



Metropolitan Police Authority

Agenda Item **4**

Co-ordination and Policing Committee 6th March 2008

BOROUGH COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FUNDING 2008/09

Report by the Chief Executive

Summary

This report outlines the progress being made to transform community police engagement arrangements at the borough level, and sets out the proposed community engagement funding allocations to the borough based community engagement groups for 2008/09

A. RECOMMENDATIONS

That members

- 1. Note the progress being made in developing community engagement arrangements for the borough based community and police engagement groups (CEGs).**
- 2. Agree the bids for the following groups: Brent, Bromley, Camden, Ealing, Croydon, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Harrow, Havering, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Kensington & Chelsea, Kingston, Lewisham, Richmond, Southwark and Waltham Forest as set out in Appendix 1**
- 3. Agree conditional funding (subject to specified improvements being undertaken and previously notified to them) for the following groups: Bexley, Enfield, Greenwich, Islington, Lambeth, Merton, Newham, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Wandsworth and Westminster as set out in Appendix 1**
- 4. Agree a separate development fund for those boroughs currently without a community engagement group, or not in a position to meet the funding application deadline. These include the following boroughs: Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Hackney and Redbridge**
- 5. Agree the funding of LCP2, which is the pan London group that replaced the London Chairs Forum.**

- 6 **Agree the amount of £100,000 for an Innovation Fund limited to a maximum of £5,000 per project; as set out in Appendix 1**
- 7 **Agree the amount of £100,000 for a Cross-borough Community Engagement Fund; as set out in Appendix 1**
- 8 **Agree the amount of £50,000 for consultancy work for the development of the commissioning and contract monitoring process for Community Engagement.**

B. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Reform Programme

- 1 The MPA has a stated commitment to robust and effective community engagement arrangements being in place for each London borough. The reform programme, started over 2 years ago to transform and develop the nature of community engagement on policing and community safety at the borough level, with the ultimate goal of providing MPA funding of up to £50,000 in each borough for community engagement activity and achieving a stronger partnership approach at borough level to community engagement. This is being done through the development and, in some boroughs, establishment of Community and Police Engagement Groups (CEGs).
- 2 This is the second year of the phased development to bring support in each borough up to the £50,000 level with growth in this year of £450,000, bringing the total budget to £1.825 million. The vast majority of borough based community engagement groups have now submitted bids for funding at that level or just slightly below. Some of those who have been allocated funds below the level that they requested are as a result of the £50,000 cap, and the need for them to utilise underspends caused by things such as recruitment drag. This means that although not all of the funding will be utilised this year the funding needs to be maintained at this level in order to fund at that level in the future.
- 3 The Reform programme had the following objectives:
 - Consultation and engagement becoming an integral part of local CDRP activity
 - The groups to be a vehicle for all partners not just the police to be answerable to the local community
 - The groups to engage with the emerging Safer Neighbourhood Panels
 - The groups to play a full part in the MPA's strategic consultation at a pan-London level

