



Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders:
Final Evaluation Report

People, Places, Public Services: Making the Connections



Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders:
Final Evaluation Report
People, Places, Public Services: Making the Connections

October 2008
SQW Consulting

Department for Communities and Local Government

The findings and recommendations in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 4400
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

© Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2008

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp, or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: licensing@opsi.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 08701 226 236
Fax: 08701 226 237
Textphone: 08701 207 405
Email: communities@capita.co.uk
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: www.communities.gov.uk

October 2008

Product Code: 08CRLD05525

ISBN: 978-1-4098-0521-2

Contents

	Key Findings	4
1	Introduction	13
	Part A: The Pathfinder Story	17
2	The Pathfinder Approach	18
3	Focus on Community Engagement	29
4	Influencing Mainstream Services	47
5	Pathfinder Impact	69
6	Mainstreaming and Roll-out	75
7	Conclusions	79
	Part B: Learning Lessons	82
8	The Case for Neighbourhood Management	83
9	Key 'How To' Lessons	90
	Annex A: Neighbourhood Management Evaluation Framework	95
	Annex B: Published National Evaluation Reports	100
	Annex C: Future Plans for Round 1 Pathfinders	102

Key Findings

1. These are the key findings of the final evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders prepared by the national evaluation team, lead by SQW Consulting, for Communities and Local Government.

The Pathfinder Programme

2. Neighbourhood management is a relatively new approach to improving public services. At its simplest, neighbourhood management is a process which brings the local community and local service providers together, at a neighbourhood level, to tackle local problems and improve local services.
3. In 2001 the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme was established by the former Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, now Communities and Local Government. It funded the development of 35 Pathfinder partnerships to develop and test neighbourhood management as proposed by the Social Exclusion Unit. Two rounds of partnerships have been funded in deprived urban and rural areas across every region of England. The aim of the Programme is:

To enable deprived communities and local services to improve local outcomes, by improving and joining up local services, and making them more responsive to local needs.

4. The twenty Round 1 Pathfinders have been operating for six years and are now in their seventh and final year of funding. The fifteen Round 2 Pathfinders have been operating for over three years. Approximately £80m has been invested so far by Communities and Local Government, with the final expenditure to 2011–12 estimated at £100m.
5. The Pathfinders have all operated the same model and approach, with a small professional team lead by a Neighbourhood Manager and supported by an Accountable Body. The team are accountable to a multi-sector partnership including local residents and have sought to bring residents and service providers together to influence mainstream services and improve local outcomes. The majority of Pathfinders are located in the 20% most deprived areas in England, with target areas of typically just over 10,000 population. Since April 2007, all Pathfinder funding has been delivered through Local Area Agreements (LAAs), heralding a transition from a centrally driven 'programme' to a situation where all funding decisions are now taken by individual Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs).

The national evaluation

6. The national evaluation was established in 2002 to “assess the extent to which the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders are meeting their objectives of helping deprived communities and local service providers work together at the neighbourhood level to improve and join up local services. The evaluation should advise on good practice in implementing and developing the neighbourhood management approach.”
7. The evaluation team, lead by SQW Consulting, has delivered the evaluation from 2002–2008 for Communities and Local Government. Research undertaken by the team includes annual reviews in every Pathfinder area, based on extensive fieldwork, together with case studies on particular themes and two waves of household surveys in all areas. The team has also prepared advice and toolkits and facilitated action learning sets in order to support the development of the Pathfinders.
8. This report brings together all of the research by the evaluation team over the last few years, including new research conducted in the autumn of 2007, and presents the final conclusions of the team.

Engaging communities

9. The Pathfinders have developed and engaged in a wide range of activities to involve the local community in their own decision-making processes, with service providers directly, and also to promote community and voluntary activity more generally. Neighbourhood management has clearly played an important role in facilitating a greater level and quality of community engagement and has successfully improved the relationship between service providers and residents.
10. The level of community engagement has varied between Pathfinders, but Pathfinders have typically been able to broaden resident engagement beyond a handful of people in the early stages to develop a strong core of 20–60 residents who are engaged in the more deliberative processes within the Pathfinder – on the Board, in working groups or helping to monitor services. This is complemented by the more limited involvement of larger numbers of local residents in networks, forums and consultation exercises. Publicity and newsletters reach an even larger number of local people, with Round 1 Pathfinders achieving an average awareness rating of 63% in their local areas by the end of year 4 of their programmes (2006), and Round 2 Pathfinders achieving 45% by the end of year 2 of their programmes (2007).
11. A study of those residents who become involved in Pathfinder Boards shows that they appear to be broadly representative of the local population in terms of age, gender and ethnicity, although engaging young people has proved more challenging. In response to this, many Pathfinders have developed targeted processes to engage young people with some evidence of success.

12. The engagement of residents has benefited service providers by providing them with access to local 'intelligence' on needs and views on services, better access to 'hard to reach' groups and improved consultation processes. This has helped service providers shape their services more in line with local priorities. Those residents involved have also benefited from gaining a stronger understanding of how local services work and giving them the opportunity to contribute to improving them. Many have also developed stronger personal knowledge, skills and confidence through their experiences.

Influencing services

13. Pathfinders have secured consistent engagement with a wide range of service providers over a number of years – including services beyond the local authority and beyond 'crime and grime'.
14. Not all service providers have been equally involved, with some difficult to engage and resistant to influence. The Police and Environmental Services have been the strongest and most active partners, and consistently so. The next most engaged group of services include schools, Primary Care Trusts, local authority housing services, local authority youth and leisure services and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs)/Housing Associations.
15. Active engagement with service providers has led to a range of changes being made to mainstream services in Pathfinder areas, with those improvements sometimes being rolled out more widely. The largest single area of influence has been in relation to community safety and environmental services (the 'cleaner, safer, greener' agenda) but with significant changes also to other services – health, children's services, lifelong learning and employment, housing and youth services.
16. The majority of changes achieved involve joining up two or more service providers and/or improving access to, or the take up of, a service. Pathfinders secure influence through a mix of routine working and pilot initiatives – sometimes their own, sometimes supporting and adding value to initiatives from providers. The project funding that Pathfinders have had available has been useful, but although it clearly increases short-term visible impacts the amount invested does not appear to be a key factor in determining a Neighbourhood Manager's longer-term influence on local mainstream services.

Impact

17. It has been a challenge to evaluate and identify the measurable impacts of the Pathfinders upon their neighbourhoods as they are complex and relatively small-scale strategic initiatives, not large spending programmes. Our evidence, however, drawn from a range of sources, including our own

household surveys, does point to positive measurable impacts across the Pathfinder areas.

Resident overview

18. Overall, residents' satisfaction across the Pathfinder areas has clearly risen and risen faster than our survey comparator during the period under scrutiny – satisfaction with their area, with a sense of improvement and with their ability to influence organisations locally. In terms of overall satisfaction, most Pathfinders remain well below the national average, largely reflecting their level of deprivation at the start of the Programme, but significant progress has been made in a relatively short period of time. For all of these indicators of change, our action research in all Pathfinder areas suggests that the changing resident perceptions are plausibly linked to Pathfinder activities and can be understood as impacts arising from the work of the Pathfinders. The key indicators are as follows:
- From 2003 to 2006 in Round 1 areas, **residents' satisfaction with their area as a place to live** rose from 71% to 75% (+4 percentage points) with no statistically significant change in the comparator. Round 2 areas showed an improvement also from 77% to 79% (+2 percentage points), again with no change in the comparator.
 - In 2006 in Round 1 areas, 31% of residents said they **thought that their area had improved in the last three years**, with 29% thinking the same in 2007 in Round 2 areas, both significantly above the percentage of residents in their comparators (22% and 24% respectively).
 - More residents **feel that they can influence decisions by local organisations that affect their area**, rising from 23% to 26% in Round 1 areas, and from 23% to 24% in Round 2 areas, both rising faster than their comparator.

Crime and environment

19. Evidence points to the positive effects of Pathfinders in making their areas safer and cleaner – their largest area of activity. We have brought together a range of evidence, including survey, crime and administrative data and case studies, largely focused on Round 1 areas, in supporting these conclusions. Key points include:
- Across Round 1 areas, from 2003 to 2006, **resident satisfaction with the police service** rose from 47% to 53% (+6 percentage points) with no statistically significant rise in the comparator with faster rises than the comparator in 14 out of 20 Round 1 Pathfinders. There was a similar increase in Round 2 areas of +7 percentage points. This is supported by much qualitative evidence from our annual reviews and case studies suggesting that Pathfinders have contributed in particular to **community reassurance** and reductions in the fear of crime.
 - In Round 1 areas **satisfaction with street cleaning** increased from 60% to 68% (+8 percentage points) from 2003 to 2006, whilst the comparator

fell, with significant rises in 17 out of 20 areas. Satisfaction also increased in Round 2 areas, although by a smaller amount (+2 percentage points).

- In Round 1 areas, the **proportion of residents who think that 'litter/rubbish in the streets' and 'vandalism and graffiti' are a problem** fell between 2003 and 2006 by 5 percentage points and 10 percentage points respectively, both changes outstripping changes in the comparator, and with reductions in this proportion evident in nearly every Round 1 Pathfinder.

20. Our fieldwork and analysis suggest a link between Pathfinder activities and improvements in local environmental conditions, with improvements in many partnership areas (though not all). Resident perceptions are supported by some local evidence of local authority administrative data of surveys of street cleanliness, and also our own case study work.
21. The situation with respect to community safety is more mixed. Resident perceptions are clearly positive, with communities feeling more reassured by the Police, but crime data is considerably more variable, with only one third of Round 1 areas 'narrowing the gap' on overall crime rates with their local authority area (2000–2004). The links between changed outcomes and Pathfinder activities were also more complex, not least as it occurred at a time of rising mainstream expenditure on Police services, making the analysis of the Pathfinders' contribution more difficult. Overall, the evidence suggests that most Pathfinders have contributed to both lower crime, lower fear of crime and higher satisfaction with the Police in their areas, but in a number of cases the wider changes in policing have been more significant in scale.

Other impacts

22. In respect of the other outcomes sought by Pathfinders – housing, education, health and employment – the scale of activities and changes are not such that they could be measured with a household survey, and despite considerable effort it has not been possible to assemble systematic, comprehensive small area administrative data on these services across the Pathfinder areas. Despite this, it is clear that Pathfinders are indeed exerting positive influences on this wider range of services and that this is providing benefits in Pathfinder areas, even if the scale of change is insufficient to measure at a neighbourhood level. The primary benefits with respect to these service areas are likely to be to the groups of participants who are directly engaged with the services and projects.
23. The wider benefits also include the improved working cultures and innovative practices within the service provider organisations involved, the implications of which are likely to be felt beyond the boundaries of each Pathfinder.

Mainstreaming and roll-out

24. Round 1 Pathfinders are presently in their seventh year of operation and most are in advanced discussions about their future. Approximately one

third are set to carry on, one third are set to close and one third are still in discussion. A final assessment on their prospects for mainstreaming is therefore not possible until later in 2008–09; it is presently a mixed picture. Most Round 2 Pathfinders look set to continue to 2011–12 to complete their initial seven year funding programme.

25. More widely, the national picture is positive. Our national survey of local authorities identified neighbourhood management initiatives currently operating in at least 27% of England's unitary or district level authorities, covering 4.2 million people (8% of England's population) across nearly 500 neighbourhoods.
26. Again, though, the longer term prospects are not clear as most of these initiatives are reliant upon short-term discretionary funding – Neighbourhood Renewal Funds and Neighbourhood Element.

Conclusions: legacy, opportunities and challenges

Legacy

27. The Pathfinders have demonstrated the value of neighbourhood management as a tool that can bring communities and service providers together in order to improve services and outcomes in an area. Neighbourhood management allows an integrated view to be taken of a particular 'place' – its needs, opportunities and services – and promotes public service improvement from the clear viewpoint of the customer – the local community. This brings a particular focus on promoting the greater joining up of local services and ensuring that they are more responsive to local needs. As well as pushing for change, Neighbourhood Managers also help to enable it by facilitating community engagement and bringing service providers together. Their location outside of traditional service silos allows them to play a unique role as a neighbourhood broker.
28. We suggest that neighbourhood management remains of greatest relevance to deprived areas where the complexity and intensity of problems can require a greater level of intervention by government, and where the role of the Neighbourhood Manager can be of greatest value. Other areas may also benefit from such processes, but the need for such an intense approach is less obvious – more 'light touch' arrangements may be appropriate.
29. There are three principal legacies from the Pathfinders to date:
 - **The model** – The pathfinder model of neighbourhood management has proved robust, flexible and appropriate. It represents a relatively inexpensive model for in-depth local engagement and service improvement. This is particularly so if a lower level of project funding is used.
 - **Pathfinder neighbourhoods** – We have identified evidence of a number of improved outcomes and resident perceptions particularly in respect

of Pathfinder neighbourhoods being ‘cleaner and safer’, together with evidence of benefits for a wider range of mainstream services.

- **Establishing a new national practice** – Neighbourhood management is now operating in over 27% of England’s unitary or district level authorities, covering an estimated 4.2 million people, 8% of England’s population, across nearly 500 neighbourhoods.

30. For what is a modest programme in resource terms, its impact is being widely felt.

Opportunities

31. It is also likely that further potential remains to be explored within neighbourhood management, as partnerships continue to develop and new opportunities arise. In particular:

- **Co-ordination of resident consultation?** With co-operation from service providers, Neighbourhood Managers could deliver more integrated consultation exercises, reducing duplication and saving money.
- **Local commissioning?** Partnership boards could become commissioners of some neighbourhood services, helping to shape them and monitor them, to hold them accountable to local people.
- **Neighbourhood service delivery?** Not really explored through the Pathfinder Programme, but the scope to deliver some services at a neighbourhood level, or manage community assets, may be appropriate for some.

32. The connection between neighbourhood management and present government agendas – central and local – is obvious, with neighbourhood management able to contribute to:

- promoting greater community involvement in making decisions about services that affect them
- supporting the implementation of neighbourhood policing and embedding it within wider attempts to tackle the causes of crime
- tackling deprivation, worklessness and promoting neighbourhood renewal
- improving public services and make them more effective at targeting those in need

Challenges

33. The experience of the Pathfinders has highlighted a key challenge for central and local government.

34. Despite the progress that neighbourhood management has made in being adopted across England, it remains clear that much of this has been enabled by the availability of dedicated funding to support it from central government. This presents an obvious challenge to LSPs and local government in respect of whether and how to mainstream these initiatives

when the initial funding comes to an end. The sustainability of the Pathfinders' legacy will be determined by these decisions over the coming few years.

35. There are also two further challenges that affect the context within which neighbourhood management initiatives operate, and which may have an important influence on their future prospects:
- **Incentives to focus on deprivation?** The framework for shaping how investments are made through LSPs at a local level has changed significantly in the last year. The advent of LAAs and greater flexibility for local government and its partners, together with the shift away from PSA floor targets in Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 (CSR07) removed the existing framework for targeting resources on deprived areas. In its place, the CSR07 established new Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs) including Communities and Local Government's DSO3¹ which focuses on regeneration. With the introduction of the Working Neighbourhoods Fund and publication of the *transforming places; changing lives*, a framework for regeneration, the context in which Neighbourhood Managers operate is therefore changing. This evaluation has shown that Neighbourhood Managers achieve most in promoting renewal when working with service providers pursuing compatible agendas – particularly tackling deprivation and involving communities in doing so. The degree to which mainstream service providers, including local government, prioritise the tackling of deprivation through their own expenditure will have a significant influence on further progress in addressing this issue, and will be strongly influenced by the emerging regeneration framework, as well as local LAA frameworks. Neighbourhood Managers cannot make change happen by themselves.
 - **Neighbourhood level service data?** The quality and quantity of timely and publicly available service data at a neighbourhood level for most mainstream services remains severely limited. This hampers monitoring and accountability for residents and the wider evaluation of pilot projects and programmes. Significant progress in the production of regular, comprehensive service data by LSPs is required to enable the effective evaluation of LAA programmes and their impact upon deprived neighbourhoods in particular. Given the lack of research skills and expertise in most neighbourhood partnerships, such central data gathering and analysis in LSPs may be the only way to ensure effective evaluation for these neighbourhoods.

¹ DSO3: To build prosperous communities by improving the **economic performance** of cities, sub-regions and local areas, promoting **regeneration** and **tackling deprivation**

Learning lessons

36. Chapter 8 of the report presents a summary of the 'case for neighbourhood management' – when and where it may be appropriate and what it should focus on, together with a summary of the costs and benefits to be considered in deciding whether to use this approach.
37. Chapter 9 concludes the report with a summary of the practical lessons learnt from the experiences of the Pathfinders over the last six years on how to design, deliver and evaluate an effective neighbourhood management initiative.

Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders National Evaluation: Further Information

The evaluation team has been lead by SQW Consulting with partners including:

GFA Consulting, Cambridge Economic Associates (CEA), Cities Research Centre (University of the West of England), European Institute for Urban Affairs (Liverpool John Moores University), Local Government Centre (Warwick Business School, University of Warwick), GfK NOP and Ipsos MORI

A wide range of research reports prepared by the team has been published since 2002, available through Communities and Local Government (www.neighbourhood.gov.uk) or the national evaluation website (www.sqw.co.uk/nme/).

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In 2001 the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme was established by the former Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, now Communities and Local Government. It funded the development of 35 Pathfinder partnerships, in two rounds, to test and develop neighbourhood management in deprived urban and rural areas across every region of England. The twenty Round 1 Pathfinders have been operating for six years now and are nearing the final year of their original seven year funding. The fifteen Round 2 Pathfinders have been operating for over three years. Approximately £80m has been invested so far by Communities and Local Government, with the final expenditure to 2011–12 estimated at £100m.
- 1.2 This is the final national evaluation report on the work of these Pathfinders, with the national evaluation programme concluding as the Round 1 Pathfinders enter their final year of committed funding. This report draws on the research of the national evaluation team from the last five years, including extensive fieldwork in every Pathfinder area, together with case studies on particular themes and household surveys in all areas. The report also includes new findings from the most recent final review of all Pathfinders in the autumn of 2007, together with new case studies.
- 1.3 The Pathfinder Programme was established as an experiment. The founding partnerships were asked not just to pilot a new way of working, but to take a relatively new idea and develop it ‘on the job’, to explore what was possible and to evolve it. The dictionary definition of ‘pathfinder’ provides an illustration of the intention:
- “Pathfinder”: One that discovers a new course or way, especially through or into unexplored regions.*
- 1.4 This final evaluation report tells the story of what happened. In particular the report seeks to answer three key questions:
- To what extent have the Pathfinders **met their objectives** in helping deprived communities and local service providers work together at a neighbourhood level to improve and join up services? (Chapters 3 to 7)
 - In the light of this, **when and where** is neighbourhood management an appropriate tool to use? (Chapter 8)
 - What are the **key lessons** that have been learnt on how to deliver neighbourhood management effectively? (Chapter 9)
- 1.5 The national evaluation has been delivered by a team of universities and consultancies led by SQW Consulting since early 2002. The team concludes its work in 2008. It has been the largest study of neighbourhood management practice in the UK.

- 1.6 There is also a companion report to this one that explores the wider growth and development of neighbourhood management in England in the last few years beyond the Pathfinder areas²; this report is also available from Communities and Local Government.

The national evaluation

- 1.7 The purpose of the national evaluation of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders is:

To assess the extent to which the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders are meeting their objectives of helping deprived communities and local service providers work together at neighbourhood level to improve and join up local services. The evaluation should advise on good practice in implementing and developing the neighbourhood management approach.

- 1.8 The evaluation team has delivered the evaluation in two contractual phases, from 2002–2004 and 2005–2008. The team has been led by SQW Consulting with partners including:

- GFA Consulting
- Cambridge Economic Associates (CEA)
- Cities Research Centre, University of the West of England
- European Institute for Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University
- Local Government Centre, Warwick Business School, University of Warwick
- GfK-NOP
- Ipsos-MORI

- 1.9 A wide range of research reports prepared by the team has been published since 2002, available through Communities and Local Government (www.neighbourhood.gov.uk) or the national evaluation website (www.sqw.co.uk/nme/). The main features of the team's work have comprised:

- Annual reviews of all 35 Pathfinders, based on both desk research and face to face fieldwork, together with national annual review reports
- Case studies and reports on specific themes, such as community safety, environmental services, economic development, community cohesion and social capital
- Two waves of household surveys undertaken by GfK-NOP and Ipsos-MORI in all Pathfinder areas

² SQW Consulting and partners, *Neighbourhood Management Beyond the Pathfinders: A National Overview* (Communities and Local Government, 2008)

- Provision of action learning sets, facilitated workshops, events, dissemination and other active support for Pathfinders
 - Publication of a toolkit to collate local service data (developed by CEA) and a range of other good practice notes.
- 1.10 The evaluation of the Pathfinders has been guided by a simple analytical framework that describes how Pathfinders operate, and which is included in Annex A for reference. All key published evaluation reports are listed in Annex B.

This report

- 1.11 This report draws on both the published body of evidence that the evaluation team has been developing for the last five years, as well as new research, particularly the most recent round of annual reviews conducted in all Pathfinder areas in the autumn of 2007. The findings of these independent reviews reflect desk research as well as nearly 400 face to face semi-structured interviews with Board members, team members, Neighbourhood Managers, local residents and service providers.
- 1.12 This report is structured as follows:
- Part A – The Pathfinder Story

The main part of the report describes the Pathfinder model in chapter 2 and explores the nature and extent of community engagement it involved in more depth in chapter 3, before presenting evidence on the influence of Pathfinders on both mainstream services in chapter 4, and, in chapter 5, on their neighbourhoods. Chapter 6 considers the future prospects for the Pathfinders from 2008–09 onwards, and chapter 7 draws together the evaluation team’s final conclusions.
 - Part B – Learning Lessons

The second part of this report sets out, in two chapters, a summary of practical lessons on neighbourhood management. The first summarises the case for neighbourhood management – *why* should it be considered, and for *what purposes* and *when* does it operate best? The second part sets out some of the practical lessons that have been observed from the Pathfinder experience on *how* best to operate neighbourhood management.

Acknowledgements

- 1.13 The evaluation has been a genuinely collaborative process without which much of our research would not have been possible. The evaluation has been a team effort with contributions from all the members listed above. The team would like to thank all present and former Pathfinder Neighbourhood Managers and their teams for their active co-operation and support of the national evaluation over the last five years. We would also like to thank successive policy and research colleagues in Communities and Local Government for their guidance and input into this research project, together with their colleagues in each of the Government Offices for the Regions.
- 1.4 We have also been assisted in particular by our 'Pathfinder Panel' of ten Neighbourhood Managers who have provided feedback on the evaluation process each year, and also the project's Steering Group.

Part A: The Pathfinder Story

2 The Pathfinder Approach

- 2.1 This chapter defines the aims, origins and activities of the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders, together with the key milestones in the development of the Programme.

