

Work in Progress
(draft as at 4 February 2005)

**The Kent Local Area Agreement
April 2005 – March 2008**

between
Kent County Council
and
The Government Office of the South East

[March 2005]

Contents

Page

1. Foreword by Chairman of The Kent Partnership
 - Concordat between GOSE and KCC
2. Kent's Approach to the LAA
 - Introduction
 - An overarching agreement for public services in Kent
 - Building on Existing Consensus
 - Integrating Kent Partnership themes
 - Integrating LPSA 2 'Priorities for Improvement' and 'targets'
 - Consulting on the LAA
 - Success criteria for the LAA
 - Focus on Areas in deprivation
3. Introduction to the high level outcomes
 - Children and Young People
 - Safer and Stronger Communities
 - Healthier Communities and Older People
4. Freedoms and flexibilities
5. Funding streams
6. Performance Management Framework
7. Rolling out the LAA

Appendices

1. Block 1. Table of outcomes, indicators, and freedoms,
2. Block 2. Table of outcomes, indicators and freedoms,
3. Block 3. Table of outcomes, indicators and freedoms,
4. Composite of all Freedoms and Flexibilities
5. Funding Streams
6. Consultation diary (not included)

1. Foreword

Ministers and Government Spending Departments have acknowledged that the conventional machinery of national controls, targets, ring fenced funding, inspection, audit and direct management from Whitehall could be improved. Also, the difficulties of joining up government nationally have been recognised and there is a growing realisation that a new framework for local decision making and collaboration is needed. Kent is keen to develop these new ideas in partnership with central government with the aim of improving public services.

In 2002 the Kent Partnership was formed as a result of the Local Government Act 2000 which gave new powers and responsibilities to local authorities to improve the social and economic wellbeing of their communities. The Kent Partnership is made up of representatives from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors. It is responsible for overseeing progress on Kent's community strategy, the "Vision for Kent", and has a key role in encouraging community leadership, new initiatives and the effective delivery of services. The "Vision for Kent" provides a sense of direction for all partners and is a longer-term plan agreed by all concerned. Importantly it is a recognition that defining and delivering Kent's future needs goes beyond the remit of local authorities acting alone.

This 'Local Area Agreement' represents a further and major step forward in helping to improve the lives, and support independence, of the people and communities of Kent. As a vehicle for taking forward the ambitions contained in the Vision for Kent, the LAA identifies 18 key issues within three core themes – Children and Young People, Safer and Stronger Communities, Healthier Communities and Older People – on which the local, regional and national partners to this Agreement have agreed to act in concert to achieve significant improvement over the next few years.

But as important as the real and positive differences it will make to residents and employees of Kent, it symbolises fundamental changes in three sets of relationships and ways of working:

- *Between national Government and Kent's local authorities and public service organisations*, melding local Kent priorities with national standards and key targets, giving Kent freedom and flexibilities – "letting go of detailed day-to-day control"¹ – to ensure that local needs and aspirations are addressed
- *Between the county's public service providers*, building on the partnerships and co-operation that already exist to forge relationships of mutual respect, confidence and collaboration in which each supports, challenges and holds others to account, and "to decide jointly which local priorities best reflect local circumstances, while contributing to the achievement of national targets"

¹ Quotations are from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's prospectus for Local Area Agreements

- *Between those responsible for public services in the county and the people of Kent*, supporting independence, strengthening ways of engaging local communities and individuals and enabling them to play an active role in shaping and delivering public services, and enhancing their accountability to local people.

This Agreement is not encyclopaedic: it does not cover all the critical work of schools and hospitals, police and social services, other public service providers, voluntary and community organisations, companies and agencies. It does though identify those priority areas in which collaborative effort can make a real difference. And it lays the foundation on which the Kent Partnership and its Public Service Board can realise its vision of accepting significantly greater autonomy and responsibility and ensure, over time, that co-ordinated action delivers the necessary outcomes, innovation and transformational change for greater social and economic well-being for all in Kent.

There will be many obstacles along the way. But we are sure that these will be tackled and overcome by the energy and enterprise of the people of Kent in combination with the skills and commitment of the staff and professionals in public services, enabled by mutual respect between local and national government. The ultimate and noble goal is to make Kent a healthier and more prosperous county for all, and for Kent to be a model of local governance supporting independence for each and every individual.

Partners in Kent are delighted to have been chosen to pilot and respond to the exciting challenge of a 'Local Area Agreement', to help in forging a new relationship between local and national government, and to serve even better the public in Kent.

Sir Sandy Bruce–Lockhart
Chairman, Kent Partnership

Concordat between Government Office of the South East (on behalf of Government) and Kent County Council (on behalf of the Kent Partnership).

This Concordat states the commitment and operating principles which GOSE and KCC have agreed for the development of the Local Area Agreement and to which they will each use their best endeavours to adhere.

a. Joint Commitment to the Development Phase

During the development phase of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) the parties have accepted that the LAA needs to be agreed in two distinct phases:

Phase 1 Agreement reached by mid March 2005 between GOSE and KCC on a set of 18 outcomes across the three blocks that will form the core of the LAA. Progress against each outcome will be assessed through an agreed set [no more than three, except by mutual agreement] of county-wide indicators.

Phase 2. Agreement reached by 31 December 2005 between the partners to the LAA on how each countywide outcome will be rolled out. This will require partners to identify their contribution using a wide range of indicators.

b. Joint Working Principles

1. To **extend the understanding and trust** between government and local partners, and between partners within Kent (e.g. opportunities will continue to be sought for staff secondments between agencies, joint training and familiarisation visits).
2. The **outcomes for the period April 2005 – March 2008 have been agreed** between GOSE and KCC in good faith reflecting priority areas, both national and local, after widespread consultation. However, the parties agree that there is scope to review the outcomes on an annual basis in the light of progress towards the outcome(s) and any other issues that may emerge. Any changes to the outcomes will be made only if both parties agree the change, and then only after consultation with other partners involved.
3. **Both parties accept these outcomes as shared priorities.** In doing so both parties will exert whatever influence they can on all other partners (Government Departments and Agencies, local service deliverers and providers) to ensure the outcomes are supported, obstacles removed and innovation allowed to flourish.
4. GOSE and KCC will be **equal partners in pursuing the range of freedoms and flexibilities** identified in the LAA and will hold each other to

account on a quarterly basis for progress made. Both parties may, by mutual agreement, seek additional freedoms.

5. There will be **no additional inspection** as a result of the LAA. Furthermore, by [April 2006] there will demonstrably less inspection of public services than in March 2005. The remaining inspection activity undertaken will be more integrated. *(This builds on the existing announcements of the Audit Commission – which need to be accepted by other inspectorates).*

Both parties accept that the sum total of performance monitoring within the LAA will, in April 2006, be less than in March 2005. The performance management of the LAA by GOSE will be through monitoring the agreed *countywide indicators* for each outcome. The **Kent Partnership will determine the performance management framework** between partners, linking it to phase 2 of the LAA development, using existing indicators wherever possible.

2. Kent's Approach to the LAA

2.1 Introduction

Central Government announced that Kent had been selected as a pilot area for developing a Local Area Agreement (LAA) in October 2004. Partners in Kent are delighted to be able to respond to this farsighted opportunity to establish a new framework for local decision making which focuses on local priorities. The Kent LAA will deliver improvements in and integration between public services that are difficult to realise through centralised initiatives and national targets with performance frameworks and funding streams controlled by central government.

Kent partners are well placed to deliver a LAA. Most of the public sector partners engaged have been independently assessed as good or excellent. The County Council and six of the District Councils have been assessed as excellent or good through Comprehensive Performance Assessment, with the County's Social Services rated as 3 star. Within the health sector, four of the eight PCTs have been awarded 3 or 2 stars and four of the five hospital trusts have been awarded 3 or 2 stars. The Police Authority consistently performs well and is regarded as one of the top five performing forces in England.

Partnership working in Kent is well advanced. For three years the Kent Partnership, comprising public, private, voluntary and community sector representatives, has guided progress on the countywide Community Strategy – the 'Vision for Kent'. In addition there are nine Local Strategic Partnerships and 12 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships led or facilitated by District Councils, each with their own local plans and strategies.

Furthermore, just prior to the announcement that Kent was to be a pilot LAA, public sector partners had established the Kent Public Service Board. The Board's purpose is to support the Kent Partnership in realising the Kent Vision, to establish a shared agenda of priorities and join together the totality of public services in Kent. The Kent Partnership will guide the development and implementation of the Kent LAA and will be advised by the Kent Public Service Board.

Partners in Kent are convinced that they are best placed to sort out many of the highly complex problems of Kent. Only they can bring the strong leadership and close collaboration required to release the often constrained innovation and energy of managers and staff who deliver or commission services. Partners in Kent wish to strengthen ways in which they engage local communities and individuals and enhance their accountability to local people. The LAA is the vehicle through which partners can realise their vision of accepting significantly greater autonomy to deliver improved and joined up services that address local priorities.

Developing Kent's LAA has been a supreme example of collaboration that exists between partners in Kent. Partners have worked within the framework set by Government to identify the 18 priority outcomes and supporting indicators. The LAA brings a much stronger focus to local priorities and will result in improved service delivery. To enable this it also sets out a series of freedoms to be negotiated.

It is acknowledged by Kent partners, and we hope by GOSE and Government, that the LAA will be a period of learning and experimentation for everyone. Therefore the LAA needs to be developed in a climate of trust, where managed risk is acceptable and innovation is encouraged.

2.2 An overarching agreement for public services in Kent

Building on Existing Consensus

Fortunately, Kent partners have been engaged in much work over the past four years to identify themes and priorities that has helped to form this LAA. In particular, at a countywide level, there is the work on the Kent Partnership and the Kent Local Public Service Agreement 1 (the period 2001-2004) and Kent Local Public Service Agreement 2 (from 2005). This work is underpinned by priorities at a more local level.

Integrating Kent Partnership themes

Consultation with key stakeholders throughout Kent between 2000 and 2002 identified nine overarching themes for Kent, which are embedded into the 'Vision for Kent'. They are long term and aspirational.

1. Economic success that is shared by all
2. Learning for everyone
3. Healthy lifestyles
4. Modern social and healthcare services
5. A better environment
6. Communities that feel safe and secure
7. Kent communities
8. Keeping Kent moving
9. Enjoying life in Kent

A review of the Vision for Kent is underway to reflect the changing scenario of local governance since it was written. In particular the review will be an opportunity for the district based Community Strategies, which have also been written since the Vision's preparation, to form part of the Vision. It will also incorporate learning from the LPSA, LAA and KPSB.

Integrating LPSA 2 'Priorities for Improvement'

A further widespread consultation exercise was conducted to inform Kent's 'Priorities for Improvement' for LPSA2. KCC's LPSA2 Stage One submission

was prepared after very full consultation that resulted in widespread agreement to the following priorities:

1. Thriving young children
2. Motivated children in excellent schools
3. Pathways to employment
4. Healthy living
5. Stable and independent families
6. Independent living for older people
7. Helping vulnerable people to help themselves
8. Work as the best form of welfare
9. Clean Kent and safe Kent
10. Personal security (from violence, abuse and aggression)
11. Active Communities
12. Quality regeneration
13. Growth in Kent
14. Dynamic Kent
15. Effectiveness of the public sector

Consultation on the LAA

Since the announcement that Kent has been selected as a pilot LAA there has been a further concerted effort by all partners in Kent to review once again our priorities for high level outcomes and to identify appropriate indicators, necessary and desirable freedoms, and relevant funding streams. There have been numerous meetings, briefings, discussions and workshops that were brought together into two comprehensive position statements. These statements were sent to over 120 key stakeholders, one prior to Christmas and one in mid January asking for views. There was a hugely positive response – both in quantity and quality - to each consultation and views have been taken on board wherever possible. A consultation diary that captures the main consultation events is attached at Appendix 6.

Success criteria for the LAA

This Local Area Agreement is part of a journey towards greater local autonomy for public services. It must evolve over the next few years. We must build within the process some key tests for gauging the success of the LAA. The key test will be progress towards the outcomes. However, the LAA is also about changing relationships and ways of working. In three years time we will therefore expect to see public services not only performing better, but also which have the scope for variety and innovation, and which are empowered to do things differently and to take well-managed risks.

Inspection, regulation, and performance monitoring by central government will all have eased and there will be an equal relationship between local services and central government. The high performance ratings, which many of the public service organisations in Kent have achieved, carry with them freedoms related to performance management, financial arrangements and inspection.

We believe that for the LAA to deliver the maximum benefit to central and local government and to the public, the LAA should deliver at least an equivalent level of freedom with no significant addition to the performance management burden. The outcomes are not meant to create an additional layer of performance management. Rather, they are designed to enhance the work being done to deliver some targets that are already in place and deliver enhanced results through “stretch”, whether that is by wider engagement, new ways of working or government-sponsored freedoms and flexibilities.

Focus on areas of deprivation

Kent is a county with stark contrasts, particularly between the more prosperous West Kent and the more deprived East Kent. The countywide and sub-county partners to the LAA are acutely aware of this disparity and are working to reduce it. The outcomes within the LAA are expressed as countywide outcomes setting out improvements for all Kent residents. The focus on converging performance and prosperity between deprived areas with the more affluent areas will emerge from the delivery mechanism of the LAA agreed with each partner.

This will support the Supporting **Independence Programme** which is a key strategic approach in Kent aiming to work in the most disadvantaged localities (as defined by the Index of Multiple Deprivation) and with the most disadvantaged groups in the population to build bespoke approaches to child poverty, worklessness and economic vitality. Many of the SIP projects and approaches will support the outcomes in each of the three blocks, such as the productive partnership with DWP and Job Centre Plus which is helping people into work.

Introduction to the high level outcomes

LAA summary of outcomes		revision #: 6	
#	Outcome	Agreed LPSA outcome	Outcome directly supports SIP
Block 1: Children and young people			
1	To promote the physical, emotional, social and intellectual development of young children so they flourish at home and at school (LPSA2)	yes	yes
2	To significantly improve performance in literacy and numeracy in primary schools (LPSA2)	yes	
3	To improve the education of children in care (LPSA2, SIP)	yes	yes
4	To identify children and young people (aged 0 to18) with emotional and / or psychological difficulties at the earliest possible stage and respond with the most effective support	yes	
5	To increase attendance in primary schools (LPSA2)	yes	
6	To increase the number of young people who have the skills and vocational qualifications for work (LPSA2, SIP)	yes	yes
7	To improve participation and engagement by all children and young people in youth, cultural and community activities.		
Block 2: Safer and stronger communities			
8	To develop the economic prosperity of Kent		yes
9	To make Kent a safer place to work, live and travel (LPSA2)	yes	yes
10	To reduce crime affecting local communities (HO PSA1).		yes
11	To reduce the harm caused by substance misuse (especially alcohol and drugs), including substantially increasing the number of drug misusing offenders entering treatment through the CJS. (HO PSA4)		yes
12	To reassure the public, reducing fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and building confidence in the Criminal Justice System without compromising fairness (HO PSA2/3).		
13	To increase the capacity of local communities so that people are empowered to participate in local decision making and delivery of services. (Mandatory-LAA Advice note 1, SSCF, HO PSA6).		

14	Cleaner and greener public spaces (LPSA2. LAA Advice Note 1)	yes	Yes
15	(Deleted)		
Block 3: Healthier communities and older people			
16	To promote independence through employment for those who are able to work.		yes
17	To promote the health of Kent's residents and reduce health inequalities by addressing variations in health across the County	yes	
18	To ensure Kent residents have access to homes of excellent quality, in the right place, at the right time, and at the right cost	yes	yes
19	To promote independent living for all (LPSA2)	yes	yes

Block 1 Children and Young People

Context: The outcomes in this block need to be seen within the context of the general development of services for children and young people in Kent and the Supporting Independence Programme. The County Council and its partners are responding in a number of ways to the Every Child Matters framework. The key policy elements and drivers that need to be recognised are:

- We have set up an overarching **strategic partnership** for children and young people. This is a multi-agency group, linked to the Kent Partnership, which will "own" those elements of the Local Area Agreement that apply to or affect the lives of children and young people. Most but not all of those elements sit within the Children and Young People's block.
- The development of multi-agency **children's consortia** and **school clusters** place the capacity for planning, developing and commissioning many services for children and young people at a local level. Children's Centres in Kent will be one focus for the delivery of these services. The children's consortia have prime responsibility for preventative services as outlined in the **Local Preventative Strategy**. Schools' clusters are exploring new, collaborative approaches to meeting the needs of pupils and driving educational improvement. The rationale for many of the **freedoms** we seek from this agreement is to maximise local flexibility for these partnerships and centres. This fits well with the government agenda for children and the DfES 5year strategy. It is also key to the successful mainstreaming of area based initiatives and to introducing maximum stability into the child care market.
- **Local Public Service Agreement.** As a result of KCC's LPSA1, significantly improved outcomes for children were achieved. In particular, against a national upward trend of children coming into local authority care, we managed to reduce those numbers and to increase stability for children in care by increasing the numbers being adopted. We now want to focus on delivering the best outcomes for those children who are looked after by us. Our second local public service agreement (LPSA2) was well advanced at the outset of this pilot and is embedded into the Local Area Agreement. LPSA2 had a concentration on children and young people. Six of the seven outcome areas in this block relate to LPSA2 targets and are the result of a much longer period of consultation with partners than has been possible within the LAA development timescale.

