

# Joint approaches to joint challenges

Evaluation of the Partnership Improvement Programme 2010

The Partnership Improvement Programme (PIP) is designed to improve cross-sector partnership working between local authorities, other statutory agencies – such as primary care trusts, police and fire - and local voluntary sector organisations. PIP started in 2006 and has so far been delivered in 33 top-tier local authority areas. Each area has developed its own local improvement plan, with the aim of contributing to more effective partnership working across sectoral divides.

## Authorship

This report was written by Ben Cairns, Gordon McCullough and Annette Stansfield. Thanks to Leila Baker, Sam Brier, Helen Garforth, Helen Hughes, Ceri Hutton for their comments and suggestions.

## Acknowledgements

We are extremely grateful to the PIP participants who have contributed so constructively and honestly to this evaluation.

## Introduction

This report summarises a recent evaluation of PIP and the influence it has had on cross-sector partnership working across five English regions.

Part 1 of this report briefly introduces the programme and describes delivery to date; Part 2 then covers the findings of a survey to evaluate the experiences of participants across 17 PIP areas; Part 3 explores the added value that PIP has had in six local authority areas in more detail<sup>i</sup>; while Part 4 examines some of the wider learning to emerge from the evaluation and some future considerations for partnership improvement work.

## Key messages

Previous research by IVAR<sup>ii</sup> has identified a number of barriers to effective cross-sector partnership working, including; a general lack of mutual understanding, respect and trust between sectors; a lack of clarity and vision about the purpose of partnerships, resulting in underachievement; and a perception of power imbalances and inequality between sectors.

Encouragingly, this evaluation demonstrates that PIP can often help to overcome some of these obstacles. First, PIP has had a positive impact on building levels of trust, mutual respect and closer understanding between sectors. Specifically, PIP has transformed relationships and opened lines of communication.

PIP provided a timely and objective framework that got the right group of individuals around the same table and helped resolve some real tensions between voluntary sector organisations and the councils. Challenging discussions, particularly about how [difficult] issues and situations were handled, have produced a much more dynamic relationship between those participants who stayed the course. **North Yorkshire**

The action plan commitments have been regularly and rigorously reviewed by the original high level group, which continues to meet on a regular basis. As well as the formal review of actions, there is “secure debate”, i.e. confidential, honest, discussion of any difficult issues or blocks to progress. **St Helens**

Second, by providing a fresh impetus, renewed focus and practical outcomes PIP has helped to develop a shared understanding and a vision for partnership working.

PIP began the review of the local Compact that has provided a positive jolt back into action with a revised agreement, building on commitments and ambitions about voluntary sector involvement in future commissioning arrangements. **Calderdale**

PIP has helped strengthen the working strategy around procurement that emphasises the role the voluntary sector can play. While work began on this before PIP, the group gave it a massive kick forward, supporting the development of a public sector delivery network approach. **St Helens**

Third, PIP has helped to test and challenge the perception of power imbalances between the voluntary and public sectors.

The programme's three national objectives are to:

- To build trust and mutual understanding across sectoral divides
- To enable senior staff in local government and the voluntary sector to take the lead in responding to the challenges of working across public/voluntary sector boundaries and in local public/voluntary sector partnerships
- To develop local improvement plans for more effective engagement and partnership working across sectoral divides, which include concrete actions for future improvement.

The work shadowing programme that began at senior levels with PIP has been very successful. Three rounds of shadowing have now been successfully completed. The feedback on matches has been very positive with most of those involved staying in contact and developing the positive networks that can generate and adopt joint approaches to local challenges.

#### **Sutton**

Finally, involvement in PIP was often found to inspire exciting and unusual responses to local challenges amongst participants.

