Neighbourhood Partnership Working Group Report
August 2012

Introduction

In 2008 14 Neighbourhood Partnerships (NPs) were established in Bristol to enable local residents to be more involved in local decision making and to help coordinate local services. Bristol City Council states that 'Neighbourhood Partnerships bring public sector decision making to a local level where local residents can influence how they would like to see their neighbourhood improve. They meet regularly, and bring together: local councillors, neighbourhood police teams, community groups and local residents to shape services' ([1]).

The Neighbourhood Partnership (NP) working group was established following the voluntary and community sector (VCS) Neighbourhood and Communities (N&C) network meeting held on 30 November 2011 ([2]). At this meeting a number of issues were raised by local residents and VCS groups involved with their NP. Up until 2011 the Thriving Neighbourhoods Board (TNB) of the Bristol Partnership provided a forum for concerns and issues from NP to be discussed; after the disbanding of the TNB no city-wide forum existed. The concerns expressed at N&C meeting included membership of NP, how decisions were made, and how information about NPs was communicated to local people and groups. The working group was formed to carry out an evaluation of resident and VCS involvement with NPs with the intention of exploring these issues further.

Executive Summary

The working group concludes that Neighbourhood Partnerships have been a positive development. They have created opportunities for residents and voluntary and community groups to engage in local decision making. However, some aspects of Neighbourhood Partnerships do not work as effectively as they could and act as a barrier to NPs reaching and engaging more people.

Consistency across NP

NPs were set up initially so that there was a wide scope for each partnership to arrange its ways of working within the Bristol City Council NPs terms of reference (see appendix 2). This approach has resulted in diverse practices within the way NPs function. The working group concludes that whilst flexibility for different approaches is welcome, it is important that these different approaches are clear and transparent to all members of the NP and across NPs. At present many are not.

---

[1] http://bristolpartnership.org/neighbourhood-partnerships
[2] http://www.voscur.org/111130networkmeeting

Devolved funding

The ability for local people to influence decisions on devolved funding has largely been a positive outcome of NPs. The working group supports the principle of devolved funding and recommends further funds be devolved, particularly to expand the wellbeing grants. This report makes a number of recommendations related to how decisions are made about devolved funding, specifically related to the transparency of the process and the role of residents and VCS members of NPs in recommending decisions to councillors.

Meaningful Neighbourhood Partnerships

For many the NP is seen as little more than a formal quarterly meeting (8-10 hours per year) – scarcely something that everyone in a NP area can engage with. Being meeting-centric undervalues the potential benefits arising from join action between statutory, business and community organisations to resolve local issues between meetings. The successful development of this aspect of partnership working is crucial to the effectiveness of NPs.

Too often agenda items and reports at formal NP meetings are 'for information' or to be endorsed. This can consume large amounts of time and lead to NP being dominated by council-led agenda items rather than responding to genuine local need. This report makes a number of recommendations that may help improve NP meetings and increase local focus of NPs.

Communication

Communication is essential if NPs are to be well connected with the local community and informed about what the local issues are. Communication is also vital so that people see how NPs are making a difference so that more people are encouraged to get involved in their NP. The working group identified that communication methods varied considerably in different NPs, but that at best communication was generally patchy, with resources (finance and time) often stretched resulting in communication happening infrequently. This report makes a number of recommendations that may help improve communication from and to NPs.

Networking.

One strength of Neighbourhood Partnerships is their potential to use local community skills and resources to address local priorities by doing things differently. Many of the good ideas in one NP could be used by other NPs but at present there is no city-wide network for members of NPs to help one another, encourage the sharing of good ideas and solve any potential difficulties they may face.

Working group recommendations

The NP working group have identified five themes, each with one key recommendation and a number of other recommendations

Ensure good NPs in every part of Bristol

Key recommendation 1.
Develop a more generally shared understanding of what NPs are and what role local residents, community groups, councillors and statutory partners have in NPs. The NP terms of reference should be reviewed and revised. Each NP needs to be closely involved in this process.

Devolve funding decisions to local partnerships

Key recommendation 2.
Increase the wellbeing fund devolved to each NP, explore incorporating funding from other partners and possibly set up two funds - one fund for councillors to allocate and another fund that would be decided by the NP or its sub groups.

Develop genuine partnerships with local people at their centre

Key recommendation 3.
Local community members of the NP together with councillors should have more control over agreeing NP business. NP agendas with only council business on them are not partnership agendas. The process for setting the agenda for NP should be opened up to ensure that in each NP part of the agenda can be set by the local community. There are many different ways that this could be done, to allow this to happen it may be necessary for NP to choose which council agenda items they want at their NP meetings.

Improve communication so that local people are better informed about their NP

Key Recommendation 4.
NP communication should be led by someone other than the NP Area Coordinator, possibly a sub group or be devolved to local community groups already producing local communication. This would free up the time of NP Area Co-ordinators and community engagement workers to focus on more community development work.

Develop a strong city-wide network of NP supporting one another and sharing good ideas.

Key Recomendation 5.
Establish a city-wide group for NPs. This group could share good examples of their activities, consider city-wide and relevant strategic issues that affect NPs. This group could also oversee improved communication and links between the 14 NPs (for example by organising joint meetings on relevant issues, supporting the twinning of NPs and establishing informal networks between members of the NPs).

There are 29 recommendations in total; these can be found on pages 13 to 19.

