



# **Participation and Local Strategic Partnerships**

**A research project for the  
Commission for Racial Equality**

**Report by**

**Black Training & Enterprise Group and Urban Forum**

**June 2007**



# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Notice	3
Terminology	3
Glossary of terms	3
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 The research	8
1.2 Background Information	8
1.3 Research methodology	13
<b>2 FINDINGS</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) and government office (GO) views	15
2.2 Performance Management Frameworks	16
2.3 Ethnic minority involvement	19
2.4 Ethnic minority representation	20
2.5 Retention	22
2.6 Recruitment	22
2.7 Allocation of neighbourhood renewal funding	23
2.8 Racial equality resources	24
2.9 LSPs and statutory organisations	24
<b>3 CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1 Performance Management Frameworks	26
3.2 Number of ethnic minorities involved in LSPs	26
3.3 Race equality duty of statutory partners	28
3.4 Ethnic minority representation within LSPs	28
3.5 Recruitment and retention	29
3.6 Allocation of neighbourhood renewal funding	29
Appendix 1 NRU and GO respondents	30
Appendix 2 LSP respondents	31

## Notice

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission for Racial Equality.

## Terminology

Throughout this report a distinction is made between the 'core' LSP and the 'wider' LSP. By core LSP we mean the main board of the LSP (usually comprised of around 20 to 30 places). By wider LSP we mean the range of groups and partnerships which sit beneath the core LSP and feed directly into it. The wider LSP generally includes thematic partnerships, delivery partnerships, local area partnerships, and a range of other sub-groups, networks and partnerships such as community empowerment networks, which are set up by local authorities to support voluntary and community groups.

Throughout this report the terms 'individual involvement' in the LSP and 'representation' on the LSP are used to mean two different things. By individual involvement (or participation or engagement) we mean the person who takes part in the LSP (e.g. who attends the LSP meetings). When the report refers to ethnic monitoring of individual involvement, this means monitoring the ethnicity of the individuals who take part in the LSP. By representation we mean the individual or the organisation which has been elected or appointed to represent a particular set of interests or views, in this case those of ethnic minority communities. The report does not assume that the people who represent ethnic minority communities will necessarily be from an ethnic minority group themselves.

## Glossary of terms

BME	Black and minority ethnic
CEHR	Commission for Equality and Human Rights
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
CPA	Comprehensive Performance Assessment
GO	Government office
LAA	Local Area Agreement
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
NRF	Neighbourhood renewal funding
NRU	Neighbourhood Renewal Unit
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PMF	Performance management framework

## Executive Summary

A Local Strategic Partnership (LSPs) is a non-statutory, multi-agency partnership which covers the same area as a local authority. It brings together representatives from the local public, private, community and voluntary sectors, to help them work together more effectively. Since 2001, the 88 most deprived local authority areas, additional resources have been made available through neighbourhood renewal funding (NRF)<sup>1</sup>. This provides additional funding to these areas to help narrow the gap between deprived areas and the rest of the country. LSPs have complex agendas, and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) has developed a system of performance management to help them to monitor their progress in achieving their aims. All LSPs are encouraged to use this management framework (PMF), and since 2003, all LSPs in receipt of NRF are required to have one in place.

This report presents the findings from research commissioned by the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) to look at participation in LSPs by people from ethnic minorities, and to investigate the extent to which NRF is distributed to people from ethnic minorities. The project forms part of the CRE's research programme on integration, which examines ways of strengthening social and political participation by all members of society.

The research was carried out by the Black Training and Enterprise Group and the Urban Forum during the period February – April 2006. The main aims of the research were:

- to identify the level of ethnic minority participation in LSPs; and
- to see how NRF is allocated, and which groups benefit from it.

The study sampled 31 LSPs that receive NRF, broadly reflecting the proportion of LSPs with large and small NRF allocations, and their regional distribution.

Telephone interviews were held with all 31 LSPs, and they were asked to send in their PMFs for review (only 18 responded). Further in-depth interviews were held with nine of the LSPs in the sample. The research also included discussions with staff from the NRU and the regional government offices (GOs) for London and the North West.