Aims and origins of neighbourhood management

- 2.2 Neighbourhood management is a relatively new approach to improving public services. At its simplest, neighbourhood management is a process which brings the local community and local service providers together, at a neighbourhood level, to tackle local problems and improve local services.
- 2.3 Neighbourhood management is a process run by a professional manager who has responsibility for viewing the neighbourhood in its totality as a 'place' rather than simply being concerned with specific services, and who seeks to develop a systematic, planned approach to improving the quality of life in that neighbourhood. The approach is usually based on influencing mainstream public service providers in how they deliver services and make resource decisions. Some initiatives go further and actually provide some services at a neighbourhood level, although this is relatively unusual. The manager is primarily accountable to the local community through a multi-sector board, which helps to maintain a focus on tackling problems from the local residents' perspective. The process therefore brings together an 'alliance' of three forces – representatives of the local community (including councillors), representatives of local service providers and a small professional team led by the Neighbourhood Manager to facilitate change.
- 2.4 Although the constituent elements of neighbourhood management are not new – community involvement, neighbourhood level working, managing places – 'neighbourhood management' as a recognisable approach only came to national prominence in 2000 as part of the Social Exclusion Unit's (SEU) review of approaches to renewing deprived areas in the preparation of a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal. The SEU's fourth Policy Action Team (PAT) report³ recommended that neighbourhood management should be piloted to establish how it might work in practice and what it could achieve. The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme was established in 2001 to test the approach proposed by the SEU.

³ *Neighbourhood Management: Report of Policy Action Team 4* (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000)

Establishing the Pathfinder Programme

Aims

- 2.5 The stated purpose of the Pathfinder Programme is to “enable deprived communities and local services to improve local outcomes, by improving and joining up local services, and making them more responsive to local needs”. It was specifically targeted on deprived areas, to test the potential role of neighbourhood management in promoting neighbourhood renewal and ‘narrowing the gap’ between deprived neighbourhoods and the rest.
- 2.6 The aim of the Pathfinder Programme was to test neighbourhood management, broadly based on the model set out in the SEU’s fourth Policy Action Team report. This considered that there were five key ingredients to effective neighbourhood management and four ways of working that, together, would provide a flexible, powerful toolkit for renewal that could be adapted to different local circumstances (see Figure 2.1).

Figure 2-1: The PAT4 neighbourhood management approach

Key ingredients	The toolkit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Someone with overall responsibility at the neighbourhood level for managing the renewal process Community involvement and leadership The tools to get things done A systematic, planned approach to tackling local problems Effective delivery mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreements with service providers Devolved service delivery and purchasing Pressure on agencies and Government Special resources on enabling and cross-cutting activities

Source: Social Exclusion Unit, (2000) Neighbourhood Management: Report of Policy Action Team 4

Designing and establishing the Programme

- 2.7 The Programme was established by the former Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and has been operating for over six years, with twenty Round 1 Pathfinders set up in 2001–02 and fifteen Round 2 Pathfinders launched in 2003–04. The thirty-five Pathfinders are listed in Figure 2.2.
- 2.8 The first round of Pathfinders was selected by the NRU in July 2001 from 72 competitive bids from local authorities who had been invited to express interest. Invitations were focused on local authority areas that had more than one ward in the 10% most deprived in England, but excluded any areas with a New Deal for Communities (NDC) Partnership⁴. Each of the 20 Round 1 authorities then prepared an initial Delivery Plan for February 2002, before all were finally given approval in April 2002.

⁴ NDC Partnerships are area-based regeneration partnerships funded by Communities and Local Government. There are 39 in England.

- 2.9 The second round of Pathfinders was intentionally established with a different mix of characteristics, with more based in rural areas and some with Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) as accountable bodies, rather than local authorities. Fifteen Round 2 Pathfinders were approved in December 2003.
- 2.10 Each Pathfinder was asked to develop a seven year programme. Round 1 Pathfinders were awarded funding of £3.5m each, over seven years from 2002–03 to 2008–09, which is an average of £500,000 per year, to cover core management and running costs and also a project/leverage fund. Round 2 Pathfinders were awarded a smaller amount of £2.45m over seven years, which is £350,000 per year from 2005–06 to 2011–12, reflecting a desire to test neighbourhood management with a smaller available ‘project’ fund.

Figure 2-2: All Pathfinders

Region	Rnd	Local Authority	Name of Pathfinder (and target area if not named)	Local authority tiers	NRF or N’hood Element in local authority area? ⁵
Lon	1	LB of Greenwich	Changes In Common (Woolwich Common)	Single	NRF
	1	LB of Camden	Go! Partnership (Gospel Oak)	Single	NRF, NE
	2	LB of Southwark	South Bermondsey	Single	NRF, NE
	2	LB of Waltham Forest	Team Leyton	Single	NRF, NE
	2	City of Westminster	Church St. Neighbourhood Forum (Church Street)	Single	NRF, NE
SE	1	Hastings BC	Greater Hollington Partnership	Two tier	NRF, NE
	2	Isle of Wight Council	Pan Village: Coming Together	Single	–
	2	Shepway DC	Hawkinge NM Partnership	Two tier	–
SW	1	Gloucester City	Community Counts (Barton, Tredworth and White City)	Two tier	–
	1	Bournemouth BC	Neighbourhood Management In Springbourne & Boscombe West	Single	–
	2	North Devon DC	Transform (Ilfracombe, Combe Martin, Bratton Fleming)	Two tier	–
WM	1	Newcastle under Lyme BC	Knutton Cross Heath Neighbourhood Management Initiative (Knutton and Cross Heath)	Two tier	–
	1	East Staffordshire BC	Heart of Burton Partnership (Burton)	Two tier	–
	2	Wyre Forest DC	Oldington & Foley Park, Kidderminster	Two tier	–
	2	Solihull MBC	Fordbridge Plus	Single	–
EM	1	Ashfield DC	Kirkby Neighbourhood Management (Kirkby-in-Ashfield)	Two tier	NRF
	1	Chesterfield BC	Staveley Neighbourhood Management	Two tier	–
	2	Bassetlaw DC	Manton Community Alliance	Two tier	–

continued

Figure 2-2: All Pathfinders

Region	Rnd	Local Authority	Name of Pathfinder (and target area if not named)	Local authority tiers	NRF or N'hood Element in local authority area? ⁵
East	1	Basildon DC	Interlock! (Northlands Park)	Two tier	–
	2	Fenland DC	Fenland Links (c.15 villages)	Two tier	–
Y&H	1	Kirklees MBC	Dewsbury West Neighbourhood Management	Single	NRF, NE
	1	Barnsley MBC	Kendray Initiative Board	Single	NRF, NE
	1	Rotherham MBC	Eastwood and Springwell Gardens Neighbourhood Management	Single	NRF
	2	Calderdale MBC	Ovenden Initiative	Single	NE
	2	North Lincolnshire Council	Turning the curve in Crosby (Crosby, Scunthorpe)	Single	–
	2	North Lincolnshire Council	Turning the curve in Crosby (Crosby, Scunthorpe)	Single	–
NW	1	Bolton MBC	Great Lever Neighbourhood Renewal	Single	NRF, NE
	1	Tameside MBC	Hattersley Neighbourhood Management	Single	NRF, NE
	1	Chester City Council	Blacon Together	Two tier	NE
	1	Lancaster City Council	Poulton Neighbourhood Management	Two tier	NE
	2	Blackburn with Darwen Council	New East Blackburn	Single	NRF
	2	Wirral MBC	Tranmere Together (Tranmere/Wirral and Rock Ferry)	Single	NRF, NE
NE	1	Stockton on Tees BC	Parkfield/Mill Lane Neighbourhood Management	Single	NRF, NE
	1	Derwentside DC	Stanley Green Corridor Neighbourhood Partnership (Stanley)	Two tier	NRF
	1	Easington DC	Coastal Area Partnership NM (Easington Colliery and Horden North)	Two tier	NRF, NE
	2	Blyth Valley BC	Improving Croft & Cowpen Quay	Two tier	–

2.11 From April 2005, funding from the NRU for the Pathfinders was pooled within the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF) for each participating local authority, along with other ODPM and Home Office funding streams. From April 2006, funding for Pathfinders was either delivered through the SSCF or was delivered through their local authority's Local Area Agreement (LAA), if one had been developed, with the Local Strategic Partnership having the discretion over how these funds were to be allocated.

⁵ Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and Neighbourhood Element (NE) funds

- 2.12 From April 2007, all Pathfinder funding has been delivered through LAAs. The Pathfinder Programme is therefore no longer a centrally driven and directed 'programme', with all funding decisions now being taken locally by individual Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs)⁶. In the autumn of 2006, the work of the NRU, the Programme's original sponsor, was also absorbed within a restructured Department for Communities and Local Government, and it ceased to be a separate unit.

Programme context

- 2.13 The nature of the neighbourhoods in which the Pathfinders are operating varies widely. They are distributed through every region of England from Basildon in Essex to Blyth Valley in Northumberland. Some are inner city, others are residential estates on the edge of towns, some are in coastal towns. The majority are urban, whether located in large cities (London) or metropolitan areas (Rotherham, Bolton, etc), or boroughs (Blackburn with Darwen, Stockton-on-Tees, etc) or towns (Morecambe, Kirkby in Ashfield, etc). A handful of Pathfinders are rural (eg Fenland and North Devon).
- 2.14 The demographic and ethnic composition of the populations of these areas varies significantly, as does the range of social and economic issues they face. Where Pan village is wrestling with the development of new housing and the integration of a new community on the Isle of Wight, Knutton and Cross Heath in Newcastle under Lyme is part of a Housing Market Renewal area seeking stabilisation of a housing market in an area facing serious economic challenges.
- 2.15 The institutional context within which Pathfinders have been operating has also varied significantly, with one of the main contextual differences being whether local government is unitary or two tier (meaning that in two-tier authority areas, there are two levels of local government which the Pathfinders must engage with, instead of just one). The performance of local public services varies considerably also, with Audit Commission assessments of Pathfinder local authorities ranging from 'weak' to 'excellent'. The extent of other regeneration activities (and funding) in each area has also varied.
- 2.16 The Pathfinders have two features in common however:
- **Scale:** The initial population⁷ of Pathfinder areas ranged from 2,770 in Pan Village (Isle of Wight) to 20,570 in Gospel Oak (Camden), but most were in the range 5,000 – 15,000 people, with the average size being 10,200 people. Most target areas therefore comprise a handful of small 'walkable' neighbourhoods, and are relatively small areas. They can sometimes be fairly homogenous, but can also contain quite distinct communities within them.

⁶ LSPs are multi-agency partnerships that match local authority boundaries and bring key partners in an area together to improve public services and promote social and economic wellbeing.

⁷ Estimated population in 2003 for target areas, based on 2001 Census and mid-year estimates of population change, calculated by the Social Disadvantage Research Centre, University of Oxford.

- **Deprivation:** The majority of the Pathfinder areas are deprived, with 30 out of 35 Pathfinders in the most deprived 20% areas in England⁸, and 15 of these in the most deprived 10% areas. All Pathfinder areas are also more deprived than their local authority area as a whole, but most are not the only deprived area within their local authority.

2.17 As a 'test-bed' for a Pathfinder Programme then, we consider the rationale for the selection of these 35 deprived areas, and their inherent variety, to be sound. The evaluation sought to consider how some of the varying characteristics of the areas influenced the effectiveness of Pathfinders, included in our analysis later in this report.

The Pathfinder model in practice

2.18 Here, we describe the overall approach to neighbourhood management that has been followed and developed by most Pathfinders. The basic model is a simple one, has been followed by all Pathfinders (even since the devolution of funding to LAAs), and comprises:

- A **small professional team** led by a Neighbourhood Manager, usually including community outreach, policy and administrative officers, all based in an accessible office within the target area;
- Team members are usually employed by, and financial and legal matters dealt with through, an **Accountable Body** – in most cases the local authority. This body provides a degree of oversight and professional support and also accountability for resources;
- A **multi-sector partnership**, including public, private and community and voluntary sector representatives, dedicated to the target area and to whom the Neighbourhood Manager is accountable. This is led by a Board, but the partnership usually has a wider range of thematic working groups and forums to involve a wider range of local stakeholders. The partnership is a voluntary association, not a legal entity; and
- Development of a **programme** set out in a **Delivery Plan** each year, signed off by the Board. The Plan sets out the partnership's aims and priorities and the range of activities it intends to pursue, usually including a mix of community development activities, work to influence local service providers and some direct project delivery.

2.19 Below we describe these components in more depth, including any significant variations of approach between Pathfinders.

i) Pathfinder team

2.20 The average size of core teams recruited to Round 1 Pathfinders was 6.5 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff, including a Neighbourhood Manager and a mix of administration/finance, policy and community outreach officers.

⁸ Based on scores calculated for target areas using the Index of Multiple Deprivation, 2004

This average disguises a range of team sizes, with the smallest teams being four people and the largest core teams being up to ten or more. The size of Round 2 Pathfinder teams is similar, the average being c.6 FTE, with a similar range.

- 2.21 Most team members have been direct employees, although some have been short-term secondments from partner organisations (eg the police).
- 2.22 All Pathfinders established offices within their target neighbourhoods, often co-located with other organisations, and usually with a 'shop front' of some kind so that the team is visible and accessible to local residents.

ii) Accountable Body

- 2.23 The majority of Pathfinders use their local authority as the Accountable Body, and this has generally worked well. Six Pathfinders use a different organisation, with most being Round 2 Pathfinders, as this was encouraged when that round was established:
- Staveley (Chesterfield, Round 1) worked with a local economic development agency, which is a limited company
 - Oldington and Foley Park (Wyre Forest) and ICCQ (Blyth Valley) use local RSLs. (Team Leyton were using an RSL (L&Q) but have recently transferred to the local authority)
 - Transform (North Devon) and Ovenden (Calderdale) use a regeneration company (North Devon and Exmoor Regeneration Company) and a company limited by guarantee (the North Halifax Partnership) respectively
 - Church Street (Westminster) relied on the Paddington Development Trust, a community-led organisation, although the Neighbourhood Manager is employed by the council.
- 2.24 Two further Pathfinders (Wirral and Waltham Forest) used their local authority as the formal Accountable Body, but worked with a local RSL to line manage and support the Neighbourhood Manager.
- 2.25 The financial and personnel systems adopted by the Pathfinders are, in the main, those of their accountable bodies, and this has generally ensured good systems, oversight and accountability and support where it is required.
- 2.26 In the early years most Pathfinders developed their own project appraisal systems, drawing on good practice, to help Board decide how best to allocate and use the available project funds.

iii) Partnership and Board

- 2.27 All Pathfinders have been led by multi-sector Boards, which have provided leadership, priority-setting and oversight of their Neighbourhood Managers and teams. Although the Boards are all formally constituted with clear written procedures, they do not have separate legal status – that is, all are voluntary associations as is common with area-based partnerships.

2.28 In 2004 and 2005 we undertook full surveys of Board membership in Round 1 and Round 2 Pathfinders respectively, revealing very similar characteristics. The average size of Boards for both Rounds was 22 members, with the average composition of Round 1 Boards shown in Figure 2.3.

Figure 2.3: Average Round 1 Pathfinder Board composition (2004, Year 2)

Group	Average membership %	Typical Board membership
Residents	37%	8 residents
Community groups (including faith groups)	8%	2 community groups
Voluntary groups	8%	2 voluntary groups
Public service provider representatives (officers)	26%	6 service providers
Councillors	16%	3 councillors
Business representatives	5%	1 business
Total Board membership	100%	22 Board members

2.29 Although the size and composition of Boards have changed over time as Pathfinders have evolved their structures and approaches, and there has been variation between Pathfinders, the overall shape of Pathfinder Boards has been fairly consistent.

2.30 The largest group of representatives on most Boards is made up of local residents, usually nominated from existing groups or forums (in a handful of cases directly elected), and accounting on average for a third of Board members. Councillors, public service providers and community/voluntary sector groups (including faith groups) are also always represented. Business representation has been the weakest, with some Pathfinders having no representation at all. Where there has been variation between Pathfinders, perhaps the most interesting difference has been in resident representation; at the time of this Board survey in 2004, one third of Boards had a resident majority, but this was not the most usual model. Boards tend to be chaired by residents or councillors in most cases.

2.31 The Board provides the focus for decision-making and partnership working in Pathfinders, but each partnership also has a wider structure, including a range of forums and working groups and networks, as follows:

- **Thematic working groups** – Most Pathfinders operate several ongoing thematic working groups (eg housing or health) which bring together a small number of interested residents and service providers on a regular basis to develop thinking and ideas about local services, and can be a useful sounding board for service providers.
- **Networking and forums** – Many Pathfinders have set up community forums, sometimes for particular groups such as younger people or minority communities, but often for the community in general. They provide opportunities to get a mix of local people together to discuss and

express views on both local issues and the work of the Pathfinder. Many Pathfinder AGMs are designed as open forums.

- **Community outreach and consultation** – Many Pathfinders have community involvement workers who undertake outreach and encourage new people to get involved in the work of the Pathfinder or with specific local activities or services. This work is assisted by local newsletters and most Pathfinders have their own website, and some do local surveys. Those Pathfinders that employ, or work with, Neighbourhood Wardens (uniformed rangers promoting community safety and the local environment) also find them to be a useful resource for this purpose. A number of Pathfinders run occasional events, such as fun days and community festivals, to support community outreach and also to promote local relationships/bonds.
- **Community and voluntary sector capacity building** – A number of Pathfinders have provided support to existing voluntary or community groups, and encouraged the formation of new groups, through training, support, networking and/or help with the refurbishment of community centres, etc.
- **Facilitating community consultation or involvement for service providers** – Pathfinders often work with service providers to support their efforts to improve the quality and extent of local consultation and community involvement particularly where service providers are not used to doing this or there is a particular challenge (eg a significant housing redevelopment).

2.32 Most Pathfinders also have formal links into their LSP and some are formally represented within their LSP, particularly where they are the only, or one of only a few, area-based renewal partnerships within the local authority.

2.33 The next chapter discusses the nature and extent of resident involvement in Pathfinders in more depth.

iv) Pathfinder programmes

2.34 Neighbourhood management as defined and developed by the Pathfinders has had two key foci – work to engage local service providers, and work to engage local residents. In respect of the former, Pathfinders have not largely engaged in the direct delivery of services, but have sought to influence mainstream public service providers to join up and improve their services in ways that will benefit Pathfinder area residents. In respect of the latter, Pathfinders have invested a significant proportion of their time in engaging local residents to understand their needs and views. Bringing the two viewpoints together – residents and service providers – has been at the heart of most Pathfinder programmes.

2.35 Each Pathfinder has developed a baseline of needs and then a vision for its area, in consultation with local residents, and set out a programme of aims and activities in annual Delivery Plans to deliver this vision. These programmes usually include the following four types of activities:


- 'Quick wins' – In the early stages of most Pathfinder programmes, short-term projects were designed to deliver early and visible benefits to residents, to raise awareness of the work of the Pathfinder, and to build confidence and interest – eg tidying up well known local eyesores, or providing new equipment to community groups.
- Influencing services – One of the main components of Pathfinder activity has been the development of relationships with local service providers, often through regular meetings, leading to the co-development of new initiatives or changes to local services. In some cases, and particularly in Round 1 Pathfinders where more resources were available, these were built upon 1–2 year pilot or demonstration projects partly funded by the Pathfinder. (A number of examples of these are provided in Chapter 4.)
- Community engagement – A constant feature has been the engagement of local people through a variety of means, from simply providing information by newsletters and websites through to supporting their active engagement in the Pathfinder and directly with service providers.
- Learning – Many Pathfinders have carried out their own monitoring and evaluation, sometimes building on the work of the national evaluation, to learn local lessons and also as part of efforts to persuade local service providers of the benefits of joint working at neighbourhood level.

Pathfinder expenditure

- 2.36 The expenditure of all Pathfinders has been analysed using actual expenditure to 2006–07 and forecast expenditure from 2007–08 onwards. The Pathfinder's own data has been used, and was collated in the last annual review in the autumn of 2007.
- 2.37 The total actual and forecast expenditure by all 35 Pathfinders from both Rounds is likely to be c.£100m if the present plans of Round 2 Pathfinders are delivered to 2011–12. By the end of 2007–08, we estimate expenditure to be just over £80m in total.
- Round 1 Pathfinders are on track to spend their full original allocation of c.£70m by the end of 2008–09 (year seven of the initial commitment) and will have spent c.£65m by the end of 2007–08 (year six), which is 93% of the total.
 - Round 2 Pathfinders are on track to spend c.£30m by the end of 2011–12 if committed funding is delivered as planned, with just over £17 million spent by the end of 2007–08 (year 3) which is 53% of the total.
- 2.38 Management and administration (including mainly team, office and other running costs) accounts for 40% of Round 1 expenditure, taking all seven years expenditure into account. The proportions range from 25% to 55%, but most are in the 35–45% range. This is just over £200,000 per year on average and has been fairly consistent over the years, with the main variation in expenditure being related to projects, peaking in years 3 and 4. For the Round 2 Pathfinders, management and administration accounts for 65% of expenditure, reflecting the much smaller project funding available, although

the management and administration funding is the same at an average of £200,000 per year.

- 2.39 Figure 2.4 shows the average distribution of expenditure by year for the Round 1 Pathfinders, showing a clear peaking of project expenditure in the middle years of the Pathfinders' programmes. This pattern reflects the time taken to develop new initiatives and get activities underway as well as the need to wind-down expenditure before the end of the initial funding period. The Round 2 expenditure profile is following the same pattern.



The Pathfinders today

- 2.40 At the time of writing, Round 1 Pathfinders are in their seventh and final year of their originally committed funding (2008–09) and Round 2 Pathfinders are in their fourth full year. It is an appropriate point at which to take stock of the Pathfinder experience. The nature and results of the Pathfinders' work with residents and service providers is discussed in more detail in following chapters, together with their plans for the future. Some of the key practical lessons learnt from setting up and operating the Pathfinders are set out in chapter nine.

Summary and Conclusions

- 2.41 The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme was established in 2001 to test a new approach to renewing deprived areas as identified and developed by the Social Exclusion Unit. Thirty-five Pathfinders were established in deprived areas in England through two Rounds of funding. The Pathfinders have used the same model, with a small professional team supported by an Accountable Body and lead by a multi-sector partnership including local residents. The Pathfinders are on track to spend c.£100m from 2001 to 2011–12 as initially intended.

3 Focus on Community Engagement

- 3.1 Community engagement has, from the outset, been a central strand of activity for the Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders. They have sought to reach residents and their local communities and to consult and involve them in local decision making processes about public services, either through the Pathfinder itself or directly with service providers. Engaging the community has formed an integral component of neighbourhood management and the Pathfinders have devoted a significant amount of time and resources to the processes of engagement in order to improve local services.
- 3.2 This chapter of the report focuses on community engagement and considers how the Pathfinders have engaged local people over the last five years. It also reflects on the nature and extent of engagement as well as the benefits and issues of engagement for both service providers and the individual residents involved. We explore and analyse what can be learnt about community engagement from the Pathfinder experience.

