

**Agenda Item:  
One Nottingham Board**

**Title of Paper: One Nottingham Partnership Audit 2017 – Outcome and Feedback**

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

**1. Purpose**

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 1.1 | This paper updates the Board on the outcome of the Partnership Audit of One Nottingham undertaken by Nottingham City Council’s Audit Committee in 2017 and the proposed response to the issues raised. |
|-----|--|

**2. Recommendations**

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| The One Nottingham Board is asked to: |  |
| 2.1                                   | Note the outcome of the Partnership Audit of One Nottingham undertaken by Nottingham City Council Audit Committee in 2017. |
| 2.2                                   | Note the recommendations from the Audit Committee and agree One Nottingham’s proposed response outlined in 4.              |
| 2.3                                   | Note the intention to bring updated Terms of Reference to the ON Board for approval in March 2018.                         |

**3. Background**

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 3.1 | Each year the NCC Audit Committee undertakes a health check and audit review of significant partnerships in the city. The health check is a guide for an annual assessment of a partnership’s governance and capacity. The aim is to make an overall assessment of the effectiveness of the partnership; identify whether there is any strategic, reputational or financial risk to the Council through its membership of the partnership; and lead to proposals for changes/improvements. |
| 3.2 | The designation as a significant partnership depends upon the level of financial, strategic or reputational risk and includes One Nottingham. As part of the process, a partnership health check is completed, and a scoring assessment completed, covering: aims and objectives, membership and structure, decision-making and accountability, performance management, evaluation and review, finance and risk management.  |
| 3.3 | As part of the review each year a small number of partnerships are subject to more detailed scrutiny through a verification process. In 2017 One Nottingham was included in this list. As a result we had to submit copies of all documents referenced in the completed Health Check including Terms of Reference, structure, members’ list and authorised deputies, policies including conflict of interest, notes including transparent decision making and anything else referenced.    |
| 3.4 | The annual health check of significant partnerships was reported to Audit Committee in November 2017 and feed back has now been received by One Nottingham. The full Audit report and draft minutes can be accessed on the Nottingham City Council Committee Website at:<br><a href="#">NCC Audit Committee November 2017</a>  |

3.5	The process of reviewing and auditing partnerships is currently being reviewed to ensure it is efficient, fit for purpose and does not duplicate other work. In the current timetable, One Nottingham is due to be verified in detail again in 2020.
-----	--

