included. This funding is allocated on a yearly basis within a three year planning framework which runs until March 2011.
- 6.2.2 C&LP finance is monitored via the County Council's SAP system for accounting purposes and overseen by the County's Joint Finance Unit and includes sample audits of C&LPs every year. At a local level the C&LP Co-ordinators and MAGs oversee the financial management.
- 6.2.3 It was also explained to us that this funding can *only* be used to deliver the children's centre and extended schools core offer and cannot be used to deliver other elements of schools' services. It is the responsibility of the Schools Forum (made up of Head teachers, governors and representatives from other education organisations) to determine how the Schools Standards fund money is allocated. It would have been possible to allocate this money to each school individually for the delivery of extended services. However, the Schools Forum decided to allocate this money to the C&LP clusters rather than to individual schools on the grounds that schools working together to commission services would achieve better value for money.
- 6.2.4 We requested and were provided with details of the administration and management costs of the C&LPs, details of which are attached at appendix two. Although the percentage expenditure on administration and management is reasonably small, these are not insubstantial figures. Therefore, we urge that any future delivery model for these services strives to keep these costs to a minimum.
- 6.2.5 In terms of the future funding there is some uncertainty. The grants which fund the C&LPs are not confirmed beyond 2011, however it is unlikely (but not certain) that all of these grant streams would be removed post March 2011. If they were the County Council would have to determine whether they wished to continue with the C&LP structure as a mechanism of delivering locality based services, and if so, alternative funding would need to be identified. If current levels of grant funding were to be significantly reduced decisions would need to be made as to in which areas services would also be reduced.

## **6.3 Governance of the C&LPs – The Management Advisory Group (MAG)**

- 6.3.1 We heard that each C&LP has a Management Advisory Group ("MAG") which generally includes PCTs, County Council members/ officers, District and Parish

Council representatives, as well as Third Sector and private providers. When the C&LPs were first established the County Council produced guidance setting out the ideal MAG membership, this guidance is attached at appendix three. The guidance issued by the Local Authority also sets out: arrangements for electing a Chairperson; the MAG aims and objectives; arrangements for meetings and notice of meetings; and voting.

- 6.3.2 At each of our meetings with representatives from C&LPs we asked about the membership of their MAG and found that, despite the original guidance, MAG membership does vary across the County. Attached at appendix four is a spreadsheet detailing membership of the MAGs. In some instances we understand that the specific make-up of a MAG reflects the particular circumstances of a cluster. However, we did hear that in some cases it has been a challenge to get partners to the table, in particular, health partners. We **recommend** that C4EO investigates the impact that the specific make-up of a C&LP may have had on its performance.
- 6.3.3 We were particularly interested in the engagement of County Councillors in the C&LPs, and their participation in the MAG meetings. All Members were contacted directly through individually posted letters in September 2009 (after the local elections) and informed about the C&LPs in their area. C&LP Coordinators also copy all Members into correspondence relating to the C&LP. However, it became evident during our review that the involvement of County Councillors in C&LPs has varied greatly across the County.
- 6.3.4 C&LPs are delivering key services aimed at raising the aspiration and attainment of children and families in Staffordshire, therefore it is imperative that the money they administer not only meets the requirements set out by Government but is spent in the most efficient and effective way. County Councillors have a duty to ensure that public money is spent effectively therefore it is extremely important that they are properly engaged in the work of the Management Advisory Group.
- 6.3.5 We **recommend** that C4EO investigates the role of County Councillors on MAGs both in terms of analysing the impact that their active membership or lack of engagement has had over the last four years; and in terms of considering how member engagement can be improved in whatever model carries on this work from 2011. In the meantime, we **recommend** that the Cabinet Member, with support from the Chair of this PAG, immediately undertakes a campaign to encourage all Members to become involved with the C&LPs in their areas.
- 6.3.6 Finally, the importance of individual officers and MAG Chairmen in the successful operation of C&LPs seems to have been of central importance and the unique skills and experience which officers have brought to their C&LPs has influenced the ways in which they have developed.<sup>2</sup> We **recommend** that C4EO reviews the following aspects of the recruitment and retention of the C&LP Coordinators:
- what processes are there in place to ensure that the right mix of skills is employed across the C&LPs in a specific area; and

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, the development of the social enterprise model in Leek due to the coordinator's entrepreneurial skills and experience in working with the private sector.