The nature and extent of community engagement

The nature of engagement

- 3.3 Throughout the evaluation it is apparent that the Pathfinders have developed, engaged in or promoted a wide range of different activities to involve the local community. These different activities can be broadly categorised into four broad groups:
- i) Encouragement of local people to get involved with the Pathfinder itself
 - ii) Promotion and improvement of community engagement directly with service providers
 - iii) Provision of information to, and at least some involvement of, a much wider range of local residents
 - iv) Development of community and voluntary sector groups and voluntary activity and social networks more generally.
- 3.4 For the first two of these broad categories the primary aim has been to bring residents and service providers together, particularly in ways that can improve their relationship and improve the flows of information between them. The third and fourth groups of activities aim to underpin and support community activity more widely, some of which will bring residents and service providers together, others of which will focus on community development.

- 3.5 Through successive annual reviews we have gathered evidence about the nature and extent of activity under each of the categories of activity, and these are discussed below in turn.

i) Engaging in the Pathfinder processes

- 3.6 The Pathfinders' partnership processes provide a managed environment in which providers and residents are brought together to discuss local issues and services. These activities include:

- **Pathfinder Boards** – All of the Pathfinders have a formal leadership body which is a partnership of residents, councillors, public service providers and representatives of the voluntary and private sectors. It is this group that sets the priorities and direction for the Pathfinder. Throughout the lifetime of the Pathfinders the average Board membership has been 22 people, varying between 15 and 33. Around one third of the representatives are made up of residents on average, although this proportion is as high as three quarters of the total membership in some Pathfinders. For 40% of the Pathfinders a resident is also the Chair of the Board. The Pathfinder Board is the key mechanism for enabling the community to participate in the decision making processes for the neighbourhood and brings service providers and residents 'face-to-face'. For a few Pathfinders the decision making process lies solely with local residents as they have made a clear distinction between service users and service providers and have developed a structure whereby service providers attend and participate but are not able to vote. A typical partnership structure is described in Figure 3.1
- **Working groups** – Below the Board nearly all Pathfinders operate a variety of working groups. The focus of these groups is either theme based (eg health, education, crime), issue based (eg open spaces, community cohesion) or administration based (eg finance, monitoring) and they bring together residents, service providers and staff to develop thinking and ideas about a specific local service or issue, often at a more focused level than can be achieved through the Board. The variation in the number of groups between partnerships inevitably affects the number of residents engaged through this process; it can be as low as two but can be over a hundred. The average number of residents engaged through this process is 35. The number and nature of working groups has also evolved over time in many partnerships.
- **Network and forums** – This mechanism of engagement enables a Pathfinder to involve a wider number, and often greater mix, of residents in its activities for three broad and distinct purposes.
 - Engagement of a particular group of residents who would otherwise not be involved in the Pathfinder such as younger people or minority communities
 - Support to residents who have a specific 'area' of interest for instance 'friends of' groups or resident associations or

- Involvement of a broader number of residents by offering other structures and activities in addition to the ‘formal’ constituted groups noted above.

A range of examples is described in Figure 3.2. Across the Pathfinders the level of engagement in these forms of activity varies significantly from 20 to over 400 with an average of c.60 people involved.

Figure 3-1: An illustrative example of the board and working group structure in the Heart of Burton Round 1 Pathfinder, East Staffordshire

The Partnership Board currently comprises twenty-five members of which eleven are residents. The service providers represented include Youth Services, Job Centre Plus, the Police, East Staffs Borough Council (Head of Regeneration), Community Action and Support East Staffordshire (CASES), a County Councillor, two Borough Councillors and Staffordshire County Council District Partnership Officer. The Board meets on a quarterly basis and resident Board members are selected through nomination of people who are known to be interested or active in local community based activities – there is thus no election process.

Below the Board there are four working groups: a Resident Sub-Group, a Respect Steering Group, a Partners and Community Together group and a Street Scene Sub Group.

- The **Resident Sub-Group** is a key part of the operational structure of the Partnership with members attending monthly meetings and reporting back to the Board. The sub-group is seen as a ‘voice’ for resident Board members and helps to improve relationships with resident and community led consultation groups enabling these groups to inform the strategic priorities of the Pathfinder. The sub-group is also seen as a ‘critical friend’ to service providers. Importantly the Board’s constitution has also established a ‘resident buddies’ system whereby resident Board members ‘buddy’ up with two resident sub-group members who accompany them to Board meetings and have the power to vote in the absence of the resident Board member.
- The **Respect Steering Group** includes a variety of partners (the police, schools, social services, the local authority and the provider sector) as well as residents and oversees the delivery of the Respect initiative (7 principles designed to encourage neighbourliness, community spirit, cohesion, engagement and action) in the Pathfinder area.
- The **Partners and Community Together (PACT)** involves structured meetings between the Police and local residents. The group has been particularly successful in allowing local residents to challenge decisions by local service providers that affect them.
- The **Street Scene Sub Group** involves regular joint workshops with services providers, residents and elected members to identify priorities and actions around street calming, street appearance, pride in the neighbourhood and litter.

Figure 3-2: Examples of different networks and forums used to engage residents in Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders

Eastwood and Springwell Gardens, Rotherham

As a central part of its community engagement strategy Eastwood and Springwell Gardens has set up a number of groups to meet the specific needs of sections of the community. This includes a Youth Initiatives Group, an Elderly Activities Group and a Women's Forum. The Women's Forum meets monthly with between five and eight members and aims to create a platform for the promotion and celebration of women from all cultural backgrounds. The group has direct links to a number of projects which promote involvement in the group and a representative of the group also sits on the Pathfinder Board.

Poulton, Lancaster

Over the last year a number of 'working lunches' have been held where on average 10 involved residents had the opportunity to hear a presentation from a senior representative of a local service provider and then ask questions. These events have improved local awareness and understanding of local service provision. Providing lunch also acts as a goodwill gesture and a way of thanking residents for being involved.

Tranmere Together, Wirral

The Pathfinder established the Residents Together Partnership to provide an umbrella forum for resident groups and community activists in the area. It meets once a month and on averages attracts 25–30 residents from about 60 who regularly receive information about the events. The aim is for the group to act as a resident monitor of the Pathfinder's progress, provide resident group validation of the approach and issues to be addressed, provide a framework for capacity building and provide the main nomination route for resident membership of the Board. The group has unified previously fragmented groups and provided them with a 'collective voice' in Together's activities enabling them to interact directly with service providers and Together Staff; the Deputy Leader and his councillor colleagues also receive a standing invitation to attend meetings. The group is also responsible for allocating and subsequently monitoring and evaluating the NRF People and Places Fund in the Pathfinder area.

Oldington and Foley Park, Wyre Forest

Sixteen young people aged 9 to 13 have been engaged in the Junior Pathfinder group. This group seeks to give young people in the area a say in their neighbourhood and the Pathfinder has earmarked £4,500 for disbursement as grants. In order to allocate the grants the young people involved have received appraisal training (linked to the training for full Board members around project appraisal). The Junior Pathfinder have also helped to plan fun days, taken part in various projects and are consulted on to included the views of young people living in the neighbourhood. There are currently plans to extend this engagement to cover scrutiny style activities to provide feedback on the impact and effectiveness of local services. The Junior Pathfinder also created a 'charter' which outlined

their thoughts on the Pathfinder's five key themes (based in part on looking at survey data with the support of the Pathfinder team to understand the issues) and included partner promises about how they will shape their services as a response.

Blacon, Chester

As part of its development the Blacon Youth Association – an inter-agency collaboration across agencies dealing with young people from 5–25 in the Pathfinder area – has developed a youth forum. This youth forum is a sub-group of the Blacon Youth Association and provides young people with a voice. The group meets every Thursday during term-time at the High School and has an average of 10 young people attending. The forum has become notably stronger throughout its lifetime and now has direct responsibility for the deployment of a £14,000 Youth Opportunity Fund. In order to deliver this fund the Forum has devised the application form, and members have been given responsibility for canvassing ideas and making the funding decisions along with an independent witness.

ii) Engaging with Service Providers

3.7 Neighbourhood management helps to facilitate community engagement in service provider processes in two keys ways. Firstly it supports or provides advice to service providers on their processes for outreach and secondly it helps to facilitate better direct links between service providers and residents, as described below and illustrated in Figure 3.3:

- **Consultation exercises** – The Pathfinders have worked closely with service providers supporting them in their efforts to engage and consult with the local community. The Pathfinder is able to use its existing local knowledge and links to 'introduce' service providers to a community and advise on, or even undertake, consultation exercises for them.
- **Service monitoring** – In order to directly link service providers and residents a number of Pathfinders have worked closely with service providers in the development of groups to monitor and discuss specific areas of public service delivery. This mechanism has helped to engage an average of c.50 residents per area, ranging from areas with almost no involvement to some with up to 200 residents involved. This type of involvement has predominately been developed in three service areas:
 - In *policing*, neighbourhood policing forums or committees have been developed in many areas with the explicit purpose of involving residents in discussions with the police about local priorities and providing an opportunity to monitor police activities. These activities have often been led by the police but greatly assisted by the Pathfinders, who have helped to improve links with the local community and identify resident representatives to participate in formal groups/forums. It is an activity that has been significantly enhanced by the advent of neighbourhood policing (with its shift in emphasis towards neighbourhood-focused teams of police officers and PCSOs) and is now being delivered in many areas (not just Pathfinder areas) across England.

- In order to engage residents in the monitoring of the local *environment* a growing number of Pathfinders (currently about one third) have worked closely with their local councils to set up local networks of street representatives or street ambassadors. These are responsible for monitoring their local street environment and reporting issues directly to the local environmental services providers.
- The engagement of residents in the direct monitoring of *housing/estate* services generally occurs in two ways. Firstly, residents can be involved in regular ‘walkabouts’ around the key housing estates alongside professionals from the RSLs/Housing Associations with the primary purpose of identifying and feeding back issues and problems. Secondly, for those neighbourhoods undergoing major estate management or housing renewal programmes, involvement occurs through regular dialogue and consultation with residents – actively involving them in the design and decision making processes.

Figure 3-3 Examples of activities that engage and involve residents in the processes of service monitoring

Street Ambassadors

New East Blackburn, Blackburn

Street Ambassadors have repeatedly been cited by mainstream partners and, in particular, the environment and policing services, as an invaluable community resource. Street Ambassadors are local residents who have been provided with training from the Pathfinder team in how to take proactive action to improve the area and deal with issues of concern (such as fly tipping, abandoned vehicles, neighbourhood disputes and anti-social behaviour). This involves an understanding of how to register issues with the appropriate public service and local Councillor, how to manage disputes and how to articulate the needs of local residents. This process of community empowerment has led to 50 active Street Ambassadors. Moreover, Street Ambassadors are also being used by the Pathfinder and other service providers to communicate changes in services such as, for example, the recent decision to revert back to weekly refuse collection. The local Cleansing team are also looking to train the Street Ambassadors to undertake Local Environment Quality Surveys (LEQS) which would provide substantially more information than the Best Value Performance Indicator survey.

Community Counts, Gloucester

The aim of the street representative scheme in Gloucester is to enable services to use resident information to help them to perform better at a neighbourhood level. Twenty-eight residents are presently Street Representatives and are responsible for monitoring the local streets (having been trained in the Highways Inspection Quality Criteria) and reporting issues to the Street Care Team as well as feeding back information from the Pathfinder to local residents. Five of the Street Reps also form a steering group and monitor the performance of the Street Care Team. In addition to Street Representatives the plan is also to have a resident in every street who knows how to report work that needs doing to the relevant agency and can act as a conduit to get information. As part of this process the Pathfinder

has developed a Street Rep Pack which provides information on who to contact for what issue, what service levels residents should expect and how long each job request should take to complete.

Policing

Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership, Tameside

The Police and Communities Together (PACT) group meets monthly providing on average three or four residents. The group provides residents with the opportunity to give feed back to the Police and identify key issues and priorities for the Police.

Manton Community Alliance, Bassetlaw

The Crime and Community Safety Action Group directly inputs into developing and monitoring police priorities in the neighbourhood. This group helps the police in deploying resources and has also drawn attention to specific local problems such as quad bikes.

Housing

Knutton Cross Heath, Newcastle under Lyme

The local RSL has established regular estate walkabouts which it publicises enabling residents to join housing officers and other service providers to walk parts of the neighbourhood and identify issues that need attention.

Kendray Initiative, Barnsley

The community have been fully engaged in housing renewal through the consideration of the proposed 'blueprint' for the area which included proposals for demolition, new development, management of the existing stock and open space improvements. There was continuous dialogue with the local community, facilitated by the Pathfinder, which meant that their views have been taken into account and influenced many decisions on management arrangements, letting policy and the form of development proposed including the mix of housing types and the design and layout.

iii) Building wider community awareness and engagement

3.8 The third broad category of engagement used by the Pathfinders is one which focuses on involving a wider spectrum of residents. It includes the following types of activity:

- **Information provision** – All of the Pathfinders use regular newsletters which are sent to the majority, if not all, of the households in their neighbourhood. This tool is used predominantly to raise awareness of the Pathfinder and to communicate what it is doing, and has achieved, in the local neighbourhood. It is a tool that on average helps the Pathfinders to engage with most of their local residents – approximately 10,000 local residents on average (clearly varying to an extent that depends on the size of the neighbourhood).

- **One off events and consultation exercises** – A number of Pathfinders run occasional events, such as fun day and community festivals. These events have the dual aim of raising the awareness of the Pathfinder as well helping build and enhance the local community ‘spirit’. In addition to this, and as noted above, the Pathfinders have also worked closely with service providers to supporting them in their efforts to consult with the community. Across all of the Pathfinders it is estimated that this type of activity has helped to engage on average over 1,000 residents per neighbourhood.

iv) Building community and voluntary capacity

- 3.9 The fourth and final type of activity goes beyond resident engagement to build the capacity of local community and voluntary sector groups, and, plausibly, build *social capital* more widely in the community. Academic literature defines social capital as the social ties and networks that give people access to resources and information, with three components:
- Social bonds – social networks and ties between people within a neighbourhood;
 - Social bridges – social ties between different social groups of varying ethnicity, culture, faith and age; and
 - Social links – informal and formal ties between the community and service providers.
- 3.10 With respect to building the capacity of local community and voluntary sector groups, a significant number of the Pathfinders have community development workers who undertake outreach and encourage new people to get involved in the work of the Pathfinder or with specific services. These workers therefore not only help with wider community development work, such as building the capacity of community groups, but they also play a crucial role in helping to engage the community in both the Pathfinder and service provider processes. In addition to the use of community development workers a number of Pathfinders also have a small grant fund/community chest to help support existing and encourage the formation of new community groups. Some of these groups will have direct links with the work of the Pathfinder, such as a ‘Friends Of’ group who ensure a local park is kept clean and well maintained, whereas for others the focus will be more on building the capacity and enhancing the local community.
- 3.11 The promotion and development of social capital has not been an explicit (or even deliberate) objective for most Pathfinders, who generally describe their activities in terms of ‘resident engagement’. However, the evaluation has found that the benefits of the Pathfinders’ resident engagement activities often can contribute, in some cases significantly, to the development of social capital in the community.
- 3.12 Pathfinders have contributed in modest ways to the development of each of the three types of linkage, as defined above. This has been done, often implicitly, through a range of activities; establishing and supporting

community and voluntary groups; creating opportunities to bring different social groups together; and supporting partnerships that bring residents and service providers together in informal and formal ways.

- 3.13 Further discussion of the contribution of neighbourhood management to the development of social capital, including one of the best examples of this (the work being done by the Manton Pathfinder), is described in a previously published report⁹. An example of some of the work in Manton is described in Figure 3.4.
- 3.14 A fuller discussion of the work of Pathfinders in exploring and supporting community cohesion is also presented in a separate published report from the evaluation team¹⁰.

Figure 3-4: Building social capital in Manton, Bassetlaw

Participatory Budgeting

The Manton Community Alliance pathfinder has developed a Participatory budgeting (PB) approach over the past year. The intention of this approach was to develop community leadership and enhance the role of local democracy in decision making and to do this the Pathfinder designated £50,000 from its budget.

As with other community engagement exercises the Pathfinder sought to use innovative means of engagement so the process started with a 'budget bingo' that involved residents identifying their top 10 priorities from a list of 40 ideas and issues previously identified by residents in other consultation exercises (such as a fun day and through the newsletter). The next stage was to decide how the budget should be spent on these 10 priorities so 200 residents were invited to an event. Residents were picked (by gender and age) to be invited so that the demography of Manton was reflected.

A total of 140 residents participated and each received 'monopoly money' of £50,000, in denominations of £5,000 (ie 10 'votes'). At the event there were presentations on each of the 10 priorities and residents were asked to place money in boxes for each priority according to their preference. The final stage of the process was for the relevant groups and service providers to submit project proposals which were judged by a steering group on the basis of criteria developed by the board and then the residents (who had been involved previously) were asked to attend a third event to decide which projects received funding.

Assessing the extent of engagement

- 3.15 There has been significant variation in terms of the number of people engaged through the work of the Pathfinders but also in the nature of the involvement. Figure 3.5 presents a summary of the average level of community engagement for each of the broad types of engagement activity.

⁹ Taylor, Marilyn, *Research Report 35: Neighbourhood Management and Social Capital*, (Communities and Local Government, 2007)

¹⁰ SQW Consulting, *Neighbourhood Management and Community Cohesion*, (Communities and Local Government, 2008)

- 3.16 This figure clearly shows that the number of residents involved in Pathfinder activity significantly decreases as the level of engagement and commitment required becomes more intense: the more time and responsibility something involves the less people are likely to engage in it.
- 3.17 It also shows that there is a strong core of residents (between about 20 and 60) who have been engaged in the more deliberative processes of neighbourhood management such as the board, working groups and service monitoring. The number involved in service monitoring is particularly encouraging because this involvement is not only more participatory but it is also likely to be sustainable beyond the lifetime of the Pathfinders.

Figure 3-5: Average levels of citizen engagement in different Pathfinder activities

Nature of involvement	Intensity of involvement	Average number of residents involved
Pathfinder Board	Ongoing participation	8
	Monthly/6 weekly meetings plus other duties	
	Key decision-making body within the Pathfinder	
Working groups	Ongoing participation	35
	Monthly meetings	
	Oversee specific area of Pathfinder activity	
Service monitoring	Ongoing participation	47
	Regular meetings and significant time commitment outside of 'formal' meetings	
	Responsibility in ensuring quality of local services	
Networks and forums	Ongoing but infrequent participation	59
	No requirement to attend meetings	
	Involvement on basis of personal choice/interest	
One off events or consultation exercises	Limited and infrequent participation	1,300
	Informal involvement	
	Involvement on basis of personal choice/interest	
Receiving information	No active participation required	10,000

- 3.18 It is important, however, not to discount the significance of receiving information and one off events as both of these methods play a central role in raising the level of awareness of the existence of the Pathfinder. Across the Round 1 areas awareness of the Pathfinders increased from 37% to 63% between 2003 and 2006 and in Round 2 areas it increased from 25% to 45% between 2004 and 2007. Whilst 'awareness' does not automatically translate into 'participation', it can be a vital first step in resident engagement. It is also worth noting in both Round 1 and Round 2 areas, the household surveys showed an increase in the proportion of local residents who felt able to influence local decisions. In Round 1 areas, the proportion increased from 23% to 26%, in Round 2 areas it increased from 23% to 24%.

- 3.19 It is also the case that engagement of residents in the more passive forms of involvement can lead to their engagement in the more intensive and deliberative forms. For example, the engagement of residents in one-off events, perhaps for the first time, can sometimes lead to their subsequent involvement in networks and forums, which in turn can lead to their involvement in the Board.
- 3.20 Finally, it is worth noting the experience of a handful of Pathfinders who chose to use direct elections to identify and elect residents onto their Board. Although a relatively time consuming and expensive process, they have often been useful in raising greater local awareness of the work of the Pathfinder, and in some cases the voter turnout has been at least as high, and sometimes higher, than the local council elections. The first elections in Camden and Bournemouth, for example, achieved turnouts of 25%.

Who has been engaged?

- 3.21 There are two common questions that arise in consideration of 'who' has been engaged in the different activities. The first is whether those residents engaged are representative of their neighbourhood both in terms of demography and ethnicity. The second is whether those engaged are the same core group of people who are involved in everything (neighbourhood management related or not) or whether participation is broader than this.
- 3.22 Taking these issues in turn, we sought to assess whether resident involvement in Pathfinders is broadly representative of the demography, in terms of age and gender, and the ethnicity of the neighbourhood by studying the demographic profile of all Board members – the most intense form of resident involvement in a Pathfinder. Figure 3.6 shows the results of the study of all Pathfinder Board members in 2007. We found that the profile of Board members was fairly representative albeit with one significant exception: young people. Young people are considerably under-represented throughout all of the different engagement activities used by the Pathfinders. In an attempt to address this, many Pathfinders developed a specific group or forum for young people in an attempt to engage them in a more appropriate and directly targeted way. There is anecdotal evidence across a range of Pathfinders that this more targeted approach does have some success.

Figure 3-6: Average demographic breakdown of Partnership Board Members

Demographic	%
Minority ethnic background	14%
Men	51%
Women	49%
Under 25 years	6%
25–59 years	64%
60 years and over	31%

- 3.23 In terms of the second issue it would appear that the Pathfinders have been able to extend engagement beyond the same small group of residents engaged at the beginning of the initiative to a larger group who are now regularly and actively engaged in the Pathfinders' activities. However, a constant challenge facing the Pathfinders has been to widen the pool of involvement even further.

The issues, benefits and costs of community engagement

- 3.24 The experience of Pathfinders in broadening the base of resident engagement in their activities, and with service providers, has demonstrated that this process takes time and has to address some critical issues. Moreover, it has proved difficult to quantify the benefits from seeking to do this in comparison with the costs.

Issues

- 3.25 Despite improvements in the level of engagement across the Pathfinders there is significant variation in involvement between individual Pathfinders – variation that can be broadly attributed to three factors:
- **The amount of time and money that the Pathfinders have invested in community engagement** – In order to effectively engage the community a significant amount of time needs to be invested into building relationships and funds need to be spent on staff to build the relationships and on publicity and events to raise awareness.
 - **The level of engagement that existed when the Pathfinder started** – Some of the neighbourhoods already had good levels of community involvement that had been built up and developed over a number of years prior to neighbourhood management whereas other were starting with no structures or involvement in place.
 - **The popularity and effectiveness of the community engagement activities themselves** – If activities are felt to be effective and worthwhile then residents are not only more likely to engage but also to encourage others to be involved. However, the converse can also be true. Ineffective activities can prompt the disillusion and subsequent disengagement of residents. This factor is particularly apparent in those activities that require more intense involvement such as the Board and working groups.
- 3.26 Despite this variation, we have concluded from our review of Pathfinder experience that there is a minimum scale of resident involvement if the more deliberative processes of neighbourhood management are to be employed. The minimum number of residents required to enable involvement through a Board, working groups and service monitoring seems to be about 20 residents.

