Community Empowerment Group

Thursday 24 June 2021, 2.30-4pm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Member | Present |
| Michelle Cochlan, Aberdeen City Council (Chair)  Maggie Hepburn, ACVO (Vice Chair)  Jonathan Smith, Civic Forum (Vice Chair)  Darren Bruce, Police Scotland  Dave Black, GREC  Scott Symon, SFRS  Fiona Clark, ACC  Gordon Edgar, ACHSCP  Wendy Henderson, Independent Care Sector  Susan Thoms, ACC  Colin Wright, ACC  Martin Wyllie, ACC  Anne McAteer, ACC | Yes  Yes  N/A Attends quarterly  Yes  Yes  Yes  Apologies  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item No. | Title | Lead | Notes/ Actions | Responsibility |
| 1. | **Welcome & Apologies** | All | The group was advised that Shamini Omnes, public health coordinator for the South Locality has taken up a new post with Robert Gordon University and will no longer be a member of the group. Gordon Edgar who is already a member of this group, will now represent the Locality Empowerment Groups and provide updates in terms of community engagement and development of the LEGs.  Colin Wright is also changing role and is the preferred candidate for the Community Learning and Development Manager post, continuing the work of Linda Clark who retired in May. This means Colin will no longer be leading on locality planning for the Torry Locality. Colin will continue to be a member of the group, reporting back on the CLD plan. The Locality Inclusion Managers have been asked to identify a substitute representative on behalf of the priority neighbourhood partnerships. In the meantime, I can provide an update on their behalf. |  |
| 2. | **[Actions from the last meeting](https://communityplanningaberdeen.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/CEG-27-05-21.pdf" \t "_blank)** | All | Actions from the last meeting were updated as complete with the following updates:  Fiona and Michelle met with Caroline Johnston to discuss the governance of the CLD Plan. It was felt that the partnership forums are a delivery mechanism for the plan and that overall governance of the implementation of the plan should sit with the Community Empowerment Group. Members of the CEG agreed to this but requested further information in the form of a reading list/ induction pack to support them in the role. This should include findings of the last inspection and areas of weakness we are trying to improve. There was some discussion about how appropriate it is for the group to scrutinise CLD. Michelle advised that the plan was for the partnership and how they support CLD, not the Council’s CLD service. Once we have seen a draft of the plan we will be able to provide feedback and once the plan is approved, the group should be well positioned to oversee progress. Colin will be asked to advise on whether there are any relevant partners not represented on the CEG which would impact on our ability to effectively scrutinise. The group also asked about the performance management framework for the CLD Plan. Michelle expects this to be outlined in the draft plan which we will hopefully get sight of soon. The plan will also include proposals about training on the national standards.  Michelle, Jonathan and Maggie met to discuss the feedback from the Community Empowerment Group on the programme for the extended meeting. Michelle reported back that whilst there was agreement that we should not rush to hold an event before we are ready, Jonathan also felt that we should not postpose unnecessarily and that it may not be perfect first time. He undertook to review the programme and suggest some amendments. This was shared with the Community Empowerment Group and it was agreed that the programme was in good shape. The next Extended Community Empowerment Group is scheduled to take place on 30 September and the group agreed that we should plan to go ahead with this. There is some work to be done now to prepare promotional materials and plan the format of the event, using separate rooms etc. Michelle agreed to arrange another meeting with Maggie and Jonathan to discuss next steps and asked if any other members would like to be involved to get in touch. | CW  ALL |
| 3. | **Work Programme Update** | All | Progress against the work programme was reviewed and updated. |  |
| 4. | **City Voice** | AM | Anne McAteer attended the meeting to present the draft City Voice Questionnaire. The questionnaire is run annually and all partners have the opportunity to ask for questions to be included. CPA Outcome Improvement Groups are also asked for questions which support them to understand the impact of their LOIP improvement activity. There are a number of questions asked which are included in the CPA Outcomes Framework. Michelle asked for members to review the draft questionnaire issued today and return comments to Anne by 13 July.  Dave asked if City Voice was a set panel and if not, how do we promote it? Anne explained that there is a set panel of 1,400 people. It was further opened up to 800 people registered with the consultation hub. Anne confirmed that the next survey will take place next year and response rates have been reducing:  45th  In relation to the hate crime questions submitted by Police Scotland, Dave queried whether we refer to the new characteristics due to come into force. Wendy felt the timing might not be right and we should wait. Anne and Darren to discuss.  Anne confirmed that the questionnaire is available online and by paper copy for those panel members who request it. There was discussion about translating the questionnaire into other languages. Anne explained that this has never been done. We would need to understand the demand for this and consider resource implications. It was agreed that translation would only be relevant to the panel members who need this and therefore would need to look at the demographics of the panel.  There was discussion about how representative is the panel is of Aberdeen at the moment. Anne explained this information is available online but undertook to provide this information.  The group discussed the merits of sharing the questionnaire more widely, for example LEG members or other groups. Anne explained that this could skew the results and the advantage of having a panel was that it was demographically representative. However, it was accepted that as the panel has not been refreshed in a few years is might be time to do this again. Although Anne also said that the response rate from long term members tends to be higher than new recruits.  Martin suggested that the simulator could complement the City Voice questionnaire and gather information from wider public. Anne and Martin to look into this. | ALL  AM/DB  AM  MS/AM |
| 4. | **Community Learning & Development Update** | CW | Colin gave a summary of the development process for the CLD plan to date and advised that he is working towards sharing a draft of the CLD Plan with the group in July. |  |
|  | **Community Engagement in LOIP Refresh/ Locality Planning** |  | The public consultation on the LOIP and Locality Plans has now closed has closed. A number of community members responded with further ideas and interest in getting involved further. These leads are being followed up to link the individuals in with the LEGs/ Priority Neighbourhood Partnerships where relevant. Raw feedback has been sent to Outcome Improvement Groups and Martin is doing some further analysis. The final LOIP and Locality Plans will be submitted to CPA Board on 7 July. |  |
| 5. | **AOB** |  | N/A |  |
| 6. | **Date of Meetings 2021/22**  **29 July**  **26 August**  **30 September – Extended Group**  **28 October**  **26 November**  **27 January**  **24 February – Extended Group**  **31 March** | All |  |  |