- what processes are there in place to enable officers to share / benefit from each other's skills and experience and/or be supported by each other.

6.3.7 We also **recommend** that C4EO review the arrangements in place to support MAG Chairmen to develop the skills to manage the partnership effectively.

## 6.4 Business Planning and Wider Stakeholder Engagement

6.4.1 One of the MAG's key responsibilities, with support from the C&LP Co-ordinator, is to develop the business plan for the C&LP. This business plan should respond to both strategic priorities and locally identified needs and must outline how the C&LP intends to use its finance for the next financial year to deliver the core offer for children's centres and extended schools.

6.4.2 We heard from a number of the officers we met with that MAGs had moved away from a system of simply assessing individual bids for funding to working more co-operatively to identify and address needs in the community, commissioning services to fill identified gaps in service delivery. Representatives from all four C&LPs we considered explained similar business planning processes, which have broadly involved mapping services in a local area and then meeting with or consulting a wide range of stakeholders, including schools, social services, health sector, parents and the third sector to identify gaps in service provision. We would certainly support this as sensible approach; however, there are a number of issues around business planning we would **recommend** that C4EO consider.

- The processes which officers outlined were broadly similar; however there were some differences in terms of which stakeholders were engaged and by what method. For example, some C&LPs used workshop events; others a single stakeholder celebration day and another questionnaires to parents. It is absolutely critical that service users are given an opportunity to influence service delivery so we would ask C4EO to consider which mechanisms for business planning have been most effective at engaging service users.
- C4EO should seek evidence that the output from consultation exercises was reflected in the business plans which were eventually ratified by the MAGs.
- We received evidence from one Councillor regarding his concerns that a clear link between some of the projects supported by his C&LP and the C&LP objectives could not be evidenced. We would ask C4EO to review a sample of projects to assess how well they have met C&LP objectives, and to assess what improvements to business planning could be made to ensure that all work funded in the future is appropriate. We would like to see any future arrangements set out robust mechanisms for dealing with concerns raised by individual MAG members about specific projects.
- We were not clear about the process for making any in-year changes to the business plans and wish to see this clarified.

## 6.5 Performance Management / Demonstrating Impact

6.5.1 We were informed that the nature of the services which the C&LPs deliver mean it can take a long time to see the impact of initiatives, particularly in terms of whether they have improved aspiration and educational attainment. Officers also

explained that it can be difficult, when considering performance information relating to attainment, to determine the specific impact of any one intervention.

- 6.5.2 We heard a number of positive examples from officers regarding the success of individual projects, and the ‘case study’ evidence base that all the C&LP Coordinators have been developing will certainly be helpful in assessing the impact of the C&LPs over the last four years. We also heard directly from service users at the Silkmore Children’s Centre about the positive impact services offered at the centre had had on their lives.
- 6.5.3 However, it is important for *any* service delivered with public money to be able to demonstrate that it is achieving its objectives, and qualitative or ‘anecdotal’ evidence does need to be supported with quantitative data. Therefore, we would make two linked **recommendations** with regard to performance management:
- that it is a key priority for C4EO to work with officers to gather hard evidence demonstrating the impact of the C&LPs over the last four years; and
  - that a framework is developed to ensure that future partnership working to deliver these services can clearly measure the effectiveness of the expenditure and that the investment is achieving the outcomes for which it is intended.