- 3.27 However, engagement does not end with the core group as it is clear that one of the real assets of neighbourhood management is its ability to engage and consult with the *wider local community*, particularly for the benefit of service providers. Therefore, it is important that neighbourhood management not only engages a core group of residents in its formal processes but that it is also able to access and involve a wider group in the less intense and more informal activities.
- 3.28 Throughout the lifetime of the Pathfinders it is clear that the different community engagement activities have become more refined and in turn greater depths and quality of engagement have become apparent. During this period the Pathfinders have been able to identify those activities that work best, predominantly those that focus on the issues and themes of greatest interest to the community or are tailored to a specific group in the community, and have developed the appropriate levels of training and support required to assist the community in their involvement. These refinements and improvements are perhaps most apparent in the Partnership Boards where the value and importance of community involvement has increased significantly through the lifetime of the programme as the resident members have developed new skills and grown in confidence and ability.

Benefits

For service providers

- 3.29 The Pathfinders, acting as broker, have sought to increase trust, understanding and a willingness to work together between residents and service providers and it is from these improved relationships that the key benefits for service providers stem.
- 3.30 Through engagement in the Pathfinder processes, particularly the Board and working groups, those residents involved develop a much greater understanding of the roles and remit of the different service providers along with an appreciation of the structures and confines in which they have to work. This understanding can reduce unrealistic expectations of service providers amongst those residents.
- 3.31 Engagement has also increased the level of communication between service providers and residents. This benefits service providers as it gives them much better access to local 'intelligence' and also enables the community to perform more of a scrutiny role and bring service providers to account as they can feedback problems and issues. Some examples are presented in Figure 3.7.

Figure 3-7: Examples of the benefit of improved communication between service providers and residents

Tranmere Together, Wirral

Resident intelligence helped Merseyside Police to pinpoint community safety issues and in turn identify where to locate mobile CCTV equipment to best advantage. This closer dialogue between residents and police has led to more responsive and informed policing which in turn has led to improve community confidence in the police and increased willingness to report crime.

Poulton, Lancaster

Lancaster City Council Direct Services has a Quick Response Vehicle which seeks to speedily collect unwanted dumped items which can pose a secondary fire risk. Residents have played an important role in scrutinising the customer service supplied by the Call Centre, monitoring the operation of the vehicle and prompting the negotiation of a Service Level Agreement.

New East Blackburn, Blackburn

In order to improve attendance at Police and Community Together (PACT) meetings the Pathfinder, on behalf of the Police and through the Street Ambassadors, conducted a survey with residents about their preferred venue, the timing and frequency of the meetings. By using the Street Ambassadors, who have good links with many groups in the community, the PACT meetings are not only now better attended because the meetings are held at a variety of venues, on different days and at different times but a wider range of the community are now engaged, particularly BME groups, because the meetings are held at more accessible venues such as the local mosque or the Islamic College.

- 3.32 The improved communication and greater level of engagement between service providers and the community has also significantly helped service providers in identifying the need for additional or re-shaped services. Those residents engaged provide, particularly through service monitoring activities, valuable evidence and real-time information about the local needs, issues, challenges and opportunities that exist in the neighbourhood. This direct input enables providers to more quickly tailor their services so that they are less remote and more responsive to local needs. Neighbourhood management has also facilitated access to some of the most 'hard to reach' groups in the community – including minority ethnic groups in many Pathfinder areas – which has also given providers a more detailed insight into the needs of the local community.

Figure 3-8: Examples of the benefit of direct input from residents about service needs

Interlock, Basildon

Residents were involved in instigating a phlebotomy clinic at the Northlands Centre as they identified the need for a local, accessible service and made suggestions for how, when and where it might run. They also provided direct feedback about the service to the PCT.

Knutton Cross Heath, Newcastle Under Lyme

Following resident concerns about young people hanging about in alleyways the police adopted a Section 30 Notice – a legal mechanism that allows the police to move on groups of two or more people who are acting in a threatening way.

- 3.33 Finally, the engagement and direct input from residents has also greatly benefited those service providers responsible for developing and delivering larger physical projects in the neighbourhood, with examples provided in Figure 3.9. The Pathfinder's community engagement structures have provided a 'ready-made' consultative group of residents saving service providers significant amounts of time and money in establishing new or separate consultation processes. Neighbourhood management also enables a smaller group from the community to be consulted on the design of potential physical developments and to actually challenge and directly influence it – often aligning it more closely with what the wider community needs and therefore achieving a greater support for, and sense of ownership of, the developments from residents who feel that the developments are more relevant to them and address their needs more responsively.

Figure 3-9: Examples of the benefit of resident consultation

Changes in Common, Greenwich

The community significantly influenced the development and design of the Brookhill Children's Centre. The original design proposed a one storey centre that would be cross subsidised by the creation of residential units. The local community was concerned about the proposed scheme, particularly the likely loss of community space, and therefore worked with the Pathfinder to commission an alternative design – a two storey centre with community facilities on the second floor. This new design was well received by the community and gave the council another option to consider. The council chose the new design recognising the additional value of the community facilities.

Parkfield Mill Lane, Stockton on Tees

The neighbourhood management team has been involved in the wider masterplanning of the physical and housing renewal of parts of the neighbourhood. Throughout this process the Pathfinder has provided a valuable link to the community and the actual shape of the third phase of delivery will be radically different from the original Housing Department proposals because of the way in which community views, especially those of the minority ethnic community, were channelled through the Community Reference Group of the Pathfinder.

3.34 These benefits can be summarised as:

- a greater understanding amongst residents of the roles and remit of different service providers
- increased communication with residents and therefore better access to local 'intelligence'
- identification of the need for additional or re-shaped services
- access to the 'hard-to-reach'
- a 'ready-made' consultative group of residents

For residents and local communities

3.35 Engagement also has tangible benefits for those residents who have been involved, with a positive correlation between the level of involvement and the benefits accrued to individuals beyond improved local services. Across the Pathfinders the following types of benefits to involved residents are apparent:

- An increased understanding of the way that service providers work, what residents' entitlements are, and what can be expected from service providers, including an appreciation of the constraints that they work within, sometimes prompting greater trust and confidence in those providers.
- The opportunity for residents to make a direct contribution and shape the development of their area – neighbourhood management provided the community with a 'voice' and helped them to express their opinions on what the key issues facing the neighbourhood are.
- Numerous stories of individual growth and personal development including growing confidence, experience of business meetings, public speaking and understanding accounts. One local resident described their involvement as "like a training course" whilst another said that their involvement "developed communication skills as well as self-control and patience". There are also many examples of residents 'moving up' from initial engagement to participating in working groups or even becoming Board members, highlighting the process of development and learning that can arise from involvement.
- 'Inside' knowledge of what is happening in the neighbourhood.
- Personal enjoyment and satisfaction along with the opportunity to meet and network with other local residents.

Costs

3.36 For service providers the costs that arise from involving the community are predominantly associated with the extra time and resources that are required to effectively engage with the community. However, by working through the neighbourhood management structures these costs have been mitigated to some extent as it is the Pathfinders who have met much of the costs involved

in engaging local residents both in terms of providing staff to reach out to residents and the time required to foster and build relationships.

- 3.37 For the residents and local communities it was apparent that whilst the costs did vary significantly depending on the individual involved there were a some types of cost that were more common. Firstly, being actively engaged takes up a significant amount of time both in formal processes, such as meetings, but also informally through speaking with and feeding back to other residents. The residents themselves said that it could feel that they were “involved all the time” with “some days ...one meeting after another” or that being involved with the Pathfinder was “taking over [their] life”. Secondly, residents were invariably seen as the public face of the Pathfinder within their neighbourhood which meant that often they were stopped in the street to hear complaints or grievances from other neighbours as they were seen as partly responsible for what was happening locally. This does not seem to have deterred those residents affected, but the burdens being taken on by their involvement should be recognised.

Community engagement and wider local governance

- 3.38 Despite some initial concerns, there appears to be little obvious conflict within most Pathfinders between residents and elected councillors. Nearly all Pathfinders have councillors on the Partnership board and in many cases these councillors play an important role in bridging the relationship between the resident members and service providers as well as providing an important link into the council, both of which support the influencing work of the Pathfinder. Councillors in turn often recognise the role that Neighbourhood Managers play in supporting their own work. Where councillors have not been interested in the work of Pathfinders, they have simply tended not to participate in meetings.
- 3.39 In rural areas, a collaborative relationship has also been developed with parish councils where they are active. In some rural Pathfinders, there are a number of resident Board members who also serve as parish councillors. In Fenland, for example, the Pathfinder has worked closely with the Rural Community Council in Cambridgeshire and parish councillors to facilitate and contribute to the development of Parish Plans for those parishes in the neighbourhood. The Pathfinder has also been central in forming a multi-agency steering group that will take forward parish planning for the whole of Fenland and provide the area with a strong platform for enhanced rural development, direct links between local communities and service providers and access to key resources to provide solutions to local issues.

Summary and conclusions

- 3.40 Neighbourhood management clearly plays an important role in facilitating a greater level and quality of community engagement through a variety of means. Not only has it involved a broad range of residents in its own decision making process but it has also successfully built the relationship between service providers and residents all of which has helped service providers to shape their service more in line with local priorities.
- 3.41 Neighbourhood management has also helped to move involvement beyond a very limited number of residents, to involve a strong core of residents in the more deliberative processes such as the board, working groups and service monitoring, as well as a larger number of residents in less intense ways. This engagement has benefited both service providers and the individual residents themselves in a variety of different ways.

4 Influencing Mainstream Services

4.1 This chapter considers the extent to which Pathfinders have influenced mainstream services and made a difference in their neighbourhoods.

The logic of influencing


4.2 A core feature of Pathfinder work has been developing relationships with local public service providers to help facilitate a more effective response to local needs. The intended process of change is represented in Figure 4.1 which summarises how Pathfinders seek to bring about change by influencing how mainstream services are designed and delivered in ways that will improve outcomes in their neighbourhood.

4.3 Although in some cases the sought outcome is an increase in public expenditure in a Pathfinder neighbourhood, many of the changes are as much about *how* existing public expenditure is delivered. During this evaluation, we have sought to identify *actual changes in mainstream service provider behaviour* according to the following typology of possible changes:

- **Changing corporate policies and practices** – changes in the way that a provider operates that are likely to bring about benefits to the neighbourhood, such as reconfiguring the area that a service covers to coincide with the neighbourhood, or revising recruitment policies to increase local employment
- **Re-allocating mainstream service resources** – increasing mainstream expenditure that benefits the neighbourhood, such as providing additional police patrols, or increasing the frequency of street cleansing
- **Joining up mainstream service provision** – improving the linkages between two or more mainstream services in ways that improve the quality, targeting, responsiveness and/or efficiency of those services
- **Reshaping mainstream service provision** – making changes in the way that a service is designed and delivered, to improve its quality, targeting, responsiveness or efficiency
- **Improving service access to increase take up** – increasing awareness amongst potential clients of the relevant services available to them and how they can be accessed, for example improving the signposting of services offering health advice and treatment through the use of outreach workers.

4.4 This is the framework that we have used in assessing the Pathfinders' success in securing changes in mainstream services. The next section considers which

providers have been most responsive, before the analysis goes on to consider the nature of changes achieved.



Engagement with service providers

- 4.5 The national evaluation has tracked the extent of service provider engagement over several years, based on their level of involvement with, and commitment to, their local Pathfinders. Figure 4.2 summarises the findings of our review of the 20 Round 1 Pathfinders over the last four successive years (the Round for which we have the longest time series data). A number of findings can be identified.
- 4.6 Firstly, as an initial observation, it must be noted that Neighbourhood Managers have successfully secured consistent engagement with a range

of service providers over a period of some years – including services beyond the local authority, and beyond ‘crime and grime’. Fears that neighbourhood management would be restricted to a ‘narrow agenda’ have proved unfounded. A good level of engagement still continues in Round 1 Pathfinders also, even though their project funding has largely wound down and they are entering their seventh year.

- 4.7 However, of the 16 main local service providers that we have tracked, there are clear differences in the extent to which providers have responded on the whole and a remarkable degree of consistency of behaviour from many of them over time. Nearly two-thirds of service providers have retained a consistent level of engagement in the last three years or more, suggesting that an organisation’s willingness and capacity to engage with neighbourhood management may well be more strongly influenced by its internal priorities, structures and geographical organisation than any external influences, including those of Neighbourhood Managers. In other words, some organisations are, as presently structured, more suited to engagement with neighbourhood management.
- 4.8 The Police and Environment Services have consistently been the strongest and most active partners (in our top category of ‘strong’) whereas the National Offender Management Services (NOMS), local Learning and Skills Councils (LSCs) and public transport bodies have been consistently ‘missing’ (in our bottom category). The remaining service providers are in our middle two categories of ‘variable’ and ‘good’ involvement.
- 4.9 The reason for the consistent difference in involvement between service providers is likely to be primarily a reflection of each organisation’s geographical scale of service operation, and also its established working structures and culture. For organisations that either operate at a larger spatial scale (for example county councils, public transport authorities) or at the level of the individual (for example social services), engagement at a neighbourhood level is often not part of the organisation’s established way of thinking. Note that it is not necessarily the nature of the service being provided that provides the barrier, but the organisational design of its delivery and its provider. Some of these services are highly relevant to deprived neighbourhoods and it is possible that neighbourhood management could assist them, but the present internal structures make this difficult.
- 4.10 Of the one third of providers who have varied their level of engagement over time, the possible reasons for this are worth considering:
- Despite the fact that many Pathfinders are in areas of high worklessness, JobCentre Plus has never had a strong involvement across all Pathfinders, and has reduced its engagement in the last year or so. The period of stronger engagement coincided with the agency’s use of ‘action teams for jobs’, focused on specific deprived areas including some Pathfinder areas, which have since been discontinued. This tends to support the idea that where an agency has internal capacity to engage, it is more likely to do so – in this case, where JobCentre Plus’s own priorities required it to

engage more with area-based partnerships in deprived areas, then it did so, supported by its own additional resources for this purpose.

- Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) illustrate a similar point. They have been reorganised twice during the Pathfinder Programme. The initial reorganisation inhibited engagement at the time in many areas in the early Pathfinder years for practical reasons, but when structures had settled down, engagement grew as PCTs were operating at the scale of local authorities for the first time, and were more inclined to think in terms of 'localities'. The most recent reorganisation however has seen PCTs amalgamated and this process has seen a reduction in engagement, not only due to the reorganisation itself but the higher geographical scale of service management.
- Social services briefly rose in engagement, largely as a result of the development of the first wave of Children's Centres, in which children's social services were involved, and which many Neighbourhood Managers have been involved in supporting.
- For the remaining services that have reduced their involvement slightly in the last year – housing, schools, and the fire service – it is possible that this is partly a result of the Round 1 Pathfinders moving towards a mature stage of their programmes with the conclusion of their project spending programmes and some consequent diminution of project activity. In the case of schools and housing services however, engagement still remains pretty strong across most Pathfinders.

4.11 The pattern of engagement in Round 2 Pathfinders is strikingly similar. The only difference is that a handful of providers presently register stronger involvement, more akin to the pattern of Round 1 Pathfinders last year, reinforcing the idea that some Round 1 Pathfinders may be experiencing a modest downturn in engagement as their programmes near the end of their original committed seven years.

Figure 4.2: Assessment of service provider involvement in Round 1 Pathfinders

Level of Involvement in 2007	Service Provider	Status in 2006	Status in 2005	Status in 2004
Strong involvement “core supporters” (70% or more of Pathfinders with ‘strong’ involvement from the provider)	Police	Strong	Strong	Strong
	Local authority environmental services	Strong	Strong	Strong
Good involvement “friends, but not always close” (‘Strong’ involvement in a few areas, and at least ‘some’ involvement in most other areas)	Local authority housing services	Strong	Strong	Good
	Primary and Secondary schools	Strong	Strong	Good
	Primary Care Trust	Good	Strong	Good
	Local authority youth services	Good	Good	Variable
	Local authority leisure services	Good	Good	Good
	RSL/Housing Associations	Good	Good	Variable
Variable involvement “acquaintances” (‘Little or no’ involvement in a third or more areas, but ‘some’ and occasionally ‘strong’ involvement in others)	JobCentre Plus	Good	Good	Variable
	Local FE/HE colleges	Variable	Variable	Good
	Connexions	Variable	Variable	Variable
	Fire service	Good	Variable	Minimal
Minimal involvement “strangers” (70% of Pathfinders with ‘little or no’ involvement from the provider, and limited involvement in remaining areas)	National Offender Management Service	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal
	Local Learning and Skills Councils	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal
	Local authority social services	Variable	Minimal	Minimal
	Local public transport bodies	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal

Bold shows service providers that have held a consistent ranking for 3 years or more.

Changing mainstream services

- 4.12 Each year, the evaluation has sought to identify instances in each Pathfinder area where their activities have directly contributed to *changes in behaviour* from mainstream service providers in ways that benefit local residents (see Figure 4.1). Evidence has gathered through our action research directly with service providers. The last full review of Pathfinders in the autumn 2007 highlighted that new changes were still being secured in nearly every Pathfinder.
- 4.13 Typically, as already seen, Pathfinders work with a range of service providers and engage in a wide variety of activities each year, most of which convey modest benefits to participants or small groups of residents. Each year, most Pathfinders can also point to a handful of more significant initiatives which

lead to changes in the way that some mainstream services operate and which benefit larger numbers of people and can have more lasting consequences for service delivery. It is these more significant initiatives that we have focused on.

- 4.14 The core role of a Neighbourhood Manager in relation to service providers is to broker and facilitate relationships between providers to improve the joining up of service planning and co-ordination, and also to broker better relationships between providers and local communities. Neighbourhood Managers also promote innovation in local service delivery and often support the piloting of new approaches or roles, sometimes directly with their own resources.
- 4.15 There are some clear patterns in the nature of changes being secured through the work of Neighbourhood Managers:
- **Influencing a wide range of services** – Across all 35 Pathfinders in 2007, we found significant instances of service changes across a wide range of service areas, as in previous years. Community safety and environmental services (‘cleaner, safer, greener’) have consistently accounted for the largest group of changes over the years, although they have fallen as a proportion of service changes from one half in the early years to one third at present, with the main change being a reduction in community safety changes. This is not unexpected, as although wider service engagement has always been present (even at the start), Pathfinders have generally prioritised crime/grime issues in their early years, broadening out later. The remaining two thirds of service changes in 2007 relate to other services – mainly health, children’s services, lifelong learning and employment, housing and youth services, but also with at least some examples from a number of other service areas, including public transport and fire services. Over the years, there has been some shift in emphasis in the nature of service changes, with health and employment services growing in significance in the last couple of years and housing declining slightly. In 2007 a modest reduction in activity in Round 1 areas was also observed, a reflection of project funding winding down (see Figure 2.4 and discussion).
 - **Influencing through a mix of routine working and pilot initiatives** – Much of a Neighbourhood Manager’s work with service providers is through the development of ongoing relationships via regular meetings, whether through partnership structures, bilateral meetings or multi-agency discussions, often involving residents. Indeed, the involvement of residents in a structured fashion can sometimes be a key attraction for service providers. Changes to services can often be prompted and developed through this ongoing work, as well as through the development of specific initiatives or pilot projects. The role of Pathfinders in supporting pilots is sometimes in initiating them (developing the initial idea) but also often in providing a test-bed for service providers where resident engagement and partnership structures are already in place, and where there is encouragement of new ways of working – a culture of ‘trying new things’ – in addition to some project funding.

- **Joining up and improving accessibility** – When considering the types of changes achieved, it is clear that the majority (over two thirds) of changes involve the improved working (joining up) of two or more service providers together and/or improved accessibility to, or take up of, a service. The two types of changes often go together – for example, a range of service providers now deliver services out of Woolwich Common’s ‘shop’, as an accessible neighbourhood base. The next most common change is the reshaping of a particular service to improve its relevance or quality. There were few instances of changes in corporate policies or the direct, intentional re-allocation of mainstream resources to the Pathfinder area, although indirect reallocation has certainly been achieved through much of the work on improving the accessibility/take up of services by residents of Pathfinder areas.
- **Scale and nature of benefits** – As can be seen in the discussions on service areas below, although some of the changes to mainstream services are significant in scale and subsequently rolled out across a wider area, many may be smaller in scale relating to particular job roles or specialist services. Influencing mainstream services is clearly not easy nor is success guaranteed; some doors remain closed. Most changes are elaborations or improvements to existing services, not completely new services in themselves. The overall significance of changes therefore must be seen in the round – the totality of changes (large and small) in a single Pathfinder area – and also the wider changes to working cultures and partnership working that these changes can bring to an organisation. In other words, the benefits of changes to mainstream services can be wider than the specific change itself.
- **The role of project funding** – Both Rounds of Pathfinders were given limited project funding each year to support their work (£150,000 pa for Round 2 and £300,000 pa for Round 1) in addition to core partnership/team running costs. Both groups of Pathfinders have been able to influence mainstream services in broadly similar ways. It seems that the availability of modest project funding is useful in supporting pilot projects and allowing more ambitious innovations and risk-taking than might otherwise be possible, but the exact amount available is not a key factor in determining a Neighbourhood Manager’s long-term influence on *mainstream services*. However, the level of project funding may be more significant in determining a Neighbourhood Manager’s direct short-term impact on their *neighbourhood* (as discussed below) as it allows a higher level of visible intervention (eg funding additional wardens).

4.16 The rest of this chapter looks in more depth at the main service areas which have been influenced by Neighbourhood Managers, and considers the nature of activities undertaken by Pathfinders and the nature of changes secured. It is difficult to do justice to the rich mix of activities that the Pathfinders have delivered between them, and so this section can only really seek to characterise the key changes, and provide illustrations. The final section takes a rounded look at the evidence for impact upon the Pathfinder neighbourhoods.

i) Safer: community safety

- 4.17 Every Pathfinder has sought to address issues of crime and anti-social behaviour in their area, all of which experience above average problems, and in some cases severe problems, although the nature and extent of these varies between areas.
- 4.18 Every Pathfinder has worked closely with the Police, often their closest partner, greatly assisted in the last few years with the national shift towards 'neighbourhood policing' which has obvious links to neighbourhood management. Neighbourhood Managers have also worked with many other community safety organisations, including Drug Action Teams, wardens and wider community safety partnerships.
- 4.19 The most typical changes achieved by Pathfinders in respect of community safety services are as follows, with specific examples shown in Figure 4.3:
- **Improved multi-agency working** – In many areas new processes have been established to bring the Police and other agencies (often including housing and environmental services) together in the neighbourhood on a regular basis to exchange information, better co-ordinate their responses to problems and to allow a more pro-active problem solving approach. This has often been focused on addressing anti-social behaviour or area-specific issues.
 - **Neighbourhood police bases** – In concert with moves by most police forces to introduce neighbourhood policing, Pathfinders have been at the forefront of efforts to secure local police teams based within their neighbourhoods, to be more accessible and visible to the local community, more focused on one area and better integrated with local networks. Some police teams are co-located with the neighbourhood management team. Pathfinders have often assisted the Police in piloting neighbourhood working for the first time.
 - **Higher level of policing resource** – Many Pathfinders have lobbied for greater dedicated resources for their neighbourhood, sometimes part-funding Police, Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) or Neighbourhood Warden posts to highlight the issue. Although the level of resources for policing has risen nationally during the Pathfinder Programme enabling greater resources to be given to these areas Pathfinders have helped to accelerate the process in their areas, with additional posts often mainstreamed.
 - **Innovations in working practices** – A range of new working practices has been tried out in partnership with the Police, in particular to see how services can be made more responsive to local people – including mobile phones to allow residents to contact beat officers more easily and new methods of resident engagement.
- 4.20 Although Pathfinders have used their own project funding to support a range of these initiatives, rising spending on policing has allowed many forces to fund new levels of service with their own resources, and therefore changes in this service area have not been closely correlated with the amount of expenditure from Pathfinders themselves.