Outcomes in this block:

- 1 To promote the physical, emotional, social and intellectual development of young children² so they flourish at home and at school (LPSA2)
- 2 To significantly improve performance in literacy and numeracy in primary schools (LPSA2)
- 3 To improve the education of children in care (LPSA2)
- 4 To identify children and young people (aged 0 to18) with emotional and / or psychological difficulties at the earliest possible stage and respond with the most effective support
- 5 To increase attendance in primary schools (LPSA2)
- 6 To increase the number of young people³ who have the skills and vocational qualifications for work (LPSA2)
- 7 To improve participation and engagement by all children and young people in youth, cultural and community activities.

Outcome 7 emerged from the LAA consultation and is strongly supported by district and borough councils. It aims to capture the unique contribution made at district level to the well being of all children and young people, directly and through their local community leadership role. We envisage that this outcome will be measured by a series of underpinning "contracts for outcomes" with district, borough and city councils and through them, their partners including the voluntary and community sector. This will form an important element of our implementation of the Every Child Matters agenda. District, borough and city council partners will use their community planning and other consultative mechanisms to agree indicators that reflect the priorities for the locality, including targeting of excluded or other high need groups.

Consultation with and participation by children and young people is a key element of developing children and young people's services in Kent, and underpins the successful achievement of all the outcomes in this block. Hence, though consideration was given, we have not identified it as a separate outcome.

This block is organised like the others to include the key indicators against which progress will be demonstrated with supporting indicators drawn from performance criteria which partners already measure. It is important that reporting, monitoring and inspection are not increased. By capturing current reporting which feeds into the overall outcome it will help to demonstrate the whole picture and ensure engagement by partners at different levels. The latter are not the indicators against which external scrutiny will be applied within the LAA.

Maximising the impact of the LAA:

The Local Area Agreement does not represent the whole of Kent's approach to children's services. It is an articulation of priorities, identified through consultation, as being shared between partners. It has been developed within the policy context described above but does not represent (and nor should it)

² Birth to five years of age

³ 13-19, with an older upper limit for young people with a disability or care leavers

everything that children and young people in Kent and their families can expect from us. We have concentrated on those outcomes where value can be added through mature partnership working.

Block 2 STRONGER AND SAFER COMMUNITIES BLOCK

Community safety issues are at the core of the Stronger and Safer Communities block but we have also sought to include issues which strengthen community cohesion and participation, the environment in which people live work and travel and the economic prosperity which underpins quality of life. The seven outcomes included in this block are:

- Outcome 8 – To develop the economic prosperity of Kent
- Outcome 9 - To make Kent a safer place to work, live and travel
- Outcome 10 - To reduce crime affecting local communities.
- Outcome 11 - To reduce harm caused by illegal drugs, including substantially increasing the number of drug misusing offenders entering treatment through the CJS.
- Outcome 12 - To reassure the public, reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and build confidence in the Criminal Justice System without compromising fairness
- Outcome 13 - To increase the capacity of local communities so that people are empowered to participate in local decision making and the delivery of services.
- Outcome 14 - Cleaner and Greener Public Spaces.

Economic prosperity is deliberately placed to the fore because it represents the core of Kent's Supporting Independence Programme: reducing dependency through increasing employment and fulfilment. The next five are community safety based and represent Home Office national PSA targets (10, 12 and 13) and one of Kent's chosen LPSA targets (9). Outcome 14 is a key component in encouraging choice, involvement and confidence in local communities. It is embedded in the "Stronger and Safer Communities Fund" with its associated targets. Finally Outcome 15 is based on a better environment with Kent's LPSA target of a "Cleaner Kent" embedded within it.

Economic prosperity in Kent can be influenced by partners' own service provision and employment and their ability to facilitate change. In Kent, partners are addressing a range of issues which aim to transform the local economy through action on, for example: the skills agenda; supporting initiatives leading to business innovation and productivity gains; supporting entrepreneurship, inward investment and business development initiatives; and by investing in infrastructure. All of these activities can only exert an indirect influence on prospects for economic prosperity but the indicators chosen for outcome 8 will show how these indirect influences increase economic prosperity in Kent.

Delivery of all these outcomes will be complex involving national agencies, county wide bodies and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships at local level. Within the overarching outcomes local priorities will vary considerably and these will be subject to subsequent negotiations between partners. There

will also be considerable cross cutting with other blocks such as mental health, school exclusion and drug treatment.

The Partnership is clear that the potential benefits of real partnership through cross agency working are considerable in this block.

This block is organised like the others to include the key indicators against which progress will be demonstrated with supporting indicators drawn from performance criteria which partners already measure. It is important that reporting, monitoring and inspection are not increased. By capturing current reporting which feeds into the overall outcome it will help to demonstrate the whole picture and ensure engagement by partners at different levels. The latter are not the indicators against which external scrutiny will be applied within the LAA.

The final part of this submission concerns potential freedoms and flexibilities. The key ones that underscore delivery of this block are:

There are two over-arching freedoms for this block:

- Lighter touch inspection process
- Crime fighting fund

Outcome 8:

- To retain a significant % of growth in business rates and council tax within Kent.

Outcome 9:

- Increased local autonomy of Kent & Medway Camera Partnerships.
- Retain revenue from Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).

Outcome 10:

- Crime measurement.
- Use of local surveys.

Outcome 11:

- Freedom to bid for the legislative opportunity to have pilot status.
- Pooled funds for alcohol and drug related problems.

The remaining bids for freedoms and flexibilities are include against the particular outcomes where they pertain.

Block 3 Healthier Communities and Older People.

1. Context.

The LAA gives partners in Kent the opportunity to deliver powerful outcomes that address the issues of poor health and variations in health. The recent White Paper *Choosing Health* creates the environment for this block and enables the partners to share ideas in a clear context:

Healthy choices are often difficult for anyone to make, but where people do not feel in control of their environment or their personal circumstances, the task can be more challenging. People who are disabled or suffer from mental ill-health, struggle for money, out of work, poorly qualified, or who live in inadequate or temporary accommodation or in an area of high crime, are likely to experience less control over their lives than others and are often pressed to cope with immediate priorities. ...People are more likely to take more control over their own health if they have more control over their lives.

Choosing Health November 2004.

In addition to the Public Health White Paper there are other policy drivers relevant to this block, including Every Child Matters and the ODPM's regional housing strategy. Kent's Supporting Independence Programme is a theme that echoes the thrust of *Choosing Health* and underpins all the outcomes in this block. The inclusion of outcomes relating to employment and housing reflects both the scale of the agenda and the commitment to integrated planning and development to deliver lasting outcomes that promote and improve the health of Kent's people and communities. There will also be a number of measures in this and other blocks that will support a reduction in the demand placed on the secondary healthcare sector, particularly attendance at Accident and Emergency and admissions.

The hallmarks of this block are: building healthier communities in a sustainable way; supporting the independence of all our population, with specific attention to the needs and aspirations of older people and people from vulnerable groups; and access to community facilities and services. All through convergent outcomes that deliver a series of benefits.

The outcomes proposed are:

- To improve the health of Kent's residents, and reduce health inequalities by addressing variations in health across the county.
- To promote independent living for all - focusing on vulnerable people
- To increase independence through reducing worklessness among those who are able to work
- To ensure that Kent residents have access to homes of excellent quality, in the right place, at the right time and at the right cost

This block is organised like the others to include the key indicators against which progress will be demonstrated with supporting indicators drawn from performance criteria which partners already measure. It is important that reporting, monitoring and inspection are not increased. By capturing current reporting which feeds into the overall outcome it will help to demonstrate the whole picture and ensure engagement by partners at different levels. The latter are not the indicators against which external scrutiny will be applied within the LAA.

3. Freedoms and flexibilities

To enable high achievement in relation to the above outcomes, to “stretch” performance beyond that achievable within current constraints, and to make major further improvements in the public service offer to the people of Kent, a series of “freedoms and flexibilities” are required. Local Area Agreements provide a further opportunity to demonstrate how Government can enable improvements in local services by freeing up local partners to deliver. This releases the energy, commitment and innovation of local agencies, managers and staff to deliver high quality and efficient services responsive to national priorities *and* local needs.

As has been discussed earlier, most of the Kent partners to this Agreement have been independently assessed as good or excellent. With the principle of ‘earned autonomy’ Kent is particularly well placed to make good use of additional freedoms. The freedoms and flexibilities we have identified, building on those proposed as part of the LPSA2 process and based on the evidence we have of the barriers to performance improvement are listed below, and details are given in Appendix 5.

Overarching Freedoms

Supporting People Programme to be managed locally: to reduce its extraordinary amount of administration

Intervention in ‘failing ‘ and ‘weak’ service providers: LAA partners should be given the responsibility to recommend the most appropriate and acceptable way to deploy the expertise of any excellent public service provider to assist the recovery of an under performing LAA partner.

Reinvestment in Kent of savings brought about through the LAA: When the LAA achieves cross-sector savings between LAA partners, these savings shall be retained within the LAA and re-invested accordingly. Where the actions and investment of a LAA partner delivers a saving to a non LAA partner, incentives shall be devised such that a portion of the saving can be retained by the LAA partner which made the original investment

Concentrations of highly dependent people within Kent: to reduce flow to Kent of high-dependency people from London, and stem the continued inflow to Kent's coastal town of high-dependency groups, particularly looked-after children, vulnerable adults and elderly adults.

Elimination of perverse effect of reducing benefit claims

Distribution of Lottery / Other Funds: Devolved management and coordination of key funding at a Kent-wide level to focus resources on priority outcomes and to avoid duplication. A greater role for the Kent PSB in the determination of Lottery and other funding distribution.

Share the Asset Gain from Regeneration: overcomes inequitable share of property value enhancement from regeneration

Deprivation Funding: use the new criterion of Super Output Areas, to bring additional money to Kent

Cheaper PFI borrowing: explore new approaches which build on the Government's Credit Guarantee Finance Initiative, to save KCC many £million from the interest rate differential, and savings from reduced banking fees

Capital and expense budgets: freedom to strike a local balance between capital and expense budget allocations, and assurance of timely operational funding.

Unrestricted funding streams: to streamline management and administration, resulting in more investment in front-line services and greater resource efficiency; more-coherent planning and more-timely expenditure; better value for money; and mitigation of risk of insufficient cash to finish a worthy job

Security of three year funding: overcomes the short-term funding horizon that inhibits medium-term project delivery and the quality of services

Referenda for hypothecated taxes: overcomes lack of local ability to raise a tax, when residents are willing to pay an additional amount for specified purpose

VAT regulations discourage the community use of school premises: freedom to apply LA VAT exempt status to community use of school facilities, and extend LA VAT exempt status to investments made via development partners in shared facilities.

Block 1 Children and Younger People

Administer weak childcare provision as 'going concern': For the LEA to administer a failed or bankrupt childcare provider on a temporary 'going concern' basis until the provision is re-registered under a new operator, or another replacement is found.

Children's Centres: flexibility to develop Children's Centres in such a way that local needs are reflected and sustainability enhanced

Extend the Lone Parent initiative of Job Centre Plus: to exploit a successful initiative that could reduce the number of lone parents claiming benefit

Collaborative working between school clusters: Incentive for schools clusters to work collaboratively on school improvement

Cluster league tables: DFES shall assist and support creation of Cluster League tables as proposed by the Innovation Forum.

Admission threshold to special school: remove the requirement for a pupil to have a Special Educational Needs assessment

Business rates on schools' work-based learning initiative (incubator units): abolition or reduction of business rates for 'incubator units' on educational sites

Block 2 Safer and Stronger Community

Lighter touch inspection process: a move away from government bureaucracy which will allow for greater autonomy in focusing on local issues.

Crime Fighting Fund: to lighten the financial sanctions and extend the fund to other members of the police family.

Increased local autonomy of Kent & Medway Camera Partnerships: to deploy speed cameras in response to local concerns

Revenue from Fixed Penalty Notices: to be used to tackle other Community Safety priorities

Crime measurement: overcomes inaccurate and misleading measurement comparisons

Use of local surveys: rather than relying on nationally held and annually published crime data, this would allow Kent to be more responsive

Bid for pilot status: Innovative Kent should be considered a prime candidate for any national pilots being considered by the CJS

Multiple Addictions – Drugs and Alcohol: More flexible use of all substance misuse related funding

Block 3: Healthier People & Older People

Evaluation of Kent Supporting Independence Programme: HMT to continue their sponsorship of the joint Government / DWP / KCC research project conducted by Oxford University into the welfare benefit expenditure in Kent.

DWP Explorer Partnership: to develop support with DWP to get clients who have been on Incapacity Benefit for two years back to work

Exemption from Personal Capability Assessment (PCA): flexibility about whether the LPSA2 target group (clients who have been receiving IB for over 2 years) who undertake permitted work are called for a Personal Capability Assessment (PCA).

Back to work payments: to be able to make one off payments to particular client groups, to provide the additional financial security they need to make the transition back to work.

Six Month Threshold for access to training: freedom to be able to offer early entry to training programs based on the needs of particularly vulnerable groups.

Permitted Work rules: harmonise different rules regarding the permitted work you can do depending on which benefit you receive

Treatment of historic accumulated debt: To ease those elements of the current NHS financial regime make it more difficult for NHS Trusts to pay historic accumulated debt

Multiple Addictions – Drugs and Alcohol: More flexible use of all substance misuse related funding

Council tax raised on long term empty homes: For Kent LAs to retain council tax raised from long term empty homes in order to re-invest it in the regeneration of local communities.

Unfit landlords: Discretion to refuse to pay Housing Benefit to landlords of unfit properties or landlords that are not part of a registration scheme

Tax incentive to assist older people to move to more appropriate accommodation: out of unsuitable, large homes

Supporting People Programme to be managed locally: reducing the requirement for so much detailed data

Direct Payments: Freedom for people to purchase social care services from KCC using Direct Payments

The LAA process is seeking to identify freedoms that can be negotiated before the end of March 2005. However, experience of developing freedoms with Government, for example through the LPSA negotiations and through the Innovation Forum (of excellent local authorities) has shown how difficult and slow this can be. Our early discussions with GOSE confirm that it will not be possible to agree many of these freedoms before the start of the LAA. However GOSE has agreed to continue the dialogue after signing and for there to be quarterly meetings to monitor progress.

4. Funding

The guidance on Local Area Agreements requires the inclusion of specified funding streams as set out in Appendix 5. While these streams will support various activities contributing to the delivery of the key outcomes in the LAA. **The Kent Partnership has undertaken not to move money between organisations without the express permission of accountable partners.** (The Stronger and Safer Communities Fund is the only one which requires advanced designation in the LAA.)

Indeed, the Kent Public Service Board has taken the strategic decision that in order to better address the needs and aspirations of Kent, to contribute even more effectively to meeting national priorities, and to promote closer collaborative working across public services, all funding should be included for consideration. The partners on the Board represent £6.9 billion of public expenditure in Kent and envisage, following due process of consideration through the appropriate accountable channels, to allocate these resources more closely in line with local and national priorities.

Hence, as the LAA is developed and implemented, opportunities for using funding streams and mainstream funding differently may emerge. If the relevant accountable partners give their full consent, we will seek to negotiate such flexibilities with GOSE and relevant Government departments.

6. Performance Management Framework

One of the aims of Local Area Agreements is to lighten the administrative burden on local agencies and organisations and to reduce, or preferably eliminate, unnecessary bureaucracy. In devising the LAA for Kent we need to guard against the creation of additional performance monitoring and against the mere transfer of administrative requirements from a national-local nexus to a county-local nexus.

Government appropriately needs reassurance that there is steady progress towards the outcomes identified in the LAA. We will provide this through regular reporting on the primary countywide indicators for each outcome (There are between two and five primary indicators per outcome.) This suite of countywide indicators will be the total performance monitoring framework between GOSE and the LAA partners.

Each outcome will also have a set of secondary indicators. The purpose of these indicators is to allow individual sub-county agencies to select those indicators that are most important to their locality. This mechanism allows them to contribute to the countywide outcome by taking action at a local level.

Even this limited form of performance management framework has the danger of resulting in additional monitoring, over and above existing monitoring. We will therefore be pressing for every opportunity to reduce this burden.

7. Delivery the Local Area Agreement across Kent

Kent's Local Area Agreement will be one of the most complicated to deliver in the country. Kent is the largest county and the LAA has been developed and will be implemented in partnership with twelve districts, nine primary care trusts, nine local strategic partnerships, three delivery boards, four area partnerships and twelve crime and reduction partnerships – and this list is not exhaustive. The Agreement has been negotiated through widespread consultation but in a highly constrained time scale. Partners have sought reassurance that the Agreement should therefore be seen not as an end product but as the basis for a maturing and iterative process in which all will continue to learn and work together.

The LAA guidance placed clear responsibility on Kent County Council to lead on consulting with partners. However delivery of the Agreement will be by the array of partners represented in the Kent Partnership and, within this, the Public Service Board. The Board is clear that as well as the involvement of public sector bodies, it is vital to have the full engagement of the private, voluntary and community sectors in supporting and guiding the delivery of this Agreement at all levels.

We propose to develop agreements between the County and each District to own and deliver the parts of the overall agreement which are pertinent. A community leadership role is envisaged in both tiers including being the respective accountable bodies. Districts will in turn engage with their local strategic partnerships and crime and disorder reduction partnerships. The result should be both horizontal and vertical engagement: for example a PCT will engage through its local strategic partnership and through the overall health arrangements for county representation. Further mechanisms will be required with area partnerships and delivery boards which will be addressed through a review of current arrangements.