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the time of this research the number of local authority areas eligible to receive full NRF has reduced to 86. Three new authorities are now eligible for NRF (Barnet, Norwich, and North East Lincolnshire) and five authorities are no longer eligible (Kensington and Chelsea, Luton, Portsmouth, Southampton and Wandsworth). Luton is the only authority affected that took part in this study [See <http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=612>, accessed 8 May 2007]

## **Findings**

### **Ethnic minority involvement in LSPs**

Most LSPs in our survey did not monitor their members by ethnic origin. Although guidance from the NRU recommends that LSPs should monitor the ethnicity of members of the core LSP of the and wider LSP, 24 of the 31 LSPs had not done this. Five LSPs monitored the ethnicity of both core and wider LSP members, while one LSP only monitored the ethnicity of board members, and one only monitored sub-groups. Without monitoring, it is not possible to determine the overall level of participation by people from ethnic minorities in LSPs across the country.

Most LSP respondents could not explain why they had not done the monitoring, with six saying they were planning to do so in the near future. A small number of LSPs said they were opposed to monitoring ethnicity because, if it showed a lack of representation from particular ethnic groups, the LSP could not compel its partners to redress any under-representation.

While the guidance from the NRU recommends that LSPs should monitor their members by ethnic background, it does not require them to do so. No satisfactory explanation has been provided by the NRU, GOs or LSPs as to how LSPs can assess participation in their partnership work without this information.

### **Ethnic minority representation in LSPs**

Less than one third (32%) LSPs in our survey had set aside places for representatives from ethnic minorities in their core structure, that is, on the main LSP board, and two in five (42%) had had done this for their wider structure.

These figures differ from those of the NRU survey commissioned in 2004, which looked at actual, rather than designated, ethnic minority representation, and found 47% representation in the core structure and 76% in the wider structure.

Our research process did not allow for examination of whether ethnic minority communities felt that their interests were effectively represented in LSPs. The limited anecdotal information collected in the course of our research suggested that some LSP ethnic minority representatives were very dissatisfied with the race equality approach taken by the NRU, government offices and LSPs.

### **Recruitment and retention**

Only one of the nine LSPs responding to questions on recruitment had an open recruitment process for some of its core LSP places. Most LSPs had designated places for identified stakeholders and did not recruit for any of those places through open competition. However, in some cases representatives for the designated places for certain sectors were recruited through an election process (for example, election via the Community Empowerment Network to select a

representative for the designated voluntary and community sector place(s) in the LSP).

None of the 31 LSPs in our sample monitored retention of members by ethnic background, while only one monitored retention at all. It was therefore not possible to develop any overall conclusions of whether ethnic minority members of LSPs stayed involved for shorter or longer periods than other members.

### **Performance Management Frameworks**

Only 18 of the 31 LSPs surveyed sent in their PMFs in response to our request. The NRU's guidance on core requirements for PMFs advises that these documents should be made publicly available. Only three of the 31 LSPs had published their PMF on their website in a downloadable format, while 15 LSPs sent documents on request. The remaining 13 LSPs (just over 40% of the sample) either did not have a PMF, or did not send it, or sent other documents instead. Since 2005, the production of a PMF that is available to the public is a requirement of receiving neighbourhood renewal funding (see page 10).

NRU guidance (*Core Requirements of a performance management framework 2005/6*) requires LSPs to include a review of partnership working, using various set criteria, including the inclusivity of the partnership. None of the PMFs submitted gave a convincing account of how the LSPs ensured that people from ethnic minorities were involved in all aspects of partnership work. It is difficult to see how the information provided in the PMFs can be used to review an LSP's performance in achieving inclusivity in partnership work.

### **Allocation of neighbourhood renewal funds**

Only a small minority of LSPs appeared to monitor ethnicity when they allocated NRF funding. Most of the people interviewed thought it was the outcomes that NRF funding was helping to achieve that mattered, and not who was receiving it, or how the money was being used.

Two of the nine LSPs that were interviewed in depth monitored ethnicity when allocating NRF funds. However, six out of the nine monitored the ethnicity of targeted and actual beneficiaries of NRF.

### **The relationship between LSPs and leading statutory organisations**

Responsibilities for promoting race equality were not generally being carried forward into the work of LSPs, even though the leading statutory body in the LSP (usually the local authority) was bound by the requirements of the Race Relations Act to promote race equality in all their work.

Only four of the nine LSPs that were interviewed in depth reported working within the equalities framework set out by the local authority.