## 6.6 Sustainability – Social Enterprise

- 6.6.1 Given the uncertain position regarding the future funding of the services which the C&LPs have been delivering, it is important that consideration is given now to how services could be sustained and/or prioritised in the future, and with potentially less funding.
- 6.6.2 We heard from officers working in Leek about a Social Enterprise Model which they have developed and which seems to be an effective approach to securing the sustainability of the services which have been delivered by the C&LPs.
- 6.6.3 A social business enterprise is a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners.
- 6.6.4 The Social Enterprise model in Staffordshire Moorlands was established in December 2008 (called SE@M – “Social Enterprise Across Moorlands”). This is now delivering integrated before and after schools clubs, holiday programmes and sporting provision. At present it is beginning to self-generate income which can be redirected into front-line main service delivery. However, this type of model cannot replace core funding for expensive, specialist services dealing with children, young people and families that is currently funded via the grant from the DCSF. These specialist services supporting children, young people and families are intensive one-to-one type services which require specialist delivery and come at a high cost per individual service.
- 6.6.5 We **recommend** that C4EO look closely at this model and at the achievements so far in the Moorlands and provide guidance to the County Council regarding how this model might be used elsewhere. C4EO also need to review the

Directorate's wider plans for sustainability beyond 2011, in particular the plans to utilize the C&LP infrastructure to deliver the Families First project.<sup>3</sup>

## **7. Implications**

### **7.1 Resources and Value for Money**

7.1.1 We asked specific questions around the administration and management costs associated with delivering these services through the C&LP model, and are assured that these costs are reasonable, although they should continue to be monitored.

7.1.2 A key reason for delivering integrated services is to avoid duplication of effort and therefore waste, so the C&LPs by their very nature should represent value for money in service delivery. However, we can only be sure of this if they have robust performance management systems in place, which enable them to demonstrate that the money they have spent has made a difference, and we have recommended that C4EO considers how this could be improved as part of their review.

### **7.2 Equalities and Legal**

7.2.1 There are no specific legal implications to this report.

7.2.2 All C&LP services are available at a universal level and are available to all residents of Staffordshire without prejudice. The C&LPs work in neighbourhoods and the services provided reflect the demographics of the area in which the C&LP is located.

### **7.3 Risk**

7.3.1 A significant risk facing the C&LPs is a possible reduction in the central government funding allocation for these services after 2011. To varying degrees the C&LPs are already preparing for this, but it is important that sustainability of service provision is a key element of the C4EO review.

### **7.4 Climate Change**

7.4.1 There are no specific climate change implications to this report.

## **8. Acknowledgements**

8.1 We would like to thank the following officers who supported the Working Group:

Jim Brady	Assistant Director, Integrated Services
Paul Woodcock	Head of Service, C&LPs and Extended Schools
Peter McKenzie	Senior Support Officer
Lucy Stratford	Scrutiny Officer

---

<sup>3</sup> Families First will restructure DCYPF professional staff teams in localities based on 2/3 C&LP boundaries

8.2 The PAG would like to thank all those officers and other individuals, named in section four of this report, who met with us and answered our questions so fully.

**County Councillor Ivan Jennings - Chairman of the Community and Learning Partnerships Policy Advisory Group  
May 13<sup>th</sup> 2010**

### **Contact Officer/s**

Lucy Stratford, Scrutiny Officer  
Staffordshire County Council  
Telephone: 01785 854086  
E-mail: lucy.stratford@staffordshire.gov.uk

### **List of Appendices/Background Papers**

Example of C&LP cluster arrangements – Appendix One

Community and Learning Partnership Central Team Budget 2010/11 – Appendix Two

Extract from C&LP County Council Guidance – Appendix Three

Management Advisory Group Members – Appendix Four

Notes of meetings of the C&LP PAG from, 14<sup>th</sup> January 2010, 4<sup>th</sup> March 2010 and 21<sup>st</sup> April 2010 (available online)

Background briefing paper for the Community and Learning Partnerships Policy Advisory Group, 14<sup>th</sup> January 2010