The LAA will incorporate Local Public Service Agreement 2, though the potential performance reward grant will apply only to targets embedded in LPSA2. However, by bringing them together it encourages coherence in what Kent is seeking to achieve.

The net impact of agreeing the Local Area Agreement will be a real impetus towards better partnership working. The consultation process has shown an enthusiasm to seize the opportunities. But realising the full potential will require patient and painstaking negotiations to work through the complex partnership arrangements to ensure wide engagement, effective joint working and a better result for the people and communities in Kent.

Block 1 Children and Young People

Note regarding freedoms:

Many of the freedoms in this block relate to more than one freedom. To avoid duplication each freedom is shown only once, in a section at the end of this block, with a note showing which outcome it relates to.

Outcome: 1: To promote the physical, emotional, social and intellectual development of young children so they flourish at home and at school.

This is an LPSA2 target and is being negotiated with ODPM. Renegotiation of the target will not form part of the LAA process.

Lead partner	KCC E & L Directorate JCP & KCC Partnership Board (Sub target ii)
Other partners	<p>Principal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All maintained, voluntary and private early years providers within the defined areas, • The Pre-School Learning Alliance, • Sure Starts, • Children's Centres • Early Years Development and Childcare Partnership, • Children's Consortia. <p>Secondary: Multi-agency preventative group overseen by the Children's Strategic Board (E&L, SSD, Health), with District based planning and commissioning.</p>

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
i. take-up of early years education by 3 year olds	LPSA2	E & L EYCCP	Sure Start Private Providers
ii. the number of lone parents coming off income support in Kent	LPSA2	JCP & KCC Partnership Board	EYCCP SIP Team
iii. In 3 District Council areas with high levels of deprivation (Dover, Gravesham and Swale) advance the development of young children by the age of 5 by 2 months, as measured by the following: - Cognition Test: (BAS Non Verbal Reasoning Pattern Construction); - Language Test: (BAS Naming Vocabulary and Verbal Comprehension).	LPSA2	E & L	
iv. (LAA additional indicator)To reduce the number of children on the Child Protection Register or coming into care whose main need for services arises because of the capacity of their parents or carers to care for them is impaired by mental illness or addictions.	CIN Census	Social Services	Children's Consortia

Secondary indicators for roll-out⁴			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Increase the number of parents who take training in parenting skills			

⁴ The primary, county-wide indicators for each outcome across all blocks are the product of focussed work looking at the priorities and targets that partners have identified which would benefit from wider involvement or where targets converge. These indicators draw in a number of suggested secondary indicators and initial thoughts about possible lead and partnership arrangements, which will be developed through further local planning.

Outcome 2: To significantly improve performance in literacy and/or numeracy in primary schools. This outcome will focus on a target group of 48 of the county's largest primary schools (NOR between 277 and 574 and total pupil roll of 18272 pupils)

This is an LPSA2 target and is being negotiated with ODPM. Renegotiation of the target will not form part of the LAA process.

Lead partner	KCC Education
Other partners	Schools, school clusters.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Number of pupils achieving level 4 or above in English (48 target schools)	LPSA2	KCC Education	
Number of pupils achieving level 4 or above in Mathematics (48 target schools)	LPSA2	KCC Education	

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners

Outcome 3: To improve the education of children in care

This is an LPSA2 target and is being negotiated with ODPM. Renegotiation of the target will not form part of the LAA process.

Lead partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Council Education & Libraries and Social Services Directorates,
Other partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools • Health Agencies, • Kent and Medway Connexions • Learning and Skills Council <p>Government Departments & Agencies engaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSCI • DfES • DH

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
i. The proportion of children looked after by Kent County Council who achieve level 4+ in English / Maths at Key Stage 2 (LPSA2)	KCC	KCC	
ii. The proportion of young people looked after by Kent County Council who achieve 5 A*-G at GCSE or equivalent ⁱ by aged 18 (LPSA2)	KCC	KCC	
iii. The proportion of young people looked after by Kent County Council who achieve level 5+ in English/Maths at Key Stage 3 (LPSA2)	KCC	KCC	

Secondary indicators for roll-out - None			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners

Outcome 4: To identify children and young people (aged 0 to18) with emotional and / or psychological difficulties at the earliest possible stage and respond with the most effective support

This is an LPSA2 target and is being negotiated with ODPM. Renegotiation of the target will not form part of the LAA process.

Lead partner	- East Kent Coastal PCT – on behalf of the Kent PCTs - CORC ‘CAMHS Outcomes Research Consortium’ suggested as the “overseers of the project”.
Other partners	Partners engaged , Project Group to be convened to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Health Authority • CAMHS Outcomes Research Consortium • Primary Care Trusts & GPs • LEA & Schools • Specialist CAMHS Providers • Social Services • Parents Government Departments & Agencies engaged: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DH • DFES • CSCI

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurable improvement in the sources of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQ) completed by parents, children/young people and practitioners to evaluate the impact of the support received by the children/young person. (LPSA2). To be applied across a range of support from early intervention through to specialist CAMHS 	SDQs	CORC	SHI Soc Services PCT's

<p>services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure change in the SDQ score at 6 month follow-up as compared with community sample, using R Goodman 'youthmind' algorithm 			
<p>EKPCT also suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLASC (Pupil Level Annual Schools Census) • referrals to Tier 3 CAMHS • a baseline for activity at Tier 2 (from existing projects such as WAVE, PIP and Cascade. <p>N.b this could still be measured on a 6 month cumulative basis, with PSA measurement principles being met through a baseline of "how many children", "without PSA" as with no support and "with PSA" as with support.</p>		<p>LEA, PCT Soc Services</p>	

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
"reduced waiting times"	NHS target		
"increased activity"	Local Del Plan		

Problem	The SEN threshold is too strict, procedures are lengthy and effect is all or nothing.
Freedom sought	Remove the requirement for a pupil to have a Special Educational Needs assessment in order to gain admission into a special school or unit.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Promotes inclusion in main stream education for children with additional needs.
Benefits to LAA partners	This will enhance engagement between mainstream and special schools.

Benefits to the community	This will support the wide range of needs across the school population.
----------------------------------	---

Notes:

- ODPM , DH and KCC all feel target all equally committed to inclusion of this target
- The target is about “quality support per child”, not just “numbers seen”.
- Kent partners believe that this is an excellent project, which could change the way in which this area of work is approached, with the possibility of highly beneficial outcomes. However, there is a large amount of risk and this should be reflected in the degree of achievement/ “stretch” required.
- Suggest that CORC be the “overseers of the project”.EKCPCT would agree to lead, but would require support in financial/ in kind terms. This could be a legitimate call on PPG

It is anticipated that KCC and Health will make use of existing flexibilities regarding joint or lead commissioning and utilising pooled budgets, however KCC would seek assurances from DOH on three points:

- 1) The CAMHS grant will not be reduced below its current level for the duration of the LPSA2 (Financial year-end 31st March 2008).
- 2) DOH will match the Councils investment for future mainstreaming of provision beyond the duration of the LPSA2 to reinforce sustainability
- 3) Any savings for PCTs under the CAMHS budget heading as a result of LPSA2, are reinvested in CAMHS preventative services

Outcome 5: To increase attendance in primary schools

This is an LPSA2 target and has been agreed with ODPM. Renegotiation of the target will not form part of the LAA process.

Lead partner	KCC Education
Other partners	Schools, schools clusters, children's consortia, police

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
The percentage of half days attended by all pupils in primary schools maintained by the local authority.	DfES performance tables		

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
None identified at this stage.			

Outcome 6: To increase the number of young people who have the skills and vocational qualifications for work

This is an LPSA2 target and is being negotiated with ODPM. Renegotiation of the target will not form part of the LAA process.

Lead partner	KCC Education
Other partners	Learning and Skills Council, Connexions

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
The number of 14-18 year olds achieving part or full vocationally related qualifications at levels 1 and 2.	Standard DfES measure		
The number of full level 3 qualifications gained by young people up to the age of 19	As above		
The number of 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training (NEET) with no increase in the number of 16-18 year olds categorised as unknown	As above		

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Negotiations not finalised at this stage.			
Possibly: young people completing higher education and numbers of young people receiving advice and guidance from the Connexions service			

Outcome 7: To improve participation and engagement by all children and young people in youth, cultural and community activities

Lead partner	District, borough and city councils
Other partners	District LSPs and other partnerships at district, borough and city level

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
<p>We envisage that this outcome will be measured by a series of underpinning "contracts for outcomes" with district, borough and city councils and through them, their partners including the voluntary and community sector.</p> <p>This will form an important element of our implementation of the Every Child Matters framework. District, borough and city council partners will use their community planning and other consultative mechanisms to agree indicators that reflect the priorities for the locality, including targeting of excluded or other need groups. Examples of possible indicators are given below</p>			<p>KCC will support the achievement of district-led targets primarily through their staff working at the local level.</p>

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Use of recreational facilities (by all and by targeted groups)	To be defined as through the contract		

	for outcomes		
Participation in organised social activities such as the Children's University, summer activity schemes, voluntary activity			
Engagement in arts and cultural activities			
Diversionary and positive living projects			
Use of libraries by children and young people			

Freedom and flexibilities for Outcome 7

None sought for this outcome specifically although some freedoms for the block could support this outcome (see schedule of freedoms). We would seek approval of the method outlined above.

Freedom: Block 1 Children and Younger People

Outcome 1.

Administer weak childcare provision as 'going concern'	
Problem	Collapse of a local childcare provider. Childcare places in Kent have high turnover rate that suggests an unstable market.
Freedom sought	<p>The LEA may administer a failed or bankrupt childcare provider on a temporary 'going concern' basis until the provision is re-registered under a new operator, or another replacement is found.</p> <p>The normal re-registration process is lengthy. The proposed power would ensure children received continuing good-quality provision of early care and education in a timely fashion. Currently, families in this situation are often left with no provision at all, causing negative impacts on employment, poverty etc.</p> <p>This power supports the Government's wrap-around childcare and child poverty ambitions.</p> <p>This power might already exist under the well-being powers of the Local Government Act 2000 - opinion sought.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Increase sustainability of childcare in Kent. Importance of stable market is two-fold; helping both early education outcomes and helping working parents.
Benefits to LAA partners	Supports agreed LAA and LPSA targets.
Benefits to the community	Increasing stability in the market helps to move from supply led to demand led market. Demand led market is more likely to raise standards.

NB. We understand from early feedback that this freedom may be unacceptable to OfSTED. We are working an alternative designed to address high turnover in the childcare economy.

Outcome 1

Children's Centres	
Problem	Ensuring that, without compromising the core offer of children's centres, we have maximum local flexibility to respond to local need
Freedom sought	<p>KCC is granted flexibility so that it may develop Children's Centres in such a way that local needs are reflected and sustainability enhanced. This includes discretion on the location, model and approval mechanism of Children's Centres. Location: maintain focus on the most deprived wards but allow us to respond to smaller sub-ward areas of disadvantage.</p> <p>Model: There are some examples in Kent where a hub and satellite model would suit local need. As an excellent authority, we believe that KCC should be able to approve its own centres. This will increase accountability to local communities and to partners.</p> <p>It will not prejudice the core offer of Children's Centres nor the focus on areas of deprivation.</p> <p>Further negotiation of this freedom will take account of the second round of Children's Centre guidance.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	<p>Sustainability, reach and mainstreaming</p> <p>Brings children's centres further into the strategic purview of the Public Service Board enabling best possible fit with extended schools and other local developments.</p>
Benefits to LAA partners	Access to best services, local flexibility.
Benefits to the community	Early Years and Child Care Unit

Outcomes 1- 6

Extend the Lone Parent initiative of Job Centre Plus	
Problem	JobCentrePlus is unable to exploit a successful initiative that could reduce the number of lone parents

	claiming benefit in Kent.
Freedom sought	<p>Extend the freedoms currently held by Job Centre Plus (in Employment Action Zones and Extended School Pilot areas) to the KCC/Job Centre Plus Partnership Board.</p> <p>This includes freedoms such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childcare Tasters (offering a lone parent a childcare trial) • Debt Counselling (offering this where debt is a barrier to employment) • Childcare Assist (advance funding of childcare costs before a parent starts work) • Quarterly Work Focussed Interviews)(with particular help focused on the needs of lone parents).
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	<p>This freedom would directly contribute to Governments social and economic programme, specifically the raft of Government Spending review targets contained in 'Opportunity for all', which have the aim of eradicating child poverty by 2010, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the employment rate of lone parents, taking account of the economic cycle, and significantly reduce the difference between their employment rate and the overall rate. DWP PSA Target 4a • 'reduce the proportion of children living in workless households by 5.0 per cent between Spring 2005 and Spring 2008' • 'Aim for 70 percent of lone parents to be in work by 2010' • 'halve the number of children in relative low-income households between 1998-99 and 2010-11, on the way to eradication of child poverty by 2010' • 'increase the take-up of formal childcare by lower income working families by 50 percent'
Benefits to LAA partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More lone parents come off welfare into paid employment. • Freedoms will help business and agencies to access another skills source, reduce skills shortages, increases qualifications base, boosts productivity; • Targeting will be directed towards particular wards with high levels of parents in long term unemployment and therefore acts as a positive stimulus to help social and economic regeneration • These freedoms would encourage partnership work between the various agencies targeting this group by giving agencies more discretion over funding • This change would ensure that to a greater degree, Kent's Supporting Independence Programme 'SIP'

	and the 9 archetypes become a central plank of LAA.
Benefits to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childcare becomes more affordable, through adjustments to the working tax credit or child tax credit. It is particularly advantageous for lone parents in disadvantaged areas. • Permits parents to enter or re-enter the labour market or training; • Helps parents overcome barriers and disincentives to employment • creating opportunities for lone mothers to improve their earnings capacity • the value of jobs in improving lone mothers' material well-being and reducing family hardship employment provides additional hidden additional advantages such as access to mainstream credit, pensions

Outcomes 3, 5 and 6.

Collaborative working between school clusters	
Problem	Incentive for schools clusters to work collaboratively on school improvement
Freedom sought	Devolve the Schools' Standards Fund and Standards Grant to School Clusters (Foundation Partnerships).
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It would act as a further major incentive for collaborative working, especially at the Secondary school level, widening their agenda to focus on school improvement.
Benefits to LAA partners	This will help KCC to meet the three challenges of raising education standards, developing the improved and better integrated services required by the Children Act, and achieving efficiency targets.
Benefits to the community	This would allow more effective targeting of resources (circa £100m or 15% of the schools budget) to meet local needs.

Outcome 2, 3, 4 and 5

Cluster league tables	
Problem	Cluster League Tables needs central support. This would support a model of mutuality driving improvement rather than competition
Freedom sought	DFES shall assist and support creation of Cluster League tables as proposed by the Innovation Forum.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Drives improvement
Benefits to LAA partners	Allows collaborative responses to local solutions.
Benefits to the community	Increased confidence in the ability of local schools to meet the needs of a wider range of children. Anything that builds confidence in local schools will have associated benefits for community cohesion and infrastructure pressures (roads, transport)

Outcomes 2- 7

Admission threshold to special school	
Problem	The SEN threshold is too strict, procedures are lengthy and effect is all or nothing.
Freedom sought	Remove the requirement for a pupil to have a Special Educational Needs assessment in order to gain admission into a special school or unit.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central	Promotes inclusion in main stream education for children with additional needs.

government	
Benefits to LAA partners	This will enhance engagement between mainstream and special schools.
Benefits to the community	This will support the wide range of needs across the school population.

Outcome 3 and 6 plus associated outcomes in other streams.

Business rates on schools' work-based learning initiative (incubator units)	
Problem	Perverse effect of business rates on schools' work-based learning initiative
Freedom sought	Abolition or reduction of business rates for 'incubator units' on educational sites. Kent is encouraging schools to develop vocational links by encouraging small businesses to locate within the school premises in return for opportunities for pupils to experience work based learning. Kent could encourage many more business to participate if those incubator units could receive business rate relief.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Practical demonstration that government rhetoric supports enterprising schools. Increases business involvement in education. Encourages business start-ups, by reducing an entry barrier. Good leverage: social and workforce gain with minimal revenue cost. Addresses the skills gap
Benefits to LAA partners	Encouragement of children to gain work experience most conveniently. Combats youth scepticism about promotional messages on working. Reinforces school lessons and pupil motivation in more schools. Improved interaction between schools, business and the community
Benefits to the community	Enhanced opportunity for young people Addresses the skills gap Pupils become more employable when they finish school.