## Recommendations

- The LSP performance management framework needs to be improved; the existing framework is not adequate for assessing whether ethnic minorities are involved in LSPs.
- Statutory government bodies, such as the NRU and government offices, should take a far stronger approach to ensuring that LSPs follow the NRU's guidance on monitoring ethnicity.
- Local authorities and other statutory partners in LSPs need to meet the requirements of the statutory duty to promote race equality and good race relations (referred to as the race equality duty) under the Race Relations Act 1976 as amended (RRA). The CRE and CEHR should use every opportunity to ensure that local authorities and their statutory partners understand that the race equality duty applies to their role as partners.
- The NRU and government offices should advise LSPs that a structure that specifically includes ethnic minority representation represents good practice.
- Future surveys and evaluations of LSPs should distinguish between the number of ethnic minority representatives involved in LSPs and the number of designated places for ethnic minorities in LSPs. Information should be collected on both, bearing in mind, however, that the former will be higher than the latter.
- LSPs should continue to be required to include reviews of their partnership work as part of their PMF. The core requirements for PMFs should be strengthened to include a more robust assessment of the LSP's involvement of people from ethnic minorities, and a requirement for the LSP to carry out a race equality impact assessment on their functions and policies.
- The CRE and CEHR should take whatever steps possible to promote ethnicity monitoring of recruitment and retention as good practice which non-statutory agencies and partnerships should adopt.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 The research

This report presents the findings from research commissioned by the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) to explore the participation of people from ethnic minority backgrounds in local strategic partnerships (LSPs). The research was carried out by the Black Training and Enterprise Group (BTEG) and the Urban Forum during the period February-April 2006. The main aims of the research were:

- to identify the level of ethnic minority participation in LSPs; and
- to see how Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) is allocated, and which groups benefit from it.

In addition, the research brief included the following specific objectives:

- to examine recruitment and selection strategies for selection to LSPs, highlighting any strategies for reaching people from ethnic minorities;
- to establish the drop-out rates of LSP members, with specific attention to ethnic minority members; and
- to see who is applying for NRF, and how this funding has been allocated since 2001, with specific reference to different ethnic minority groups.

The project forms part of the CRE's research programme on integration, which looks at ways of strengthening social and political participation by all members of society.

## 1.2 Background information

The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal is the government's principal vehicle for tackling deprivation in England. The initiative is managed by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU), which is now part of the Department for Communities and Local Government. In concentrating on the 88 most deprived local authority areas in England, the NRU's aim is to use current resources better, and to supplement these with extra, relatively small-scale funding – through the NRF, which is only available in those 88 areas – in order to tackle the causes of deprivation.

To deliver the neighbourhood renewal programme, each local authority was required to set up an LSP, to bring together key agencies from the public sector (police, health, education and other local organisations) with representatives from the voluntary and community sector, faith organisations, businesses and



residents. These multi-agency partnerships play a central role in planning and reviewing local services.

LSPs therefore have considerable influence in facilitating integration, which the CRE identifies as having three key components – equality of opportunity, universal participation, and interaction between people from different ethnic groups.

Over two-thirds of Britain's ethnic minority population live in the 88 most deprived local authority areas targeted by the NRF. People from ethnic minorities should therefore be among the main beneficiaries of the programme, and should play a key role in shaping it.

In 2000, the Race Relations Act 1976 (RRA) was amended to place a statutory duty on public authorities to pay 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, and promote equality of opportunity and good race relations. This is referred to as the race equality duty. Both the setting up and monitoring of LSPs, as well as the work carried out by the statutory agencies that form LSPs, are covered by the race equality duty.

### **Local Strategic Partnerships**

A Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) is a non-statutory, multi-agency body which covers the same area as a local authority. It brings together representatives from the local public, private, community and voluntary sectors, to help them work together more effectively. The main objective of LSPs is 'to set out the vision of an area and co-ordinate and drive the delivery of local services leading to improved outcomes for citizens that go beyond the remit of any one partner' [*Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their future: A consultation paper*, ODPM, December 2005].

Government proposals for establishing LSPs were first introduced in 2000 followed by further non-statutory guidance in 2001. Since then, LSPs have been established in most local authority areas. LSPs have been central to the delivery of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal and are expected to play a central role within the Local Area Agreements which are being introduced on a rolling programme which began in 2005.

### **Neighbourhood renewal funding**

The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal was launched in 2001 with the vision that within 10 years no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live. The National Strategy and supporting documents highlight race equality as a priority in achieving the neighbourhood renewal vision, for two key reasons:

Past initiatives have often failed to engage or benefit Black and minority ethnic voluntary and community groups. Issues important to Black and minority ethnic communities have frequently been given low priority.

Black and minority ethnic communities are disproportionately represented in deprived areas. Over two thirds of England's Black and minority ethnic population live in the 88 most deprived local authority districts ... compared to 40% of the total population.