Figure 4.3: Examples of recent changes to community safety services

Greater Hollington, Hastings: Anti-social behaviour multi-agency team

Established in 2003 by the Pathfinder, the team brings together the Police, the Youth Development Service, local housing associations, the Family Support Team (from Social Services) and officers from the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit. Chaired by the Police it meets every 2–3 weeks to share information and build working relationships between agencies. Its benefits include:

- Greater trust and sharing of information between relevant agencies
- More effective and targeted enforcement, including a more strategic approach from housing associations, introducing new tenancy agreements and ‘acceptable behaviour contracts’
- Greater attention now paid to prevention of anti-social behaviour, particularly through youth programmes
- Anti-social behaviour has fallen and residents no longer rate it as their main concern
- Working practices are being rolled out across Hastings to others

Pan Village, Isle of Wight: Tactical co-ordination group

This group – run by the Police and the neighbourhood management partnership – involves other providers as needed including: Isle of Wight Safer Neighbourhoods; the Highways Department; Environmental Services; and the Fire Service. The group meets fortnightly and discusses ways of maximising Police and NM resources. It uses information from a variety of sources, including police crime statistics and a CCTV system to deal with local problems

The coordinated approach employed by the group has brought together a number of agencies and improved service delivery on a number of fronts. A primary example of the changes initiated is the reduction in anti social behaviour and littering in the Coppins Bridge car park area, where there was a problem with youths congregating in cars. The group also discuss the location of the mobile CCTV camera which operates in Pan.

The Pathfinder have also influenced service provision by being the area which was used as a pilot scheme for the police community intelligence gathering project. The pathfinder played a leading role in these developments by bringing together agencies in a coordinated way. They have helped to develop a training session which the police undertake with other agencies; they also had an input into how the scheme could run in order to obtain the maximum benefits for the community and the police. This scheme has now been extended to the Safer Neighbourhood Partnership within the IW Council.

Knutton Cross Heath, Newcastle under Lyme: Neighbourhood police base

This service change involves the establishment of a Police Post (a neighbourhood police base) in the NM team’s offices in Knutton Cross Heath. It followed

discussions between the Pathfinder and the Commander of Staffordshire Police's North Staffordshire Division about the roll-out of neighbourhood policing, something that the Pathfinder had helped to pilot. Previously all of the Neighbourhood Beat Officers (NBO) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) were based in the main police station in Newcastle town centre, some distance from the community. Now the 2 NBOs and 4 PCSOs have a small, dedicated office in the heart of the neighbourhood.

This change represents a re-shaping of an existing service. The Pathfinder has provided the (small) office space to the police on a rent-free basis. It is expected to lead to a further improvement in community reassurance and some efficiency savings for the police (compared to the alternative provision in Newcastle police station). A dedicated police base should reduce the time for the NBOs and PCSOs to travel, and it should also reduce the opportunities for their abstraction away from Knutton Cross Heath, which is the natural tendency when based in a central office.

ii) Cleaner and greener neighbourhoods

- 4.21 Every Pathfinder has also sought to improve its local environmental quality, particularly improved street cleaning, removing graffiti, abandoned cars and flytipping/rubbish more quickly, as well as dealing with vandalism and improving the responsiveness of maintenance services.
- 4.22 The most typical changes that Pathfinders have facilitated include the following (with examples given in Figure 4.4):
- **Integrated environmental services** – A number of local authorities have brought together street cleaning, waste removal and even grounds maintenance services to provide a more integrated and effective street scene service. Quite a few Pathfinders have been closely involved in supporting the piloting of such changes, often providing the test-bed for learning, such as the Community Counts Pathfinder (Gloucester) which supported the Street Care Pilot, now rolled out across the whole authority, integrating refuse collection, street cleaning, graffiti removal and deep cleansing.
 - **More responsive services** – A key feature of Pathfinder work has been to improve the flow of information from residents to service providers – so that residents can more easily share identified problems or concerns about their neighbourhood, and so that services can respond more quickly. Various initiatives have been set up – including street rep schemes, 'weeks of action' and walk-about sessions with officers and councillors.
 - **Charters** – Some areas have piloted Charters, setting out the 'rights and responsibilities' of residents in relation to their neighbourhood environment – what they are entitled to from services, but what they are also expected to do themselves. Some Pathfinders have progressed Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in this area instead, although they can be difficult to sustain over time, as they usually cannot be enforced and largely rely on goodwill.

- 4.23 Improving the local environment has been one of the most common targets for the Pathfinders' own spending, and there is some correlation between how much they have spent and improved resident perceptions of their environment, suggesting that direct action by Pathfinders may well have complemented the various improvements secured to mainstream services.

Figure 4.4: Examples of recent changes to environmental services

Great Lever, Bolton: Neighbourhood Environmental Action Team (NEAT)

This intervention comprises a team of five people employed by the Commercial (Environmental) Services Department of Bolton MBC, with transport and equipment, who deliver general environmental improvements (and a range of specific projects) in the Great Lever area. They carry out tasks such as basic repairs, cleaning and alerting other agencies and partners to problems that they cannot deal with directly. The Team began work in December 2003 with pump priming money from the Pathfinder (£30,000) and a larger investment from Commercial Services (£125,000) to go towards training and the salary costs of the Team as well as some capital costs.

Benefits of this service include:

- The council spends more resources on improving the environment in Great Lever now as a result of this initiative.
- The model of working has now been rolled out to the neighbouring Burnden ward.
- The 2005 Streetworks survey reveals that average satisfaction levels within Great Lever have risen from 30% in 2002 to 66% in 2005. Survey results show significant improvements across all categories – 'customers expressed a notable difference in the estate, many attributed the change to the joint working being seen in the area'.
- Great Lever's DLEQ (District Local Environmental Quality) results have also improved significantly – by some 21% during the period 2002 – 2005.

Springbourne and Boscombe West, Bournemouth: Street Improvement Co-ordinator

A Streets Improvement Coordinator was originally employed by the pathfinder to look at a wide range of environmental issues covering housing, environmental protection and planning. The pathfinder originally funded the post, which was later funded as a three way split between the council's housing, environmental protection and planning departments. The coordinator is now filling a vacant post in environmental protection and is in a position to write a new job specification that encompasses all three areas, which should lead to a more joined up, cross cutting work across the three areas.

The project has led to a change in the way a number of agencies operate and is in the process of being mainstreamed. A number of agencies are working together on the project and there has been joined up work between Bournemouth Local Authority Housing, Environmental Protection, and Planning. The role now includes the identification of sites where Section 215 notices should be served.

There was a target to have 6 properties in disrepair improved per quarter – and 5 properties per quarter have improved. There was another target to have 19 eyesore properties improved per quarter, and there have been 23 property eyesore improvements per quarter.

Church Street, Westminster: 'Red Dot' exercise

The Church Street neighbourhood management office received regular complaints from residents concerning the state of, and problems with, roads and pavements in the Church Street area. Previously there was no regular maintenance check of Church Street, with some parts of the neighbourhood being left to decline. It was also unclear who to report the problems to, what problems were actually being reported and what action was being taken by the Council.

The Neighbourhood Manager met with the Director of Transport at Westminster City Council with the latter asking the Church Street team to produce a report identifying the physical improvement priorities for the area. In response to the Red Dot report, the Council tasked an officer to coordinate a response to the list. The Council carried out their own internal work on the document by checking the state of roads and pathways in the area. In September 2007 the first feedback and monitoring meeting was held between the Council and the neighbourhood management team to outline what the Council was able to commit to. Whilst the improvements are ongoing there is now in place a structure for the flow of information and communication about physical improvement problems and changes in the area.

The neighbourhood management team designed a questionnaire for residents to identify what physical improvements needed to be carried out. This was distributed to 300 households in the Church Street area and two open meetings were held for residents to share their concerns. CivicWatch was also consulted to identify key actions. The input from over 50 residents, local shopkeepers and traders and service providers part of CivicWatch (City Guardians, Police, Housing Managers and the Street Environment Manager) resulted in 'wish list' of 800 items.

A team consisting of a neighbourhood management officer, three residents, a ward councillor and CivicWatch representatives then carried out six walkabouts around Church Street (four day time, one Saturday and one evening) to check the list was correct and to identify the priorities. The emphasis was placed on health and safety, and impact on the area in terms of traders, shops and residents. This led to the neighbourhood management officer producing a report which included a series of maps and photographs of the physical improvement priorities for the area.

The work has changed both practices within the Council and helped to re-shape a mainstream service. The neighbourhood management team has been able to provide focused, local intelligence to the Council on what physical improvements are a priority for the area which would have been difficult for Council officers to identify.

Some physical improvement work has already been completed such as repairing dangerous pavements and re-painting faded yellow lines. However, much of the work is ongoing. The Council has formed a monitoring group which meets quarterly to update the relevant Church Street neighbourhood management officer on progress. A residents group also meets to check that the right action has been taken on the red dots with this information being fed back to Council i.e. stating which red dots have been turned into green dots. The exercise has demonstrated to residents that their time (through the completed questionnaires, meetings and walkabouts) was not wasted and that they provided valuable inputs to effect change.

Improving Croft and Cowpen Quay, Blyth Valley: Weeks of Action

'Weeks of Action' is an initiative focusing on a specific geographical or thematic area, which brings together residents and service providers for one week each year to improve an environmental aspect of the ICCQ area. The Weeks of Action in 2005 and 2006 focused on specific areas with the Pathfinder area. The third Week of Action, 'Our House', was held in March 2007 and covered the whole ward. The initiative is heavily publicised by ICCQ and partner agencies. Areas for intervention are identified jointly with service providers and local residents. Dizzy Hub, the base for the cross tenure housing worker, was launched during the 'Our House' week.

Weeks of Action are the key mechanism through which neighbourhood management approaches are being rolled out across Blyth. BVBC staff voted ICCQ Partner of the Year for 2007, largely because of the Weeks of Action initiative. Staff were allocated to the initiative for the week. The 'Night I' Community Watch walk was organised as part of the 'Our House' Week of Action. These walks identify environmental improvements needed across Croft ward.

iii) Housing

- 4.24 Housing issues vary enormously between Pathfinder areas, with some in areas of low housing demand requiring restructuring, some with concentrations of poor quality private rented housing, some in need of better managed social housing estates and some undergoing stock transfer and even significant redevelopment.
- 4.25 There are three main ways that Pathfinders have impacted upon housing:
- **Private rented housing** – Some Pathfinders have significant concentrations of poor quality or badly managed private rented housing. Without significant resources of their own the strategy used by Pathfinders has been to employ workers to do research and improve understanding about the issues and then to work with the council and landlords to improve housing management (eg landlord accreditation schemes) and lever in grant funding and landlord investment to improve the housing quality (eg improving enforcement and requiring landlords to improve housing). Some areas have seen significant improvements with relatively low cost to the Pathfinder.

- **Community engagement at times of transition** – Where significant housing changes are proposed – in housing market renewal areas or areas of redevelopment, Pathfinders have worked with the housing authorities and/or social landlords and sometimes private developers to add value to community consultation efforts and ensure that changes reflect local wishes. A number of major schemes in Pathfinder areas have been reshaped or improved in the light of such involvement.
- **Improved social housing management** – Some Pathfinders have helped to identify issues with housing and estate management and supported tenants in talking to landlords (including councils) about how the services can be improved.

Figure 4.5: Examples of recent changes to housing services

Transform, North Devon: Improving private rented housing

Transform funds one of three housing workers in the District Council, to follow up a previous survey (also funded by Transform) and encourage, or enforce, improvements in private rented housing through take-up of Decent Homes funding. The Pathfinder undertook the initial survey work, and is promoting take up of funding to deliver Decent Homes standards through its support for the worker covering part of its area.

£200,000 worth of insulation grants have been delivered and 294 enquiries made for housing improvements (mostly in the private rented sector). Much of the impetus is coming from landlords themselves. Environmental Health Officers have also served 81 improvement notices on unfit properties (up 100% from previous years). The Council feels that this has contributed to its regrading from Weak to Fair on the CPA. One voluntary sector worker said that: 'the housing improvement work has made a huge impact – we have two clients who say their whole lives have been changed'.

Dewsbury West, Kirklees: Multi-agency working to improve an estate environment

The Pilgrim Estate is severely deprived and presents a significant challenge to neighbourhood working in Dewsbury West. Community tensions are present and Pilgrim has seen a lower level of resident involvement than other parts of the Pathfinder area. The Pilgrim multi agency group (PMAG) was established in September 2006. It was initially an initiative responding to concerns about anti-social behaviour and harassment. The group is jointly chaired by the Neighbourhood Manager and the local Kirklees Neighbourhood Housing operations manager who both see this area as a priority. The PMAG identified four objectives:

- Increase youth provision in the area
- Improve the environmental quality
- Increase community engagement
- Reduce crime and anti-social behaviour

An action plan was developed focussing on the four objectives. The group involved the Pathfinder, Kirkless Neighbourhood Housing, wardens, Sure Start, the Police, Kirkless Young Peoples' Service (YPS), ARK (Anti Racism Kirkless), Connect Housing and Kirkless Community Support Service (CSS). Progress was made through the year on the objectives:

- A fun day on the estate signalled to the community a new approach to working with them.
- YPS and ARK co-operated in providing additional youth activity throughout the year. Connect Housing led on a Dreamscheme project, which involved local young people on environmental activity in February half term.
- CSS led on establishing a women's group on the estate.
- Using the community Ambassadors, a detailed survey of the estate was completed identifying the main environmental issues. This survey will form the basis of an updated action plan.
- A few years ago Kirkless introduced charging for the removal of bulky items of waste. This was heavily publicised. The removal of charges was less so. In Pilgrim there is low awareness that bulky items are removed without charge. The PMAG produced fridge magnets in English and Urdu that provide the phone number for the removal of such waste.

PMAG has not had a funding allocation and most of its activity has been completed through mainstream resources with about £5,000 from the Pathfinder. Service providers are working to a clear set of objectives and co-ordination of youth activity especially is leading to a reduction in the demarcation of service responsibilities. There is a shared ownership of the problems of the area and key players like Connect Housing and ARK, from the third sector are fully engaged. The impact of the Action Group has been significant. The % of residents on the Pilgrim Estate who declared themselves satisfied with the cleanliness of their area rose from 24% in 2006 to 37% in 2007. Whilst this indicates the amount of work still to be done the impact of the Group in its first year has seen a marked improvement.

iv) Adult health and wellbeing

- 4.26 Beyond crime and environmental services, work with health services (and to a lesser extent with social services) has been a key feature for many Pathfinders, mainly working with PCTs, and sometimes directly with local GPs, to tackle health inequalities. Pathfinders have benefited from many PCTs understanding the value of 'locality working' and the need to reach out to communities, in addition to their statutory commitment to address health inequalities. Their joint working has been a consequence of the natural confluence of overlapping agendas.
- 4.27 The main focus of the work has been threefold:
- **Health needs assessments** – A number of Pathfinders have either commissioned or persuaded their PCT to undertake, local health needs assessments to understand the nature of health issues in their areas, to provide evidence to inform local spending programmes.

- **Take up of services around public health issues** – The links that Pathfinders have to local community and voluntary groups have been useful in helping PCTs to improve the accessibility, and therefore take up, of public health services that focus on preventative measures – encouraging healthy lifestyles, good diet, exercise, take up of vaccinations, screening, etc. This has often taken the form of PCTs appointing workers to assist this, working closely with Pathfinders, or delivering more services from a neighbourhood base.
- **GP referrals, linked to wider services** – An increasing theme in the last couple of years has been greater contact with GPs, and improving their links with other non-medical services to enhance ‘social prescribing’ approaches. This is particularly relevant for people on Incapacity Benefit (IB) who may be able to get back into work with wider support.

4.28 Some illustrations of Pathfinder work in this area are shown in Figure 4.6. Much of the value of the Neighbourhood Manager to PCTs is their rounded understanding of their local area and their links into the local community. The impact of the most recent reorganisation of PCTs (reducing their number through amalgamation) on neighbourhood management remains to be seen.

v) Economy, skills and employment

- 4.29 Worklessness is a key issue in many Pathfinder areas, sometimes as part of wider economic problems. A previously published evaluation report discusses the role of Pathfinders in relation to these issues in more depth¹¹; here we summarise the changes that the Pathfinders have made.
- 4.30 Most Pathfinders did not prioritise economic issues early in their programmes, and some have yet to do so, but it has grown as an issue for Pathfinders in the last couple of years and is a key area where neighbourhood management may have further potential.
- 4.31 The most common role that Neighbourhood Managers played in relation to economic issues is in working with employment agencies and learning/training providers to improve the *targeting, tailoring and take up* of their services to those in need of training or work, drawing on their local understanding and community networks. Some examples are shown in Figure 4.6.
- 4.32 JobCentre Plus has been fairly well engaged in a number of areas, but its involvement has declined more recently, as discussed earlier. Local LSCs have not been engaged at all in most cases, and involvement with colleges and other training/employment providers has been variable.
- 4.33 In addition to this, Pathfinders have contributed to the issue in two other ways, although less significantly:

¹¹ SQW Consulting and partners, *Neighbourhood Management and Economic Development: Theme Report*, (Communities and Local Government, 2007)

- Some have sought to make jobs more accessible, improving the publicity for vacancies/services and encouraging local recruitment by employers.
- Some have adopted longer term strategies of seeking to shape and improve the local context for business and enterprise, by promoting enterprise in schools and colleges, supporting local businesses to organise themselves more effectively to lobby for better services and taking measures to improve the physical attractiveness and safety of the area to support business activity and inward investment.

Figure 4.6: Examples of recent changes to adult health/wellbeing, learning and employment services

Transform, North Devon: Social prescribing

A worker based at the local GP surgery takes referrals from the GPs where there are social issues (debt, poor housing etc) affecting the patients' health. This entitles them to three 45 minute sessions with the Transform worker (although often more time is involved), who will – directly or through signposting to other agencies – seek to alleviate the problems. The worker has a current workload of 20 people.

The Pathfinder commissioned the initial work to develop this project; identified funding for the worker, liaised with the practice and deals with landlords and other agencies to resolve outstanding problems. The GP suggested that the benefits of this scheme were that *'the worker is on the premises, has more resources at her disposal and can co-ordinate the action needed'*. The scheme is now being extended to another GP practice in another village.

Examples of support given included:

- A woman who was suffering from damp as a result of a neighbour putting in roof lights without flashings. Remedial work has now been done
- Another patient with a very noisy neighbour and a wife with epilepsy, who was frightened of complaining. Two or three weeks later the problem was solved
- A woman whose flat has now been upgraded with a new kitchen and ventilation
- People whose benefits have been sorted out.

Community Counts, Gloucester: Diabetes and health promotion

Community Counts has pioneered initiatives working with minority ethnic elder groups to counter a high rate of diabetes and heart disease among both Asian and African–Caribbean elders (particularly women) and high rates of hospitalisation. The social aspects of these medical issues included a low level of English among many older Asian women, dietary advice that did not relate to Asian diet and lack of clarity about diagnosis and use of medication. Community Counts workers on both diabetes and health promotion were able to develop a team of peer educators from Asian and African Caribbean women and transform the service, establishing clinics in five local GP surgeries. This project has been successfully mainstreamed with the Gloucestershire Primary Care Trust taking over the funding of the service.

The change represents a re-allocation of mainstream resources to a specialist community intervention and a re-shaping of mainstream service with better provision of health advice to increase take-up of health advice and reduce the need to use emergency health services. The Pathfinder developed connections with a hard-to-reach community at risk and used expertise in community development to get the mainstream service much closer to excluded service users.

These services are successfully mainstreamed with the PCT taking over the funding responsibility. Impact on the client group in the last twelve months includes: 158 patients seen for diabetes, a diabetes support group with 80+ members and 15 volunteers received OCN diabetes training; 93 residents attending healthy living activities and 30 health practitioner members on the Health Action Group in the neighbourhood.

Eastwood and Springwell Gardens, Rotherham: Community tutor

Research indicated that local schools and community premises are often underused at key times and could therefore provide a resource for the whole community during out of hours periods. The role of the Community Tutor is to broker the use of these premises for the whole community to increase adult learning opportunities/community activities.

School premises are mainly used between 8am & 6pm during term time with very little evening, weekend or holiday use. They are sometimes reluctant to make the premises available to other groups. The Tutor has promoted a range of activities that provided learning opportunities for children, childcare, family learning, adult learning and recreational events. The involvement of schools has enabled them to develop closer links with the wider community, make greater use of their premises and encourage greater involvement in school-based activities. Through the work of the Tutor it has been possible to publicise courses and events, establish easier access and develop active participation in the programme.

The Pathfinder shared funding of the Community Tutor post with Valley Community Partnership (and from April 2007 the Clifton Partnership) for the Community Tutor Project. The success of the Community Tutor project has been highlighted in a report commissioned by the Pathfinder (Changing Lives – Consultants: Thinking Success, July 2006) that provided evidence of the positive project outputs, outcomes and cost benefits and supported the need for a further year of funding.

Building on the success of this project the NMP has funded a further intervention project which is providing additional learning opportunities, especially for those from minority ethnic groups, migrant families and asylum seekers who experience language barriers and require bi-lingual support in gaining access to learning opportunities.

Kendray Initiative, Barnsley: NEETs project

The NEET project grew out of the experience of the local LearningNet manager observing NEET young people (“not in education, employment or training”)

hanging around on the streets and who were ineligible for LearningNet provision being under 19 and complaining of 'having nothing to do'. The Kendray Initiative Board agreed to help develop the project and it is now funded by Connexions and LSC, and directed by a Steering Group composed of the Lifelong Learning Theme Group Co-ordinator, the LearningNet manager, Connexions, Barnsley MBC Youth Service – with Nord Anglia Lifetime Developments working alongside.