Block 2: Safer and Stronger Communities

Outcome 8: To develop the economic prosperity of Kent

Lead partner	Kent County Council.
Other partners	SEEDA, District Councils, LSC, Further and Higher Education sector, Area Strategic Partnerships, LSP's, Locate in Kent, KMEB, Delivery Boards for Sustainable Communities plan, KSBP.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Improve average wage levels in Kent compared to the National Average.	ASHE	KCC	
Increase by 100,000 over 10 years, and 30, 000 over the life of the LAA, the number of Kent people with jobs.	NOMIS/ABI	KCC	
Improve quality of life for people in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods (SSCF mandatory national outcome 4).	Shepway Pathfinder project	DC	All
User satisfaction.	Agency surveys	KCC, Kent Police, Kent Fire & Rescue Service	All

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
% of green technologies as part of overall businesses in Kent.	KER ^o	KCC	ALL

% of public sector procurement from businesses in Kent.	KER	KCC	ALL
% of new business start ups in Kent (some measure of perceptions of Kent as place for new business?).	KER	KCC	ALL
Male and female gross weekly earnings comparison.	KER	KCC	ALL
% of people not in work			
Tourism – something to measure it's contribution to economic prosperity.	KER	KCC	ALL
Kent utilising it's unique location as gateway to Europe - % of funds into Kent economy from Europe?	KER	KCC	ALL
% of people past statutory retirement age in employment.	KER	KCC	ALL
Average total income and % that is disposable income?	KER	KCC	ALL
Skills and qualifications – education, skills and training deprivation domain.	KER	KCC	ALL
Growth of social enterprise.	KER	KCC	ALL
Commuting – accessibility of adjacent labour markets.	KER	KCC	ALL

Freedom and flexibilities for Outcome 8	
Problem	Kent residents not seeing direct benefits of employment and housing growth
Freedom sought	Retain significant % of growth in business rates and council tax base within Kent
Priority	Desirable.
Benefits to central government	Create local funding streams to support infrastructure, skills and growth Support localism agenda
Benefits to LAA partners	More of Kent money for Kent people
Benefits to the community	Increase investment and return in skills, jobs growth and infrastructure

Outcome 9: To make Kent a safer place to work, live and travel (LPSA 2).

Lead partner	Kent Police
Other partners	Kent Fire and Rescue Service, Highways Agency, Driver & Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA), Strategic Health Authority (SHA), CDRPs, Kent County Council (KCC), District Councils (DCs), Kent Association of Parish Councils (KAPCs), Youth Offending Service (YOS), Kent Probation Service (KPS), Kent Drug & Alcohol Action Team (KDAAT), Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB), Voluntary Groups, Victim Support, Neighbourhood Watch.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
A reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road crashes (LPSA2).	STATS 19	KCC	DCs, Parish Councils, Highways Agency, Kent Police
Reduce anti-social behavior and violence in the nighttime economy, across the whole of Kent, by 10% against a current rising trend (LPSA2).	Storm Logs and recorded crime	Kent Police	All
Increase the percentage of people who consider Kent is a Safer County (LPSA2).	Your Police Survey (YPS)	Kent Police	All

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Levels of violence linked to the night-time economy	Recorded crime	Kent Police	All
Levels of criminal damage/vandalism	Recorded crime	Kent Police	All
Levels of antisocial behaviour	Storm	Kent Police	All
Worry about victimisation	YPS	Kent Police	All

Perceptions of antisocial behaviour	YPS	Kent Police	All
Feelings of safety	YPS	Kent Police	All

Freedom and flexibilities for Outcome 9	
Problem	1. Insufficient local autonomy of Kent & Medway Camera Partnerships.
Freedom sought	Increased local autonomy to Kent & Medway Camera Partnerships to deploy speed cameras in response to local concerns (currently 10% of deployments can be in response to local concerns, the other 90% are prescribed). This freedom is linked to achieving LPSA2. Kent & Medway Camera Partnership need to have greater autonomy in its deployment of speed enforcement cameras. This will create a better opportunity to work with the local community to raise awareness of the need to reduce road fatalities and allow the local authority to deliver a more cost effective speed enforcement campaign.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It will establish a more community focused enforcement campaign.
Benefits to LAA partners	Kent & Medway Camera Partnership will be able to work with a more joined up approach to speed enforcement within Kent.
Benefits to the community	By having the freedom to target problem roads in Kent it will help make Kent a safer place to travel.

Freedom and flexibilities for Outcome 9	
Problem	2. Revenue from Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).
Freedom sought	Freedom to use the revenue gained from Fixed Penalty Tickets for Disorder for other Community Safety initiatives. Currently revenue gained from Fixed Penalty Notices for Fly Tipping is given back to the issuing council to be used again in tackling the problem. We would seek to extend this process to include Fixed Penalty Notices for disorder so the revenue gained can be used in other Community Safety initiatives.
Priority	Essential.
Benefits to central government	The revenue gained will be used to tackle other Community Safety priorities
Benefits to LAA partners	They will create an additional income generator. Fixed Penalty Notices are a useful sanction that can be used to tackle anti-social behaviour. FPNs can also be a useful tool in measuring incidents of anti-social behaviour/disorder.
Benefits to the community	Will help to tackle issues of anti-social behaviour at a local level.

Outcome 10: To reduce crime affecting local communities (HO PSA1).

Lead partner	Kent Police.
Other partners	CDRPs, Kent County Council (KCC), District Councils (DCs), Kent Association of Parish Councils (KAPCs), Youth Offending Service (YOS), Kent Probation Service (KPS), Kent Drug & Alcohol Action Team (KDAAT), Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB), Job Centre Plus, Kent Fire & Rescue Service, Voluntary Groups, Victim Support, Neighbourhood Watch.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Reduce BCS overall crime (HO PSA1)	BCS	Kent Police	CDRPs, KDAAT, Kent Probation Service, YOS, LCJB
Increase the number of offenders supported into sustainable employment (SIP).	Kent Probation Service	Kent Probation Service	KCC, Job Centre Plus

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Domestic burglary per 1000 households	Recorded crime	Kent Police	CDRPs, Kent Probation Service, LCJB
Violent crime per 1000 households	Recorded crime	Kent Police	CDRPs, Kent Probation Service, LCJB
Vehicle crime per 1000 households	Recorded crime	Kent Police	CDRPs, Kent Probation Service, LCJB
Robberies per 1000 households	Recorded crime	Kent Police	CDRPs, Kent Probation Service, LCJB
Number of repeat incidents of domestic violence	CDRPs	CDRPs	Police, Kent Probation Service, LCJB

Freedom and flexibilities for Outcome 10	
Problem	1. Crime measurement.
Freedom sought	Kent performance to be monitored and assessed using overall BCS crime rather than BCS comparator recorded crime.
Priority	Essential

Benefits to central government	Being measured as per Home Office PSA1 rather than unreliable proxy measures currently being used. Kent does not have any of its CDRPs in the 40 high crime decided areas.
Benefits to LAA partners	A more accurate assessment of how crime in Kent is contributing the Home Office method of measurement.
Benefits to the community	More realistic measurement would allow BCU Commanders to tackle local crime issues with CDRP agencies, which will assist in achieving HO PSA1 target.

Freedoms and flexibilities for Outcome 10	
Problem	2. Use of local surveys
Freedom sought	The freedom to use local surveys to measure BCS crime categories.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It will give us our own continual data source which will assist us in monitoring crime trends and responding to these quickly therefore, we would be better able to deploy and direct resources more effectively to achieve the HO PSA and LAA outcomes.
Benefits to LAA partners	The use of locally available data sources rather than relying on nationally held and annually published data would allow Kent to be more responsive.
Benefits to the community	This would mean a better service delivery for the people in Kent.

Freedoms and flexibilities for Outcome 10	
Problem	3. Restrictions associated with the Crime Fighting Fund.
Freedom sought	Currently the crime fighting fund is an additional fund specifically used for the recruitment of Police Officers. However, for some reason if we do not achieve our recruitment targets then there is a punitive impact by way of the money we lose for under achievement. This punitive sanction appears to be very disproportionate (hammer to crack a nut) it also understates the importance of PCSOs and other non-police personnel make in the fight against crime. We would seek to lighten the financial sanctions and extend the crime fighting fund to other members of the police family.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	The money could be used to create a more diverse workforce within the larger police family.
Benefits to LAA partners	Increase in PCSO establishment could help to tackle various quality of life issues including anti social behaviour and an increase in public reassurance.
Benefits to the community	More local needs could be met by the removal of sanctions around the Crime Fighting Fund.

community	
------------------	--

Outcome 11: To reduce the harm caused by illegal drugs, including substantially increasing the number of drug misusing offenders entering treatment through the CJS (HO PSA4).

Lead partner	Kent Drug & Alcohol Action Team (KDAAT).
Other partners	Strategic Health Authority (SHA), CDRPs, Kent County Council (KCC), District Councils (DCs), Kent Association of Parish Councils (KAPCs), Kent County Council (KCC), Youth Offending Service (YOS), Kent Probation Service (KPS), Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB), Job Centre Plus, Voluntary Groups, Victim Support, Neighbourhood Watch.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Increase the participation of problem drug users in drug treatment programmes by 100% by 2008 and increase year on year the proportion of users successfully sustaining or completing treatment programmes (PSA2).	KDAAT	KDAAT	Kent Probation Service, Kent Police, YOS, Local Criminal Justice Board, Strategic Health Authority
The numbers of drug offenders placed on Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTOs) or Drug Rehabilitation requirements by the Courts, and the proportion that complete treatment or rehabilitation requirements successfully.	Kent Probation Service	Kent Probation Service	KDAAT, Kent Police, YOS, Local Criminal Justice Board, Strategic Health Authority
Reduction in people's perception of local drug use or drug dealing (SSCF, mandatory).	BCS	KDAAT	Kent Probation Service, Kent Police, YOT, Local Criminal Justice Board, Strategic Health Authority

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Perceptions of drug use/dealing	YPS survey	Kent Police	CDRPs, KDAAT, LCJB
Number of Class A drugs offences brought to justice per 10,000 of population	iQuanta	LCJB	Kent Police, CDRPs, KDAAT
Rehabilitation of drug users through training and	None currently	KDATT	Job Centre Plus,

employment			KDAAT, Strategic Health Authority
No. of IPPOs linked to the use of Class A drugs.	Awaiting a System of measurement	Kent Police	KDAAT, LCJB

Freeloms and flexibilities for Outcome 11	
Problem	2. Many addicts face multiple addictions and at present there is a structural inability to tackle drug and alcohol related problems holistically
Freedom sought	More flexible use of, and ability to pool, all substance misuse related funding for prevention and enforcement purposes. Removing restrictions and funding blocks that currently exist between NTA pooled budget, Drug Intervention Prevention grants, Safer Stronger Communities grant (allocation for tackling drugs in the community) and arrest referral allocation so that all substance misuse funding streams are combined and protected.
Priority	Desirable.
Benefits to central government	Contribution towards Alcohol Harm reduction strategy.
Benefits to LAA partners	Ability to integrate resources to reflect the need to treat addicts holistically. Reduced pressure on NHS resources through a reduction in A+E admissions.
Benefits to the community	Seamless access to services and support for those with multiple addictions.

Outcome 12: To reassure the public, reducing fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and building confidence in the Criminal Justice System without compromising fairness (HO PSA2/3).

Lead partner	LCJB, Kent Police
Other partners	CDRPs, Kent County Council (KCC), District Councils (DCs), Kent Association of Parish Councils (KAPCs), Kent County Council (KCC), Youth Offending Service (YOS), Kent Probation Service (KPS), Job Centre Plus, Voluntary Groups, Victim Support, Neighbourhood Watch, Kent Fire & Rescue Service.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Increase public confidence in bringing offenders to Justice.	BCS	LCJB	Kent Police
Perception of worry about violent crime, vehicle crime and burglary.	BCS	Kent Police	LCJB, Kent Probation Service, Neighbourhood Watch, YOS, DCs, Parish Councils
Perceptions of anti-social behaviour.	YPS survey	CDRPs	Kent Police, KCC, DCs, Parish Councils
Perceptions of worry about 10 different crime types.	YPS survey	CDRPs	Kent Police, LCJB, Voluntary Groups

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Number of sanction detections (charges, cautions, offences taken into consideration (TICs), Penalty Notices for Disorder (PNDs).	Genesis	Kent Police	LCJB
Increase in the number of Offences Brought to Justice (HO PSA 3).	iQuanta	LCJB	Kent Police

Outcome 13: To increase the capacity of local communities so that people are empowered to participate in local decision making and delivery of services. (Mandatory-LAA Advice note 1, SSCF, HO PSA6).

Lead partner	CDRPs
Other partners	Strategic Health Authority (SHA), CDRPs, Kent County Council (KCC), District Councils (DCs), Kent Association of Parish Councils (KAPCs), Kent County Council (KCC), Kent Police, Kent Fire & Rescue Service, Youth Offending Service (YOS), Kent Probation Service (KPS), Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB), Job Centre Plus, Voluntary Groups, Victim Support, Neighbourhood Watch.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Voluntary activity - especially by those at risk of social exclusion (HO PSA6)	KCC/Voluntary groups. Year 05/06 will be provide baseline data	KCC	CDRPs, DCs, Parish Councils, Voluntary groups
Number of neighbourhood bodies and community-led projects, e.g. Residents Associations, Neighbourhood Watch.	Year 05/06 will be provide baseline data	CDRPs, DCs	All
Perceptions of community cohesion	BCS (confidence measure). Year 05/06 will be provide baseline data	Kent Police	All

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Number of residents who feel involved in their local community	Provisional: Year 05/06 will be provide baseline data	CDRPs/DCs	All
Voluntary and community sector contribution to delivering public services (HO PSA6 measure)	Provisional: Year 05/06 will be provide baseline data	KCC/Voluntary groups	All
Number of people who are aware of CDRPs and local police officer.	Year 05/06 will be provide baseline data	CDRPs/DCs	Kent Police, Parish Councils

Outcome 14: Cleaner and Greener Public Spaces (LPSA2 LAA Advice note 1).

Lead partner	KCC.
Other partners	CDRPs, Kent County Council (KCC), District Councils (DCs), Kent Association of Parish Councils (KAPCs), English Nature, Environment Agency, Countryside Agency, Highways Agency, Kent Fire & Rescue Service, Kent Police, Kent Energy Centre, Voluntary Groups.

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Increase by 20% the number of residents who consider that Kent is a clean County (LPSA2).	Survey in spring 04/05 setting baseline	KCC	Districts, Environment Agency
Reduce the number of loose rubbish fires (non-contained) by e.g. 10% (LPSA2).	Recorded Incidents	Kent Fire Brigade	Districts
To increase the number of fly-tipping incidents investigated resulting in further action by 50% (LPSA2).	Recorded incidents	KCC / Districts	Environment Agency

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
% Of residents reporting an increase in satisfaction with their neighbourhoods (SSCF Mandatory).	Districts	Districts	KCC
Cleanliness of the Environment (BVPI 199).	Districts	Districts	KCC
Number of fixed penalty notices issued for waste offences.	Districts	Districts	Environment Agency
Increased provision of accessible natural green spaces for Kent's urban dwellers per English Nature's range of indicators, particularly: an accessible natural green space within 300m (5 minutes' walk) from every urban home, improved green spaces in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and at least one local nature reserve per district or borough.	English Nature	Districts	KCC, Countryside Agency, English Nature
Increase in number of visitors to Kent's areas of green space.	KCC, Districts, English Nature	KCC	Districts, English Nature, Countryside Agency

Overarching freedom and flexibility for all outcomes	
Problem	1. Freedom to bid for the legislative opportunity to have pilot status
Freedom sought	As the LAA will be at the cutting edge of change and innovation we would like to register that Kent should be considered a prime candidate for any national pilots being considered. See freedom 2 below concerning the DIP.
Priority	Desirable.
Benefits to central government	Economies of scale.
Benefits to LAA partners	Combining pilot status as opposed to a piecemeal approach.
Benefits to the community	Exploration of better/smarter ways of working.

Overarching Freedom and flexibility for all outcomes	
Problem	1. Much more strengthened proposal around less/lighter audit and inspection.
Freedom sought	At the moment we in Kent consistently perform well and regarded as one of the top five performing forces. To maintain the capacity of regularly performing to this high standard we have had to establish a tight inspection process, which is both transparent and robust. And yet despite this tight regime we are still assessed against the less well performing forces. Because our inspection processes are so rigorous within the LAA we seek to be freed of such a tight inspection process in favour of a lighter approach.
Priority	Essential.
Benefits to central government	It will give central government an evidenced based example of a 'lighter touch' inspection regime and demonstrate a more mature working arrangement. Which will help to establish best practice and allow government offices to focus on developing under performance issues in other forces.
Benefits to LAA partners	A positive move away from government bureaucracy which will allow for greater autonomy in focusing on local issues.
Benefits to the community	The opportunity to focus more on real community issues.

Outcome 15 no longer exists

Block 3: Older People and Healthier Communities

Outcome 16: To promote independence through employment for those who are able to work.