Membership of and involvement with the working group

The group sought to involve voluntary and community members and/or equalities representatives from each of the 14 Neighbourhoods Partnerships. Members from eight NPs regularly attended all working group meetings (3), members from two additional NPs attended some meetings (4), no members from four NPs attended any of the working group meetings (5).

The working group met 7 times between March and July 2012. The working group agreed that its purpose would be to seek to evaluate the following areas of the Neighbourhood Partnerships from the perspective of voluntary and community members (including residents);

- Cost effectiveness and the devolution of funding.
- Membership, accountability, representation and diversity within NPs.
- Communication, community involvement and development within NPs.
- Structure, geography and definition for NPs.

To ensure that the views were gathered from a wide range of residents and VCS members of NPs and not only those involved with the working group a survey was carried out. The survey was carried out between 14 May and Monday 9 July 2012 (the initial closing date of 18 June was extended). The questions in the survey were developed by the working group of voluntary and community sector members of Bristol's Neighbourhood Partnerships. The survey was available to complete online or by paper copy. A copy of the survey can be found in Apendix 1. The survey findings are included in this report.

---

[3] Avonmouth and Kingsweston NP, Bishopston, Redland and Cotham NP, Brislington Community Partnership, Cabot, Clifton and Clifton East NP, Filwood, Knowle and Windmill Hill NP, Greater Bedminster Community Partnership, Greater Fishponds, , Horfield and Lockleaze NP.
[4] St George NP, Dundry View NP
[5] Henbury and Southmead NP, Hengrove and Stockwood NP, Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury on Trym NP, Ashley, Easton and Lawrence Hill NP

Who completed the NP working group survey?

The survey was circulated by the Neighbourhood Partnership Area Coordinators to residents, voluntary and community groups involved with their Neighbourhood Partnerships. 101 surveys were completed. The working group recognises the limitations of the survey in that it concentrated on formal procedures such as meetings rather than partnership working more generally. However, the survey responses provide some useful additional information.

The responses were collated and weighted to ensure the results were not biased to any one particular partnership. Those who completed the survey were invited to complete equalities monitoring information to help us assess whether the survey results reflected a diverse group. The following summary of who completed the survey is based on this information.

49% male 43% female 8% preferred not to answer

9% participants who completed the equalities monitoring section stated that there ethnic background was other than white British. 2% preferred not to answer

9% participants who completed the equalities monitoring section stated that they were disabled. 8% preferred not to answer.

Age of participants who completed the equalities monitoring section.

Under 18:	0%	19-25:	0%
26-39:	10%	40-50:	17%
51-64:	35%	65 or over:	30%
Prefer not to answer:	8%		

What the survey revealed?

Respondents to the survey told us which meetings they attended, their views on the work of their NP, views on importance of devolved budgets and NP communication. The survey also asked participants to give thier views on whether they were clear of their role in their NP. The survey responses provided additional information for the working group members to consider and helped to inform their discussions and recommendations.

Attendance and participation at NPs

Respondents were asked which meetings they attended and how often, the responses were as follows;

>   Neighbourhood Forum meetings
>   41 attend four or more meetings a year
>   32 attend two - three meetings a year
>   9 attend one meeting or less a year
>   7 do not attend
>
>   Neighbourhood Partnership meetings
>   46 attend four or more meetings a year
>   26 attend two - three meetings a year
>   9 attend one meeting or less a year
>   8 do not attend
>
>   Other meetings organised by my Neighbourhood Partnership
>   31 attend four or more meetings a year
>   18 attend two - three meetings a year
>   14 attend one meeting or less a year
>   14 do not attend

Most of those who completed the survey stated that they were involved with their NP as a member on their NP steering group (30), as a resident in their NP (49) or as a community group representative on their NP (49).

No one under the age of 25 completed the survey and only 10% of those who completed the survey ticked the 26-39 years of age catergory. This suggests that Neighbourhood Partnerships are not engaging many younger participants.

Devolved decision making

Of those who responded to the NP working group survey there was overall strong support for devolving local decision making to Neighbourhood Partnerships. However, there were many comments about the things that have been devolved to NP, for example;

>   *I think that the devolved decision making items that the council has*
>   *selected is a bit limited and are probably not all issues that local people*

want to get involved with. It would be good if there was a wider range of devolved decision making items that NP could choose to, or not to get involved with. (survey participant)

Respondents were asked to state whether they thought it was important that decisions about each of the devolved budgets were made by and at their NP. Those surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with the statement for the devolved decision making as follows:

Highway maintenance budget (highways and pavements)

Strongly agreed (29%) / agreed (27%)	56%
Disagreed (19%) / strongly disagreed (21%)	40%
Don't know	4%

Minor traffic works budgets

Strongly agreed (37%) / agreed (43%)	80%
Disagreed (15%) / strongly disagreed (3%)	18%
Don't know	2%

Wellbeing small grants funding

Strongly agreed (63%) / agreed (27%)	90%
Disagreed (8.5%) / strongly disagreed (1%)	9.5%
Don't know	0.5%

Clean and Green budget

Strongly agreed (42%) / agreed (41%)	83%
Disagreed (14%) / strongly disagreed (1%)	15%
Don't know	2%

54% of respondents stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that their Neighbourhood Partnership has influenced decisions* made by Bristol City Council (BCC) other than decisions on the devolved budgets (* For example: on other local issues such as planning applications, or decisions about local education).