*[Neighbourhood Renewal Unit Race Equality Action Plan, ODPM, 2005]*

The government made funding available to the 88 most deprived local authority areas through the NRF with the aim of 'kick starting' neighbourhood renewal. NRF funding totalled around £2,675 million over the period 2001/2 to 2005/6 [NRU website April 2006].

### **Local Area Agreements**

The aim of Local Area Agreements (LAAs) is to achieve greater devolution of decision-making from the central to local levels. The LAA is a three-year agreement that sets out priorities in a local area as agreed between central government and the local area, as represented by the local authority and LSP. Each LAA is focused around four blocks of activities and services:

- safer and stronger communities;
- children and young people;
- healthier communities and older people; and
- economic development and enterprise.

The first, pilot round of LAAs took place in 2005. The second round of LAAs has just been completed, and a third round will see LAAs completed with all remaining local authority areas by March 2007.

### **Performance management framework**

Between 2001 and 2003, each LSP went through an annual accreditation process managed by their regional GO. Since October 2003, the accreditation process for NRF LSPs has been replaced with a requirement to have a performance management framework (PMF) in place.<sup>2</sup> The NRU has issued guidance on the core requirements which the PMF must include, and has also produced a model PMF which LSPs may adopt.

LSPs are free to develop their PMF in any way, providing it includes the core requirements of:

- a review of outcomes;

---

<sup>2</sup> Although only LSPs in receipt of NRF are required to use a PMF, other LSPs are also encouraged to use one.

- a review of partnership working, and;
- an improvement plan.

LSPs are only required to undertake a review of partnership working every three years, although should report annually in their improvement plans on any actions to address identified weaknesses in this area. Guidance on the core requirements for PMFs states that the review of partnership working must set out how well the LSP is performing in meeting a number of criteria, including whether it is inclusive of all key sectors, 'the community and voluntary sectors through the Community Empowerment Network, black and minority ethnic and other minority communities, the private sector and public sector partners' [*Core Requirements of a performance management framework 2005/6*, NRU].

The accreditation process which PMFs have superseded included a greater number and more detailed criteria which LSPs were expected to meet. In terms of racial equality, the accreditation guidance for 2002/3 stated that the LSP and its network of partners were required to commit themselves to the following principles:

.... All public sector members of the LSP (including service provision that is sub-contracted) must adhere to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act.

.... LSPs should consider Community Cohesion in their area, using the joint guidance produced by Government, the Local Government Association and other partners. This says that public sector bodies should extend their race equality schemes to cover their partnership work on LSPs and other partnerships ...

[*Accreditation Guidance for LSPs*, ODPM, November 2002]

These principles are not included in the core requirements for PMFs, although the PMF process is expected to 'build upon the process of accreditation undertaken by [the] LSP over the past two years' [*performance management framework for Local Strategic Partnerships; The NRU model: A suggested approach*, ODPM].

PMFs now form part of the self-assessment process introduced in 2005, through which LSPs self-assess their thematic and overall performance using a traffic light system. The PMF and the traffic light assessments are reviewed by GOs as part of their annual review process. LSPs are required to make the information in the PMF available to the public. Guidance on LAAs advises that the PMFs of NRF LSPs should be integrated with the performance management framework for the LAA [*Local Area Agreements: Guidance for Round 3 and Refresh of Rounds 1 and 2*, ODPM, March 2006].

The NRU asked the Audit Commission to undertake a series of reviews in 2004/5 to validate the PMFs of those LSPs receiving significant amounts of NRF. The validation reviews were intended to determine:

- whether PMFs had been developed and agreed within the LSP;
- if the PMF met the core requirements; and
- whether the PMF included a means of identifying 'plausible interventions which take account of baseline information, comparative information, clear milestones, option appraisal and best practice'

[*Validation Review Report: Birmingham City Strategic Partnership*, Audit Commission, June 2004].

### **Guidance on ethnicity monitoring**

The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal made a commitment that ethnic minority groups would be involved in the neighbourhood renewal process and would benefit from its delivery. To support LSPs to achieve this, the NRU has developed a range of resources, including guidance on why and how LSPs should undertake ethnicity monitoring. Two guides to ethnicity monitoring were published by the NRU in 2004 and distributed to all NRF LSPs. One guide focuses on monitoring involvement in partnerships,<sup>3</sup> and the other on monitoring the benefits of their work.<sup>4</sup>

The guidance can be used to support the performance management process by helping LSPs to gather evidence in their self assessments and assisting GOs in their review of these. The steps which the guidance advises LSPs to take include the following:

- asking each member of both the core and wider LSP to identify their ethnic group in order to create an accurate picture of membership;
- identifying the ethnic breakdown of the local population and the voluntary and community sector; and
- analysing the findings from ethnicity monitoring to identify whether the LSP is inclusive and representative of the diversity of the local area.