Lead partner	Jobcentre Plus
Other partners	Kent County Council, District Councils, Probation, SEEDA, LSC, Prison Service

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
To increase the number of people dependent on benefits - but able to work - successfully moving into paid employment by X as measured by:			
<i>Increase the number of people on an incapacity benefit moving into paid employment</i>	DWP	Jobcentre Plus,	Kent County Council, District Councils, Probation, LSC, Health, SEEDA
<i>Increase the number of people on Job Seekers Allowance moving into paid employment</i>	DWP	Jobcentre Plus	Kent County Council, District Councils, Probation, LSC, SEEDA
<i>Increase the number of people on Income Support (but not Income Support for reasons of incapacity) moving into paid employment</i>	DWP	Jobcentre Plus	Kent County Council, District Councils, LSC, SEEDA

Secondary indicative indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
<i>Short-term (less than 2 years) incapacity benefits clients</i>			
Increase the number of people who have been claiming an incapacity benefit for up to 2 years moving into paid employment	DWP	Jobcentre Plus	Kent County Council, District Councils, Probation, Health
<i>Long-term (2 years and more) incapacity benefits clients</i>			

Increase the number of people who are Kent County Council Social Services clients and have been claiming an incapacity benefit for 2 years or more gaining Permitted Work for 13 consecutive weeks or more (LPSA2).	KCC	KCC	Jobcentre Plus, District Councils, Health
Increase the number of people, who have been claiming an incapacity benefit for 2 years or more, gaining a JCP job entry (LPSA2)	DWP	Jobcentre Plus	Kent County Council, District Councils
Increase the number of people who have been claiming an incapacity benefit* for 2 years or more gaining a Job Entry, and who are not in receipt of an active or inactive benefit 13 weeks after starting their employment.(LPSA2)	DWP	Jobcentre Plus	Kent County Council, District Councils
Other indicators			
<i>Increase the number of people who complete basic skills courses.</i>	LSC/KCC	Jobcentre Plus, LSC, Kent County Council	Prisons, Probation...
SSC Block – contributory indicator <i>Increase in the number of offenders supported into sustainable employment.</i>	JCP/Probation/ Prison service	Jobcentre Plus, Probation, Prison service	Kent County Council, District Councils
CYP block contributory indicator - <i>Increase the number of lone parents coming off Income Support and moving into paid employment</i>	DWP	Jobcentre Plus	Kent County Council, EYCCP, District Councils

Freedom and flexibilities for this Outcome	
Problem	
Freedom sought	Kent to form a strategic partnership with central government to trial radical ideas on reducing benefit expenditure in Kent, building on SiP work.
Priority	
Benefits to central government	
Benefits to LAA partners	
Benefits to the community	

Reinvestment in Kent of savings brought about through the LAA.	
Problem	<p>There are significant obstacles to attaining full co-operation between public service agencies. Even where agencies agree priority outcomes there are problems because of perverse incentives.</p> <p>For example: In order to secure an outcome, Agency A invests heavily in a service which results in Agency B meeting B's target and saving B's cash. Understandably, Agency A is reluctant to divert resources into services from which it reaps no benefit.</p>
Freedom sought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the LAA achieves cross-sector savings between LAA partners, these savings shall be retained within the LAA and re-invested accordingly. • Where the actions and investment of a LAA partner delivers a saving to a non LAA partner, incentives shall be devised such that a portion of the saving can be retained by the LAA partner which made the original investment. This builds on the principle accepted by Government in 2001 (during the LPSA1 negotiation) that if it could be demonstrated that there were savings to the DWP budget brought about through the actions of the LPSA, then Government would negotiate the potential re-investment of those savings within Kent.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devising incentives for one agency to invest in services that will result in savings being accrued by another agency will unlock huge potential for co-operation between sectors. • This has the potential to deliver huge efficiencies. Two agencies with a stake in the same problem are much more likely to work together and deliver a holistic solution. • It will incentivise investment in preventative measures, which will be more effective for the public sector overall. For example, better health will reduce health spending; less anti-social behaviour will reduce police and prison spending.
Benefits to LAA partners	It will release partners to think creatively about strategies to improve services without being so concerned about funding new initiatives.
Benefits to the community	More joined-up services.

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome	
Problem	Lapse of a valuable research project (Evaluation of Kent Supporting Independence Programme)
Freedom sought	HMT to continue their sponsorship of the joint Government / DWP / KCC research project conducted by Oxford University into the welfare benefit expenditure in Kent. This very valuable project (initiated in the LPSA1 agreement) is about to produce its final report. One of the recommendations will be the need to continue the evaluation of the impact on welfare expenditure of the SIP programme. The original contract was let by HMT.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Data to April 2003 suggested that that the Supported Independence Programme may have had an impact on particular groups, for example, the relative position of lone parents in 2003 and the pattern of exiting benefit by younger lone parent with one child under five in the priority 1 wards. Continuing this research will allow the position to be clarified through the use of more recent data. It will also allow help measure the effectiveness of the LAA pilot.
Benefits to LAA partners	Issues facing vulnerable people and the barriers to independence identified. As a result a shared understanding will be developed alongside increased partnership working (both of which underpin the LAA approach)
Benefits to the community	Improved access to and delivery of services.

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome	
Problem	In supporting clients who have been on Incapacity Benefit for two years back to work, the DWP has acknowledged that Kent partners are tackling an area of work that is both new and challenging; therefore, DWP involvement is essential.
Freedom sought	To develop an explorer partnership with DWP
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	The work will provide DWP with additional expertise regarding a client group that they do not currently focus on, and it will help to deliver on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	This will directly support Jobcentre Plus service delivery and will impact on other partners by reducing the need for remedial services by improving health and supporting independence through work.
Benefits to the community	Working with the DWP, Kent Partners will be able to deliver an improved service to people who have been claiming IB for two years. Clients should receive a more flexible and holistic service. The focus on reducing the IB claimant count will also form an essential part of the wider regeneration element of the LAA bringing wider benefits to deprived communities.

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome	
Problem	Highly challenging incapacity benefit target for KCC, working with a group distant from the labour market and will require high levels of innovation
Freedom sought	The Performance Reward Grant to be awarded on a pro rata basis without the necessity of achieving the normal baseline of 60% of the target.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentivise performance from the start • Build up evidence base of success with this key policy area group, whether or not the target is achieved
Benefits to LAA partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Guaranteed” reward for support with this client group, that can be used to re-invest to related services or projects.
Benefits to the community	More investment in related services and therefore improved services for those reliant on benefits as a consequence of their health

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome	
Problem	The perception amongst the IB client group is that permitted work will trigger a Personal Capability Assessment (PCA) and this is seen as specific barrier in terms of engaging clients in permitted work as a route back to full employment.
Freedom sought	To introduce a flexibility where the LPSA2 target group (clients who have been receiving IB for over 2 years) who undertake permitted work are NOT called for a Personal Capability Assessment (PCA).
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	In supporting long term IB clients back to work it will reduce the IB claimant count by focusing on those clients that the Government is not currently focused on, and, therefore, it will help to deliver on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	Clients will have greater confidence in the process. Therefore, it will be easier for all partners to engage clients and deliver services.
Benefits to the community	Incapacity Benefit clients will have more confidence in the support they receive – they will not feel that their benefits are at risk in the short term. Therefore, they will be more likely to engage in this process and more likely to enter employment and independence.

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome:	
Problem	Moving from benefits into the world of work is a difficult transition for many people. Financial insecurity is one of the important barriers to making this transition successfully. Currently, it is not clear whether Kent partners can offer additional 'back to work' payments without this affecting their benefits/in work credits.
Freedom sought	Kent partners to be able to make one off payments to particular client groups (for example, those who have been on Incapacity Benefit for more than two years) to give provide the additional financial security they need to make the transition back to work.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Improved return to work figures and lower benefit claimant counts, and it improved delivery on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	This is an important incentive in supporting people back to work, therefore, it is important for LAA partners in delivering a better service.
Benefits to the community	Greater confidence in returning to work gained through increased financial security. More people being supported into independence.

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome:	
Problem	A number of Jobcentre Plus training programs require clients to have been unemployed for at least six months before they can qualify for early entry onto the program. For certain high risk groups, for example, ex-offenders this wait is a barrier to returning to work, and a risk factor in terms of them disengaging from the system altogether.
Freedom sought	The freedom to be able to offer early entry to training programs based on the needs of particularly vulnerable groups.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	More particularly vulnerable clients engaged in the back to work process and, therefore, more of this client group being helped back to work. Therefore, it will help to deliver on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	The ability to offer a more flexible service in response to an individual client's needs.
Benefits to the community	A better, more flexible, service for particularly vulnerable groups, which should help them to find sustainable employment. The focus on supporting people back into work will also form an essential part of the wider regeneration element of the LAA bringing wider benefits to deprived communities.

Freedoms and flexibilities for this Outcome:	
Problem	For a significant number of benefit claimants permitted work is a vital stepping stone back to the world of work, or indeed to a more independent life if they are not able to take up full time employment. However, there are different rules regarding the permitted work you can do depending on which benefit you receive: Income Support or Incapacity Benefit/Severe Disability Allowance.
Freedom sought	Ideally the disparity referred to above needs to be eradicated. If this is not possible, we would wish to be able to dis-apply the earnings disregard rules in selected areas of Kent. Specifically: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow the earnings disregard for those on Income Support, Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit who are undertaking Permitted Work to increase to £78 net per week (in line with rules for Permitted Work Higher Limit and Supported Permitted Work). 2. To allow one disregard for each member of a couple.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	It will provide further support for clients seeking sustainable employment and therefore should play an important role in reducing the number of benefit claimants.
Benefits to LAA partners	It will provide local partners with more flexibility to help benefit claimants back to work in a less threatening way. Therefore, enabling them to provide better support and a more effective service.
Benefits to the community	Agreeing to the above flexibility would help to encourage and enable claimants to develop their capacity for sustained employment on a step by step basis.

Outcome 17: To promote the health of Kent's residents and reduce health inequalities by addressing variations in health across the County

Lead partner	Kent Public Health Network sponsored by the PCTs
Other partners	SHA, KCC, District Councils

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
1. Reduction in the number of people who smoke	Public Health Network	PHN	SHA, KCC, District Councils
2. Reduce the risk factors associated with obesity levels across the county	PHN	PHN	KCC, District Councils
3. Improve sexual health and reduce teenage pregnancy	PHN Teenage Pregnancy Strategy	Children's consortia for teenage pregnancy PCTs for sexual health	Children's consortia; education; social services; primary care
4. Reduce substance abuse (including drugs and alcohol)	DAAT	DAAT	Health community; social services; voluntary sector agencies
5. Improve the mental health and emotional well being of the people of Kent	PHN	PHN	Districts Mental health services

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Indicators to be developed around having smoke-free public sector organisations that have eliminated second-hand smoke from their premises and be able to offer support to all who want to give up by X	KASH	PCTs/PHN	Acute and mental health services
Indicator to be developed around targeted smoking cessation services.	KASH	PCTs	DCs
Increase in the number of people who participate in activities such as walking or cycling to work or school, and walking or cycling as a leisure pursuit (with a focus on priority postcode areas-disadvantaged and socially excluded groups).	Life Style Survey	District Councils	PCTs

Increase in the percentage of pupils aged 5 to 16 in Kent schools who spend an average of [2] hours per week across the whole school year on high quality PE and school sport within and beyond the curriculum by (xx%) in primary, (xx)% in secondary and (xx%) in special schools by March 2008. (LPSA2)	Data from PSA	KCC	Districts/PCTs
Increase by [XX%] the number of people who participate in activities such as [details related to "moderate intensity activity"] [3 or 5] times a week or more for 30 minutes at least. (LPSA2)	Data from PSA	DCs	PCTs
To increase the uptake in school meals to 35% by 2008 and to increase the nutritional value of school meals selected by pupils.	Healthy Schools	KCC Education	Healthy Schools Programme
Increase in the numbers of people who access organised sport and recreation, by: age group, on referral from their GP, by priority postcode area (disadvantaged or socially excluded group)	Kent Lifestyle Survey	PCTs	DCs
Increase the number of schools in Kent accredited to National Healthy School Standard Level 3 status.	Healthy Schools	KCC	PCTs, DCs
Increasing no. local schools who reach National Health Schools standard	Healthy Schools Co-ordinator/Strategy	KCC	PCTs, DCs
Increasing no children 2hrs+ in physical activity	PCTs	Education	Healthy Schools; PCTs; DCs
Increase 40-60 year olds who participate in exercise x2 week	PCTs	District councils	PCTs
Achieve a percentage point reduction in the proportion of mothers who continue to smoke during pregnancy (in fully operational SureStart programmes and Children Centres, during the LAA term)	PCT data collected by PHN	PCTs	DC
Increase the number of mothers breast feeding at birth, in fully operational SureStart programmes and Children Centres	PCT data collected by PHN	PCTs	DCs Children's consortia
Reduction in sexually transmitted infections	PCT and acute sector data collected by PHN	PCTs	Healthy Schools
Reduction in the under-18 conception rate (SIP).	TP strategy/co-	Children's consortia	PCTs; social services;

	ordinator		healthy schools
Increase [from X to Y] the number of people successfully completing drugs treatment	DAAT	PCTs	DCs Probation Service
Increase the participation of problem drug users in drug treatment programmes by 100% by 2008 and increase year on year the proportion of users successfully sustaining or completing treatment programmes	DAAT	DAAT	PCTs DCs Probation Service
Work with X number of employers across Kent to raise awareness of drug and alcohol issues	DAAT	DAAT	Public sector employers
From baseline, to increase the number (by X)the number of people accessing treatment with alcohol as the primary drug of misuse	DAAT	DAAT	PCTs Probation Service
Increase in the number of people visiting natural green spaces	Kent Lifestyle Survey	DCs	voluntary sector education
Reduction in levels of absence from work caused by work-related mental health and emotional problems	PHN/lifestyle survey	PCTs	Public and voluntary sector employers
Reduction in levels of self harm <i>LPSA2 CAMHS target</i>	Kent CAMHS teams	CAMHS service	PCT; social services; education
Reduction in the number of suicides in particular risk groups <i>e.g. prison population; vulnerable adults</i>	PHN	PCTs	Prisons Supporting People Kent Criminal Justice Board Probation Service
Improve children and young persons emotional and mental health: decrease referrals to Tier 3 services by 10%	CAMHS LPSA 2 target	KCC	PCTs
Reduction of waits for CAMHS assessments to 8 weeks	CAMHS LPSA target	KCC	PCTs

Treatment of historic accumulated debt	
Problem	<p>Elements of the current NHS financial regime make it more difficult for NHS Trusts to pay historic accumulated debt</p> <p>NHS Trusts have a given set of resources in any one year with which to deliver services. The repayment must come from this same resource space</p>
Freedom sought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the DH take LAAs into account in any future deliberations on the treatment of accumulated deficits within specific local health economies or health organisations. • It is suggested that any strategies developed to support the reduction and/or elimination of such historic debt be prioritised to those SHA areas that are involved in LAA pilots. The reasoning being that reducing the local NHS debt burden would allow additional resources to be deployed in preventative services supporting LAA implementation, as opposed to debt recovery. Request the DH to recognise the implications of partnership working under LAA in any future review of the financial regime governing either PCTs, NHS Trusts or Foundation Trusts.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Achievement of financial statutory duty
Benefits to LAA partners	Financial stability within the NHS and the servicing of debt does not have to come from NHS budgets.
Benefits to the community	Increase provision and quality of health services

Multiple Addictions – Drugs and Alcohol	
Problem	Many addicts face multiple addictions and at present there is a structural inability to tackle drug and alcohol related problems holistically
Freedom sought	More flexible use of and ability to pool all substance misuse related funding. Removing restrictions and funding blocks that currently exist between NTA pooled budget, Drug Intervention Prevention grants, Safer Stronger Communities grant (allocation for tackling drugs in the community) and arrest referral allocation so that all substance misuse funding streams are combined and protected.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Contributes towards Alcohol Harm reduction strategy. Contributes towards Anti-Social Behaviour agenda.
Benefits to LAA partners	Ability to integrate resources to reflect need to treat addicts holistically. Reduced pressure on NHS resources through a reduction in A+E admissions.
Benefits to the community	Seamless access to services and support for those with multiple addictions

NB. Similar Freedom in S&SC

Outcome 18: To ensure Kent residents have access to homes of excellent quality, in the right place, at the right time and at the right cost

Lead partner	District Councils
Other partners	Kent County Council, Home Improvement Agencies, RSLs, SEEDA

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
1. Increase in the number of homes that meet the 'decent homes' standard in both the private and public sector	DCs	DCs	KCC; RSLs; HIAs; PCTs
2. Increasing the number of dwellings that meet the 'lifetime' homes standard	DCs	DCs	KCC; RSLs; HIAs; PCTs

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Increase the number of private sector long term empty or poorly used properties, including HMOs, in Dover, Shepway, Swale and Thanet districts which are returned to occupation as quality accommodation (LPSA2).	DCs	DCs	RSLs
Number of homes made more energy efficient reaching an average SAP rating of 60.	HIAs	DCs	RSLs
Improve public perceptions of the physical environment and business confidence, in the areas of Dover, Shepway, Swale and Thanet, where empty properties have been brought back into use (LPSA2) [move to Stronger Safer Communities]			
Number of 'affordable' housing units / joint equity provided to meet locally defined need	ODPM	DCs	RSLs
Increase the number and/or capacity of authorised transit and permanent encampment sites for Gypsies and travellers	DCs	DCs	Voluntary sector, Countryside Agency
Increasing the number of homeless people/households provided with long term accommodation	ODPM	DCs	RSLs SP
Increase the number of transit housing places provided for rehabilitating drug users and ex-offenders		Supporting People	Voluntary sector RSLs

Increased proportion of sheltered housing with extra care across all tenures	Supporting People	DCs	DCs; PCTs; Supporting People
Possible indicator on housing quality / design?			

Council tax raised on long term empty homes	
Problem	The Local Government Act 2003 gives local authorities the power to reduce discounts on long term empty properties and second homes after six months. Local authorities are allowed to keep the extra council tax revenue generated by second homes, but after 2004/05 they will not be allowed to keep the extra revenue generated by long term empty properties.
Freedom sought	For Kent LAs to retain council tax raised from long term empty homes to be re-invested in the regeneration of local communities.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Removes current perverse incentive to keep homes empty and encourages LAs to return more empty properties back to the market, which will help to deliver on the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda.
Benefits to LAA partners	Retains funding raised in Kent for use locally on an LAA priority.
Benefits to the community	Improved supply of housing for the most vulnerable groups and for the wider community it will reduce the problems related to empty and derelict houses, for example, vandalism.