The role of NP members and the function of the NP

Most respondents strongly agreed or agreed (87%) that they fully understood their role in the NP; however this was not evenly spread across all the NPs. Those involved with some NPs were less clear than others. 71% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they had been well supported to undertake their role in the Neighbourhood Partnership. Not all respondents

knew about how to get items on the agenda at NP meetings or how to make formal statements to meetings. 87% of respondents stated they knew how to submit items onto the agenda of NP meetings, however only 79% of respondents knew when to submit an agenda item. 76% of respondents said they understood how their NP helped to resolve issues raised at Neighbourhood Forums, however there were several comments about the Neighbourhood Forums, the items discussed and how issues are raised, addressed or prioritised, for example;

> *Forums should be the starting point for discussion so local issues can arise - they are instead seen as a place to get council policy rubber-stamped and for politicians to grandstand. (survey participant)*

> *I believe the forums are not working for local people and residents. The reps do not go out and speak with the community as a whole. They tend to take this job on and are not actively engaged with local residents discussing what really matters to them. (survey participant)*

> *Only those committed already to community groups come to meetings. (survey participant)*

> *The one Forum meeting I attended and the lack of any follow-up was very disappointing. The distinction betwen Forum and Partnership is unclear. (survey participant)*

When asked about sub groups in their NP not all respondents were clear about how NP sub groups were formed or what their role/functions were. 73% of respondents said they understood the remit of NP sub-groups. However only 42.5% of respondents said that they understood how the membership of NP sub-groups were agreed.

Engaging local people in NPs

Those who responded agreed (68%) or strongly agreed (13%) that their Neighbourhood Partnership engaged existing local neighbourhood and community groups. However when asked whether there were any particular groups or sections of their neighbourhood who were not involved with their Neighbourhood Partnership, 49% said yes and 27% were not sure. Participants identified these particular groups as not engaed with their NP:

- Students.
- People who are working (I.e. those who are not retired).
- Young people.
- Parents with young children.
- Faith groups.
- Business people.

> *When I go to local meetings its always the same people who get involved many retired people who can afford the time. vast majority of people in area wouldn't know what np is or what its supposed to be doing. (survey participant)*

There are large sections of the local community who are not engaged in the NP. The purpose of the NP is not clear & appears to be made up of a clique of people who already know each other and have agendas to bang on about. (survey participant)

NP Communication

The survey responses highlighted that poor NP communication was a major concern for many, both communication from NPs to their local community and communication between the 14 NPs. Respondents were asked whether they felt their local community receives regular communication and news from their Neighbourhood Partnership.

Strongly agreed (11%) / agreed (27%)	38%
Disagreed (27%) / strongly disagreed (31%)	58%
Don't know	4%

Respondents were asked whether they felt their Neighbourhood Partnership communicates and shares good ideas with other Neighbourhood Partnerships.

Strongly agreed (3%) / agreed (15%)	18%
Disagreed (22%) / strongly disagreed (11%)	33%
Don't know	49%

I know through cut backs that some departments are fully stretched but it would be nice if there is response to emails , even if the department cannot act for the moment. I E People raise important issues which I pass on, but no reply received (survey participant)

[I would like NPs to have] Regular meetings or engagement with Director of Neighbourhoods and Council Executive Members. We rarely or never see them or have the opportunity to meet with them. (survey participant)

Better publicity is urgently needed in order for these forum and partnerships to be representative and fair. (survey participant)

Communications are poor. Minutes could be emailed or put on web site. (survey participant)

I feel this [NP] is a valuable exercise, but is not widely known enough. membership confined to local activists or people already committed to other local issues. Need to reach others.Bit cliquy...could put people off (survey participant)

NP communication budgets need to be increased to enable NPs to effectively communicate with those in the NP area. (survey participant)

Working group findings

The working group concludes that Neighbourhood Partnerships have been a positive development. They have created opportunities for residents and voluntary and community groups to engage in local decision making. However, some aspects of Neighbourhood Partnerships do not work as effectively as they could and act as a barrier to NPs reaching and engaging more people.

Consistency in NPs

NPs were set up initially so that there was a wide scope for each partnership to arrange its ways of working within the Bristol City Council NP terms of reference (see appendix 2). This approach has resulted in diverse practices within the way NPs function. The working group believes that whilst different practices in different NPs are acceptable, each NP should ensure that its approach is clear and transparent.

Devolved funding

The ability for local people to influence decisions on devolved funding has largely been a positive outcome of NPs. The working group supports the principle of devolved funding and recomend further funds be devolved, particularly to expand the wellbeing grants. This report makes a number of recommendations related to how decisions are made about devolved funding, specifically related to the transparency of the process and the role of residents and VCS members of NPs in recommending decisions to councillors.

Meaningful Neighbourhood Partnerships

Too often agenda items and reports to NPs are 'for information' or to be endorsed. Additionally, agenda items and report presentation is often over complicated and generally off-putting, although they have improved over time. This can consume large amounts of time and lead to NPs being dominated by council-led agenda items rather than responding to genuine local need. This report makes a number of recommendations that may help improve NP meetings and increase local focus of NPs.

Communication

Communication is essential if NPs are to be well connected with the local community and informed about what the local issues are. The working group recognised that a major barrier to successful communication is the sheer size of NPs, they are equivalent to small towns. Communication is also vital so that people see how NPs are making a difference so that more people are encouraged to get involved in their NPs. The working group identified that communication methods varied considerably in different NPs, but that at best communication was generally patchy, with resources (finance, time and over reliance on particular individuals) often stretched resulting in communication

happening infrequently. This report makes a number of recommendations that may help improve communication from and to NPs.