- 4 The last year has seen many of the community engagement groups (CEGs) develop improved links with local partnerships, with many now having places at partnership meetings with either the Chair or other members of the Executive of the groups attending.
- 5 The MPA has encouraged the CEGs to involve the Safer Neighbourhood panels in their work. Many of the groups now have good representation from the panels at meetings of the group. In some cases these panel representatives have become involved in the Executives of the CEGs.
- 6 In retrospect, the formal holding of partners to account is not something that the CEGs will be able to achieve, as they have no statutory role in relation to the work of the partnerships. There has however been within the Community Safety Boards and some of the other CEGs an improved level of engagement with other statutory partners and a broadening of focus to look at how all of the various partners work together to develop and deliver initiatives and determine priorities.
- 7 In relation to the objective of contributing to the MPA's consultative process at a pan-London level. The CEGs were asked to provide borough level feedback in relation to the Together Against Terrorism debate. More recently they have been tasked to provide feedback for the Youth Scrutiny initiative, which the MPA is undertaking. There is scope to utilise the CEGs more as a pan-London consultative resource either as individual CEGs or under the umbrella of LCP2.
- 8 Many of the groups have had to undergo a process of change in order to meet some of the challenges that the MPA have placed on them regarding the 4 R's (relevant, representative, reaching out to all communities and to relate to the MPA in a proactive fashion) This focus has led many of them to look at how they communicate and engage generally with the local communities, and examine more innovative approaches. This has also led through the assistance in some cases of LCP2, a greater level of sharing of good practice and knowledge between CEGs.
- 9 The Community Engagement and Citizen Focus Oversight Group is monitoring the development of this work. The Group, Chaired by Cindy Butts, has reviewed the current round of bids and will be meeting on a bi-monthly basis to review and oversee the MPA's supported community engagement activities, police citizen focused work and the planning for the annual community engagement conference. As part of the group's work programme it intends to review the breakdown in funding applications between money spent on administration and that spent on the delivery of community engagement work to ensure that the maximum benefit is gained from the resources allocated by the MPA.

- 10 Additionally, the changes to the structure of the Engagement and Partnership Unit during the last year mean that the MPA is better resourced to not only monitor and evaluate the use of the funding provided to CEGs. It will also be able to provide practical support and guidance through its team of Engagement and Partnership Officers.

Pan-London Community Engagement

- 11 The new pan-London group LCP2 has been disseminating information on best practice to the CEGs, it has also staged a number of workshop/seminars in order to capacity build the Chairs and other members of CEGs. LCP2 has also provided direct hands on support to a number of CEGs to address particular local difficulties. It is through this kind of support from LCP2 and the closer links that hopefully will develop with the Engagement and Partnerships Officers that the volunteers who make up the CEGs will be empowered to move away from a reactive almost passive approach to borough wide engagement to a more proactive and strategic interventions on behalf of local communities regarding policing and community safety.
- 12 The MPA will need to have continuing detailed discussions to ensure that LCP2 is developing the relationship with the CEGs that will make it an effective mechanism for engaging with Londoners on policing and community safety issues across the region. This increased capacity to support the CEGs should enable those that are underachieving to become more focused on delivering effective feedback from local communities rather than tying up scarce resources in expensive administrative and bureaucratic processes.

Funding Application Process

- 13 The overall standard of the funding applications has improved with better detailing of achievements during the course of the year and outlining of plans for the coming financial year. The knowledge of the CEGs and their effectiveness within the MPA should develop over time with the links becoming better established between themselves and their respective Engagement and Partnership Officer. The Engagement and Partnership Officers will not just monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the CEGs but hopefully they will be able to offer some support and guidance that will aid the development of the groups.
- 14 A number of issues are still apparent from the funding applications, such as the need to invest more resources into capacity building the volunteers who comprise the membership of CEGs. They are often expected to make interventions on behalf of their local communities when looking at often quite complex issues regarding policing and community safety. A number of groups still struggle in relation to reflecting the diversity of their boroughs, and some of the groups are going to have to look at the issue of succession planning. Unless they

recruit some new membership over the next few years the knowledge that those groups have will be lost because the members will become too old or infirm to play an active role any longer.

Community Engagement Conference

- 15 The MPA held its 3rd Annual Community Engagement Conference on the 23rd November 2007 at Central Halls, Westminster. The conference aim was to bring together Londoners who are engaging with the police and other agencies who influence safety priorities and activities locally. It provided information on academic studies, policy and activities involving young people. It enabled participants to learn from best practice and identify and explore the key elements of a strategic approach to engaging young people. Most importantly it also provided participants with the opportunity to hear directly from young people about effective means of engaging with themselves and their peers. A number of CEGs have since taken the lessons learnt on the day to improve their communication with young people in their respective boroughs. It is intended that the conference will enable a greater opportunity for the recognition of good practice and to this end the conference will provide the venue for an annual community engagement award to encourage innovation, creativity and good practice.