The project funds a half time youth worker post based within LearningNet but also with access to the Connexions database. This allows him to identify every NEET young person in Kendray and Worsbrough and their qualification levels. Every NEET young person in the area has been contacted. To overcome the barriers faced by this client group, who were unlikely to drop into the Connexions office in the town centre (too formal), the youth worker knocked on every single young person's door, following the good practice established by the Individual Opportunity Adviser (IOA) project for adults. The project re-shaped mainstream services to improve access and take-up and is being rolled out borough-wide; and possibly nationwide.

vi) Children and young families

- 4.34 Most Pathfinders have developed good relationships with local schools, especially primary schools, which have good links into their local community and are naturally locally oriented. Much of the work of Neighbourhood Managers in relation to children has been in helping schools to work with other services more effectively, often to provide stronger health and social support to children and families to support their education and welfare, rather than direct interventions to improve attainment in the classroom. Typical initiatives include supporting the transition of children from primary to secondary school, promoting healthier lifestyles and piloting new ways to help children with behavioural difficulties or who are dropping out of school. Many Managers have also worked closely with local Sure Start teams, sometimes being co-located and in one case (Woolwich Common, Greenwich) fully integrated with them. Some examples of changes are provided in Figure 4.7.
- 4.35 The shifting agenda in the last few years towards extended schools (with schools acting as a base for the provision of a wider range of related services for children and families) and also the move to support early years development through Children's Centres has fitted well with the work of Neighbourhood Managers, as both seek the greater joining up of services locally. There are many examples of Pathfinders working closely with schools and local authorities to support and facilitate, and in some cases lead the development of, such changes in services.

vii) Young people

- 4.36 From the earliest days of the Programme, the issue of providing better facilities and opportunities for young people has been high on the agenda for many Pathfinder communities, reflecting the underfunding of youth services for many years. Many Pathfinders have funded their own youth provision to plug gaps, have co-ordinated existing provision and have also sought greater

funding from local authorities and others. Some have made a particular focus of organising additional activities over the school summer holidays in partnership with youth organisations, to provide activities for young people (for example, the 'summer splash' in Blacon, now mainstreamed, helping to reduce youth crime in that area).

- 4.37 Some innovative work has been done in some areas, with national recognition, as illustrated in Figure 4.7, including work to improve the involvement of young people in both Pathfinders and wider local decision-making fora. The main role of Pathfinders has been to highlight this issue locally and nationally and also to pilot new ways of working.

Figure 4.7: Examples of recent changes to children's and youth services

Knutton Cross Heath, Newcastle under Lyme: Primary school multi-agency centre

This initiative established a small-scale Multi Agency Centre ("Mini-MAC") within the recently amalgamated Knutton St Mary's Primary School. Here, children's attainment on entry is very low, and the school has a very high proportion of children with learning difficulties and many come from families with low levels of educational attainment themselves. The Mini-MAC is a dedicated area within one of the school rooms which provides healthcare, information, advisory and counselling services to pupils and to their parents. It gives children a place to go where they can share their concerns with others and receive a wide range of practical and emotional support. The Mini-MAC receives regular visits from organisations such as Young Carers, the Alcohol and Drugs Advisory Service, Relationships Without Fear, the school nurse and a trained counsellor.

The NM Pathfinder and PCT provided a small amount of initial funding for the Mini-MAC which was used to purchase furniture and books. The pupils themselves were involved in the process of designing the space, deciding on what books to buy and shaping the services being provided. The school has maintained the facility and services with no further NM funding, such is the value it brings to the personal, health and social development of the pupils.

The school prepared an overview on the first year's operation which showed that 14 children visited the Mini-MAC each day during the autumn term for 2006. The evidence suggests higher take-up by girls than boys, but take-up has been across all year groups, not just amongst older children. Feedback from teachers suggests that the issues raised included home life, friendships, and concerns about siblings and parents who were unwell, and that the facility and the services provided there have helped children to interact better with their peers. The existence of the Mini-MAC, and the valuable role played by it, helped the school to achieve a Grade 1 (excellent) rating in terms of care, guidance and support and a Grade 2 (good) rating in relation to personal development and well-being in the school's 2006 Ofsted inspection.

Kendray Initiative, Barnsley: Youth inclusion support programme

The youth inclusion support programme (YISP) involves bringing together practitioners from several agencies to work on a neighbourhood basis with young people identified as being at risk of future anti-social behaviour or offending. Young people are identified as facing challenges in four domains: anti-social behaviour, problems in the community, drug mis-use or family. A panel then assesses each individual's needs, and devises a Plan to address all the risk factors in that person's life: the response might range from drugs advice and parenting classes to very intensive intervention. For example, in Kendray this has included a fishing club run by the PCSO and emotional literacy.

The YISP is a national model for youth inclusion which has been tailored in Kendray to specific local needs. The Kendray Initiative employs a local youth worker, line managed by the YOT. In Kendray, the key difference is that the YISP is open to all young people irrespective of their involvement in the criminal justice system – in other words young offenders are also eligible as well as those 'at risk' or not at risk of offending.

Because of funding constraints, the YISP only operates in the three most deprived parts of Barnsley and only with those young people deemed at risk of offending. The Pathfinder has enabled improved access to this hard to reach client group and extended the benefits of the project to young people who may not be 'at risk yet' of offending or have already offended – it's more preventative in approach and its benefits are wider. This flexibility offers the ability to be very responsive to local and individual needs – the local Early Intervention Manager felt that this could only be achieved with the local devolution the Pathfinder provides.

There has been value added to the delivery of the project in Kendray, compared to other areas, because it ties in with existing neighbourhood management structures, for example there is a single social services team, the Barnsley Academy and safer neighbourhoods team who all have an understanding of the client group and a clear incentive to get involved. A high level of trust has been built up between the different agencies with clear communication making each agency better equipped to respond.

Delivering the project from the Kendray Initiative has been helped by having a non-stigmatised, non-statutory provider – no need to bring young people to the YOT building. This 'friendly feel' is seen as valuable and YOT is trying to adopt this across the borough. Building on this, YOT is experimenting with engaging more parents, local sessional workers and volunteers in the activities provided under the YISP umbrella. The YISP has also now been rolled out to Athersley, the second neighbourhood management area in Barnsley.

Summary and Conclusions

- 4.38 Pathfinders have secured consistent engagement with a wide range of service providers over a number of years – including services beyond the local authority and beyond ‘crime and grime’. Not all service providers have been equally involved, with some difficult to engage.
- 4.39 Active engagement with service providers has led to a range of changes being made to mainstream services in Pathfinder areas, with those improvements sometimes being rolled out more widely. The largest single area of influence has been in relation to community safety and environmental services (the ‘cleaner, safer, greener’ agenda) but with significant changes also to other services – health, children’s services, lifelong learning and employment, housing and youth services. The chapter provides examples of changes in each of these service areas.

5 Pathfinder Impact

- 5.1 Whilst there is plenty of evidence that the work of the Pathfinders has affected mainstream services and that these have conveyed benefits to Pathfinder areas, the underlying question is to what extent this has had a *measurable impact* upon the deprived neighbourhoods that the Pathfinders are seeking to serve. Has it made any tangible difference to the lives of people living in these areas? Have the changes been of sufficient relevance and scale to make a difference?
- 5.2 This is the most difficult question that the evaluation has had to answer as the Pathfinder programmes are complex including a variety of activities, they involve relatively modest amounts of direct expenditure, the available data on changing neighbourhood conditions is limited owing to the paucity of relevant small area data, and the amount of 'background change' (other programmes and processes) happening at the same time is significant. Some impacts also take a long time to be felt. However, using our annual reviews and case study evidence, together with some limited administrative data provided through research by Cambridge Economic Associates (CEA) and the Social Disadvantage Research Centre (SDRC), and two waves of household surveys in every area, we have sought to provide the most robust answer possible.

Neighbourhood change

- 5.3 The general picture of change across all Pathfinder areas over the last few years is largely a positive one. The two waves of household surveys have provided a clear view of resident perceptions – between 2003 and 2006 in Round 1 areas and 2004 and 2007 in Round 2 areas¹². The surveys show that, over the survey period, residents overall are more satisfied with their local areas, more inclined to think that their areas are improving, and are more likely to think that local crime and environmental problems have been, or are being, dealt with. They are more satisfied with their local police service and with street cleanliness and the maintenance of the public realm. Residents who rent their homes are more satisfied with repairs and improvements.
- 5.4 There are a handful of issues where the surveys highlight little change in the eyes of residents – views on health and education services are mixed, with no obvious increase in satisfaction. Some specific services – particularly dentistry – are also felt to be 'harder to access' now. There is also little evidence of change in patterns of employment or worklessness. However, few problems have actually worsened in the eyes of residents, and many have improved.

¹² Fuller analysis of these two sets of surveys can be found in previously published reports, as listed in Annex B. In Round 1 areas a total of 10,000 households were interviewed in 2003 and 8,000 households were interviewed in 2006. In Round 2 areas a total of 7,500 households were interviewed in 2004 and 6,000 households were interviewed in 2007.

- 5.5 This is how Pathfinder areas have changed. Clearly, some of these changes will be reflecting national changes in public services and wider social and economic trends; the Pathfinder Programme has operated thus far in a benign economic climate, with rising public expenditure. Out of these general changes, though, we can also identify improvements that are occurring faster in Pathfinder areas than in other equally deprived comparator¹³ areas and which can be linked to Pathfinder activities – evidence of the impact of the Pathfinders, and it is this which we now consider.

Pathfinder impact

- 5.6 The impact of Pathfinders is considered under three headings:

- Resident overview
- Crime and environment
- Other impacts

Resident overview

- 5.7 Overall resident satisfaction across the Pathfinder areas has clearly risen and risen faster than our comparator during the period under scrutiny – satisfaction with their area, with a sense of improvement and with their ability to influence organisations locally. In terms of overall satisfaction, most Pathfinders remain well below the national average, largely reflecting their level of deprivation at the start of the Programme, but significant progress has been made in a relatively short period of time to close the gap between their area and the national average. For all of these indicators of change, our action research in all Pathfinder areas suggests that the changing resident perceptions are linked to Pathfinder activities and can be understood as impacts arising from the work of the Pathfinders. The key indicators are as follows:
- From 2003 to 2006 in Round 1 areas, **resident satisfaction with their area as a place to live** rose from 71% to 75% (+4 percentage points) with no statistically significant change in the comparator. Round 2 areas showed an improvement also from 77% to 79% (+2 percentage points), again with no change in the comparator. These improvements can be clearly statistically correlated with improvements in resident perceptions about local ‘crime and grime’ issues, as described below.
 - In 2006 in Round 1 areas, 31% of residents said they **thought that their area had improved in the last three years**, with 29% thinking the

¹³ For each Round of Pathfinders, we established a comparator sample of households. The comparator sample was built up by taking a random sample of households from one ward in each Pathfinder local authority area that was as deprived as the Pathfinder area, but which was not benefiting from neighbourhood management, and adding them together. The comparator for each Round of Pathfinders helps us to identify the difference between the changes observed in Pathfinder areas and what might have happened in those areas anyway.

same in 2007 in Round 2 areas, both significantly above the percentage of residents in their comparators (22% and 24% respectively).

- More residents **feel that they can influence decisions by local organisations that affect their area**, rising from 23% to 26% in Round 1 areas, and from 23% to 24% in Round 2 areas, both rising faster than their comparator.
- A large number of residents are **aware of their local Pathfinder** – 63% in Round 1 areas in 2006 and 45% in Round 2 areas in 2007.

Crime and environment

- 5.8 Good evidence also exists to demonstrate the impact of Pathfinders in making their areas safer and cleaner – their largest area of activity. We have brought together a range of evidence, including survey, crime and administrative data and case studies, largely focused on Round 1 areas, reported more fully elsewhere¹⁴ in supporting these conclusions.
- 5.9 Key points include:
- Across Round 1 areas, from 2003 to 2006, **resident satisfaction with the police service** rose from 47% to 53% (+6 percentage points) with no statistically significant rise in the comparator with faster rises than the comparator in 14 out of 20 Round 1 Pathfinders. There was a similar increase in Round 2 areas of +7 percentage points. This is supported by much qualitative evidence from our annual reviews and case studies suggesting that Pathfinders have contributed in particular to **community reassurance** and reductions in the fear of crime.
 - In Round 1 areas **satisfaction with street cleaning** increased from 60% to 68% (+8 percentage points) from 2003 to 2006, whilst the comparator fell, with significant rises in 17 out of 20 areas. Satisfaction also increased in Round 2 areas, although by a smaller amount (+2 percentage points).
 - In Round 1 areas, the **proportion of residents who think that 'litter/rubbish in the streets' and 'vandalism and graffiti' are a problem** fell between 2003 and 2006 by 5 percentage points and 10 percentage points respectively, both changes outstripping changes in the comparator, and with reductions in this proportion evident in nearly every Round 1 Pathfinder.
- 5.10 Our fieldwork and analysis suggests a link between Pathfinder activities and improvements in local environmental conditions, with improvements in many partnership areas (though not all). Resident perceptions are supported by some local evidence of local authority administrative data of surveys of street cleanliness, and also our own case study work.
- 5.11 The situation with respect to community safety is more mixed. Resident perceptions are clearly positive, with communities feeling more reassured by the Police, but crime data is considerably more variable, with only one

¹⁴ SQW Consulting and partners, *Research Report 36: The contribution of neighbourhood management to cleaner and safer neighbourhoods*, (Communities and Local Government, 2007)

third of Round 1 areas ‘narrowing the gap’ on overall crime rates with their local authority area (2000–2004). The links between changed outcomes and Pathfinder activities were also more complex, not least as it occurred at a time of rising mainstream expenditure on Police services, making the analysis of the Pathfinders’ contribution more difficult. Overall, the evidence suggests that most Pathfinders have contributed to both lower crime, lower fear of crime and higher satisfaction with the Police in their areas, but in a number of cases the wider changes in policing have been more significant in scale.

Other impacts

- 5.12 In respect of the other outcomes sought by Pathfinders – housing, education, health and employment – the scale of activities and changes are not such that they could be measured with a household survey, and despite considerable effort it has not been possible to assemble systematic, comprehensive small area administrative data on these services across the Pathfinder areas, despite attempts to do so. A fuller description of the challenges in collating such neighbourhood data is set out in a separate report by CEA¹⁵.
- 5.13 Despite this, it is clear from the evidence already discussed in respect of changed services in Chapter 4, that Pathfinders are indeed exerting positive influence on this wider range of services and that this is providing benefits in Pathfinder areas, even if the scale of change is insufficient to measure. The primary benefits with respect to these service areas are likely to be to the groups of participants who are directly engaged with the services and projects.
- 5.14 The wider benefits also include the improved working cultures and innovative practices within the service provider organisations involved, the implications of which are likely to be felt beyond the boundaries of each Pathfinder.

Factors influencing impact

- 5.15 Our analysis of the results and impacts secured by Pathfinders reveals a complex picture, with varying contexts, varying approaches and a multiplicity of other programmes and processes at work in any one area. Identifying causal factors to explain ‘what works and why?’ is therefore very difficult. We believe that some reasons can be offered for at least some of the variations in outcome between Pathfinder areas.
- 5.16 There appear to be two key sets of factors that have the biggest influence on a Pathfinder’s effectiveness – those **internal** to a Pathfinder, defining its capacity and will to act – and those **external** to the Pathfinder, principally the institutional public sector context within which it has to work. Where those two sets of factors are positively aligned, the most progress can be

¹⁵ CEA, *Measuring Public Services at a Neighbourhood Level: Final Report* (Communities and Local Government, 2008)

made, and conversely, where one or both sets of factors are not in place, success is difficult to achieve.

- 5.17 The internal factors that seem to matter most can be summarised as **'calibre and continuity'**. Pathfinder Neighbourhood Managers have tended to be well qualified and effective middle managers, from a range of backgrounds in community development or service provision (or both), usually with a range of skills and a flexible, sometimes creative, approach. Where such Managers have been recruited and have stayed for 3–4 years (few stay longer), a strong degree of organisational competence has been developed, including both the professional team and the wider partnership structure. This has enabled good decision-making and built the confidence of service providers in particular who recognise a partner with whom they can 'do business'. Given the relatively small scale of Pathfinder organisations, the calibre of leadership of one individual can make a significant difference. The recruitment and continuity of a full team complement, and the motivation of service provider managers and involved residents are also a very important part of this.
- 5.18 The external factor that appears to matter most is the working corporate attitude of key service providers, particularly the local authority, towards engagement at a neighbourhood level, perhaps best summarised as **'attitude and agenda'**. This varies enormously between local authorities in particular. Where authorities have a basic acceptance of the value of resident engagement, a clear agenda of service improvement and at least some interest in neighbourhood working then Pathfinders have found fertile ground in which to work. Local authorities are by far the most significant partner for Neighbourhood Managers given the range of local services that they provide and their willingness to co-operate or support neighbourhood management is crucial. Support from the local authority is generally heightened when it is the Neighbourhood Manager's Accountable Body, as the Pathfinder team is then considered to be part of the authority (even if semi-autonomous in practice) and can have greater access to service managers. It has also generally proved easier to engage with local government in unitary/single tier areas, as two tier local government is more complex and more prone to political differences.
- 5.19 These same lessons apply to service providers more generally. Where a service provider has corporate priorities and attitudes that are positively aligned with neighbourhood level working Neighbourhood Managers have been able to make significantly faster progress. The Police are the best example of such an organisation – the shift towards neighbourhood policing and their acceptance of the value of resident involvement has been crucial in making them one of the key partners for most Pathfinders.
- 5.20 These are the primary factors influencing outcomes and their variation. There are a handful of other factors that are also worth noting and which explain some of the *differences* observed between Pathfinder areas:
- **Resident involvement** – The involvement of residents on Pathfinder Boards and in working groups, face to face with service provider

representatives, has provided a degree of focus and accountability in the improvement of services and securing greater responsiveness to local needs that would have been unlikely without their involvement. Residents have provided an energy and vitality to neighbourhood management, which has contributed to achieving changes in local services. The variation in the quality and extent of this engagement has affected processes to influence service providers.

- **Project funding** – Round 1 and Round 2 were established with the same core funding but varying amounts of project funding. Our analysis of Pathfinder impacts upon policing and environmental services suggested that the availability of project funding was not necessary to influence services, but did have the effect of reinforcing these efforts, and also allowed the Pathfinder to have a greater tangible impact upon the neighbourhood through direct interventions. It can be said then that project funding is not *necessary* for neighbourhood managers, but that some available funding is *preferable*. The proviso is that it should not become such a distraction in itself that the delivery of projects obscures the central neighbourhood management role of influencing mainstream service delivery.
- **Credibility grows** – Our annual reviews have highlighted over the years that relationships between Neighbourhood Managers and both communities and service providers evolve over time and that, if trust and credibility grow, then more ambitious initiatives can be attempted together. In other words, influence grows over time as an organisation's reputation grows.
- **Communication matters** – Related to this, those Pathfinders that were able to deliver one or two significant service improvement initiatives in their early years in partnership with providers have found it easier to communicate the value of their work to residents and service providers subsequently. The value of relatively high profile and well received initiatives can have a positive effect for years to come.

Summary and Conclusions

- 5.21 Despite the challenges of evaluating the impact of a small-scale strategic initiative we have identified clear evidence of a number of improved outcomes and resident perceptions in Pathfinder neighbourhoods, particularly in respect of these neighbourhoods being 'cleaner and safer', together with plausible evidence of improvements to a wider range of mainstream services.

6 Mainstreaming and Roll-out

- 6.1 This chapter considers the progress of the Pathfinders in securing the mainstreaming and rolling-out of neighbourhood management in their 35 areas and also considers the wider roll out of neighbourhood management nationally.
- 6.2 As already discussed in earlier chapters, much of the legacy of Pathfinders is in facilitating the piloting of new ways of working for mainstream services, and, in some cases the rolling out of those practices more widely. This chapter is not concerned with these effects of neighbourhood management, but focused on the core function of neighbourhood management itself.

Roll out of neighbourhood management across England

- 6.3 The principal legacy of the Pathfinders is establishing the viability of neighbourhood management as a practical tool to promote renewal in deprived areas. This was the original aim of the Pathfinder Programme. The evidence would suggest that this has succeeded to a significant extent.
- 6.4 As described in more detail in our parallel report¹⁶, our survey of local government in late 2007 has shown that at least 27% of England's unitary or district level local authorities are presently operating neighbourhood management. These initiatives cover **4.2 million people, 8% of England's population in nearly 500 different neighbourhoods, most of which are deprived**. The Pathfinders now represent less than 10% of this total. Most of this expansion has occurred since 2002. The model being adopted by these newer initiatives is normally that which the Pathfinders have trialled, with a clear focus on influencing rather than delivering services, with a strong community involvement strand.
- 6.5 Much of this growth has been funded through Neighbourhood Renewal Funds (NRF) and particularly the Neighbourhood Element (NE – now part of LAAs and originally committed until 2009–10). The clear majority of neighbourhood management initiatives are reliant on these funds. The growth of neighbourhood management in England has been directly enabled by the provision of special funding by central government. As NRF and NE comes to an end, there is an open question as to whether these initiatives will continue to be funded, and if so, how.

¹⁶ SQW Consulting and partners, (2008), *Neighbourhood Management Beyond the Pathfinders: A National Overview*, CLG

Round 1 Pathfinders

- 6.6 Whilst the Pathfinder Programme began as a central government initiative, the funding was subsequently devolved to the individual local authorities as part of LAAs, giving full control over future funding of all Pathfinders to their relevant local authority and partners. This created some uncertainty and concern at the time although it has actually transpired that despite local authorities not being required to continue fund their Pathfinders, all original commitments have in fact been honoured. At the time of writing all 20 Round 1 Pathfinders are still in operation, and barring one which opted to complete its activities in March 2008, the rest will see out their full seven year programmes to March 2009.
- 6.7 However, a consideration of the prospects for the Round 1 Pathfinders beyond March 2009 provides a more mixed picture. A summary of the plans for each Round 1 Pathfinder is presented in Annex C, based on our review from the autumn of 2007. These plans are clearly subject to change as they are still over a year away from the end of their committed funding, but they nevertheless provide a good picture of the direction of this group of Pathfinders.
- 6.8 Our review of the twenty Round 1 Pathfinders suggested that five look certain to continue as Neighbourhood Management initiatives with core funding on a more sustainable basis; a further two should continue as a wider form of area management; seven seem likely to close in March 2009 or shortly after; and six are still in discussions about the future. These plans are clearly subject to change as, at the time of the research, the Pathfinders were still over a year away from the end of their committed funding. If the majority survive, that would be a good outcome for what has been an experimental programme, where it would not be reasonable to expect every partnership to succeed. However, final decisions on most will not be made until the autumn of 2008.
- 6.9 Most authorities either have, or are putting in place, arrangements for greater sub-district working to involve local citizens, whether area management, parish councils, area forums, ward committees or even some mix of these. However, working at a neighbourhood level or with any intensity, is less common.
- 6.10 Over half of the Round 1 Pathfinder authorities are operating neighbourhood management or something similar in other neighbourhoods beyond their Pathfinder neighbourhood – funded mainly from Neighbourhood Element or NRF.
- 6.11 Whilst accepting that neighbourhood management will not be appropriate in all circumstances, our evidence suggests that there are two additional issues that will influence whether or not neighbourhood management is selected as an approach for an area:

- **Distinct benefits of neighbourhood working are not well understood** – There seems to be a general presumption that neighbourhood level and area level working are likely to be capable of delivering similar outcomes in terms of community engagement in particular. Our own previous research amongst a range of neighbourhood and area management initiatives¹⁷ suggests that this is not the case, as neighbourhood working allows for greater intensity of engagement and more in-depth working with different groups of the community, which can lead to improved outcomes. In addition, the relatively modest scale of the Pathfinders, with limited direct expenditure (they are not significant spending programmes) cannot reasonably be expected to deliver large-scale impacts in a short space of time, and therefore their benefits and impacts may be real, but less obvious and hard to measure at an area level. The fact that some Pathfinders have not clearly communicated the nature of their work and its benefits to local decision-makers may therefore also be an issue.
- **Local government has difficulty justifying the cost of neighbourhood working** – Continued neighbourhood level working in deprived areas will clearly depend on local government in particular accepting the value of such working. Present moves to promote cost efficiency in service improvement can only make it harder for local authorities to prioritise neighbourhood working over other demands.