As a direct result of agreed actions, the Fire and Rescue Service is now involved in volunteering. As the first in Humberside, the service has identified £15,000 for recruitment, training, uniforms and equipment so they can pilot an approach with ten volunteers. PIP involvement has also generated the idea to open the Fire and Rescue Authority gym facilities up to local communities. **North East**

#### **Lincolnshire**

In many areas PIP has created – through intensive support, care and attention – the conditions for more effective and efficient joint working. In turn, this had led to increased opportunities for innovative and collaborate approaches to the delivery of public services and the development of stronger community empowerment. However, without strong and trusting relationships between local authorities, voluntary sector organisations and other agencies, practical attempts to address local challenges in responsive and cost-effective ways frequently flounder. Our experience tells us that bringing about lasting improvements to cross-sector partnership working is likely to require sustained investment and time.

## **Part 1: The programme**

The Partnership Improvement Programme (PIP) is designed to address the fundamental challenge of building and sustaining effective local cross-sector collaboration. Over four years, PIP has been delivered in 33 top-tier local authority areas (see

The 17 PIP groups we asked to take part in this online survey were in:

- Portsmouth
- Bournemouth
- Bristol
- Torbay
- North Yorkshire
- North East Lincolnshire
- Calderdale
- St Helens
- Wigan
- Warrington
- Newham
- Sutton
- Darlington
- Derwentside
- Gateshead
- South Tyneside
- Tynedale

Appendix 1). As PIP has evolved it has broadened its scope to include a wider range of public sector partners with a growing emphasis on value for money, commissioning and a 'total place' way of working.

The programme consists of four half-day sessions for mixed groups of senior officers and practitioners from the local authority, other statutory agencies and the local voluntary sector. All sessions are held in local venues and are co-ordinated by two facilitators from the Institute for Voluntary Action Research (IVAR).

## Part 2: Participant feedback

Between December 2008 and April 2010 we asked 224 participants from 17 PIP groups to ask for their feedback on the programme. We received 99 replies (a response rate of 44%).

Participants were asked to rate the helpfulness of PIP in enabling, contributing to and achieving improvements on a range of issues associated with cross-sector partnership working. In each case, there were five possible responses; 'not helpful'; 'partially helpful'; 'neither helpful nor unhelpful'; 'helpful'; and 'very helpful'.

Participants were also asked "Is there anything you have done as a result of PIP that you may not have done otherwise?" There was also space to make further comments, some of which are included in the analysis below.

### 2.1 Findings

The responses represent views from programme participants who work in public sector bodies - local authorities, health, fire and police - and voluntary sector organisations (45% and 54% respectively). The majority of the respondents (82%) had attended between three and four sessions.

Table 1 shows respondents' rating of PIP's helpfulness in enabling them to work with others.

**Table 1**

Question: <i>How helpful was PIP in enabling you to:</i>	Helpful or very helpful	Partially helpful	Neither helpful nor unhelpful	Not helpful
Learn more about the perspective of people from other sectors	<b>84%</b>	11%	4%	1%
Feel more able to approach colleagues from other sectors to discuss issues and problems	<b>71%</b>	6%	19%	4%
Gain more respect for colleagues from other sector(s)	<b>60%</b>	10%	28%	2%
Trust colleagues from other sector(s) more	<b>55%</b>	14%	29%	2%

The survey found that 84% of respondents said PIP was ‘*helpful*’ or ‘*very helpful*’ in enabling them to learn more about the perspectives of people from other sectors:

*“The opportunities to get to know each other and understand each other’s pressures a little better was invaluable and I believe will make a real difference to things on the ground in the longer term.”*

*“As a result of PIP we have shared our learning and worked together to develop the local authority’s voluntary sector commissioning framework.”*

*“PIP gave an understanding of all sectors frustrations and the difficulties faced when trying to work in partnership.”*

A total of 71% of respondents said PIP was ‘*helpful*’ or ‘*very helpful*’ in enabling them to feel more able to approach colleagues from other sectors to discuss issues and problems:

*“Communications are already much improved. We have a much better understanding of each other’s needs which in turn is leading to greater respect for each other’s organisations.”*

*“[I am] due to meet up with a couple of other [PIP] participants to put forward ideas for more innovative commissioning and procurement of services.”*

*“[We have] had the debate about a thriving voluntary sector at the highest level.”*

Table 2 shows how respondents rated PIP’s ability to help them carry out various aspects of partnership working.