Innovations Fund

- 16 The sum of £80,000 was set aside within the 2007/08 Community Engagement Funding round in order to fund innovative community engagement initiatives. Up to the maximum level of £5,000 per bid. This has proved to be a popular initiative, but the small grants funding process was not put in place until late in the financial year which means that the projects will not finish until the end of the financial year. The outcome reports will not be completed therefore until the new financial year. A report will be produced for this Committee in the early part of the 2008/09 financial year. It is recommended that a sum of £100,000 to be set-aside in the 2008/09 budget to fund similar initiatives.

Cross-Borough Community Engagement Fund

- 17 It is recommended that the amount of £100,000 be set aside in the 2008/09 as set out in Appendix 1, in order to develop a Cross-Borough Community Engagement Fund. It is proposed that this funding will be available to borough based community engagement groups who develop community engagement activities that link together 2 or more boroughs. This will encourage improved levels of collaboration between groups in addressing policing and community safety issues that cut across borough boundaries. If for example there is a need to communicate with a particular hard to reach community, it may be necessary to develop initiatives that focus on the needs of the

community who do not necessarily fit in with the demographic concept of borough boundaries. It is hoped that this funding will enable the MPA to support the groups in developing proactive innovative approaches to community engagement issues, and also benefit their communities through an increased sharing of best practice.

Consultancy on grant making activities

18. The recent development of the Community Engagement Groups has, in some cases, led to them becoming or seeking to become registered charities and companies limited by liability. Within that context the work that they undertake, within the purposes of their charity, can be more than that which the MPA wishes to commission. In that context, with the potential expansion of their work, there is a need for the MPA to ensure that its commissioned work is backed by more detailed and focused service level agreements and that contract monitoring processes are developed to deal with the emerging diversification of the CEG's.
19. It is therefore recommended that the amount of £50,000 be set aside in the 2008/09 budget, as set out in Appendix 1, in order to research and develop a contract management and commissioning process for funding of community engagement groups. This consultancy will examine best practice in other grant funding bodies and assist in the development of a bespoke process that will be both robust and transparent. It would also be expected to develop more a systematic monitoring and evaluation processes in relation to that funding.

Groups to be funded

- 20 It is recommended that the following groups are funded based upon their submitted bid applications for 2008/09: Brent, Bromley, Camden, Croydon, Ealing, Hammersmith & Fulham, Haringey, Harrow, Havering, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Kensington & Chelsea, Kingston, Lewisham, Richmond, Southwark and Waltham Forest as detailed in Appendix 1.

Groups to be funded with conditions

- 21 It is recommended that funding for the following CEGs, based upon their submitted bid applications is agreed in principle but is subject to further specified development work being undertaken (of which they have been informed): Bexley, Enfield, Greenwich, Islington, Lambeth, Merton, Newham, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Wandsworth and Westminster as set out in Appendix 1. These groups will be supported and encouraged to achieve the required improvements by their individual MPA Engagement and Partnerships Officers

Groups requiring substantial support to develop new structures

- 22 It is recommended that a sum of money, as detailed in Appendix 1, is set aside to develop community engagement arrangements in the following boroughs: Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Hackney and Redbridge.

RACE AND EQUALITY IMPACT

It is a funding requirement for all groups to have adopted an equality statement and make every effort to ensure that their membership criteria and activities are in line with good practice. The Engagement and Partnership Unit will liaise with the Equalities and Diversity Unit and LCP2 to ensure that information regarding good practice and changes to legislation etc. is being distributed to the groups.

D. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The financial implications are the subject of this report, and are contained within existing budgets.