Networking.

A very significant strength of Neighbourhood Partnerships is their potential to use local community skills and resources to address local priorities by doing things differently rather than replicating processes which may be appropriate in the Council but do not work elsewhere. Many of the good ideas in one NP could be used by other NP but at present there is no city-wide network for members of NPs to help one another, encourage the sharing of good ideas and solve any potential difficulties they may face.

Recommendations

The working group members have identified a number of recommendations that they believe, if implemented, will help to strengthen and improve Neighbourhood Partnerships. The recommendations have been developed through facilitated group discussions, research into existing practice gathered from the NPs and information identified in the survey.

Many of the ideas and recommendations in this report are already being practised in one or more NP. The working group believe that defining best practice that could be adopted by NPs will create stronger partnerships, greater transparency in decision making and more consistentcy in NP activity across the city.

In addition to the five main recommendations in the report there are 24 additional recommendations. All the recommendations are set out on the following pages under the following five themes;

Ensure good NPs in every part of Bristol

Devolve funding decisions to local partnerships

Develop genuine partnerships with local people at their centre

Improve communication so that local people are better informed about their NPs

Develop a strong city-wide network of NPs supporting one another and sharing good ideas.

Ensure good NPs in every part of Bristol

1. Develop one shared understanding of what NPs are and what role local residents, community groups, councillors and statutory partners have in NPs. The NP terms of reference should be reviewed and revised. Each NP needs to be closely involved in this process.

1.1 Develop and agree one common definition of Neighbourhood Partnerships (as NP currently means or is interpreted to mean different things in different areas). Produce one NP glossary to clarify the definitions and terms for NPs and the different roles (for example the role of the NP Area Coordinator) and include greater recognition of the wider activity of NPs (for example informal networking and wider community activity).

1.2 Ensure that all reports to Neighbourhood Partnerships requiring a decision include more than one option or officer recommendation to ensure that NPs have genuine choice. There should be clarity and transparency showing what criteria has been used to produce report recommendations. Offer officers guidance on how to produce reports with this information.

1.3 Provide to NP officers (board and/or steering group members) guidance, support and or training to help them establish sub-groups and/or identify or affiliate existing community groups that can feed into how decisions are made about devolved budgets, services and city-wide service level agreements.

1.4 Ensure all NPs produce a short and clear definition of what membership of its partnership means (for example, does it mean just members of a steering group or does it mean a wider membership and who can vote and what they can vote on). Ensure a members' role outline is published by each NP. The selection process and membership could be/mean different things in different NPs, but whatever these are it should be clearly stated. Each NP should establish and make clear to the public their selection process for the residents, community group or other members of their NP.

1.5 Review the membership of the NPs to consider how General Practitioners (GPs) and other health workers could/should be engaged in the work of NPs.

1.6 Maintain the current NP geographical areas (i.e. a maximum of 3 wards), these should not be merged or made any larger. However, closer working between NP area coordinators, local authority and other officers should be reviewed to ensure this provides effective but efficient support to NPs.

1.7 Ensure that a planned review of NPs geographical boundaries take place when council ward boundaries are reviewed. Any future NP review should consider and ensure 'natural neighbourhood' boundaries or smaller areas (for example smaller than ward size areas such as super output areas) informs any changes to the NP boundaries.

1.8 The Bristol Partnership and/or a council select committee should review the democratic accountability of the NPs and consider whether they should ultimately become independent of, but serviced and (partly) funded by the council.

Devolve funding decisions to local partnerships

2. Increase the wellbeing fund devolved to each NP, explore incorporating funding from other partners and possibly set up two funds - one fund for councillors to allocate and another fund that would be decided by the NP or its sub groups.

2.1 All NPs should establish a transparent process for local people/groups to be able to submit ideas, bids or applications on how NP funding should be spent. Ensure that the process for how decisions are made about how funding is allocated is transparent. Ensure the process for allocating NP funding supports joint or cross NP funding bids.

2.2 Review and reconsider the Bristol City Council policy that allows only the Neighbourhood Committee consisting of elected councillors to make decisions on devolved council budgets in public and consider how some decisions could be delegated to the NPs and/or NP sub-groups.

2.3 Ensure there is at least one consistent communication method to publicise applications for Wellbeing funds (this should be in addition to local communication, for example this could be a funding page of the city-wide NP website or the council website or through existing communication about funding such as the Quartet website or the Voscur e-bulletin).

Develop genuine partnerships with local people at their centre

3. Local community members of the NP together with councillors should have more control over agreeing NP business. NP agendas with only council business on them are not partnership agendas. The process for setting the agenda for NP should be opened up to ensure that in each NP part of the agenda can be set by the local community. There are many different ways that this could be done, to allow this to happen it would probably be necessary for NPs to choose which council agenda items they want at their NP meetings.

3.1 Ensure that sub groups established to make recommendations on NP devolved budgets have a good balance of residents/community group membership so that councillors and officer are not over represented.

3.2 Develop an induction process for members of NPs* that is offered before NP members attend any meetings. This could be done in individual NPs by Area Co-ordinators or Development workers of could be part of a citywide induction session for any new NP members.
*Member needs clarification – see recommendation 1.4

3.3 Ensure each NP monitors membership of their partnership and set out annually how they propose to engage under represented groups with their NP. Increase membership and community involvement activity in the NP and ensure that this includes a more diverse range of activity, much of which could be delivered by different NP partners (both statutory and voluntary/community partners).