### **Ethnicity monitoring pathfinder project**

On publication of the ethnicity monitoring guidance in 2004, the NRU invited all NRF LSPs to participate in a pathfinder project focused on implementing ethnicity monitoring. The LSPs in Bristol, Coventry, Lewisham, Liverpool and West Cornwall took part in this.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ethnicity Monitoring: Involvement, Guidance for Partnerships on Monitoring Involvement*, NRU, ODPM, 2004

<sup>4</sup> *Ethnicity Monitoring: Benefit, Guidance for Partnerships on Monitoring Benefit*, NRU, ODPM, 2004

### **1.3 Research methodology**

Discussions were held with the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) and with the London and the North West regional government offices (GOs), to identify what, if any, data on ethnic minority participation LSPs are expected to collect and report on and the broader question of ethnic minority involvement in LSPs. Discussions with the NRU also covered LSP Factsheets.

A sample was drawn up of 35 LSPs that were receiving NRF (see Appendix 2). The sample broadly reflected the regional distribution of LSPs that were receiving NRF, but was weighted towards the regions with the largest ethnic minority populations, London and the West Midlands. The sample included LSPs from local authority areas with both large and small ethnic minority populations, and with both large and small NRF allocations.

Each LSP in the sample was contacted to obtain a copy of their performance management framework (PMF). Some LSPs told us that their PMF documentation was very extensive (in other words, it consisted of more than one document); in these cases we asked them to send the document representing their most recent review of partnership work. Full PMFs or relevant sections of PMFs were obtained from 18 of the 35 LSPs in the sample. The PMFs were reviewed for information on ethnic minority participation in the LSPs. Very few included any information on this, so we contacted each of the sample LSPs to arrange a brief telephone interview with the person who was considered able to give a response from the LSP about ethnic minority participation. We completed brief interviews with 31 of the 35 sample LSPs (see Appendix 1 for a list of LSP respondents).

More detailed telephone interviews were undertaken with nine of the LSPs in the sample: Sandwell, Sheffield, Lewisham, Walsall, Newham, Luton, Bradford, Coventry and Leeds. This sample was largely self-selecting, being based on who was available and willing to take part in the research. Efforts were made to include LSPs that had taken part in the ethnicity monitoring pathfinder project (see p12), and two of the nine detailed interviews were with authorities that had taken part in the pathfinder project – Coventry and Lewisham.

To further explore the role that leading statutory partners played in developing the LSPs' approach to racial equality, additional telephone discussions were held with LSPs in Leeds and Lewisham, which we had identified as following good practice in some aspects of their racial equality approach. The identification of these LSPs as examples of good practice should not be taken to indicate that no other LSPs in the research sample were following good practice. It was not possible to identify good practice examples from the brief interviews undertaken with the wider sample of LSPs, and some of these may well have been adopting good practice in some or all aspects of their racial equality approach.

## 2. Findings

The research findings are presented in this part of the report. Section 2.1 reports on the key points from the discussions which were held with the NRU and GOs. Section 2.2 presents findings from the review of the PMFs which were obtained from LSPs in the sample. Sections 2.3 to 2.5 report on the responses to the questions which were asked of all 31 LSPs. Sections 2.6 to 2.8 report on findings from the additional questions which were discussed with the smaller sample of nine LSPs. Section 2.9 reports on findings from further discussions which were held with two LSPs to explore the role of the main statutory partners in developing the LSPs' race equality approach. The questions which we asked LSPs are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Interview questions**