Report author:

Maurice Blades

Background Papers

None

Appendix 1

Boroughs	2007/08 funding allocated	Funding requested	Funding allocated
Groups funded (no or minor conditions)			
Brent	£ 44,200.00	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00
Bromley	£ 34,112.00	£ 51,753.00	£ 50,000.00
Camden	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00
Croydon	£ 34,282.00	£ 36,598.00	£ 36,598.00
Ealing	£ 33,170.00	£ 45,000.00	£ 45,000.00 ⁱ
Hammersmith & Fulham	£ 40,300.00	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00 ⁱⁱ
Haringey	£ 50,000.00	£ 67,850.00	£ 50,000.00
Harrow	£ 20,000.00	£ 29,788.00	£ 29,788.00
Havering	£ 37,000.00	£ 53,000.00	£ 50,000.00 ⁱⁱⁱ
Hillingdon	£ 24,054.00	£ 29,765.00	£ 29,765.00
Hounslow	£ 28,668.00	£ 45,125.00	£ 45,125.00 ^{iv}
Kensington & Chelsea	£ 32,670.00	£ 49,184.00	£ 49,184.00 ^v
Kingston upon Thames	£ 40,253.00	£ 47,900.00	£ 47,900.00
Lewisham	£ 50,000.00	£ 62,219.00	£ 50,000.00
Richmond upon Thames	£ 24,648.00	£ 47,950.54	£ 47,950.54 ^{vi}
Southwark	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00
Waltham Forest	£ 40,000.00	£ 49,563.00	£ 49,563.00
Total		£ 815,695.54	£ 780,873.54
Groups funded (conditions)			
Bexley	£ 31,922.00	£ 45,950.00	£ 45,950.00 ^{vii}
Enfield	£ 31,757.42	£ 55,584.00	£ 32,551.36
Greenwich	£ 22,956.06	£ 49,895.51	£ 49,895.51 ^{viii}
Islington	£ 42,463.00	£ 43,563.00	£ 17,563.00
Lambeth	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00	£ 50,000.00
Merton		£ 38,448.00	£ 38,448.00
Newham	£ 41,411.00	£ 45,598.00	£ 45,598.00
Sutton	£ 22,969.00	£ 18,760.00	£ 18,760.00
Tower Hamlets	£ 50,000.00	£ 47,525.00	£ 47,525.00
Wandsworth	£ 30,000.00	£ 35,706.00	£ 35,706.00
Westminster	£ 50,000.00	£ 64,252.00	£ 50,000.00
Total		£ 495,281.51	£ 431,996.87
Groups to be developed			
Barking & Dagenham			
Barnet			
Hackney			
Redbridge			
Total	£ 140,000.00		£ 160,000.00

Boroughs	2007/08 funding allocated	Funding requested	Funding allocated
LCP2			
Development programme	£ 50,000.00		
Administration	£ 16,789.00		
Total	£ 66,789.00	£ 86,537.00	£ 86,537.00
Innovations Fund			
	£ 80,000.00		£ 100,000.00
Cross-Borough Community Engagement Fund			
			£ 100,000.00
Consultancy on borough focused funding			
			£ 50,000.00
Misc.			
Community Engagement Groups Conference	£ 16,708.00		£ 20,000.00
Grand Total			£ 1,729,407.41
Budget			£ 1,825,000.00

-
- ⁱ Ealing - Business case made for increased level of outreach work with young people, and hard to reach groups.
- ⁱⁱ Hammersmith & Fulham - Funding level based on CSB now having use of office space and full costs of administration.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Havering - Business case made and no longer has recruitment drag as both Development and Admin worker now in post (will not fund in excess of the cap).
- ^{iv} Hounslow - Business case made and supported by statutory partners for increased level of outreach
- ^v Kensington & Chelsea - Business case made and supported by statutory partners for specific outreach work with bme groups.
- ^{vi} Richmond upon Thames - Business case made and supported by statutory partners for specific work with young people, SN Panels and East European communities
- ^{vii} Bexley - Funding level reflects the development work and outreach that will be required to implement Consultant's recommendations and supported by statutory partners
- ^{viii} Greenwich - Previous funding only covered development work. Funding level reflects cost of delivering work plan.