3.4 Provide dedicated community development support to help establish and support new groups, targeted in NP areas where there are low levels of community activity, and/or imbalance in community representation on the NP. Provide additional support to engage younger people in the NPs. Ensure each NP annual report sets out how the community has been engeged with the NP including groups that have been engaged and those who do not attend formal meetings.

3.5 Each NP Area Co-ordinators and/or community engagement workers should be based in the communities they cover for at least part of their working time. Identify local host organisations (for example community centres or schools) that could be used by co-ordinators/workers as a local base. Consider whether Area-Coordinators could be employed directly by or seconded to local community organisations.

3.6 Improve networking and joint working between statutory workers in NP areas to ensure that they identify and address local priorities that feeds into the NP. For example this might be done through improved communication, creating more formal links between different statutory workers, good practice might be to develop a more clearly defined, cross sector 'neighbourhood team'.

3.7 Provide guidance and support to ensure that statutory sector partners and councillors help community groups that straddle more than one NP. For example better coordination so that groups are not expected to engage in multiple NPs. The introduction of a lead link (either a NP Area Coordinators or public sector officer) would improve communication. Ensure that Joint NP sub-groups are supported by coordinators/officers and encouraged where an issue is relevant to more than one NP.

3.8 Invite local community groups to organise NP meetings, for example at least one NP meeting each year to be hosted by one or jointly by several existing community organisations. These events or meeting could be part of or organised alongside existing events such as a school or church event or a community festival or fair rather than a stand-alone NP meeting.

Improve communication so that local people are better informed about their NP

4. NP communication should be led by someone other than the NP Area Coordinator, possibly a sub group or be devolved to local community groups already producing local communication. This would free up the time of NP Area Coordinators and community engagement workers to focus on more community development work.

4.1 Ensure that each NP provides an agreed minimum level and frequency of communication (to be be determined by each NP)

4.2 Allow NPs to set up and manage their own websites and not be required to have a BCC hosted/managed NP website.

4.3 Encourage each NP to establish a clear name (that may be other than the ward names) and logo/brand and ensure that all the NP publicity includes the NP name, logo/brand to help raise awareness of the work of the NP.

4.4 Complete an audit of existing BCC and other statutory partners' existing communication channels (for example communication to benefit recipients, council tenants, council tax payers, recipients of health and social care services and parents through school book bags). Ensure that NPs can use statutory partners' communication to promote NP activity.

Develop a strong city-wide network of NPs supporting one another and sharing good ideas.

5. Establish a city-wide group for NPs. This group could share good examples of their activities, consider city-wide and relevant strategic issues that affect NPs. This group could also oversee improved communication and links between the 14 NPs (for example by organising joint meetings on relevant issues, supporting the twinning of NP and establishing informal networks between members of the NPs).

5.1 Launch an ongoing programme (perhaps coordinated city-wide) to promote and encourage people to get involved with their NP. This is a significant task, over and above the work of the NP Area Coordinators and current development worker resources.

5.2 Establish a way to measure wider public perceptions of the effectiveness of NPs using the Quality of Life (QofL) survey, add additional NP specific QofL survey question/s.

5.3 Hold an annual recognition of the contribution NPs make to Bristol. Consider re-launching the Pride of Place awards or organising a new celebration.

Appendix

Appendix 1: NP working group survey

Appendix 2: NP Terms of Reference

Appendix 1: NP working group survey

Neighbourhood Partnership survey

Introduction
The voluntary and community sector (VCS) Voice and Influence service is facilitating a Neighbourhood Partnership working group to evaluate resident, community group and equality rep involvement in Neighbourhood Partnerships (NP).

The working group, supported by Voscur, has prepared this survey to gather as many views as possible from residents, community groups and equalities reps involved with NP.

Thank you in advance for completing the survey. The survey results will help inform the working groups work and report on voluntary and community involvement in Neighbourhood Partnerships. The final report will be shared with Bristol City Council and with all NP.

Please answer as many of the questions as you can from your experience and perspective of your NP, there are no right or wrong answers.

We will treat all responses we receive anonymously.

The survey will take about 10 minutes to complete.
Please complete the survey by **Monday 18 June, 2012**.
The survey can be completed online at:
http://www.survey.bris.ac.uk/voscur/NPurvey

or please complete this hard copy and return to Matthew Symonds at Voscur, Royal Oak House, Bristol, BS1 4GB.

Section 1

Q1. What best describes your involvement with your Neighbourhood Partnership? (Tick all that apply)

I am involved as a member on my NP steering group.
I am involved as a resident in my NP
I am involved as a community group representative in my NP
I am involved as a local business representative in my NP
I am involved as an equalities representative in my NP
I am involved in my NP in some other way (please specify)

Q2. Please tell us which meetings you have attended

Type of meeting	I do not attend these.	One meeting or less a year	Two – three meetings a year	Four or more meetings a year
a) Neighbourhood Forum meetings				
b) Neighbourhood Partnership meetings				
c) Other meetings organised by my NP, for example: sub groups such as Pride of Place or transport meetings)				

Q3. Devolved decision making

The council has devolved decision making on some budgets to Neighbourhood Partnerships. For each of the devolved budgets please indicate which answer best matches your response to this statement:

'I think it is important that decisions about this devolved budget are made at and by the Neighbourhood Partnership'.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
a) Highway maintenance budget (highways and pavements)					
b) Minor traffic works budgets					
c) Wellbeing small grants funding					
d) Clean and Green budget					
e) Section 106 funding (for example parks and green space)					

Q4. Influencing council decisions.