Unfit landlords	
Problem	Unfit landlords subsidised
Freedom sought	Refuse to pay Housing Benefit to landlords of unfit properties or landlords that are not part of a registration scheme
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central	Reduction in housing benefit subsidy and contribution towards decent homes standard.

government	
Benefits to LAA partners	Help to increase quality and quantity of affordable housing
Benefits to the community	Vulnerable people protected from unfit housing

Tax incentive to assist older people to move to more appropriate accommodation	
Problem	Existing tax and benefit incentives encourage elderly people to stay in unsuitable, large homes
Freedom sought	<p>To give an older person a tax incentive to move home, into smaller and more suitable accommodation, where they wish to</p> <p>Presently many older people live by themselves in large 3 or 4 bedroom homes. The existing tax and benefit incentives encourage them to stay in these large homes (sole occupancy council tax discount, heating allowances etc). Often these homes are unsuitable for their needs, many are in poor condition, with stairs, costly to heat etc.</p> <p>In addition it represents inefficient use of the housing resource that feeds into additional demand for new homes on greenfield sites.</p> <p>A tax incentive to help older people move into smaller and more suitable accommodation would have the twin benefits making them safer and release additional housing supply thereby reducing the need for new units. Tax incentives could include the waiving of stamp duty on any purchase or certain concessions on capital gains tax.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Freeing housing market and decrease dependence on benefits
Benefits to	Freeing housing market and decrease dependence on benefits locally. Help prevent admissions and

LAA partners	delayed discharges.
Benefits to the community	Ability to stay in own homes/familiar setting for longer periods of time. Reduces the risk of falls/injuries due to familiar setting.

Outcome 19: To promote independent living for all

Lead partner	Kent County Council
Other partners	District Councils, PCTs, Jobcentre Plus

Primary countywide indicators			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
1 Increase the number of people who are supported to live independently in their own homes		This is a headline target, made up over several client-group specific indicators, set out below.	
2 To increase the take up of benefits and tax credits among vulnerable groups	DWP, District Councils	Relevant DWP agencies / District Councils	KCC, PCTs, District Council
3 A 15% reduction in emergency (unscheduled), acute bed days occupied by people over 75 years old (LPSA2)	HES, Census, GAD, Social Services, etc	Social Services	PCTs

Secondary indicators for roll-out			
Indicator	Data source	Lead partner	Other partners
Reduce by 10% the number of care managed clients in a permanent residential/ nursing placement (including preserved rights clients but excluding section 28(a) clients) (LPSA2).	Kent Social Services	Kent Social Services	District Councils, PCTs
Increase by 12% the number of Supporting People service users, who have successfully completed a planned move from a short-term service into independence (LPSA2).	Supporting People Team	Supporting People Team (KCC)	Home Improvement Agencies
Increase the number of older people (65+) helped to live at home (PAF indicator C32).	Kent Social Services	Kent Social Services	District Councils, PCTs,
Increase the number of people with a disability enabled to remain in their own homes through the use of floating support, assistive technology, adaptations or advice	Kent Social Services	Kent Social Services	Housing Providers District Councils, PCTs, Police, Home Improvement Agencies
Reduce the number of vulnerable people living in a home that fails to meet	Supporting People	Supporting People	District Councils

the decent homes standard			
Reduce delayed transfer of care from mental health in-patient facilities by provision of move-on accommodation	Supporting People	Supporting People	Mental Health Trusts Social Services
To reduce the number of drug users and ex-offenders homeless or housed in temporary or inappropriate housing	Supporting People	Supporting People	Districts
To support people out of benefit dependency, but ensuring those in need receive the benefits they deserve (e.g. Disability Living Allowance, Attendance Allowance)	DWP	Relevant DWP agencies	KCC, PCTs, District Council
To support people out of benefit dependency, but ensuring those in need receive the benefits they deserve (e.g. Council Tax Benefit, Housing Benefit)	District Councils	District Councils	KCC, PCTs and relevant DWP agencies

Freedoms and Flexibilities

Concordat between Government Office of the South East (on behalf of Government) and Kent County Council (on behalf of the Kent Partnership).

These 7 clauses state the approach agreed between GOSE and KCC on the development of the Local Area Agreement. They are operation principles that have been accepted and that GOSE and KCC will endeavour to adhere to.

b. Joint Commitment to the Development Phase

During the development phase of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) the parties have accepted that the LAA needs to be agreed in two distinct phases:

Phase 1. Agreement reached by mid March 2005 between GOSE and KCC on a set of [19] outcomes across the three blocks which will form the core of the LAA. Progress against each outcome will be assessed through an agreed set [no more than 3, except by mutual agreement] of county-wide indicators.

Phase 2. Agreement reached by 31 December 2005 between the partners of the LAA on how each countywide outcome will rolled out. This will require partners to select their contribution from a wide range of indicators.

b. Joint Working Principles

6. To **extend the understanding and trust** between government and local partners, and between partners within Kent (e.g. opportunities will continue to be sought for staff secondments between agencies, joint training and familiarisation visits).
7. The **outcomes for the period April 2005 – March 2008 have been agreed** between GOSE and KCC in good faith reflecting priority areas, both national and local, after widespread consultation. However, the parties agree that there is scope to review the outcomes on an annual basis in the light of progress towards the outcome(s) and any other issues that may emerge. Any changes to the outcomes can be made only if both parties agree the change, and then only after consultation with other partners involved.

8. **Both parties accept these outcomes as shared priorities.** In doing so both parties will exert whatever influence they can on all other partners (Government Departments and Agencies, local service deliverers and providers) to ensure the outcomes are supported, obstacles removed and innovation allowed to flourish.
9. GOSE and KCC will be **equal partners in pursuing the range of freedoms and flexibilities** identified in the LAA and will hold each other to account on a [quarterly] basis for progress made. Both parties may, by mutual agreement, to introduce additional freedoms for discussion.
10. There will be **no additional inspection** as a result of the LAA. Furthermore, by [April 2006] there will demonstrably less inspection of public services than in April 2006. The remaining inspection activity undertaken will be more integrated. *(This builds on the existing announcements of the Audit Commission – which need to be accepted by other inspectorates).*
11. Both parties accept that the sum total of performance monitoring within the LAA will, in [April 2006], be less than in March 2005. The performance management of the LAA by GOSE will be determined through the agreed countywide indicators for each outcome. The **Kent Partnership will determine the performance management framework** between partners, linking it to phase 2 of the LAA development, using existing indicators wherever possible.

Overarching Freedoms

The LAA gives another opportunity to demonstrate how Government can achieve improvements in local services by freeing up local partners to deliver. This releases the energy, commitment and innovation of local agencies, managers and staff to deliver fast and responsive services to local priorities.

The following section contains a number of overarching and ambitious freedoms that span a number of outcomes in more than one block of the Local Area Agreement. It is acknowledged that a number of these will take months, even years, to develop and will require much investment of time by civil servants and local partners.

Supporting People Programme to be manage locally	
Problem	Unintended consequences of ODPM's approach to the Supporting People programme. ODPM have consistently advised that the Supporting People Programme is a locally managed programme. Concerns arise (for example) from guidance issued by the ODPM to refine the HRS criteria. Kent's Commissioning Body has agreed the criteria, and by changing code tables in our SPLS (Supporting People Local System) to reflect Kent's locally managed Programme would no longer be validated by the upload processes in place from the ODPM. In addition to this, we are in the process of consulting on our Steady State Contract. We are looking at changing a number of aspects, one for example is renaming the Contract Types. This, again will fail to meet the criteria in SPLS uploads.
Freedom sought	Supporting People. Detailed work, supported by a legal view, has been undertaken on the consequences of ODPM's approach to the SP programme and on the degree of freedom and flexibility we currently have. This will lead to a specific proposal(s) re a 3 year commitment from Government and freedom to manage locally.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Demonstrate that central government commitment to allowing local authorities to do what they do best. It reflects the commitment within Wendy Jarvis's letter (13 th January 2005 to Mike Pitt) to reduce bureaucracy. It enables local authorities to deliver a cost-effective service where the majority of funding is directed at front line services rather than resulting in the need to recruit additional staff to deliver the requirements that currently stand.
Benefits to	The Supporting People Programme has been criticized for the extraordinary amount of administration

LAA partners	associated with ODPM requirements. The Freedoms and Flexibilities asked for would preclude the requirement for service rich data (eg. Distance from scheme to post office etc). The Supporting people Team wishes to commission a needs-led, quality service without the distractions of bureaucratic red-tape.
Benefits to the community	Ability to strategically plan community focussed needs- led services.

Direct Payments	
Problem	People are not allowed to use their Direct Payments (cash to buy social care services, following an assessment of need) on services provided by KCC. Therefore, they can only be given Direct Payments if they plan to purchase services from the independent sector.
Freedom sought	Freedom for people to purchase services from KCC using Direct Payments
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Testing out of a policy that Government may want to roll out nationally.
Benefits to LAA partners	Removes perverse incentives and bureaucracy for Kent Social Services. Promotes Direct Payments, thus increasing the opportunity for the voluntary and private sectors to tap into this market.
Benefits to the community	People who are eligible for support from Social Services can have the flexibility to choose whether to spend their Direct Payments on in-house services or the independent sector, without having to decide this up-front. This would give existing in-house service users an incentive to try out Direct Payments and would encourage them to purchase their own support over the longer term in the community.

Intervention in 'failing' and 'weak' service providers	
Problem	Government deploys a range of strategies to intervene in weak or failing service providers. Some of these interventions can be by managers and consultants who are remote from recent service delivery management and lack recent experience based in good or excellent service providers. Also, interventions can be un-joined up and react to part of the problem rather than the overarching problems of the service provider. Intervention decisions are being made without assessment of all the alternatives
Freedom sought	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LAA partners should be given the responsibility to recommend the most appropriate and acceptable way to deploy the expertise of any excellent public service provider to assist the recovery of an under performing LAA partner. 2. Assistance of any under performing local authority partner to improve services by arranging support from a high-performing council from within the LAA or support from another Excellent council from elsewhere in the country through the brokerage of the Inter-Authority Partnership Unit. 3. This will require the LAA partners to have access to the funding that Government Departments and Agencies would have spent on alternative intervention and improvement strategies.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swifter turn around of weak and failing services. • More effective spending on turning around weak and failing services. • More holistic and sustainable recovery
Benefits to LAA partners	The partners within the LAA have become much more accountable to each other for their performance. Where the performance of one partner is causing concern, then it is in the interest of all partners to make swift improvement. Within Kent there is capacity within a range of partners that have been deemed 'excellent' or 'three stars' that could support their weaker partners.
Benefits to the community	Provision of better services sooner.

Elimination of perverse effect of reducing benefit claims	
Problem	<p>Kent partners lose grants disproportionately if they reduce the number of welfare benefit claimants.</p> <p>Background: KCC's revenue support grant is calculated using the FFS (formula spending shares) method, which takes account of a number of deprivation indices, including the number of people on benefits. The way the FFS operates means that a 1% reduction in the claimant total corresponds to a loss of about £600k for KCC. Kent's district councils and the Police are similarly affected. Partners across Kent are already working together to reduce dependency, and wish to extend this focus as part of the LAA. They need assurance that their success in this national and local priority will not undermine their financial position.</p>
Freedom sought	Elimination of the perverse incentive. The FFS is amended in a way that reduction in the number of claimants does not result in loss of grant.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	<p>Wins stronger efforts by local authorities and agencies to reduce welfare dependency.</p> <p>Consistent with the LPSA1 agreement, that government would negotiate reinvestment in Kent of savings to DWP caused by KCC's LPSA actions.</p>
Benefits to LAA partners	Significant, positive financial incentive to vigorously develop joint strategies which result in fewer welfare claimants in Kent.
Benefits to the community	More residents off welfare and into work.

Concentrations of highly dependent people within Kent	
Problem	<p>Many people, particularly looked after children and people with learning disabilities are 'placed' in Kent from London. This places disproportionate burdens on local services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of looked-after children placed in Kent by other authorities (c. 1500) exceeds Kent's own looked-after children. Thanet is the 62nd most deprived UK authority but has 35 children's homes. DfES and DH have ignored Kent's protests about the unfair burden this places on Kent services; while acknowledging the negative impact on the children's education and social well-being. Discharged prisoners are a similar but diminishing burden. • London borough councils take one-third of the care beds in Kent. Their ability to pay more money per person (through Area Cost Adjustment), than KCC is able, sets KCC at a disadvantage in negotiating with care-home owners for Kent's settled residents. • Kent is home to a highly disproportionate number of over-85s (compared with national average). This age cohort is very costly for medical and care services Wealth depleters migrate to Kent, initially spending their own savings on residential care, but eventually depending upon KCC for financial support.
Freedom sought	<p>Reduce flow to Kent of high-dependency people from London. Stem the continued inflow to Kent's coastal town of high-dependency groups, particularly looked-after children, vulnerable adults and elderly adults.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department of Health and DfES shall endorse the LAC protocols of Kent on out-of-authority placement. 2. Review PAF indicators. 3. Reduce perverse incentives for placing dependent people out of county 4. Co-sponsor an independent enquiry on the issue of LAC placed in Kent by other local authorities 5. Charge the originating local authority the full cost of any public services used in Kent by the originator's dependent people.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central	Addresses the unintentional consequences of Government policy which result in makes it very difficult for certain areas to recover.

government	
Benefits to LAA partners	An Area Cost Adjustment 'top-up' will allow KCC and other relevant partners to compete fairly in its own market place - because London Boroughs can afford higher prices.
Benefits to the community	Less use by these groups on services within Kent which are there primarily to meet the needs to Kent's residents.

Distribution of Lottery / Other Funds	
Problem	Distribution of Lottery Funds is inefficient and the allocation of these with Sport England/others does not necessarily add value to major public spend
Freedom sought	Devolved management and coordination of key funding at a Kent-wide level to focus resources on priority outcomes and to avoid duplication. A greater role for the LPSB in the determination of Lottery and other funding distribution within Kent.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Build on the ODPM model of Single Local Management Centres to reduce bureaucratic costs at central/regional levels and pool disparate pots together to be administered efficiently and effectively. In line with recent Directions Paper on the Big Lottery Fund.
Benefits to LAA partners	Better alignment of resources to priorities ; better inter-agency coordination of resource allocation ; better long-term community investment
Benefits to the community	More resources targeted effectively with clear and proven evidence of achieving better results for the community.

Share the Asset Gain From Regeneration	
Problem	Inequitable share of property value enhancement from regeneration
Freedom sought	<p>Kent local authorities receive a proportion of the additional tax yield gained from increase rateable values and land values, that arise from regeneration investment using public funds and rights.</p> <p>This innovatively extends the principle of the LA Business Growth Incentive Scheme.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Contribution to delivery to the Sustainable Communities strategy would be enhanced and momentum increased.
Benefits to LAA partners	By working together and pooling resources in regeneration areas, partners can not only see a return on their investment but plan to invest any new resources more effectively over an appropriate economic timescale
Benefits to the community	The impact of regeneration is particularly focussed on the Sustainable Communities Areas and cover a broad range of outcomes often for those in greatest need.

Deprivation Funding	
Problem	Kent local authorities are ineligible for Neighbourhood Renewal Funding.
Freedom sought	<p>Access to deprivation related funding, using the Super Output Area option.</p> <p>Background: Under the previous 1998 Index for Multiple Deprivation Kent LAs were omitted from receiving Neighbourhood Renewal Funding because no District Council area, overall, met the criteria for the index. Government has now published more refined data and a further consultation paper. Of the options contained within the paper, only one, based on Super Output Areas, would bring any additional money to Kent and then only to Thanet. Kent should now be eligible for this, and other deprivation related funding.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	An NRF project will strongly link with the new SR2004 PSA 1 which straddles most of the LAA outcomes. NRF is congruent with the rest of the LAA in aims and delivery, and enhances the quality with which the overall package is achieved.
Benefits to LAA partners	<p>Major opportunity for multi-partner working focussed at District level.</p> <p>NRF delivery is synchronised with other projects, particularly to effect managed transition when EU Objective 2 (2006) demises thus sustaining community infrastructure and capability which will enhance the stretch and impact of NRF resources</p> <p>Programme management efficiency is enhanced by NRF project being overseen by existing structure.</p>
Benefits to the community	NRF resources will assist with the development of a locally-owned Neighbourhood Plan which targets resources more effectively to those in greatest need. The Plan will act as a catalyst to lever other resources and partner efforts.

Cheaper PFI borrowing	
Problem	KCC's money borrowing rates for PFI are higher than necessary.
Freedom sought	KCC needs the freedom to provide through borrowing the capital to fund PFI schemes. This would allow KCC to access cheaper money rates than the private sector accesses. KCC would wish to explore new approaches which build on the Government's Credit Guarantee Finance Initiative
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Reduction in administrative costs; leveraging credit rating of government
Benefits to LAA partners	Would save KCC many £million from the interest rate differential, and savings from reduced banking fees.
Benefits to the community	More output or reduced costs achieving more benefits for local communities (e.g. schools, sheltered housing, highways, culture). Also potential positive impact on Council Tax

Capital and expense budgets	
Problem	<p>Mismatch between capital and expense budgets, on both proportion and timing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many capital projects under-perform because of inadequate support on operating and maintenance funding. • The Prudential Code has (since 1/4/04) enabled KCC to take its own decisions about capital investment. However, we need assurance that associated revenue funding will come on stream at the right time, so that we can actually bring the capital asset into use. • The balance of capital and operating expenditure is sometimes inappropriate. For example CDRPs arbitrarily are required to have a capital: expense split of 1:2. In some cases a different ratio would be more effective. • Information and permission from central government about Supported Borrowing (which gives working capital) is poor and tardy. Currently it is one year late. This causes avoidable uncertainty and distortion in financial planning. Therefore, in the current consultation on the Three-Year Settlement, KCC is pressing for a better deal on Supported Borrowing.