Round 2 Pathfinders

- 6.12 It is too early to assess the prospects for the mainstreaming of Round 2 Pathfinders, as they are only entering their fourth year. At the time of writing, all but one of the Round 2 Pathfinders are still operating. One Pathfinder ceased operating in 2006 due to organisational difficulties and a shift in local priorities.
- 6.13 As with Round 1 Pathfinders, there is a reasonable degree of roll-out of neighbourhood management in Round 2 local authority areas. One third of Round 2 areas have further neighbourhood management initiatives and another third are piloting other forms of local area working.

Summary and Conclusions

- 6.14 Round 1 Pathfinders are presently in their seventh year of operation and most are in advanced discussions about their future. Approximately one third are set to carry on, one third are set to close and one third are still in discussion. A final assessment on their prospects for mainstreaming is therefore not possible until later 2008–09. Most Round 2 Pathfinders look set to continue to 2011–12, to complete their initial seven year funding

¹⁷ SQW Consulting and partners, *Research Report 27: Alternative Approaches to Neighbourhood Management* (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2006)

programme. More widely, the picture is presently positive, with our survey identifying neighbourhood management initiatives in at least 27% of England's unitary or district level authorities, covering 4.2 million people in nearly 500 neighbourhoods, mostly in deprived areas, although it must be noted that most are still presently reliant on short-term funding.

7 Conclusions

Assessment

- 7.1 In 2001, the Pathfinder Programme was launched by Government to test and develop neighbourhood management as a tool for renewal in deprived areas. Has it been successful?
- 7.2 There are three answers to this question:
- **The model** – The pathfinder model of neighbourhood management has proved robust, flexible and appropriate. It represents a relatively inexpensive model for in-depth local engagement and service improvement. This is particularly so if a lower level of project funding is used; our evidence, as discussed in Chapter 8, suggests that the level of project funding is not a decisive factor in long-term effectiveness.
 - **Pathfinder neighbourhoods** – Despite the challenges of evaluating the impact of a small-scale strategic initiative we have identified evidence of a number of improved outcomes and resident perceptions particularly in respect of Pathfinder neighbourhoods being ‘cleaner and safer’, together with evidence of improvements to a wider range of mainstream services.
 - **Establishing a new national practice** – Our recent survey has highlighted that neighbourhood management is now operating in over 27% of England’s unitary or district level authorities, covering an estimated 4.2 million people, 8% of England’s population, across nearly 500 neighbourhoods, mostly in deprived areas.
- 7.3 The most important legacy of this Pathfinder Programme is almost certainly the confidence and impetus that it has given other authorities and partnerships to roll out neighbourhood management more widely. For what is a modest programme in resource terms, its impact is being widely felt.
- 7.4 Neighbourhood management has demonstrated its value as a tool that can bring communities and service providers together in order to improve services and outcomes in an area. It is unusual in that it takes an integrated view of a particular ‘place’ – its needs, opportunities and services – and promotes public service improvement from the clear viewpoint of the customer – the local community. This brings a particular focus on promoting the greater joining up of local services and ensuring that they are more responsive to local needs. As well as pushing for change, Neighbourhood Managers also help to enable it, by facilitating community engagement and bringing service providers together. Their location outside of traditional service silos allows them to play a unique role as a neighbourhood broker.
- 7.5 We suggest that neighbourhood management remains of greatest relevance to deprived areas where the complexity and intensity of problems can require

a greater level of intervention by government, and where the role of the Neighbourhood Manager can be of greatest value. Other areas may also benefit from such processes, but the need for such an intense approach is less obvious – more ‘light touch’ arrangements may be appropriate.

Further development

- 7.6 It is also likely that further potential remains to be explored within neighbourhood management, as partnerships continue to develop and new opportunities arise. In particular:
- **Co-ordination of resident consultation?** With co-operation from service providers, Neighbourhood Managers could deliver more integrated consultation exercises, reducing duplication and saving money.
 - **Local commissioning?** Partnership boards could become commissioners of some neighbourhood services, helping to shape them and monitor them, to hold them accountable to local people.
 - **Neighbourhood service delivery?** Not really explored through the Pathfinder Programme, but the scope to deliver some services at a neighbourhood level, or manage community assets, may be appropriate for some.
- 7.7 The connection between neighbourhood management and present government agendas – central and local – is obvious, with neighbourhood management able to contribute to:
- promoting greater community involvement in making decisions about services that affect them
 - supporting the implementation of neighbourhood policing and embedding it within wider attempts to tackle the causes of crime
 - tackling deprivation, worklessness and promoting neighbourhood renewal
 - improving public services and make them more effective at targeting those in need
- 7.8 The strategic role that Neighbourhood Managers play in empowering communities and ‘shaping places’ makes the process of neighbourhood management highly relevant to these agendas. It is also clear from the Pathfinder experience that most service providers require support and assistance in working more closely with local communities, which Neighbourhood Managers are well placed to provide.

Challenges for the future...

- 7.9 The experience of the Pathfinders has highlighted some key challenges for central and local government:

- **The challenge of mainstreaming** – Neighbourhood management has made good progress in being adopted across England. It is clear that much of this has been enabled by the availability of funding to support it from central government. As with other time-limited, area-based funding, this presents an obvious challenge to LSPs and local government in respect of whether and how to mainstream these initiatives when the initial funding comes to an end. The sustainability of the Pathfinders' legacy will be determined by these decisions over the coming few years.

7.10 There are also two further challenges that affect the context within which neighbourhood management initiatives operate, and which may have an important influence on their future prospects:

- **Incentives to focus on deprivation?** The framework for shaping how investments are made through LSPs at a local level has changed significantly in the last year. The advent of LAAs and greater flexibility for local government and its partners, together with the shift away from PSA floor targets in Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 (CSR07) removed the existing framework for targeting resources on deprived areas. In its place, the CSR07 established new Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs) including Community and Local Government's DSO3¹⁸ which focuses on regeneration. With the introduction of the Working Neighbourhoods Fund and publication of the *transforming places; changing lives*, a framework for regeneration, the context in which Neighbourhood Managers operate is therefore changing. This evaluation has shown that Neighbourhood Managers achieve most in promoting renewal when working with service providers pursuing compatible agendas – particularly tackling deprivation and involving communities in doing so. The degree to which mainstream service providers, including local government, prioritise the tackling of deprivation through their own expenditure will have a significant influence on further progress in addressing this issue, and will be strongly influenced by the emerging national regeneration framework, as well as local LAA frameworks. Neighbourhood Managers cannot make change happen by themselves.
- **Neighbourhood level service data?** The quality and quantity of timely and publicly available service data at a neighbourhood level for most mainstream services remains severely limited; something which has been a challenge for this evaluation and which is evidenced in a separate report by CEA¹⁹. This hampers monitoring and accountability for residents and the wider evaluation of pilot projects and programmes. Significant progress in the production of regular, comprehensive service data by LSPs is required to enable the effective evaluation of LAA programmes and their impact upon deprived neighbourhoods in particular. Given the lack of research skills and expertise in most neighbourhood partnerships, such central data gathering and analysis in LSPs may be the only way to ensure effective evaluation for these neighbourhoods.

¹⁸ DSO3: To build prosperous communities by improving the **economic performance** of cities, sub-regions and local areas, promoting **regeneration** and **tackling deprivation**

¹⁹ CEA, *Measuring Public Services at a Neighbourhood Level: Final Report* (Communities and Local Government, 2008)

Part B: Learning Lessons

8 The Case for Neighbourhood Management

- 8.1 Why would an area wish to operate neighbourhood management? When and where is it appropriate? What should it focus on? This chapter summarises the costs and benefits of neighbourhood management and defines the circumstances where it may be most appropriate.

The role and value of neighbourhood management

- 8.2 Neighbourhood management is a tool that brings communities and service providers together in order to improve services and outcomes in an area. It has mainly been used thus far in deprived areas. It takes an integrated view of a particular 'place' – its needs, opportunities and services – and promotes public service improvement from the clear viewpoint of the customer – the local community. This brings a particular focus on promoting the greater joining up of local services and ensuring that they are more responsive to local needs. As well as pushing for change, Neighbourhood Managers also help to enable it, by facilitating community engagement and bringing service providers together.
- 8.3 Neighbourhood Managers therefore play a strategic role in 'empowering communities' and 'shaping places'. Their location outside of traditional service silos allows them to play a unique role as a 'neighbourhood broker'. The Pathfinder model of neighbourhood management mainly seeks to influence mainstream services, not deliver them. The added value of this approach can be summarised as follows, highlighting the **six dimensions of neighbourhood management**, described here in terms of the six different roles that Neighbourhood Managers play:
- **Customer advocate** – Neighbourhood Managers are often the only professionals in many neighbourhoods that are paid to identify and analyse issues from a customer perspective – not from a particular 'service silo' as a provider. This allows a much more coherent focus on a 'place', understanding the gaps between services and the challenge of joining up service responses. It promotes coherent problem solving.
 - **Community facilitator** – Facilitating the greater involvement of local residents in consultation and decision-making about local services, through a range of mechanisms, with particular value from the greater use of deliberative processes. Neighbourhood Managers can provide a valuable supporting role to service providers in facilitating such community engagement, particularly where those service providers lack the expertise to do it themselves.

- **Local broker** – Supporting networking between service providers, the building of relationships and trust between them, and promoting joint working at a neighbourhood level between them, and with the local community.
- **Area champion** – Highlighting local issues and communicating these to service providers often serves to raise the profile of the neighbourhood and promote faster action in addressing problems. This can often be achieved in close collaboration with local councillors, who may take a lead on this.
- **Innovator and change agent** – Providing a supportive context for the piloting of new working practices and methods of service delivery, where the Neighbourhood Manager's established networks with the local community and service providers can be used to improve the chance of success and help to develop services. The ongoing presence of a neighbourhood management team can often have a wider benefit of promoting positive attitudes to change, and supporting culture change in service provider organisations.
- **Community catalyst** – Supporting local community and voluntary groups through signposting them to professional advice and funding and helping them to build their capacity. Their engagement processes often play a wider community development role too, promoting the development of social capital.

8.4 Given the growing importance to government of involving communities in shaping public services, and seeking a more tailored approach, the role that Neighbourhood Managers can play seems significant. Where it works effectively, neighbourhood management can add value to, and support the work of, mainstream public service providers in understanding local needs and how they differ between areas. Neighbourhood management is not sufficient to deliver renewal or public service improvement alone but as a tool it has proven that it can add value in ways not readily found from alternative sources. (The key lessons learnt from the Pathfinder experiences on how to deliver neighbourhood management are set out in the next chapter.)

When and where is neighbourhood management appropriate?

- 8.5 The evidence from the national evaluation suggests that neighbourhood management can work effectively in a range of contexts – urban and rural, inner city and outer estate and areas with different types of economic and housing market challenges.
- 8.6 The main purposes to which it has been put are:
- Promoting the improvement of services in deprived areas

- Supporting community engagement and the management of change in areas of significant transition – eg housing market renewal areas, stock transfer, estate redevelopment, housing growth, etc.

8.7 It does not seem likely that every neighbourhood in a local authority area would benefit from neighbourhood management to the same extent, with deprived areas usually exhibiting more complex and intense needs and therefore requiring a greater intensity of resource. However, the absence of any form of neighbourhood or area engagement structure in an area can hinder the rolling out of lessons learnt from neighbourhood management partnerships. The ideal mix therefore is perhaps for local authorities to ensure that some form of 'light touch' resident engagement structures exist in all areas/neighbourhoods, with a more intense form of engagement – neighbourhood management – in the more deprived neighbourhoods, or areas undergoing significant transition.

8.8 In terms of improving services, the most effective gains to date have been in respect of the following services:

- Policing and community safety
- Environmental services, particularly streetscene and maintenance of the public realm, and social housing estate management
- Improving the management of private rented housing through the promotion of more consistent local regulation
- Improving the 'targeting, tailoring and take up' of employment, training and health services
- Improving links between schools and other services, to support the health and welfare of children and families.

8.9 Our cumulative national evidence suggests that it works best when:

- It is focused on a small area of 5,000–15,000 people. Meaningful community engagement becomes harder to deliver in areas of 15–20,000 upwards
- There is a good calibre Neighbourhood Manager and team in place, to provide a range of skills and continuity over time
- There is a pre-existing agenda or willingness to try neighbourhood/locality working in the local authority and preferably other key partners also
- There is a single tier of local government, although it can work in two tier areas where there are strong levels of collaboration
- It is allowed to develop and build confidence with service providers and communities over a period of years
- There is a systematic programme of activity each year, with a limited range of priorities at any one time, and evaluated periodically.

The costs and benefits of neighbourhood management

- 8.10 A 'pathfinder model' neighbourhood management partnership with a full multi-sector partnership, a Neighbourhood Manager and a team of 4–5 people based in a local office can be delivered for £200,000 per year. Our wider research on alternative approaches shows that a similar model can be delivered for less, at perhaps £150,000 per year, if there is a smaller team of a Manager and 2–3 staff. Assuming an average population of 10,000 in the target neighbourhood, the cost is therefore £15–20 per head per year.
- 8.11 Although a project fund can improve the impact of a partnership, it is not essential, and even a modest budget can be used to good effect. A project fund of the level of Round 1 Pathfinders is c.£300,000 per year, or £30 per head, and for Round 2 Pathfinders, has been closer to c.£150,000 per year, or £15 per head. A larger project fund can contribute to a larger and more visible direct impact in the early years of a programme, but the longer term achievements and impact are more likely to be determined by the influence of the partnership on mainstream services and their indirect impacts.
- 8.12 The benefits of neighbourhood management are very difficult to quantify and measure. Most of the benefits of neighbourhood management are delivered indirectly through influence on service providers providing the kinds of benefits presented above. They could be in the form of improved quality or quantity of service, or enhanced take up of a service, or possibly cost savings from greater efficiency and the prevention of future problems/costs. It is not a spending programme delivering projects and outputs but a strategic initiative seeking 'added value' on partnership working.
- 8.13 In terms of systematic quantification of benefits, the household survey data provides the most robust evidence thus far. With reference to a handful of key indicators for the Round 1 Pathfinders, the following changes were identified from 2003 to 2006, as set out in Figure 8.1, providing both the actual change and the net change over and above the comparator figure, as a crude estimate of net added value:

Figure 8 -1: Net change in key indicators for 20 Round 1 areas

Household survey question	2003	2006	Net % point change in indicator 2003 to 2006	Net % point change OVER and ABOVE the change in the comparator
% residents satisfied with the area as a place to live	71%	75%	+4%	+3% net
% of residents who think that their area has improved in the last 3 years	–	31%	–	+9% above
% of residents who feel that they can influence decisions by local organisations that affect their area	23%	26%	+3%	+1% net
% of residents who are satisfied with street cleaning	60%	68%	+8%	+10% net
% of residents who are satisfied with the police service in their area	47%	53%	+6%	+4% net

- 8.14 In Round 1 areas, including all of their project funding, these changes were achieved on average with costs of c.£50 per head per year.
- 8.15 An alternative perspective for local authorities or LSPs considering whether to operate or mainstream neighbourhood management is to assess the extent to which the benefits of neighbourhood management are already being delivered through alternative mechanisms. If they are not then it may be worth asking what is being lost by *not operating* neighbourhood management? Lost opportunities could include in-depth local community engagement, the involvement of residents in shaping services, the greater joining up and co-ordination of public services and the development of innovative working practices.

What next?

- 8.16 The evidence presented draws on what has been achieved to date, largely by Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders. Such partnerships are also clearly evolving each year, and their focus has shifted onto different services over the years. It is plausible to suggest that there is still further potential to be secured from the neighbourhood management approach, not yet realised. In particular, future possibilities include:
- **Better neighbourhood level service data** – With improved neighbourhood level data on service performance, benchmarked against wider district performance, Neighbourhood Managers may be able to lobby providers more effectively for changes, and evaluate past achievements more effectively.
 - **Co-ordinated public consultation** – Although attempted in modest ways, there seems the prospect of greater efficiency to be gained from

different service providers using Neighbourhood Managers together in more co-ordinated and integrated public consultation processes, saving time and reducing duplication.

- **Local commissioning** – Could some neighbourhood partnerships take on a delegated commissioning role for some services delivered in their area? With strong links into the community and an ongoing monitoring role, it could provide a valuable link to establish the greater ownership (and influence) of some services by local communities.
- **Stronger relationships** – As relationships and trust mature over several years, more ambitious and innovative pilots may be possible.
- **Stronger links with neighbourhood policing** – Links with the Police have been strong in most Pathfinder areas. The recommendations from the recent Flanagan Review of Policing in England²⁰ highlighted the importance of neighbourhood management for the successful delivery of neighbourhood policing more widely, and this may open up possibilities for deeper engagement with the Police.

Neighbourhood management in their own words...

- 8.17 From our annual reviews, we have identified a number of quotes from Neighbourhood Managers, residents and service providers that offer a more personal view of neighbourhood management from some who have been directly involved in it, illustrating what it looks like in practice...

I live here and I never thought it would change. But I've got a job here, I've got to know lots of people and I've got skills and experience now that I can put on my CV when I have to move on. (Resident involved in Northlands Park Pathfinder, Basildon)

The Council were people behind desks looking at Staveley in figures. Now they understand we are human beings and when we want something done – they have to listen to residents, and not just sit behind desks – that's down to the Pathfinder – they have put the links in that were missing. (Resident, Staveley, Chesterfield)

Networking and strengthening the relationships between the services has been the real benefit of the Pathfinder for us. The Pathfinder provided the forum for joint working, such as the Rapid Response Team. Working more closely together reminds people that money isn't always the root of the problem. (Rapid Response Team Manager, Dewsbury West)

It is refreshing to find an office such as Transform [Pathfinder] who are open to new ideas and concepts and willing to back them. I think their inclusion in ideas makes those ideas more likely to come to fruition. There is a model of things being tested out here. (Service provider, North Devon)

²⁰ Sir Ronnie Flanagan, *The Review of Policing: Final Report* (Home Office, 2008)

What is the most significant difference that neighbourhood management has made to this area? It has improved Staveley's image internally and externally, and raised residents' expectations of themselves and services. (Neighbourhood Manager, Staveley, Chesterfield)

Neighbourhood management is both the nagging thorn that prompts action and the facilitator that enables it. (Basildon evaluator)

9 Key 'How To' Lessons

- 9.1 This chapter seeks to summarise the more practical lessons on *how* you might establish and operate neighbourhood management, drawing on experiences from across both Rounds of Pathfinders.

Initial design

Target area

- Meaningful community engagement becomes more difficult with areas over 15–20,000 population. Unit costs become very high with small populations. Most of the Pathfinders have operated with areas of 5,000–15,000 population.
- Where a target area has several distinct neighbourhoods, and particularly if there is any conflict or tension between them, consideration should be given to ensuring that the Partnership Board includes fair representation from each constituent neighbourhood.
- Aligning the target area boundaries with at least some existing administrative boundaries (eg wards, police beat areas, PCT locality areas) will help with joint working, but the lack of co-terminous boundaries is rarely a deciding factor in whether a service provider will work closely with a Neighbourhood Manager – their degree of commitment is more important.

Team and Office

- A good calibre Neighbourhood Manager is essential, with the ability to engage with both residents and service providers, with flexibility and a creative, positive approach to problem solving. They should be at least middle manager grade.
- The Neighbourhood Manager should have a clearly identified line manager in the Accountable Body who can provide support and guidance, but the Neighbourhood Manager (and their team) also needs to be allowed to operate at arms length from the Accountable Body to give them flexibility and freedom. Managers need to be supported but not controlled.
- The team usually needs different types of people with a mix of skills – community outreach workers, finance/admin officers, policy officers, etc. The skills mix should reflect the nature of the programme being proposed.
- It is essential for the team to have an office base within the target area that is visible and accessible to residents.

Partnership

- To be effective partnerships need clear engagement of both communities and service providers, not just one or the other. Boards should include representatives of both groups of stakeholders.
- In terms of the partnership structure, the most important criteria for effective working are that it should be clearly structured (the simpler the better) and that the roles and responsibilities of the various groups within it should be clearly understood. The precise form and shape of the partnership rarely matters, as many variations appear to work equally well, and so partnerships should resist the temptation to spend a lot of time in the early years attempting to design elaborate structures or 'fine tune' them too often.

Accountable body

- Unless there is a strong reason not to, local authorities should be used as the Accountable Body for neighbourhood management partnerships. They can provide good financial and personnel systems and processes, and being 'in-house' usually enables greater links to local authority run services and councillors.

Aims and Programme

- The overall purpose of the partnership and its programme should be clearly defined at the outset. Is it primarily aiming to tackle deprivation and 'narrow the gap', or does it have a more general service improvement mission on behalf of the wider area? What is the scope of target services – narrow or broad? Is it aiming to influence services or deliver them?
- The programme of activities should be based upon an evidence-based assessment of local need, together with the local community's assessment of its priorities.
- A project fund is not necessary to operate neighbourhood management, although some funds can be helpful in supporting early quick wins and also pump-priming pilot projects jointly with service providers. However, the evidence suggests that project funding is a double-edged sword in that, whilst it can enable more activities, it can also be a serious distraction in the time required to manage its delivery (time taken away from influencing mainstream services). Project funding is most useful in the early years of a neighbourhood management partnership, to help it 'make a splash' and build awareness and confidence in the partnership, although even then care needs to be taken not to distract attention away from partnership building and a clear focus on influencing mainstream services.

Partner engagement

- There must be some commitment from the local authority at least, at a senior level, to working with the neighbourhood management partnership and a willingness to be receptive to new ways of working. Without some

basic institutional support, making progress will be very difficult. In two tier areas, both tiers of local government must be committed.

- Service provider organisations usually require as much capacity building to engage with communities, as communities do to engage with service providers. It requires time and investment.
- An area's history of partnership and regeneration can influence the effectiveness of any new partnership in its early years. Established institutions, groups and relationships can be very helpful to build upon, and should be used where possible. If there were tensions or failures previously, it will be important to understand what these were and ensure that lessons are learnt.