**Table 2**

Question: <i>How helpful was PIP in enabling you to:</i>	Helpful or very helpful	Partially helpful	Neither helpful nor unhelpful	Not helpful
Overcome barriers and obstacles to partnership working	<b>71%</b>	14%	13%	2%
Manage cross-sector partnerships better	<b>57%</b>	15%	24%	4%
Develop a meaningful action plan for improving partnerships	<b>69%</b>	14%	12%	5%
Achieve better outcomes through partnership working	<b>68%</b>	14%	14%	4%

Overall, the response was positive: 71% of respondents rated PIP as ‘helpful’ or ‘very helpful’ in enabling them to overcome barriers and obstacles to partnership working, while 69% of respondents gave the same rating for PIP’s contribution towards achieving a meaningful action plan for improving partnerships.

*“We have established a strong interdepartmental team to ensure a joined up approach to [the] voluntary and community sector - and have clearer working relationships with the local authority.”*

*“[PIP] quickly built credibility within the statutory sector that would have taken months or years to develop otherwise.”*

*“PIP helped stimulate discussions and helped move a number of agendas forward and made me aware of the barriers to*

*real joint working presented by silos in the public and third sectors.”*

*“I think it has cemented trust. Prior to PIP we were faltering, despite best efforts, and PIP came at just the right time.”*

PIP was also scored well in helping respondents to achieve better outcomes through partnership working, with 68% rating it as ‘helpful’ or ‘very helpful’:

*“[PIP] has created stronger relationships between members who have used their understanding gained through PIP to incorporate the needs of other partners in their thinking. Where it needs to go next is to spread this way of working amongst all colleagues within the partnership so that this style of working becomes the norm.”*

*“A delivery group was created in order to develop a more partnership action focused approach for the LSP board. This was created as a result of discussions at PIP.”*

Respondents also rated PIP’s helpfulness in contributing to improvements in other areas. In total, 61% of respondents described PIP as ‘helpful’ or ‘very helpful’ in contributing to improvements in cross-sector communication.

*“The statutory sector has the true power in the partnership and this is a problem both sides understand and are working to solve”.*

*“We’re looking forward to hosting statutory sector reps as part of their induction/training, which wouldn’t have happened otherwise”.*

*“It was a good process for having open dialogue and sharing how it feels from both sides.”*

For the other two areas – arranging for voluntary sector representation and the organising and managing of cross-sector partnerships – 42% and 41% respectively of respondents said that PIP’s contribution was either ‘helpful’

Part three of the report is based on a qualitative evaluation of PIP in the following six areas, that were selected to provide a broad geographic and political spread of local authority areas. The six areas were:

- Sutton
- St. Helens
- Darlington
- North East Lincolnshire
- North Yorkshire
- Calderdale

The findings of this part of the evaluation are presented under four broad headings:

- relationship and trust
- commissioning and funding
- planning and practical action
- looking ahead and acting together

or 'very helpful'. The low figures are not surprising: these are both areas that have been addressed in a number of action plans, and as such, we might expect impact to be less immediate and for improvements to emerge over time.

*"The sector has made great inroads in representation at all levels of decision making which, without the input from PIP, would have been much slower".*

### Part 3: The value of PIP

Partnership working, at whatever level, is difficult and any improvements in relationships or practice can be incremental and take time to embed. Nevertheless we felt it was important to expand our field of vision, beyond the direct experiences of participants, to look at the wider value and legacy of PIP.

IVAR commissioned a series of in-depth, semi-structured interviews were carried out with a range of PIP participants from both the voluntary and public sectors between February and April 2010.<sup>iii</sup>

#### 3.1 Relationships and trust

All areas felt the PIP programme has been crucial in **building levels of trust, mutual respect and closer understanding** of the other's sector working environment.