Freedom sought	Freedom to strike a local balance between capital and expense budget allocations, and assurance of timely operational funding.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Efficacy in use of funds and property assets. A truer view in financial reporting. Applies the Prudential Code.
Benefits to LAA partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer financial planning and reporting. Enhanced application of true, fair and prudent principles in accounting. • Local discretion on whether expenditure should be charged to Capital or Expense headings will produce a truer view in financial reporting. It will simplify allocation of funds for property maintenance (especially of roads and schools), by enabling significant expenditure to be booked properly as an expense (within the financial year) rather than as long-term capital improvement (amortised over two years or longer). • If central government assures that it will release associated operational funding at the right time to put new assets into use, KCC will have firmer confidence about timing its capital investment, and hence better socio-economic return on that investment. Assurance will also reduce interest cost on any short-term borrowing that KCC has to do to cover tardy central funding. • It is consistent with a long-term goal of proper Full Depreciation Accounting, which would bring KCC's Accounts closer to corporate reporting conventions, standards and transparency.
Benefits to the community	Better application of funds in public services.

Unrestricted funding streams.	
Problem	Obstacles in fund allocation.
Freedom sought	Remove all restrictions within all of the funding streams such as remove all ring fencing, age limits, geographic specificity, and other targeting criteria. We must have freedom to vire funding between the three LAA blocks. Roll forward under-expenditure in any funding streams associated with the LAA. Allow pooling of funds in order to pursue shared LAA outcomes.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Enables localised discretion, and therefore better targeting of resources that often support the same communities or groups. Streamlines management and administration, resulting in greater investment in front line services and greater efficiency. Consistent with the 'single pot' pilot.
Benefits to LAA partners	Streamlines management and administration, resulting in more investment in front-line services and greater resource efficiency. More-coherent planning and more-timely expenditure. Better value for money. Mitigates risk (threat) of insufficient cash to finish a worthy job merely because of arbitrary constraints. Grants should be general, not specific, because this will yield better delivery results, by reducing overhead costs. Restrictions cause petty, painstaking auditing requirements - the cost of which tends to swamp (and certainly debase) the value of the restricted grant. It is often the smaller grants that come with more restrictions - disregarding the economic principle that overhead expense should be proportionate to fund amount. Similarly, many invitations to make a proposal for a grant bear so many criteria and regulations that the bid-cost threshold rises and deters would-be proposers from making a smaller proposal that would otherwise be worthwhile. This is bureaucratic burden to no good purpose. If a specific grant were tied to a head-count but then is converted to an unrestricted grant, its pro-rata basis must

	<p>be retained in order to index the grant value fairly should the number of users subsequently change significantly. Otherwise users of social services could suffer.</p> <p>Instances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C&YP. The Trust/Consortia structure and Clusters would target resources in accordance with local need within the countywide strategy. For example: the Children’s Fund would be invested in very local communities where indicators support this. This will help Kent to meet the joint challenges of raising standards and developing the improved and better integrated services required by the Children Act, while also contributing to efficiency targets. • C&YP. Permit pooled funding for Education Business Links. Permit the Further Education Participation budget to be merged with the Adult Community Learning budget. • HCOP. The Regional Housing Board Funding streams are too prescriptive. For example: funding for key worker housing is tied to an over-prescriptive definition of ‘key workers’ which is not relevant to some parts of Kent. • SSC. Free up the criteria for investment by CDRPs in CCTV schemes. <p>KCC may roll forward its general funds. Health partners have more difficulty, therefore are inhibited from participating in joint projects. There is already scope to pool funds in many sectors (e.g. Health Act section 31 - pioneer use by Drugs Action Team), but all parties and partners will benefit from clearing any barriers (whether actual, perceived or cultural) to make advantageous use of them.</p>
Benefits to the community	Better quality and more timely application of funds in public services.

Security of three year funding	
Problem	<p>A short-term funding horizon inhibits medium-term project delivery and the quality of services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In KCC's experience, central government funding has been very volatile and therefore disruptive to sound financing and excellence in serving Kent's public. KCC will be retrospectively docked £3 million in grant, (resulting from errors in the 2001 Census), and has also lost up to £9 million in grant because the Government has decided not to implement the new socio-economic data from the 2001 Census until 2006-07 at the earliest. • While Biennial Spending Reviews have improved assurance on funding, nevertheless the resulting Area Cost Adjustment is inadequate. • Annual VCS grant funding is detrimental to effectiveness and sustainability of services by this sector.
Freedom sought	<p>Assured minimum three-year funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central government shall guarantee that government funds pledged to LAA partners will be available for at least a three-year term, or for the lifetime of a specified LAA project if longer. • There must be no clawbacks of funds already committed. • Project funds may be subject to review at the end of each project stage, or annually if a stage exceeds one year.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables the implementation of the National Compact guidelines. • Consistent with the Treasury's Cross-Cutting Review on Service Delivery through the Voluntary and Community Sector. • Supports the VCS Infrastructure Programme.
Benefits to LAA partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security that enables projects to develop to support LAA outcomes, help retain key staff, and sustain impact till positive change is embedded more strongly. • Central government is currently consulting on the introduction of three-year revenue and capital settlements for local government from 2006-07. LAA partners will benefit to the extent that their points (including the need for medium-term assurance) are heard and acted upon.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All partners will work towards investing in a strong VCS focussed on delivering LAA outcomes.
Benefits to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger voluntary and community sector (VCS) infrastructure and greater opportunity to develop more mature commissioning partnerships that deliver better services. • A key aspiration of the Kent Compact is achieved, and more effective deployment of KCC and other resources is supported, achieving higher-quality services through the VCS. Hence more strategic commissioning and enhanced impact.

Referenda for hypothecated taxes	
Problem	Lack of local ability to raise a tax, when residents are willing to pay an additional amount for specified purpose.
Freedom sought	<p>Referenda for relatively small, local, hypothecated taxes.</p> <p>Authority to hold referenda on proposals for additional local taxation and to invest monies arising from such tax in specified local services.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	<p>More money into a public good, at no cost to central exchequer.</p> <p>Tests the 'well-being' principle of the Local Government Act 2000.</p>
Benefits to LAA partners	A local community receives an additional service that it has voted and paid for as a group.
Benefits to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthens community, economy, and democracy. • Extends to groups of private residents the tested concept that underlies Business Improvement Districts. • Parish Councils obtain greater scope and responsibility (though must consult thoroughly on specific, larger-outlay proposals). • Suits operation at a very local level e.g. a village or town seeking additional services (village hall, support for community groups, community transport, street lighting, waste collection); or at a more strategic level such as additional investment in health or education services.

VAT regulations discourage the community use of school premises	
Problem	<p>Obstacle to extending community use of school premises and joint development of shared facilities.</p> <p>At present, when community use of school premises (e.g. the new Academy and Extended School projects) exceeds 10%, the total project becomes liable for VAT. This is invidious.</p> <p>At present, the local authority may not use its VAT exempt status for its share in a new facility that it has paid for jointly with a commercial developer. This neutralises a valuable attribute.</p>
Freedom sought	<p>Extend the VAT exempt status of local authorities, allowing VAT exempt status to be used more flexibly.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply LA VAT exempt status to community use of school facilities. This requires abolition of the 10% threshold, or limitation of VAT to just the proportion of the facility deemed to be for community use. 2. Extend LA VAT exempt status to investments made via development partners in shared facilities. For example where sports facilities are created jointly by developers and local authorities (e.g. LA has 20% use and the developer 80% use) then apply VAT exempt status proportionately to the 20% LA share.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Strengthened communities, by enabling fuller use of school premises for community activities.
Benefits to LAA partners	Extended and enriched use of the joint facility, from money otherwise paid in VAT.
Benefits to the community	Facilities that are more useful to the community, e.g. enabling a facility to open sooner, stay open longer, provide wider choice to attract more users.

Block 1 Freedoms: Children and Younger People

Outcome 1.

Administer weak childcare provision as 'going concern'	
Problem	Collapse of a local childcare provider. Childcare places in Kent have high turnover rate that suggests an unstable market.
Freedom sought	<p>The LEA may administer a failed or bankrupt childcare provider on a temporary 'going concern' basis until the provision is re-registered under a new operator, or another replacement is found.</p> <p>The normal re-registration process is lengthy. The proposed power would ensure children received continuing good-quality provision of early care and education in a timely fashion. Currently, families in this situation are often left with no provision at all, causing negative impacts on employment, poverty etc.</p> <p>This power supports the Government's wrap-around childcare and child poverty ambitions.</p> <p>This power might already exist under the well-being powers of the Local Government Act 2000 - opinion sought.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Increase sustainability of childcare in Kent. Importance of stable market is two-fold; helping both early education outcomes and helping working parents.
Benefits to LAA partners	Supports agreed LAA and LPSA targets.
Benefits to the community	Increasing stability in the market helps to move from supply led to demand led market. Demand led market is more likely to raise standards.

NB. We understand from early feedback that this freedom may be unacceptable to OfSTED. We are working an alternative designed to address high turnover in the childcare economy.

Outcome 1

Children's Centres	
Problem	Ensuring that, without compromising the core offer of children's centres, we have maximum local flexibility to respond to local need
Freedom sought	<p>KCC is granted flexibility so that it may develop Children's Centres in such a way that local needs are reflected and sustainability enhanced. This includes discretion on the location, model and approval mechanism of Children's Centres. Location: maintain focus on the most deprived wards but allow us to respond to smaller sub-ward areas of disadvantage.</p> <p>Model: There are some examples in Kent where a hub and satellite model would suit local need. As an excellent authority, we believe that KCC should be able to approve its own centres. This will increase accountability to local communities and to partners.</p> <p>It will not prejudice the core offer of Children's Centres nor the focus on areas of deprivation.</p> <p>Further negotiation of this freedom will take account of the second round of Children's Centre guidance.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	<p>Sustainability, reach and mainstreaming</p> <p>Brings children's centres further into the strategic purview of the Public Service Board enabling best possible fit with extended schools and other local developments.</p>
Benefits to LAA partners	Access to best services, local flexibility.
Benefits to the community	Early Years and Child Care Unit

Outcomes 1- 6

Extend the Lone Parent initiative of Job Centre Plus	
Problem	JobCentrePlus is unable to exploit a successful initiative that could reduce the number of lone parents claiming benefit in Kent.
Freedom sought	<p>Extend the freedoms currently held by Job Centre Plus (in Employment Action Zones and Extended School Pilot areas) to the KCC/Job Centre Plus Partnership Board.</p> <p>This includes freedoms such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childcare Tasters (offering a lone parent a childcare trial) • Debt Counselling (offering this where debt is a barrier to employment) • Childcare Assist (advance funding of childcare costs before a parent starts work) • Quarterly Work Focussed Interviews)(with particular help focused on the needs of lone parents).
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	<p>This freedom would directly contribute to Governments social and economic programme, specifically the raft of Government Spending review targets contained in 'Opportunity for all', which have the aim of eradicating child poverty by 2010, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the employment rate of lone parents, taking account of the economic cycle, and significantly reduce the difference between their employment rate and the overall rate. DWP PSA Target 4a • 'reduce the proportion of children living in workless households by 5.0 per cent between Spring 2005 and Spring 2008' • 'Aim for 70 percent of lone parents to be in work by 2010' • 'halve the number of children in relative low-income households between 1998-99 and 2010-11, on the way to eradication of child poverty by 2010' • 'increase the take-up of formal childcare by lower income working families by 50 percent'
Benefits to LAA partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More lone parents come off welfare into paid employment. • Freedoms will help business and agencies to access another skills source, reduce skills shortages, increases qualifications base, boosts productivity; • Targeting will be directed towards particular wards with high levels of parents in long term unemployment

	<p>and therefore acts as a positive stimulus to help social and economic regeneration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These freedoms would encourage partnership work between the various agencies targeting this group by giving agencies more discretion over funding • This change would ensure that to a greater degree, Kent's Supporting Independence Programme 'SIP' and the 9 archetypes become a central plank of LAA.
Benefits to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Childcare becomes more affordable, through adjustments to the working tax credit or child tax credit. It is particularly advantageous for lone parents in disadvantaged areas. • Permits parents to enter or re-enter the labour market or training; • Helps parents overcome barriers and disincentives to employment • creating opportunities for lone mothers to improve their earnings capacity • the value of jobs in improving lone mothers' material well-being and reducing family hardship employment provides additional hidden additional advantages such as access to mainstream credit, pensions

Outcomes 3, 5 and 6.

Collaborative working between school clusters	
Problem	Incentive for schools clusters to work collaboratively on school improvement
Freedom sought	Devolve the Schools' Standards Fund and Standards Grant to School Clusters (Foundation Partnerships).
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It would act as a further major incentive for collaborative working, especially at the Secondary school level, widening their agenda to focus on school improvement.
Benefits to LAA partners	This will help KCC to meet the three challenges of raising education standards, developing the improved and better integrated services required by the Children Act, and achieving efficiency targets.
Benefits to the community	This would allow more effective targeting of resources (circa £100m or 15% of the schools budget) to meet local needs.

Outcome 2, 3, 4 and 5

Cluster league tables	
Problem	Cluster League Tables needs central support. This would support a model of mutuality driving improvement rather than competition
Freedom sought	DFES shall assist and support creation of Cluster League tables as proposed by the Innovation Forum.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Drives improvement
Benefits to LAA partners	Allows collaborative responses to local solutions.
Benefits to the community	Increased confidence in the ability of local schools to meet the needs of a wider range of children. Anything that builds confidence in local schools will have associated benefits for community cohesion and infrastructure pressures (roads, transport)

Outcomes 2- 7

Admission threshold to special school	
Problem	The SEN threshold is too strict, procedures are lengthy and effect is all or nothing.
Freedom sought	Remove the requirement for a pupil to have a Special Educational Needs assessment in order to gain admission into a special school or unit.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Promotes inclusion in main stream education for children with additional needs.
Benefits to LAA partners	This will enhance engagement between mainstream and special schools.
Benefits to the community	This will support the wide range of needs across the school population.

Outcome 3 and 6 plus associated outcomes in other streams.

Business rates on schools' work-based learning initiative (incubator units)	
Problem	Perverse effect of business rates on schools' work-based learning initiative
Freedom sought	Abolition or reduction of business rates for 'incubator units' on educational sites. Kent is encouraging schools to develop vocational links by encouraging small businesses to locate within the school premises in return for opportunities for pupils to experience work based learning. Kent could encourage many more business to participate if those incubator units could receive business rate relief.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Practical demonstration that government rhetoric supports enterprising schools. Increases business involvement in education. Encourages business start-ups, by reducing an entry barrier. Good leverage: social and workforce gain with minimal revenue cost.

	Addresses the skills gap
Benefits to LAA partners	<p>Encouragement of children to gain work experience most conveniently.</p> <p>Combats youth scepticism about promotional messages on working.</p> <p>Reinforces school lessons and pupil motivation in more schools.</p> <p>Improved interaction between schools, business and the community</p>
Benefits to the community	<p>Enhanced opportunity for young people</p> <p>Addresses the skills gap</p> <p>Pupils become more employable when they finish school.</p>

Block 2 Freedoms: Stronger and Safer Communities

Lighter touch inspection process	
Problem	1. Much more strengthened proposal around less/lighter audit and inspection.
Freedom sought	At the moment we in Kent consistently perform well and regarded as one of the top five performing forces. To maintain the capacity of regularly performing to this high standard we have had to establish a tight inspection process, which is both transparent and robust. And yet despite this tight regime we are still assessed against the less well performing forces. Because our inspection processes are so rigorous within the LAA we seek to be freed of such a tight inspection process in favour of a lighter approach.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It will give central government an evidenced based example of a 'lighter touch' inspection regime and demonstrate a more mature working arrangement. Which will help to establish best practice and allow government offices to focus on developing under performance issues in other forces.
Benefits to LAA partners	A positive move away from government bureaucracy which will allow for greater autonomy in focusing on local issues.
Benefits to the community	The opportunity to focus more on real community issues.

NB. This illustrates the issue addressed under one of the 'Concordat' clauses.

Crime Fighting Fund.	
Problem	2. Restrictions associated with the Crime Fighting Fund.
Freedom sought	Currently the crime fighting fund is an additional fund specifically used for the recruitment of Police Officers. However, for some reason if we do not achieve our recruitment targets then there is a punitive impact by way of the money we lose for under achievement. This punitive sanction appears to be very disproportionate (hammer to crack a nut). It also understates the importance of PCSOs and other non-police personnel make in the fight against crime. We would seek to lighten the financial sanctions and extend the crime fighting fund to other members of the police family.
Priority	Essential

Benefits to central government	The money could be used to create a more diverse workforce within the larger police family.
Benefits to LAA partners	Increase in PCSO establishment could help to tackle various quality of life issues including anti social behaviour and an increase in public reassurance.
Benefits to the community	More local needs could be met by the removal of sanctions around the Crime Fighting Fund.