#### 4. Feedback from Audit Committee

4.1	<p>Initial feedback from the Audit Committee meeting in November has now been received and the draft minutes have been published. The Audit Committee agreed with One Nottingham’s health check assessment and the scores we had submitted:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; margin-bottom: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Health Check Scores 2017 Partnerships</th> <th style="text-align: center;">One Nottingham</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Aims and objectives</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Membership and structure</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Decision making and accountability</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Performance management</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>Evaluation and review</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Equalities</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>Finance</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>Partnership Risk Management</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td><b>Overall Score</b></td><td style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Score</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">1</td><td>Excellent</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">2</td><td>Good</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">3</td><td>Some key areas for improvement</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">4</td><td>Many key weaknesses</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Health Check Scores 2017 Partnerships	One Nottingham	Aims and objectives	1	Membership and structure	1	Decision making and accountability	1	Performance management	2	Evaluation and review	1	Equalities	2	Finance	2	Partnership Risk Management	2	<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>2</b>	Score	Category	1	Excellent	2	Good	3	Some key areas for improvement	4	Many key weaknesses
Health Check Scores 2017 Partnerships	One Nottingham																														
Aims and objectives	1																														
Membership and structure	1																														
Decision making and accountability	1																														
Performance management	2																														
Evaluation and review	1																														
Equalities	2																														
Finance	2																														
Partnership Risk Management	2																														
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>2</b>																														
Score	Category																														
1	Excellent																														
2	Good																														
3	Some key areas for improvement																														
4	Many key weaknesses																														
4.2	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>The Audit Committee made a small number of recommendations; these are listed below, along with the proposed response from One Nottingham.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; margin-top: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Recommendation</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Proposed Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>To all Partnerships</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1.a Whilst many of the Terms of Reference were comprehensive and recent, we would recommend each partnership considers including on the document a ‘revision date’, as is often included on policies, to prompt a timely review.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1.b This will be added to the Terms of Reference when updated for the March ON Board.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>To One Nottingham</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">2.a One Nottingham confirmed that they are drafting a complaints procedure, which we hope to see finalised soon. In their Health Check return the partnership confirms the intended process for dealing with complaints and disputes, which we feel is comprehensive. We recommend this procedure is formalised and included in the terms of reference as soon as possible.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">2.b A complaints procedure has been drafted and will be circulated to the Board for comment. This will be added to the Terms of Reference when updated for the March ON Board.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">3.a One Nottingham confirms in their Health Check that the Corporate Policy Team is responsible for monitoring the Nottingham Plan performance and providing information for an annual report. The Health Check also confirms that action is taken to improve performance if needed, but does not elaborate on who is responsible for either highlighting missed targets or undertaking remedial action. Whatever the process we would recommend this is clarified in documentation, for example Terms of Reference or a Ways of Working paper.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">3.b This will be reviewed following the outcome of the discussions on the future of the Nottingham Plan to 2020 and beyond. A Ways of Working agreement will then be developed as appropriate.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Recommendation	Proposed Response	<b>To all Partnerships</b>		1.a Whilst many of the Terms of Reference were comprehensive and recent, we would recommend each partnership considers including on the document a ‘revision date’, as is often included on policies, to prompt a timely review.	1.b This will be added to the Terms of Reference when updated for the March ON Board.	<b>To One Nottingham</b>		2.a One Nottingham confirmed that they are drafting a complaints procedure, which we hope to see finalised soon. In their Health Check return the partnership confirms the intended process for dealing with complaints and disputes, which we feel is comprehensive. We recommend this procedure is formalised and included in the terms of reference as soon as possible.	2.b A complaints procedure has been drafted and will be circulated to the Board for comment. This will be added to the Terms of Reference when updated for the March ON Board.	3.a One Nottingham confirms in their Health Check that the Corporate Policy Team is responsible for monitoring the Nottingham Plan performance and providing information for an annual report. The Health Check also confirms that action is taken to improve performance if needed, but does not elaborate on who is responsible for either highlighting missed targets or undertaking remedial action. Whatever the process we would recommend this is clarified in documentation, for example Terms of Reference or a Ways of Working paper.	3.b This will be reviewed following the outcome of the discussions on the future of the Nottingham Plan to 2020 and beyond. A Ways of Working agreement will then be developed as appropriate.																		
Recommendation	Proposed Response																														
<b>To all Partnerships</b>																															
1.a Whilst many of the Terms of Reference were comprehensive and recent, we would recommend each partnership considers including on the document a ‘revision date’, as is often included on policies, to prompt a timely review.	1.b This will be added to the Terms of Reference when updated for the March ON Board.																														
<b>To One Nottingham</b>																															
2.a One Nottingham confirmed that they are drafting a complaints procedure, which we hope to see finalised soon. In their Health Check return the partnership confirms the intended process for dealing with complaints and disputes, which we feel is comprehensive. We recommend this procedure is formalised and included in the terms of reference as soon as possible.	2.b A complaints procedure has been drafted and will be circulated to the Board for comment. This will be added to the Terms of Reference when updated for the March ON Board.																														
3.a One Nottingham confirms in their Health Check that the Corporate Policy Team is responsible for monitoring the Nottingham Plan performance and providing information for an annual report. The Health Check also confirms that action is taken to improve performance if needed, but does not elaborate on who is responsible for either highlighting missed targets or undertaking remedial action. Whatever the process we would recommend this is clarified in documentation, for example Terms of Reference or a Ways of Working paper.	3.b This will be reviewed following the outcome of the discussions on the future of the Nottingham Plan to 2020 and beyond. A Ways of Working agreement will then be developed as appropriate.																														

4.3	4.a The Health Check confirms a Funding Sub Group of ON Board members has been established, but this is not included in the Terms of Reference or other formal documentation. We would recommend, especially given the concerns about diminishing funding, that this group's remit, membership and targets are formally recorded, for example in an updated Terms of Reference document or similar.	4.b The Funding Sub Group of ON Board members is currently an informal group that meets on an adhoc basis. It is therefore not felt appropriate to formalise the arrangements at this point.
	5.a One Nottingham did not share with us a formal risk register or risk assessment. If one does not exist, we recommend one is developed to include consideration of the risk to the partnership's existence and to the Nottingham Plan targets if sufficient future funding is not secured.	5.b One Nottingham will develop a risk register to cover its core activities. Responsibility for risk to Nottingham Plan targets will be clarified through the Ways of Working agreement under 3.b above.
	<b>Other Comments</b>	
	6.a Please note that next year we will be adding a question to the template to seek to assure Audit Committee that partnerships are compliant with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), so please ensure you are in a position to answer this after the introduction of GDPR in May 2018.	6.b This work has already commenced as part of Nottingham City Council's preparation for GDPR.
<p>Following the establishment of the VCS Strategic Reference Group in 2017, it was always intended to update the One Nottingham Governance Framework and Ways of Working in 2018. A revised draft document will be prepared for the March ON Board meeting, to include this, other changes to membership, and the introduction of a suitable complaints procedure.</p>		

<b>5. Contact Details</b>
<p>Name: Lorel Manders   0115 8765000   lorel.manders@onenottingham.org.uk</p>