Please indicate how you feel about the following statement:

'My Neighbourhood Partnership has influenced decisions* made by Bristol City Council (BCC) other than decisions on devolved budgets'.

* For example: on other local issues such as planning applications, or decisions about local education.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know

Q5. Involving local people, voluntary and community groups in Neighbourhood Partnerships.

Please indicate how you feel about the following statement:

'My Neighbourhood Partnership engages existing local neighbourhood and community groups in our partnership'.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know

Q6. Your role in the Neighbourhood Partnership.

Please indicate how you feel about the following statement:

'I feel fully clear about my role in the Neighbourhood Partnership'.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know

Q7. Support for your Neighbourhood Partnership.

Please indicate how you feel about the following statement:

'I feel that I have been well supported to undertake my role in the neighbourhood partnership'.

Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know

Q8. Additional support for you.

Is there anything else that would help you undertake your role in your Neighbourhood Partnership?

No
Yes (please specify)
Don't know

Q9. Please indicate how well you understand the following matters of organisation/procedure within your NP.

Questions	Yes	No	Not sure
A) I know <u>how</u> to submit an item for the agenda at NP meetings.			
B) I know <u>when</u> to submit an item for the agenda at NP meetings.			
C) I understand how the NP help to resolve issues raised at Neighbourhood Forums			
D) I understand the purpose of making a formal statement* at my NP meeting.			
E) I understand the remit of NP sub-groups.			
F) I understand how the membership of NP sub-groups are agreed			

*Formal statements are written statements that must be submitted in writing by 12 noon on the last working days before a NP meeting. These are then circulated to everyone attending the NP meeting.

Q10. Do you think that there are any particular groups or sections of your neighbourhood who are not involved with your Neighbourhood Partnership?

No
Yes (please specify)
Not sure

Q11. Communication between Neighbourhood Partnerships

Please indicate how you feel about the following statements.

'The local community receives regular communication and news from our Neighbourhood Partnership'.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure

Q12. Communication between Neighbourhood Partnerships

Please indicate how you feel about the following statements.

'My Neighbourhood Partnership communicates and shares good ideas with other Neighbourhood Partnerships'.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure

Q 13. Any other comments

Do you have any other comments you would like to make about your involvement with Neighbourhood Partnerships?

Section 2, Your Neighbourhood Partnership(s)

Q14.Which Neighbourhood Partnership(s) are you involved with?
(please tick all that apply)

	NP1: Avonmouth & Kingsweston
	NP2: Henbury & Southmead
	NP3: Henleaze, Stoke Bishop, Westbury-on-Trym
	NP4: Horfield & Lockleaze
	NP5: Greater Fishponds Area Neighbourhood Partnership
	NP6: Bishopston Cotham & Redland
	NP7: Cabot Clifton & Clifton East
	NP8: Ashley Easton & Lawrence Hill
	NP9: St George Neighbourhood Partnership
	NP10: Greater Bedminster Community Partnership
	NP11: Filwood Knowle & Windmill Hill
	NP12: Brislington Community Partnership
	NP13: Dundry View Neighbourhood Partnership
	NP14: Hengrove & Stockwood
	Don't know

Please give the first part of your postcode (for example BS1)

Section 3, Equalities monitoring questions

These questions are to help tell us who has and who has not completed the survey.

Please be assured that this information is held anonymously and cannot be traced to you individually.

You can choose to answer all, some or none of these questions.

Race and Ethnicity
Choose one section from A – E then tick the appropriate box to indicate your cultural background

A) Asian or Asian British	B) Black or Black British	C) Chinese or other Ethnic Group	D) Dual Heritage	E) White
Indian	Caribbean	Chinese	White and Black Caribbean	British
Pakistani	African		White and Black African	Irish
Bangladeshi	Somali		White and Asian	Eastern European
				Gypsy
				Roma
				Irish or Scottish Traveller
Any other Asian background Please state	Any other Black background Please state ………………..	Any other ethnic group Please state ....………	Any other mixed background Please state	Any other White background Please state ....
Prefer not to answer				

Gender (Please tick):
Female
Male
Prefer not to answer

Trans (Please tick):
Yes   No   Prefer not to answer

Age (please tick):
Under 18   40 – 50
19 – 25   51 – 64
26 – 39   65 or over   Prefer not to answer

Sexual Orientation (please tick):
Bisexual   Lesbian or Gay
Heterosexual   Prefer not to answer

Disability (please tick)
Do you consider yourself disabled?
Yes   No   Prefer not to answer

The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) defines a disabled person as
someone who has a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and
long-term adverse effect on his or her ability to carry out normal day-to-day
activities.

Faith: How would you describe your Religion and/or Belief? (Please tick):
Buddhist
Muslim
Christian
Sikh
Hindu
None
Jewish
Don't know / not sure
Other faith, religion or belief (please state) …………………………………..
Prefer not to answer

Thank you

Thank you for completing this survey. If you have any questions please
contact Matthew Symonds at Voscur on 0117 909 9949 or email:
matthew@voscur.org

Appendix 2: NP Model Terms of Reference

Neighbourhood Partnerships in Bristol

Terms of Reference

Introduction:

The 14 Neighbourhood Partnerships in Bristol are each unique, having developed in response to local needs, in different ways and at different rates. The distinctiveness of Neighbourhood Partnerships is acknowledged and this document seeks to provide a stronger foundation for this distinctiveness to grow and develop.