PIP is about how we work together. We wouldn't have been able to have that discussion [about the commissioning process] two years ago. **Sutton**

PIP has created a fresh mandate, the "need to do", around partnerships involving the voluntary sector and the LSP. Relationships are now closer, sharper and clearer. PIP is referred to frequently in a variety of settings, ranging from the review of the commissioning strategy through to the work of the Children's Trusts.

**St Helens**

For specialist senior council managers in the specialist adult and children's areas, the workshops provided a very valuable introduction to fresh networks and a new language that was commonly used and understood by voluntary sector managers. **Darlington**

Perhaps most significantly, levels of openness and the wish to collaborate have stood the test of time. For most, there is now **immediate rapport in new settings** so members of the core PIP group can jointly ensure voluntary sector involvement in cross-sector initiatives and meetings now lead to positive practical outcomes. For others, the PIP network has led to regular, confidential and honest discussion of any issues on the horizon. As a result problems can often be resolved before they become major areas of contention.

If an initiative loses momentum or direction, PIP members are confident they can revitalise or refocus their efforts. This has happened on a number of occasions, such as in the neighbourhood management group and across some LSP theme groups. **North East Lincolnshire**

The action plan commitments have been regularly and rigorously reviewed by the original high-level group, which continues to meet on a regular basis. As well as the formal review of actions, there is "*secure debate*", i.e. confidential, honest discussion of any difficult issues or blocks to progress. **St Helens**

PIP has brought more honesty into working relationships so partners are now more accustomed to getting issues out on the table and addressing them as they arise. This openness has helped build much more solid working relationships. **Darlington**

Participants still have vivid memories of some of the most effective exercises, such as the role play or having to present viewpoints from another's perspective. In four of the six areas, there had been at least one contentious PIP session where **issues and very different perspectives were aired openly**. Participants felt that sensitive and effective

facilitation helped shift attitudes and helped them to reach a stronger shared understanding of why and how they needed to work more closely in future.

*“The second workshop was difficult...a heated discussion that was facilitated very sensitively, so the group felt strengthened as a result of agreeing how similar processes would be handled differently in future”.*

The negativity became a catalyst for improvement and getting people *“on the same page”*. PIP generated very open and honest discussion in all areas and led to a shared acceptance that while things are not perfect, working collaboratively is likely to ensure the most positive result. **North East Lincolnshire**

PIP provided a timely and objective framework that got the right group of individuals around the same table and helped resolve some real tensions between voluntary sector organisations and the council. Challenging discussions, particularly about how (difficult) issues and situations were handled, have produced a much more dynamic relationship between those participants who stayed the course. **North Yorkshire**

The most successful PIP programmes have been **supported by influential and visionary senior managers**, who attended the full programme and have ensured that commitments to collaborative action are fulfilled. A strong and consistent senior presence has helped ensure that the positive dynamic between participants is valued and developed.<sup>iv</sup>

### **3.2 Commissioning and funding**

The main area where all have been working together is around preparing the ground for increased voluntary sector involvement in **commissioning**, particularly around personalisation and adult social care with council and health partners. Most joint work has taken place in developing shared frameworks: a few areas have been through at least one round of tendering. **In Sutton and St Helens, smaller**

**organisations had successful with bids after attending training that was jointly designed and delivered.** In many cases, council-based procurement teams were often leading the way in ensuring equality of access and opportunity.

Participants noted that PIP has usually resulted in greater clarity about the value of and the need to **work much more closely with the voluntary sector**. As a result, public sector colleagues now seek to involve them earlier, more strategically and more formally in developments.