Other freedoms associated with Stronger and Safer Communities Block (outcome order)

Outcome 9: To make Kent a safer place to work, live and travel (LPSA 2).

Freedoms and flexibilities for Outcome 9	
Problem	1. Increased local autonomy of Kent & Medway Camera Partnerships.
Freedom sought	Increased local autonomy to Kent & Medway Camera Partnerships to deploy speed cameras in response to local concerns (currently 10% of deployments can be in response to local concerns, the other 90% are prescribed). This freedom is linked to achieving LPSA2. Kent & Medway Camera Partnership need to have greater autonomy in its deployment of speed enforcement cameras. This will create a better opportunity to work with the local community to raise awareness of the need to reduce road fatalities and allow the local authority to deliver a more cost effective speed enforcement campaign.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It will establish a more community focused enforcement campaign.
Benefits to LAA partners	Kent & Medway Camera Partnership will be able to work with a more joined up approach to speed enforcement within Kent.
Benefits to the community	By having the freedom to target problem roads in Kent it will help make Kent a safer place to travel.

Revenue from Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).	
Problem	2. Insufficient flexibility on the use of revenue generated from Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).
Freedom sought	Freedom to use the revenue gained from Fixed Penalty Tickets for Disorder for other Community Safety initiatives. Currently revenue gained from Fixed Penalty Notices for Fly Tipping is given back to the issuing council to be used again in tackling the problem. We would seek to extend this process to include Fixed Penalty Notices for disorder so the revenue gained can be used in other Community Safety initiatives.
Priority	Essential.
Benefits to central government	The revenue gained will be used to tackle other Community Safety priorities
Benefits to LAA partners	They will create an additional income generator. Fixed Penalty Notices are a useful sanction that can be used to tackle anti-social behaviour. FPNs can also be a useful tool in measuring incidents of anti-social behaviour/disorder.
Benefits to the community	Will help to tackle issues of anti-social behaviour at a local level.

Outcome 10: To reduce crime effecting local communities

Crime measurement.	
Problem	1. Inaccurate and misleading measurement comparisons
Freedom sought	Kent performance to be monitored and assessed using overall BCS crime rather than BCS comparator recorded crime.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Being measured as per Home Office PSA1 rather than unreliable proxy measures currently being used. Kent does not have any of its CDRPs in the 40 high crime decided areas.
Benefits to LAA partners	A more accurate assessment of how crime in Kent is contributing to the Home Office method of measurement.

Benefits to the community	More realistic measurement would allow BCU Commanders to tackle local crime issues with CDRP agencies which, will assist in achieving HO PSA1 target.
----------------------------------	---

Use of local surveys	
Problem	2. Local surveys not valid to measure BCS crime categories
Freedom sought	The freedom to use local surveys to measure BCS crime categories.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	It will give us our own continual data source which will assist us in monitoring crime trends and responding to these quickly therefore, we would be better able to deploy and direct resources more effectively to achieve the HO PSA and LAA outcomes.
Benefits to LAA partners	The use of locally available data sources rather than relying on nationally held and annually published data would allow Kent to be more responsive.
Benefits to the community	This would mean a better service delivery for the people in Kent.

Outcome 11: To reduce the harm caused by illegal drugs, including substantially increasing the number of drug misusing offenders entering treatment through the CJS.

Bid for pilot status	
Problem	1. Freedom to bid for legislative opportunity to have pilot status.
Freedom sought	As the LAA will be at the cutting edge of change and innovation we would like to register that Kent should be considered a prime candidate for any national pilots being considered. See freedom 2 below concerning the DIP.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Economies of scale.
Benefits to LAA partners	Combining pilot status as opposed to a piecemeal approach.

Benefits to the community	Exploration of better/smarter ways of working.
----------------------------------	--

Multiple Addictions – Drugs and Alcohol	
Problem	Many addicts face multiple addictions and at present there is a structural inability to tackle drug and alcohol related problems holistically
Freedom sought	Flexible use of and ability to pool all substance misuse related funding for prevention and enforcement purposes. Removing restrictions and funding blocks that currently exist between NTA pooled budget, Drug Intervention Prevention grants, Safer Stronger Communities grant (allocation for tackling drugs in the community) and arrest referral allocation so that all substance misuse funding streams are combined and protected.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Contribution towards Alcohol Harm reduction strategy.
Benefits to LAA partners	Ability to integrate resources to reflect the need to treat addicts holistically. Reduced pressure on NHS resources through a reduction in A+E admissions.
Benefits to the community	Seamless access to services and support for those with multiple addictions.

NB. Similar Freedom in OP&HC

Outcome 12: To reassure the public, reducing fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and building confidence in the Criminal Justice System without compromising fairness (HO PSA2).

And

Outcome 13: To increase the capacity of local communities so that people are empowered to participate in local decision making and delivery of services.

And

Outcome 14: Cleaner and Greener Public Spaces

None identified at this stage.

Block 3 Freedoms: Healthier People & Older People

Outcome 16: *To promote independence through employment for those who are able to work.*

Evaluation of Kent Supporting Independence Programme	
Problem	Lapse of a valuable research project (Evaluation of Kent Supporting Independence Programme)
Freedom sought	<p>HMT to continue their sponsorship of the joint Government / DWP / KCC research project conducted by Oxford University into the welfare benefit expenditure in Kent.</p> <p>This very valuable project (initiated in the LPSA1 agreement) is about to produce its final report. One of the recommendations will be the need to continue the evaluation of the impact on welfare expenditure of the SIP programme. The original contract was let by HMT.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Data to April 2003 suggested that that the Supporting Independence Programme might have had an impact on particular groups, for example, the relative position of lone parents in 2003 and the pattern of exiting benefit by younger lone parent with one child under five in the priority 1 wards. Continuing this research will allow the position to be clarified through the use of more recent data. It will also help measure the effectiveness of the LAA pilot.
Benefits to LAA partners	Issues facing vulnerable people and the barriers to independence identified. As a result a shared understanding will be developed alongside increased partnership working (both of which underpin the LAA approach)
Benefits to the community	Improved access to and delivery of services.

DWP Explorer Partnership	
Problem	In supporting clients who have been on Incapacity Benefit for two years back to work, the DWP has acknowledged that Kent partners are tackling an area of work that is both new and challenging; therefore, DWP involvement is essential.
Freedom sought	To develop an explorer partnership with DWP
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	The work will provide DWP with additional expertise regarding a client group that they do not currently focus on, and it will help to deliver on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	This will directly support Jobcentre Plus service delivery and will impact on other partners by reducing the need for remedial services by improving health and supporting independence through work.
Benefits to the community	Working with the DWP, Kent Partners will be able to deliver an improved service to people who have been claiming IB for two years. Clients should receive a more flexible and holistic service. The focus on reducing the IB claimant count will also form an essential part of the wider regeneration element of the LAA bringing wider benefits to deprived communities.

Exemption from Personal Capability Assessment (PCA).	
Problem	The perception amongst the IB client group is that permitted work will trigger a Personal Capability Assessment (PCA) and this is seen as specific barrier in terms of engaging clients in permitted work as a route back to full employment.
Freedom sought	To introduce a flexibility where the LPSA2 target group (clients who have been receiving IB for over 2 years) who undertake permitted work are NOT called for a Personal Capability Assessment (PCA).
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	In supporting long term IB clients back to work it will reduce the IB claimant count by focusing on those clients that the Government is not currently focused on, and, therefore, it will help to deliver on national PSA targets.

Benefits to LAA partners	Clients will have greater confidence in the process. Therefore, it will be easier for all partners to engage clients and deliver services.
Benefits to the community	Incapacity Benefit clients will have more confidence in the support they receive – they will not feel that their benefits are at risk in the short term. Therefore, they will be more likely to engage in this process and more likely to enter employment and independence.

Back to work payments	
Problem	Moving from benefits into the world of work is a difficult transition for many people. Financial insecurity is one of the important barriers to making this transition successfully. Currently, it is not clear whether Kent partners can offer additional 'back to work' payments without this affecting their benefits/in work credits.
Freedom sought	Kent partners to be able to make one off payments to particular client groups (for example, those who have been on Incapacity Benefit for more than two years) to give provide the additional financial security they need to make the transition back to work.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Improved return to work figures and lower benefit claimant counts, and it improved delivery on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	This is an important incentive in supporting people back to work, therefore, it is important for LAA partners in delivering a better service.
Benefits to the community	Greater confidence in returning to work gained through increased financial security. More people being supported into independence.

Six Month Threshold for access to training	
Problem	A number of Jobcentre Plus training programs require clients to have been unemployed for at least six months before they can qualify for early entry onto the programme. For certain high risk groups, for example, ex-offenders this wait is a barrier to returning to work, and a risk factor in terms of them disengaging from the system altogether.
Freedom sought	The freedom to be able to offer early entry to training programs based on the needs of particularly vulnerable groups.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	More particularly vulnerable clients engaged in the back to work process and, therefore, more of this client group being helped back to work. Therefore, it will help to deliver on national PSA targets.
Benefits to LAA partners	The ability to offer a more flexible service in response to an individual client's needs.
Benefits to the community	A better, more flexible, service for particularly vulnerable groups, which should help them to find sustainable employment. The focus on supporting people back into work will also form an essential part of the wider regeneration element of the LAA bringing wider benefits to deprived communities.

Permitted Work rules	
Problem	For a significant number of benefit claimants permitted work is a vital stepping stone back to the world of work, or indeed to a more independent life if they are not able to take up full time employment. However, there are different rules regarding the permitted work you can do depending on which benefit you receive: Income Support or Incapacity Benefit/Severe Disability Allowance.
Freedom sought	Ideally the disparity referred to above needs to be eradicated. If this is not possible, we would wish to be able to dis-apply the earnings disregard rules in selected areas of Kent. Specifically: 3. Allow the earnings disregard for those on Income Support, Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit who are undertaking Permitted Work to increase to £78 net per week (in line with rules for Permitted Work Higher Limit and Supported Permitted Work).

	4. To allow one disregard for each member of a couple.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	It will provide further support for clients seeking sustainable employment and therefore should play an important role in reducing the number of benefit claimants.
Benefits to LAA partners	It will provide local partners with more flexibility to help benefit claimants back to work in a less threatening way. Therefore, enabling them to provide better support and a more effective service.
Benefits to the community	Agreeing to the above flexibility would help to encourage and enable claimants to develop their capacity for sustained employment on a step by step basis.

Outcome 17: To promote the health of Kent's residents

Treatment of historic accumulated debt	
Problem	<p>Elements of the current NHS financial regime make it more difficult for NHS Trusts to pay historic accumulated debt</p> <p>NHS Trusts have a given set of resources in any one year with which to deliver services. The repayment must come from this same resource space</p>
Freedom sought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that the DH take LAAs into account in any future deliberations on the treatment of accumulated deficits within specific local health economies or health organisations. It is suggested that any strategies developed to support the reduction and/or elimination of such historic debt be prioritised to those SHA areas that are involved in LAA pilots. The reasoning being that reducing the local NHS debt burden would allow additional resources to be deployed in preventative services supporting LAA implementation, as opposed to debt recovery. Request the DH to recognise the implications of partnership working under LAA in any future review of the financial regime governing either PCTs, NHS Trusts or Foundation Trusts.

Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Achievement of financial statutory duty
Benefits to LAA partners	Financial stability within the NHS and the servicing of debt does not have to come from NHS budgets.
Benefits to the community	Increase provision and quality of health services

Multiple Addictions – Drugs and Alcohol	
Problem	Many addicts face multiple addictions and at present there is a structural inability to tackle drug and alcohol related problems holistically
Freedom sought	More flexible use of and ability to pool all substance misuse related funding. Removing restrictions and funding blocks that currently exist between NTA pooled budget, Drug Intervention Prevention grants, Safer Stronger Communities grant (allocation for tackling drugs in the community) and arrest referral allocation so that all substance misuse funding streams are combined and protected.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Contributes towards Alcohol Harm reduction strategy. Contributes towards Anti-Social Behaviour agenda.
Benefits to LAA partners	Ability to integrate resources to reflect need to treat addicts holistically. Reduced pressure on NHS resources through a reduction in A+E admissions.
Benefits to the community	Seamless access to services and support for those with multiple addictions

NB. Similar Freedom in S&SC

Outcome 18: To ensure Kent residents have access to homes of excellent quality, in the right place, at the right time and at the right cost

Council tax raised on long term empty homes	
Problem	The Local Government Act 2003 gives local authorities the power to reduce discounts on long term empty properties and second homes after six months. Local authorities are allowed to keep the extra council tax revenue generated by second homes, but after 2004/05 they will not be allowed to keep the extra revenue generated by long term empty properties.
Freedom sought	For Kent LAs to retain council tax raised from long term empty homes to be re-invested in the regeneration of local communities.
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Removes current perverse incentive to keep homes empty and encourages LAs to return more empty properties back to the market, which will help to deliver on the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda.
Benefits to LAA partners	Retains funding raised in Kent for use locally on an LAA priority.
Benefits to the community	Improved supply of housing for the most vulnerable groups and for the wider community it will reduce the problems related to empty and derelict houses, for example, vandalism.

Unfit landlords	
Problem	Unfit landlords subsidised
Freedom sought	Refuse to pay Housing Benefit to landlords of unfit properties or landlords that are not part of a registration scheme
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Reduction in housing benefit subsidy and contribution towards decent homes standard.
Benefits to	Help to increase quality and quantity of affordable housing

LAA partners	
Benefits to the community	Vulnerable people protected from unfit housing

Tax incentive to assist older people to move to more appropriate accommodation	
Problem	Existing tax and benefit incentives encourage elderly people to stay in unsuitable, large homes
Freedom sought	<p>To give an older person a tax incentive to move home, into smaller and more suitable accommodation, where they wish to</p> <p>Presently many older people live by themselves in large 3 or 4 bedroom homes. The existing tax and benefit incentives encourage them to stay in these large homes (sole occupancy council tax discount, heating allowances etc). Often these homes are unsuitable for their needs, many are in poor condition, with stairs, costly to heat etc.</p> <p>In addition it represents inefficient use of the housing resource that feeds into additional demand for new homes on greenfield sites.</p> <p>A tax incentive to help older people move into smaller and more suitable accommodation would have the twin benefits making them safer and release additional housing supply thereby reducing the need for new units. Tax incentives could include the waiving of stamp duty on any purchase or certain concessions on capital gains tax.</p>
Priority	Desirable
Benefits to central government	Freeing housing market and decrease dependence on benefits
Benefits to LAA partners	<p>Freeing housing market and decrease dependence on benefits locally. Help prevent admissions and delayed discharges.</p> <p>This would assist Registered Social Landlords in their initiatives to free up under-occupied accommodation in</p>

	this freedom.
Benefits to the community	Ability to stay in own homes/familiar setting for longer periods of time. Reduces the risk of falls/injuries due to familiar setting.

Outcome 19: To promote independent living for all

Supporting People Programme to be managed locally	
Problem	Unintended consequences of ODPM's approach to the Supporting People programme. ODPM have consistently advised that the Supporting People Programme is a locally managed programme. Concerns arise (for example) from guidance issued by the ODPM to refine the HRS criteria. Kent's Commissioning Body has agreed the criteria, and by changing code tables in our SPLS (Supporting People Local System) to reflect Kent's locally managed Programme would no longer be validated by the upload processes in place from the ODPM. In addition to this, we are in the process of consulting on our Steady State Contract. We are looking at changing a number of aspects, one for example is renaming the Contract Types. This, again will fail to meet the criteria in SPLS uploads.
Freedom sought	Supporting People. Detailed work, supported by a legal view, has been undertaken on the consequences of ODPM's approach to the SP programme and on the degree of freedom and flexibility we currently have. This will lead to a specific proposal(s) re a 3 year commitment from Government and freedom to manage locally.
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Demonstrate that central government commitment to allowing local authorities to do what they do best. It reflects the commitment within Wendy Jarvis's letter (13 th January 2005 to Mike Pitt) to reduce bureaucracy. It enables local authorities to deliver a cost-effective service where the majority of funding is directed at front line services rather than resulting in the need to recruit additional staff to deliver the requirements that currently stand.
Benefits to LAA partners	The Supporting People Programme has been criticized for the extraordinary amount of administration associated with ODPM requirements. The Freedoms and Flexibilities asked for would preclude the requirement for service rich data (eg. Distance from scheme to post office etc). The Supporting people Team wishes to commission a

	needs-led, quality service without the distractions of bureaucratic red-tape.
Benefits to the community	Ability to strategically plan community focussed needs- led services.

Direct Payments	
Problem	People are not allowed to use their Direct Payments (cash to buy social care services, following an assessment of need) on services provided by KCC. Therefore, they can only be given Direct Payments if they plan to purchase services from the independent sector.
Freedom sought	Freedom for people to purchase services from KCC using Direct Payments
Priority	Essential
Benefits to central government	Testing out of a policy that Government may want to roll out nationally.
Benefits to LAA partners	Removes perverse incentives and bureaucracy for Kent Social Services. Promotes Direct Payments, thus increasing the opportunity for the voluntary and private sectors to tap into this market.
Benefits to the community	People who are eligible for support from Social Services can have the flexibility to choose whether to spend their Direct Payments on in-house services or the independent sector, without having to decide this up-front. This would give existing in-house service users an incentive to try out Direct Payments and would encourage them to purchase their own support over the longer term in the community.