However, there is a general view that some consistency is needed so that Neighbourhood Partnerships can step up to their expanding role, as a Neighbourhood approach in Bristol is strengthened significantly. However this is not an attempt to standardise, but a framework which sets a "floor" and a "core" which all can recognise.

Throughout, maximum discretion and flexibility is built in, so that each NP can make its own decisions to suit the local realities of its own neighbourhood.

1. Name

a. The name of the Neighbourhood Partnership shall be ………….and it will cover the wards of……………;

1.

known as "the Neighbourhood".

2. Purpose

The …………. Neighbourhood Partnership (hereafter "the Partnership") aims to improve the quality of life for residents in the neighbourhood so that satisfaction levels increase, and also increase civic pride, community cohesion and community involvement by:

- Developing local solutions to local problems wherever possible
- Encouraging public, private and community and voluntary organisations to work together to deliver improvements to residents' quality of life.
- Tackling deprivation and discrimination in the neighbourhood, and promoting equality of opportunity for all those living or working there.
- Considering proposed decisions of the Neighbourhood Committee and influencing such so as to use resources to best meet the needs of the neighbourhood.
- Receiving reports from service delivery bodies and influencing service priorities within the neighbourhood in accordance with identified needs

and priorities
- Actively engaging with local people across the neighbourhood, seeking their views and active participation in improving their quality of life. This includes seeking the views and participation of residents that are hard to reach.
- Co-ordinating community engagement, approving an annual multi-agency community engagement plan for the Neighbourhood, accompanied by a local communication strategy to raise awareness of engagement opportunities as widely as possible, in accordance with the Bristol Community Engagement framework.
- Considering regularly the results of community engagement activities, ensuring that wherever possible action is taken in response to the issues raised
- Supporting and promoting locally the aims of the Bristol Partnership as set out in the Bristol 20:20 Plan.

We Value:

- Civic pride, protecting our public realm and making it better
- Respect and Compassion
- Aspiration, energy, enthusiasm and creativity
- Personal responsibility and accountability
- Community development / involvement and 'grass-roots' action

3. Membership of the Neighbourhood Partnership

Set out below are the requirements for all Neighbourhood Partnerships, which many already have in place. It is important to try to ensure that each locality within the neighbourhood has a voice, hence the requirement to have two resident representatives per ward.

a. Bristol has 14 Neighbourhood Partnerships , each covering two or three wards. Accordingly, it is proposed that the membership composition and numbers will vary according to the size of the neighbourhood:

Neighbourhood Partnership (NP)	2 Ward	3 Ward
(i) All ward councillors	*4*	*6*
(ii) Equalities Forum representative	1	1
(iii)Young Persons representative	1	1
(iv)2 Representatives from each ward *(may be from Residents or local voluntary group)*	4	6
(**v) Other members as decided by the NP** (*eg vol sector, business, arts, environment etc*) *NB This gives every NP full flexibility to include members to suit local needs and preferences*	**NP decides**	**NP decides**

b. All Members of the NP, except elected councillors, will be expected to live or work in the neighbourhood concerned.

c. The size and composition of the Neighbourhood Partnership should be decided and recorded at the Annual Meeting. The size of the Partnership is for local decision, but for practical reasons, it is recommended to number approximately 20 in total, excluding officers of statutory bodies.

d. The Partnership may co-opt up to two non-voting members during the year to provide specialist expertise from the time of the appointment to the next Annual meeting.

e. The quorum for meetings of the Neighbourhood Partnership will be one half of voting members, to include at least two ward councillors and two other members.

f. Observers are always welcome at Neighbourhood Partnership meetings, which are public partnerships, of course subject to the capacity of the venue.

4. Officers of Statutory Bodies

- The following officers are expected to attend all meetings of the Neighbourhood Partnership in a non voting capacity to provide support and assistance as required:
  - o Bristol City Council Area Coordinator (or their representative)
  - o The Neighbourhood Police Inspector (or their representative)
  - o NHS Bristol
  - o Avon and Somerset Fire and Rescue
  - o A representative of the most relevant Children and Young People's Partnership (CYPP)
- Officers of other bodies (eg Environment Agency, Registered Social Landlords) may choose to attend Neighbourhood Partnership meetings if aspects of the agenda are relevant to them, or if invited by the Neighbourhood Partnership.

5. Neighbourhood Committees

Neighbourhood Committees are committees of Bristol City Council. They comprise the councillors elected to serve the wards within the Neighbourhood. Neighbourhood Committee meetings will normally take place jointly with meetings of the Neighbourhood Partnership. All Neighbourhood Committee members will also be members of the Neighbourhood Partnership.
Neighbourhood Committees have delegated power to take a range of council decisions relating to their respective Neighbourhoods (eg. expenditure of certain council budgets). Neighbourhood Partnerships may consider matters that are to be decided by its Neighbourhood Committee and may seek to influence the Neighbourhood Committee as to how it

exercises its powers. The Neighbourhood Committee must take into account any relevant views of the Neighbourhood Partnership, but the final decision is taken by the councillors in the Neighbourhood Committee.