The early PIP discussions began to open up the potential for voluntary sector involvement in the big commissioning agendas that have since become much clearer around children's and adult services. [Public sector] managers involved in this [commissioning] felt PIP was important at the time but, given the recent changes, had no idea just how useful the network of relationships and commitments to working jointly would be in the current climate. **Darlington**

All value the aspiration for closer engagement in making sure commissioning arrangements are collaboratively developed so opportunities to secure tenders and become involved in the delivery of vital local services are made open and accessible to a wide variety of organisations. **Sutton**

The local primary care trust (PCT) has adopted a pathway model to commissioning for community health services, partly prompted by the preparation of a local prospectus of voluntary and community sector service options and effective presentations by the sector. The production of the prospectus was funded by the PCT and underpinned by lots of 'PIP conversations' about how kite marking might be used. The aim is to secure some services via local voluntary sector providers. **St Helens**

All involved noted that it was difficult and complex to develop commissioning, even when frameworks are previously agreed, as funding opportunities often appear at short notice and need flexible responses – meaning, for instance, that it may be necessary to reduce consultation times to meet

deadlines. In such circumstances, most groups also found that strong PIP-based relationships were usually enabled them to have fair and frank discussions to agree a constructive way through.

Across partners there is growing awareness of the need to firm up effective cross-sector working relationships. The Change Board has been created with strong voluntary sector representation and recognition of the need to rationalise engagement has led to the formation of the community investment team. Voluntary sector funding relationships now come through a single contact point in the council rather than various points and levels across different departments. **North East Lincolnshire**

Some public sector managers have been surprised and encouraged by how well the voluntary sector can generate plans for exciting schemes that fit new funding criteria. Those strategically involved in the voluntary sector are increasingly aware of the constraints of political decision-making and the likely implications of the massive shrinkage of public sector funding. However, all are confident that they will be able to work together to ensure the best local solutions are found to whatever challenges or opportunities lie ahead.

In some areas, such as community safety, there has already been a rapid increase in commissioning from the voluntary sector and a growing confidence that statutory agencies can look to voluntary and community organisations to generate fresh ideas and innovative approaches to problems. **St Helens**

### **3.3 Planning and practical action**

Some **planned actions** have already been successful in addressing key issues, including: a work shadowing programme in Sutton; joint organisation of large events, opening up training programmes, increased volunteering and better joined-up communications in Darlington and North East Lincolnshire; and Compact reviews in St Helens and Calderdale.

PIP began the review of the local Compact that has provided a positive jolt back into action with a revised agreement, building on commitments and ambitions about voluntary sector involvement in future commissioning arrangements.

**Calderdale**

The work shadowing programme that began at senior levels with PIP has been very successful. Three rounds of shadowing have now been successfully completed. The feedback on matches has been very positive with most of those involved staying in contact and developing the positive networks that can generate and adopt joint approaches to local challenges.

**Sutton**

Statutory partners now recognise the importance of involving the voluntary sector whenever partnership opportunities arise and appreciate that this should lead to “getting more for less”. PIP has also enabled participants to be more open about anticipating and seizing partnership opportunities to work together - for instance when local partners worked very effectively together to secure a Compact award.

**North East Lincolnshire**

PIP involvement has also generated some **exciting and unusual examples** of lateral thinking and new ideas among partners previously unaccustomed to working with the voluntary sector.

As a direct result of agreed actions, the Fire and Rescue Service is now involved in volunteering. As the first in Humberside, the service has identified £15,000 for recruitment, training, uniforms and equipment so they can pilot an approach with 10 volunteers. PIP involvement has also generated the idea of opening up the Fire and Rescue Authority gym facilities up to local communities.

**North East Lincolnshire**

PIP did help develop some strong new relationships across partners and agencies, particularly with the police, who have

now begun to work through existing local consultative structures rather than create a fresh set. **North Yorkshire**

For most, the voluntary sector has become more fundamental to, and **influential in the local strategic partnership**. Often directly involved in specialist thematic groups for children's and adult social care, it is also helping shape approaches to commissioning.