Strategy and approach

Tools and approaches

- A delivery plan should be prepared each year, defining a limited set of priorities, and setting out key activities and milestones.
- Evidence suggests that it is difficult for a partnership to effectively influence mainstream services and deliver its own services at the same time – they usually have to focus on one or the other.
- The collation and analysis of relevant neighbourhood service performance data should be a regular part of the team's work, so that such data can be used in discussions with service providers about what quality and quantities of service are appropriate for the neighbourhood, and to allow changes to be monitored over time.
- Service Level Agreements (SLAs) can be useful tools to define expected service standards in a neighbourhood, and as a basis for discussion with service providers, but the development of an SLA cannot in itself deliver change – that requires commitment from the service provider. A good SLA is usually a response to service provider commitment to a neighbourhood, not a means of achieving it.

Retaining ongoing partner engagement

- One of the key areas of added value from neighbourhood management for service providers is the ability to meet residents directly and discuss services with them in a managed/facilitated environment. Ensuring that this happens regularly may be key to retaining the interest of service provider organisations. They will need to show some responsiveness to resident views though if they are to retain resident support/engagement in the longer term.
- Service providers are more easily engaged when they can see a clear benefit to the delivery of their own services.
- It is easier to engage residents and retain their involvement when they can see how their involvement makes a difference to decision-making or services or funding allocations.

Early years (1–3)

- Evaluation of both Rounds of Pathfinders suggested that the early recruitment of a Neighbourhood Manager was the best option when a new initiative is being established and that a team, office and partnership can be established and fully 'ready for business' within 18 months.
- The priority in the first year or two of a neighbourhood management partnership should be to tackle visible and obvious resident priorities – often related to 'crime and grime'. This could be done through influencing services, but also 'quick wins' such as tidying up local eyesores, providing small grants to local community groups or other highly visible short-term initiatives. Such activity serves to boost confidence in the partnership and its capacity to get things done, and builds interest amongst residents in being involved, as well as wider awareness.
- Neighbourhood Managers must communicate regularly what they are doing and why, to both service providers and residents, so that people understand and 'buy in' to neighbourhood management.
- Service providers which are county-wide or sub-regional or even regional in scope can be harder to engage at a neighbourhood level. Unless there are strong relationships in place, it is best to consider engagement with these services as a longer term process, not an early priority.

Mature phase (year 4+)

- Each year, the partnership should have clear priorities. Whilst some continuity is required over time, these may evolve, and it may be appropriate to shift attention to emphasise different services from time to time.
- The mainstreaming and rolling out of pilot projects to other areas can sometimes lead to a reduction in that service in the original pilot area. Whilst understandable during the roll-out itself, service levels need to be monitored even after mainstreaming to ensure that they return to and remain at an appropriate level.

Monitoring and evaluation

- A clear area baseline should be put in place at an early point and updated at least annually to allow the regular and systematic monitoring of neighbourhood change over time
- Activities should be reviewed each year, including an element of independent/external challenge.
- All significant pilot projects or initiatives should be reviewed and the key findings communicated in writing to relevant service providers to establish achievements and lessons learnt.
- Wherever possible, Neighbourhood Managers should seek to build their own monitoring and evaluation activities upon the wider structures of


process already in place. Relevant LAAs indicators that are being tracked by the LSP should also be tracked at neighbourhood level. Similarly, where surveys are done across a local authority (eg an annual quality of life survey), it may be sensible to do a 'booster' sample in the neighbourhood, allowing data to be gathered that is comparable with that of the local authority. Most neighbourhood partnerships lack the skills to provide effective monitoring and evaluation, and therefore seeking support from bigger partner organisations, particularly those with research officers, may be the best solution for many.

Annex A: Neighbourhood Management Evaluation Framework

- A.1 This Annex outlines a basic model for understanding what Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders do, what sort of changes they might effect, and how this might happen. It identifies a chain of events (or 'channel of influence') and seeks to establish clear terms which can be used to describe different features of the process.

(1) General Process of Change

- A.2 Figure A1 (overleaf) illustrates the main process of change and the basic concepts. It also highlights the key questions for the evaluation as a whole.



(2) NM Pathfinder Activities of Influence

- A.3 This is a categorisation of the various activities that *Pathfinders* can engage in to secure change in their neighbourhoods, whether directly through their own expenditure, or indirectly through influencing others.

(1) Improving Local Services through Influence and Demonstration

These activities are designed to secure permanent, sustainable change to the way that local services are delivered, in a way that benefits residents in the neighbourhood. Activities include:

- **Research and analysis** – collecting, analysing and discussing information about local needs and services, to inform discussions with service providers about the appropriate nature and level of services for the neighbourhood, and the feasibility of new approaches.
- **Lobbying** – raising awareness of the Pathfinder and neighbourhood management objectives, creating an environment conducive to change, and seeking changes by persuasion.
- **Training/development for culture change** – building the capacity of the Pathfinder Board, team and local service providers, including front-line managers, to promote change in local services. These activities may help in breaking down professional ‘silos’, equipping people with more relevant skills, and developing trust between organisations.
- **Negotiating and monitoring SLAs** – creating and using ‘tools’ to promote and monitor change to local services. The focus is on establishing explicit targets for the neighbourhood to be monitored.
- **Developing new mechanisms for service delivery** – discussing and developing new ways of delivering, monitoring or advertising services. Could include devolved delivery, budget pooling, co-location of staff, joint working arrangements, information sharing, incentivisation schemes, etc. The Pathfinder may or may not be involved in the resultant process.
- **Monitoring and evaluating public services** – maintaining a ‘watching brief’ on changes in services and their performance, and monitoring against targets or standards if they exist. The purpose of such monitoring/evaluation is to feed into ongoing the discussions and relationship with service providers.
- **Pilot/Demonstration Projects** – this is the piloting of new services to fill gaps or to experiment with innovative approaches, with the intention that the services will either demonstrate a need or demonstrate a successful new approach. The projects are run with the explicit objective of ensuring that they are mainstreamed if successful, or that the lessons are learned by the service provider.

(2) Improving Community Engagement

There are different types of activity that a Pathfinder might engage in with respect to engaging the local community:

- Building the capacity of local people to get involved with the pathfinder itself (on the Board, through forums, etc);
- Promoting community development more generally;
- Improving community engagement with service providers, helping to make services more responsive to local concerns.

(3) Delivering ‘Quick Wins’

These activities are likely to be relatively small scale and short term and may not necessarily be innovative or aimed at mainstreaming, but are designed to deliver benefits to local residents quickly. The purpose of such actions is to build local confidence, tackle specific problems and raise the profile of the Pathfinder.

(4) Learning & Development

These are activities that involve Pathfinders in reviewing their own progress, developing their institutions, systems and personnel and sharing information. It includes monitoring, evaluation, training and partnership development. Pathfinders should have formal reflective processes to ensure that their progress is reviewed regularly (‘how are we doing?’) and that their experiences are recorded, assessed and shared (‘what are we learning?’). This could include a range of activities from informal feedback, use of statistics to formal evaluation and self-evaluation.

(3) Types of Changes to Services

A.4 This is a categorisation of the various changes to services that Pathfinders might seek. These are changes/activities undertaken by *service providers* themselves and are the desired immediate end-product of the Pathfinder’s activities:

(1) Changing corporate policies amongst service providers

- Securing changes to corporate policies (recruitment, procurement of services or goods, style of approach, etc) that benefit the neighbourhood and overcome previous stigmatisation or discrimination.

(2) Re-allocating mainstream resources

- Increasing expenditure on services
- Moving expenditure between services, to improve ‘fit’ with nature of local needs

(3) Re-shaping mainstream services

- Improving co-ordination between services:
 - i. Sharing data
 - ii. Referral of beneficiaries

- iii. Operational co-ordination of services
- iv. Co-location of delivery teams
- v. Changes to area boundaries of services
- Filling gaps between services
- Reducing overlaps of services
- Joint working arrangements between services
- Joined up working at the point of delivery
- Devolved decision-making
- Devolved delivery of services
- Pooling of budgets

(4) Improving service access to increase take-up

- Increasing general awareness and take up of services
- Increasing awareness and take up of services amongst particular groups or in particular areas of the neighbourhood

A.5 It may be possible to measure and monitor changes to particular services with regard to various hard indicators, as follows:

- level of service expenditure
- level of service provision
- improved quality of services
- changes to the nature of services
- better take-up of services
- better take up of services by particular groups within the community, or from particular areas of the neighbourhood
- improved value for money

A.6 These indicators allow changes to services to be monitored and understood. As such, they represent 'interim outcomes', as they are a sign of change but are not the ultimate objective of neighbourhood management. The main aim is to change neighbourhood conditions (eg unemployment, crime levels, etc) and these are measured through local condition indicators.

A.7 Within this, particular issues to be alert to, in terms of clarifying benefits, are:

- Is there anything particularly innovative or unusual about the changes?
- Are any public expenditure savings likely to be made across service or organisational boundaries (will spending by one body save another one money)?
- Is there any shift from reactive to preventative expenditure or any recognition that the balance between the two types of expenditure is an issue?

Annex B: Published National Evaluation Reports

- B.1 The following reports are the main published outputs from the National Evaluation team, all published by Communities and Local Government (or its predecessor department ODPM). Unless otherwise stated, all reports were authored by the evaluation team lead by SQW Consulting. All are available on the department's website (www.communities.gov.uk) or the project website (www.sqw.co.uk/nme/). Reports are listed in chronological order of publication under each heading.

Annual Reports

Research Report 37: Neighbourhood Management: empowering communities, shaping places: Review 2006–07, 2007

Research Report 23: Neighbourhood management at the turning point? Programme Review 2005–06, 2006

Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme National Evaluation: Annual Review 2003–04, 2004

Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme National Evaluation: Annual Review 2002–03, 2003

Scoping Research: Main Findings and Implications for Stakeholders, 2002

Theme Reports

Neighbourhood Management: Beyond the Pathfinders, A National Overview, 2008

Community Cohesion and Neighbourhood Management, 2008

Alternative Approaches to Neighbourhood Management: 7 Updated Case Study Reports, 2008

Research Report 38: NM: An overview of the 2004 and 2007 Round 2 Pathfinder household surveys: Key Findings, 2007

Research Report 36: The Contribution of Neighbourhood Management to Cleaner and Safer Neighbourhoods, 2007

Research Report 35: Neighbourhood Management and Social Capital, 2007

Research Report 34: Neighbourhood Management and Neighbourhood Economic Development, 2007

Research Report 31: Joining up for Safer Neighbourhoods: Theme Report, 2006

Research Report 30: NM and Services for Young People: Theme Report, 2006

Research Report 29: Housing: a Theme Report (joint output with Action Learning Set on housing), 2006

Research Report 28: NM: An Overview of the 2003 and 2006 Round 1 Pathfinder Household Surveys: Key Findings, 2006

Research Report 27: Alternative Approaches to NM: 7 Case Study Summaries and Analysis, 2006 (complemented by two background reports containing the full case studies: Alternative Approaches to NM: 6 Full Case Studies, Wolverhampton Case Study Report)

Research Report 25: Rolling out Neighbourhood Management: Theme Report, 2006

Reports on Improving Public Service Data

Measuring Public Services at a Neighbourhood Level: Final Report, CEA, 2008 (forthcoming)

Measuring Public Services at a Neighbourhood Level: Lessons and Challenges (Interim Report), CEA, 2008

Using Data to Improve Services: A Toolkit to for Neighbourhood Management Initiatives (2nd Edition), CEA, 2007

Action Learning Set Outputs

Action Learning Set Summary Paper on Economic Development, 2007

Action Learning Set Summary Paper on Social Capital, 2007

Action Learning Set Report on Rolling-out Neighbourhood Management: The 'Rough Guide to NM', 2006

Good Practice Notes

GPN 1: Creating, Updating and Using a Neighbourhood Baseline, 2004

GPN 2: Undertaking Local Evaluation, 2004

GPN 3: Developing Strategies, 2004

GPN 4: Using Household Survey Data, 2004

GPN 5: Managing Risks, 2004

Annex C: Future Plans for Round 1 Pathfinders

This table summarises future plans for Round 1 Pathfinders, based upon a review conducted by the evaluation team in Autumn 2007

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF? N/hd Element?
Greenwich	Changes in Common (Woolwich Common)	London Borough of Greenwich (unitary)	No The Pathfinder has brought forward its final year funding into year 6 and is planning an early completion in March 2008. There are presently no plans to continue the Pathfinder. It is hoped that some form of partnership will continue, and some of the key projects, but there will be no NM team.	No, moved to Area Management The council has divided the borough into 4 areas and is moving to deliver a range of services and engage with partners on this basis (including housing, street cleaning/grounds maintenance, safer neighbourhoods teams, children/family services and youth services). There are presently no plans for neighbourhood management although NM-style working at area level is emerging to some extent.	Yes No
Camden	Go! Partnership (Gospel Oak)	Camden (unitary)	NM unlikely to continue Camden had identified 10 deprived areas in 2007–08 which would have Neighbourhood Co-ordinators, and a partnership, enabling the GO! Partnership to continue with a Co-ordinator with a 'light touch' approach. Presently, plans for 2008–09 onwards are for ward level Area Forums, primarily linking councillors and the public.	No The likely approach for other areas is to rely on new ward level Area Forums.	Yes Yes

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF? N/hd Element?
Hastings	Greater Hollington Partnership	East Sussex County Council (two tier area)	<p>To continue as Area Management</p> <p>The borough is being divided into 4 areas, with each area having c.21,000 residents, its own Management Board (of residents, councillors and service providers) and with multi-agency tasking teams to co-ordinate and deliver actions. The present NM team/model is not continuing, but the area is to be increased in size to become one of the 4 areas (North St. Leonards Area), as part of the area co-ordination model. The Greater Hollington Partnership has restructured to become the community-based Greater Hollington Association.</p>	<p>Area Management</p> <p>The new co-ordination approach will cover the whole borough, although with a 'slimmed down' model.</p>	Yes Yes
Gloucester City	Community Counts Partnership (Barton Tredworth & White City)	Gloucestershire County Council (two tier area)	<p>NM will not continue</p> <p>There are no plans to continue NM in this area after March 2009. Citizen engagement will continue through 10 Neighbourhood Partnerships covering the local authority area, including one for the Community Counts area, although these partnerships do not have dedicated teams or resources. Some services (policing, streetcare) are moving to area provision also.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>All of the local authority will be covered by the neighbourhood partnerships.</p>	No No

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF?	N/hd Element?
Bournemouth	NM in Springbourne & Boscombe West	Bournemouth (unitary)	NM future under discussion The NM partnership is exploring the options for the future after March 2009, including income generation as an independent company.	No NM is not being rolled out as such, although some of the practices of the Pathfinder are being applied in three other neighbourhoods – particularly more joined up ‘clean-ups’ – and more intensive neighbourhood working is being applied in Keeble.	No	No
Newcastle under Lyme	Knutton Cross NM Initiative (Knutton and Cross Heath)	Staffordshire County Council (two tier area)	Yes, as part of borough-wide NM A single NM team is to be established within a new partnerships unit in the borough council, to roll-out NM across the borough and also support the LSP. The existing Pathfinder team will become part of this new unit. Detailed arrangements and funding are still under discussion.	Yes An NM approach has been rolled out to Greater Chesterton (12,000 pop), although on a smaller budget than the Pathfinder, which has also provided support. NM is also being rolled out more widely across the borough, although the model for this is still under discussion.	No	No
East Staffs	Heart of Burton Partnership (Burton)	Staffordshire County Council (two tier area)	NM future under discussion The NM area has been extended to match the Inner Burton Housing Area, a long term housing initiative. Future funding for the NM team is under discussion. The council are also considering the parish council model as an alternative.	No There are presently no plans to roll out neighbourhood management any further.	No	No

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF?	N/hd Element?
Ashfield	Kirkby NM (Kirkby in Ashfield)	Nottinghamshire County Council (two tier area)	No NM will not continue in its present form, although a more systematic area-based approach is being taken to some services and resident engagement through a new developing 'neighbourhood governance model'.	No A new 'neighbourhood governance' approach is being developed across Ashfield by the district and county council jointly, with 'area partnership groups' overseeing the work of Local Action Teams, consisting of councillors, police beat officers and community development workers.	Yes	No
Chesterfield	Staveley NM	Derbyshire County Council (two tier area)	NM unlikely to continue Funding is tapering down and some will actually continue into 2009-10 to allow a full year of activity in 2008-09, but there are presently no plans to continue the NM team beyond this point. Some aspects of NM working are likely to continue, including some of the thematic working groups.	Under discussion The council has 8 community forums that cover the borough and the county council is interested in the possibility of 'area champions' so the prospect for further NM working remains under discussion.	No	No
Basildon	Interlock (Northlands Park)	Essex County Council (two tier area)	NM unlikely to continue There are no plans by the council to continue NM after 2008-09. The Borough council is exploring a new parish/town council as an alternative to NM, although local interest has been muted so far.	No There are no plans to extend NM further within the borough. Council plans for local engagement are focused on establishing parish councils.	No	No

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF? N/hd Element?
Kirklees	Dewsbury West	Kirklees (unitary)	<p>NM unlikely to continue but Locality Partnerships being established</p> <p>The NM area was expanded in 2006 to include Chickenley. NM is due to continue until March 2009 although core management/ administration funding is reducing to match that of the 3 other NM initiatives in Kirkless. From 2009 onwards, the local authority has been divided into 7 localities, each with a locality partnership and a manager, and the Pathfinder's work will transfer to the Dewsbury and Mirfield Locality Partnership – an area of c.70,000 people.</p>	<p>Locality Partnerships</p> <p>Neighbourhood management has been extended to 3 new neighbourhoods of c.15,000 population, one in Batley and two in Huddersfield. Funding is from Neighbourhood Element and NRF. Together with the Pathfinder, the four NMs are expected to co-ordinate their activities. All areas in Kirkless will become part of the 7 new locality partnerships.</p>	Yes Yes
Barnsley	Kendray Initiative	Barnsley MBC (unitary)	<p>No, although resident Board will continue</p> <p>A restructured Board, with stronger resident representation, will continue to operate, supported by 'Laying the Foundations', a local charity, but there will be no NM or team.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Nine Area Boards and Area Community Partnerships have been established across the borough (c.22,000 population each). Below this, a new NM team and partnership has been set up in Athersley, and New Lodge neighbourhood is establishing a partnership and will receive modest support. Discussions continue about extending NM to other neighbourhoods also.</p>	Yes Yes

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF? N/hd Element?
Rotherham	Eastwood & Springwell Gardens NM	Rotherham (unitary)	NM future under discussion, but Area Assemblies in place The prospects for the continuation of a focused team in this area after March 2009 are still under discussion.	No NM is not likely to be rolled out, although 7 Area Assemblies have been established across the borough (30–40,000 population), each with a team and a partnership manager. The council are also exploring how to deliver more services along area lines.	Yes No
Bolton	Great Lever NM	Bolton MBC (unitary)	NM future under discussion, but positive Bolton's neighbourhood renewal strategy has been updated, and now includes 10 priority areas, including Great Lever. The NM team have been awarded £475k Neighbourhood Element funding to 2010. Prospects for continuity look positive.	Yes The Great Lever NM team are also providing support to the Farnworth area now (a priority area), with Neighbourhood Element funding 2007–10.	Yes Yes
Tameside	Hattersley Neighbourhood Partnership	Tameside MBC (unitary)	NM likely to continue Tameside already provide £100k pa core funding, which is likely to continue, and a further £100k pa is being sought from other funders, with the expectation that a smaller NM team (4 FTE) will continue after 2008–09. Hattersley remains one of six priority deprived areas in Tameside.	Yes Two other priority areas (with populations of 11,000 and 14,000) have small NM teams on the Pathfinder model, funded by the Neighbourhood Element.	Yes Yes

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF? N/hd Element?
Chester	Blacon NM – Blacon Together	Cheshire County Council (two tier area)	NM future under discussion Plans to continue NM are under active discussion with the Blacon Community Trust and the Chester and District Housing Trust, including the possibility of a new asset-owning organisation.	Yes Neighbourhood Element funding has been allocated to Lache area (c.1,000 households) which is developing its own NM approach. The council's existing Area Committees are also adopting some aspects of the NM approach.	No Yes
Lancaster City	Poulton	Lancashire County Council (two tier area)	NM future under discussion Funding is in place until 2009–10 from a range of sources to continue the joint Poulton and West End Neighbourhood Task Force. The NM model has changed, now covering two areas with a joint team but is still led by the (former) Neighbourhood Manager for Poulton. Plans for a partnership focused on Poulton to continue after March 2009 are still under discussion, although the council is committed to NM across the borough more generally.	Yes NM has now been extended to the West End of Morecambe (5,200 pop), with a joint team now in place (Neighbourhood Task Force) with two joint project directors (one dealing with housing, one with community engagement) but also separate team members based in each area. Funding includes Neighbourhood Element and some from the council. The city council is considering rolling out NM to other deprived and rural areas in Lancaster, and the county council is supporting NM in other areas also.	No Yes
Stockton-on-Tees	Parkfield / Mill Lane NM	Stockton on Tees (unitary)	NM future under discussion, but positive Future funding is under discussion, although the partnership is well respected locally, and the team are hopeful of continuing, albeit at a smaller scale with less resources.	Yes An NM team has been established in Portrack/Tilery, another deprived neighbourhood, with Neighbourhood Element funding. The Pathfinder is providing advice. The LAA suggests that NM may be extended to other areas in the future.	Yes Yes

Local Authority	R1 Pathfinder	Local Area Agreement 2007	Prospects for NM continuity after 2008/9 (Year 7)	Rolling out of NM	NRF?	N/hd Element?
Derwent-side	Green Corridor Neighbourhood Partnership (Stanley)	Durham County Council (two tier area)	NM future under discussion Future funding is under discussion, and will depend on the county-wide approach agreed in the LAA. The LAA Board have been positive about NM in principle, but no commitments have yet been made post March 2009. The Pathfinder is also establishing a Community Interest Company to increase its possible options for the future.	Under discussion There are currently no plans to roll out NM in the district although the county LAA includes a commitment to 'integrated neighbourhood management' as a principle across the county, although details of implementation are yet to be agreed.	Yes	No
Easington	Coastal Area Partnership (Easington Colliery & Horden North)	Durham County Council (two tier area)	NM future under discussion, but positive Neighbourhood Manager promoted to N'hood Programmes Manager, with oversight of both existing NM team and new area in Peterlee, both of which will have Area Managers. Some team members are shared. Funding confirmed to March 2009, continuation after that still under discussion, complicated by the local government reform proposals for County Durham.	Yes NM has been extended to Peterlee (10,000) in Easington with a joint team with existing Pathfinder, and its own partnership. County LAA also includes broader commitment to NM.	Yes	Yes

ISBN 978-1-4098-0521-2

ISBN 978-1-4098-0521-2



9 781409 805212