6. Working arrangements

a) The Neighbourhood Partnership will meet in public at least four times per year, but may of course choose to meet more frequently. *(see guidance note 2)*

b) One of these meetings will include an Annual Meeting, for which the quorum shall be at least 50% of voting members.

c) The Partnership will elect a Chair and Vice Chair from its membership at the Annual meeting, by simple majority of those present and eligible to vote. (In the event of a tie, each shall take each office for 6 months.)

d) The Partnership may elect other officers as it decides are required (eg treasurer, secretary etc.)

e) The Partnership may establish sub groups, task groups etc as required and not limited to Neighbourhood Partnership members only.

f) Minutes of the meetings will be taken by Bristol City Council officers and made public (on the website of both the Council and Bristol Partnership) within one month of the Partnership meeting.

g) An agenda showing time and place of the meeting will be published (as above) at least two weeks prior to the Partnership meeting.

h) All meetings will be open to the public, unless there is a specific reason (such as data protection) and formal vote to allow closed session. This should be avoided wherever possible.

7. Complaints

Anyone wishing to make a complaint about the NP may put their concerns in writing to Bristol City Council, Democratic Services Section, Room 220, Council House, College Green, Bristol BS1 5TR or by email to democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk).

Complaints about councillors or any person employed by a statutory agency should be submitted in the usual way to the council or the relevant agency.

The Chief Executive of Bristol City Council, or her representative, may access any records held by a Neighbourhood Partnership on receipt by the Chair/ Vice Chair of a written request setting out why such a request is made. Such documents will be made available within a reasonable period, and not longer than 14 days.

Neighbourhood Partnership Terms of Reference - Guidance notes

1. Name: The Neighbourhood Partnership name will be decided by the Neighbourhood Partnership at its annual meeting

2. Frequency of meetings: Based on current practice, up to 6 meetings per year can be supported by the Council, in terms of room rental and

note-taking, although it is expected that most will opt for 4 per year. This will be reviewed at the end of the year.

Neighbourhood Partnership membership

3. Resident representatives from wards: It is recommended that such representatives are agreed where possible by the relevant Neighbourhood Forum prior to the Partnership AGM. It is hoped that such representatives may be from local residents or community organisations, but they may be individual Neighbourhood Forum nominees.

4. Each Neighbourhood Partnership should decide at its annual meeting the number and composition of other members not set out within the framework Terms of Reference. The following are given as examples, being already in place in some NPs:-

   - *Voluntary or community sector*
   - *Local businesses*
   - *Environmental groups*
   - *More resident representatives than specified*

5. Some Neighbourhood Partnerships keep a simple register of all voluntary, community and faith organisations and local businesses that become members of the Partnership (providing they agree to support it's aims and values). This assists communication and also enables an election process if needed to select NP representatives. Membership will be free.

6. These registered voluntary, community and faith organisations and local businesses are invited to nominate representatives to the Neighbourhood Partnership, in accordance with the categories decided by the Partnership usually at the annual meeting *(for example: 2 voluntary sector representatives and I business representative).* An election will be held if the numbers of nominees exceeds places available. In the interests of securing the broadest possible input, community organisations should be discouraged from "upping" their representation by seeking nomination in more than one section – ie as a resident representative and as a voluntary sector

7. The Bristol Equalities Forum will nominate a representative from the Neighbourhood who will seek to make a contribution for all equalities groups. Support will be provided.

8. Neighbourhood Partnerships may also wish to consider co-options in order to make the partnership more balanced eg by gender, age, ethnicity, geography.

9. The officers (Chair, Vice-Chair etc) can be elected from any member of the Neighbourhood Partnership. This may result in a different Neighbourhood Committee Chair (who must be a ward councillor by law) and Neighbourhood Partnership Chair sitting on the same Neighbourhood Partnership. Partnerships may wish to consider making them the Chair and Vice Chair of the NP, although this is not prescribed.

10. Theme groups may be convened by the Neighbourhood Partnership and will be expected to report to the Neighbourhood Partnership and, if directed, to the Neighbourhood Forums. All theme group recommendations must be agreed by the Neighbourhood Partnership before they are actioned, unless they are explicitly empowered to act by the Neighbourhood Partnership.

Note on Community engagement, Neighbourhood Forums

The Council and the Police agreed in 2010 to merge their community engagement mechanisms (Neighbourhood Forums/ PACTs). This is on the basis that

1. Neighbourhood Forums will be held at ward level, four times per year.
2. The Police will provide administrative support and provide a note taking service.
3. The Neighbourhood Partnership may decide that other formats are more effective for enabling resident engagement than a standard meeting format. Whilst it will need to ensure that agreed elements, such as progress updates from previous, or consultation activities are retained, the emphasis should be on providing opportunities that provide the greatest level of engagement. (*For example, neighbourhood walkabouts with agencies in attendance, marketplace drop- in sessions, or meetings led by young people, may from time to time be deemed more appropriate formats.*)
4. Twice a year, the Partnership will receive a report highlighting the issues raised during community engagement activities in the Neighbourhood.

The Partnership has lead responsibility for the quality of community engagement in its neighbourhood, and is advised to regularly consider how it may improve further.

For further information on this report contact:

Matthew Symonds
Manager – participation
Voscur
Royal Oak House
Royal oak Avenue
Bristol
BS1 4GB

matthew@voscur.org

(0117) 909 9949