The CVS is playing a crucial role in preparing for change, through delivery of an enhanced capacity building training programme, ensuring smaller organisations are fit for purpose before tendering for work. Through sitting on specialist advisory groups the voluntary sector now has a stronger voice within the LSP and all its thematic partnerships. **St Helens**

### **3.4 Looking ahead and acting together**

In some areas, relationships forged through PIP have become more significant as the scale of new areas of development has broadened and the pace of change has quickened. Participants' examples given of this include commissioning in children's and adult areas and responses to the recession where advice services have been enhanced by Citizens' Advice Bureau (CAB) support and through some major reviews of funding or neighbourhood working. Many appreciated the fact that the **mutual trust and understanding built up through PIP meant that they could move far more quickly** to develop sound commissioning arrangements and engage a range of voluntary sector organisations in tendering for work.

PIP has improved the dynamic and provided a common point of reference for participants as it highlighted the need to think in similar ways across sectors, so the voluntary sector becomes more able to recognise the value of achieving economies of scale and the public sector becomes more adept at breaking down development opportunities into smaller, manageable areas. **Calderdale**

PIP has helped strengthen the working strategy around procurement that emphasises the role the voluntary sector can play. While work began on this before PIP, the group gave it a massive kick forward, supporting the development of a public sector delivery network approach. **St Helens**

There were some impressive examples of joint working through the local challenges brought about by the economic recession. Rather than duplicate provision, statutory partners in most areas had **found additional funding** for the CAB to deliver debt advice. There had also been collaborative responses in areas with worklessness funding, although there is scope to tighten these further. There will continue to be a need for effective joint responses in communities that have been affected by the economic downturn.

The allocation of £13million to address the challenge of worklessness has generated a high level of collaborative and cross-sector activity in response to the commissioning process, such as intermediate labour market models around catering and cleaning and an expansion of volunteering through an alliance with Unlimited. **North East Lincolnshire**

In a climate of reducing resources there is much concern about how the **voluntary sector will need to flex and change** to be fully prepared for tougher times ahead. Greater collaboration, co-location or even merger proposals are being discussed and developed locally and nationally to enable consortia to be formed more easily as the funding arrangements change. In some areas infrastructure bodies, such as the local councils for voluntary service, now have a clearer remit to communicate with and help build interest and capacity within smaller organisations [to help them] adapt to changes. A common message coming from statutory partners is that the voluntary sector will need to continue to demonstrate that it can handle relationships and performance professionally.

Working relationships between the council and the voluntary sector have improved markedly in some areas but there is still a need to broaden mutual understanding and engagement.

#### **Darlington**

Larger voluntary and community organisations are encouraging the whole sector to plan now to survive in a climate of commissioning and lower budgets. Future commissioning opportunities could provide the incentive for closer integration of delivery or organisations. The reason for increasing voluntary sector involvement is that the value they add to delivery is increasingly recognised. **St Helens**

Statutory partners are increasingly **working through localities** and appreciating both the potential of smaller local groups and their capacity building needs. Effective communication – particularly around of changes and opportunities – is still seen as a challenge. Local responses vary, but as budgets invariable shrink, most areas consider their biggest ongoing challenges to be the broadening of engagement and addressing communities’ needs.

## **Part Four: Next steps**

The final part of this report briefly sets out some of the lessons learnt from this evaluation and some wider considerations for any future partnership improvement programme.

### **4.1 The programme**

The results from this evaluation are encouraging and suggest that PIP continues to:

- tackle the key issue of mutual understanding
- enable open and honest dialogue
- build relationships and trust
- develop open communication channels
- provide focus, impetus and practical outcomes.

However, challenges do remain in relation to promoting and implementing of partnership improvement action plans, as well as achieving wider endorsement of new approaches to joint working:

*“There is still insufficient commitment from senior Directors in the local authority.”*

*“The [process] worked well but progress is reliant on participants making it work.”*

*“The people who really need to be engaged in the PIP outputs and outcomes need to be reached.”*

In future, it may be necessary to take a more flexible approach to delivery in order to ensure the participation of key individuals. In addition, a focus on specific areas of partnership working – for example, commissioning or the Big Society – might increase the potential for practical outcomes.

## **4.2 The legacy**

It is difficult for any evaluation to find a causal link between a change in behaviour or circumstance and a single action or intervention. However, participants’ comments point to recognition that **PIP has had a transformative effect on partnership working.**

The same can also be said for PIP’s longer-term legacy. In many cases it is too early or too difficult to assess what that legacy will be. Nevertheless, there are encouraging signs, backed up by the evidence presented in this report, that well-founded, trusting and dynamic PIP-based relationships equip partners to respond flexibly, imaginatively and effectively to new local challenges and opportunities as they arise. However, while PIP can create the conditions for more effective and efficient joint working, lasting change in cross-sector partnership working is likely to require sustained investment and time.

### **4.3 The policy context**

The need to develop joint approaches to joint challenges is more pressing than ever. Reductions in public finances, the policy focus on localism, the need for greater efficiencies and joined-up solutions and the voluntary sector ongoing role in public service delivery are all predicated on a partnership approach.

As the coalition government begins to confirm its priorities, it is still difficult to predict which new policy drivers will have local implications, but early messages indicate that cross-sector approaches in local areas and neighbourhoods will be increasingly relevant over the next few years. This evaluation has shown that PIP can have a wider impact beyond its original objectives. There are practical examples where the environment created by PIP has provided the impetus for partners to work creatively to build stronger communities which involve local people more fully in community life.

This evaluation confirms that finding ways to develop and nurture effective and efficient cross-sector partnerships should not be seen as a luxury. Cross-sector working is a necessity if the collective challenges faced by all sectors are to be tackled with a shared purpose and common understanding.

## Appendix One

Since 2006, PIP has been delivered in the following local authority areas across five regions:

**Table One**

2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Camden	Darlington	Barking and Dagenham	Calderdale	Portsmouth
Waltham Forest	Derwentside	Sutton	NE Lincolnshire	Bournemouth
Birmingham	South Tyneside	St Helens	North Yorkshire	Wiltshire
Leicester	Tynedale	Wigan	Ryedale	Thurrock
Derbyshire	Gateshead	Warrington	Cumbria	Reading
Cornwall		Newham	Torbay	Southampton
Bassetlaw			Bristol	West Sussex*
West Devon				

\* PIP sessions are still ongoing in this area.

### Find out more

For information about the Partnership Improvement Programme email Gordon McCullough at [gordon@ivar.org.uk](mailto:gordon@ivar.org.uk) or Helen Hughes at [helen.hughes@idea.gov.uk](mailto:helen.hughes@idea.gov.uk)

### Download

For more information about IVAR or to download other research into organisational change and management visit [www.ivar.org.uk](http://www.ivar.org.uk)

### Subscribe to

To keep abreast of the latest developments at IVAR, subscribe to our monthly newsletter, i-think, at [www.ivar.org.uk/newsletter](http://www.ivar.org.uk/newsletter)

The remaining regions to be covered by PIP are the West Midlands, East Midlands and the East of England.

<sup>i</sup> This part of the evaluation was commissioned by IVAR and was conducted by Annette Stansfield Consulting between February and April 2010.

<sup>ii</sup> Cairns, B., Brier, S., Harris, J., Harris, M. and Hughes, H. (2006) *Making it Real: A report of the partnership improvement programme with voluntary and community organisations and local authorities*, IDeA: London

Cairns, B., Harris, J., Brier, S., Moran, R. (2009) *Getting things done together: key findings from the Partnership Improvement Programme*, IDeA: London

<sup>iii</sup> Local summary reports have been agreed with each area to inform their own planning for future development.

<sup>iv</sup> Senior involvement has included the chief executive of the local authority and the primary care trust, the leader of the council or cabinet members and directors of service departments.