Question	Number of LSPs asked	Reported in section
1. Does the LSP monitor the ethnicity of the individuals in the core LSP?	31	2.3
2. Does the LSP monitor the ethnicity of the individuals in the wider LSP?	31	2.3
3. Does the structure of the core LSP specifically include BME representation?	31	2.4
4. Do the structures of the wider LSP specifically include BME representation?	31	2.4
5. Does the LSP monitor retention of members on the core LSP or wider LSP?	31	2.5
6. How are new members recruited to the core LSP?	9	2.6
7. What are the LSPs processes for allocating NRF funds?	9	2.7
8. Does the LSP monitor the ethnicity of organisations which apply for and/or are allocated NRF funds?	9	2.7
9. Does the LSP monitor the ethnicity of the target beneficiaries for NRF funds, and achievement of those outputs?	9	2.7
10. Has the LSP used the NRU's guidance on ethnicity monitoring?	9	2.8
11. Has the LSP used on line race equality resource which is available via the NRU website?	9	2.8
12. Has the LSP used any other race equality resources or guidance?	9	2.8
13. Has the lead statutory partner been involved in developing the LSP's approach to race equality?	2	2.9
14. Is the LSP PMF process linked to the lead statutory partner's process for Comprehensive Performance Assessment?	2	2.9

## **2.1 Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) and government office (GO) views**

Our discussions with the NRU and GOs aimed to identify what information on ethnic minority participation in LSPs is currently being collected. The main points from discussion with the NRU were:

- The NRU had previously tried to collect data on the ethnicity of LSP members but had stopped doing this some years ago. This had happened before the NRU staff involved in this discussion were in post, so the timing of this is uncertain. It was felt that there were too many difficulties in obtaining up-to-date information from the LSPs to enable a robust information system to be maintained.
- The NRU replaced the previous data collection system with a simpler process which uses a 'factsheet' to capture basic information about the number of NRF LSP board members and which sectors they are from. The factsheet asks how many of the LSP board members 'represent BME groups'. The LSP factsheets were last updated in August 2005, at which time GOs provided full or partial returns for 55 of the 87 NRF LSPs (two of the 88 NRF eligible areas have formed a single LSP, giving 87 LSPs in total).
- The NRU advises LSPs to undertake ethnicity monitoring of the LSP members but there is no expectation that LSPs should report on this.
- The NRU expects that LSPs should demonstrate that they are being inclusive, and that the GOs would identify if this were not the case. However, there is no expectation that this should involve collecting information on the number of ethnic minority LSP members.
- The NRU expects LSPs to monitor the impact of NRF-funded actions on outcomes, including outcomes for key groups such as ethnic minority communities. The NRU's focus is on outcomes rather than on the processes used to achieve these. There is therefore no expectation that LSPs should monitor the processes for allocation of NRF funds to a level of detail that includes ethnicity monitoring.

The main points from discussions with the GOs were:

- The GOs do not collect any ethnicity monitoring information from LSPs.
- The GOs expect ethnic minority views to be represented or included within the LSPs in some way, and would expect to see an account of this within the PMF. However, there is no expectation that LSPs should carry out ethnicity monitoring or report on this in the PMF.

- The formal structure of the LSP, including who should be represented within it, should be documented by the local authority, to which the LSP is accountable. Now that the accreditation process has been superseded by PMF, GOs do not review this information.

## 2.2 Performance Management Frameworks

Of the 35 LSPs in the research sample, 31 were available and willing to contribute to the research. We asked these LSPs for a copy of their PMF and obtained the relevant document from 18 of them. Of these, 15 LSPs e-mailed or posted their PMF to us in response to our request, and three others had their PMF in a downloadable format on their website.

We were unable to obtain PMFs for 13 LSPs, for the following reasons:

- five LSPs said that they had no PMF or that it was not currently available;
- five LSPs promised to send their PMF but we did not receive it; and
- three LSPs sent other documents instead.

A summary of the information collected from the PMFs, including details on inclusive partnership working, is given in Table 2. The main points arising from the review of the PMFs are as follows:

- It was not possible to identify the level of ethnic minority participation in the LSP through the information contained in any of the PMFs.
- Three PMFs did not include a review of partnership working. However, the core requirement for PMFs is for a review of partnership working once every three years, so not all LSPs will include this section in every annual PMF.
- Only seven of the 18 PMFs included references to racial equality or to ethnic minority inclusion within their review of inclusivity.
- Reference to ethnicity monitoring was made in only two PMFs. Newham's included ethnicity monitoring data of participants at community forum meetings, while Lewisham's referred to ethnicity monitoring of involvement in the LSP but did not present the data.
- Of the nine LSPs which included a self-assessment score on the inclusivity of their partnership working, all score themselves at Green or Amber/Green (i.e. they considered themselves to be doing well on this element).



- It is very difficult to see how the information contained in the PMFs could help the GOs or LSPs take an informed view of whether an LSP is an inclusive partnership which represents the diversity of the local area.
- A number of the PMFs reviewed had received a positive validation report from the Audit Commission. It is not clear whether all the sample LSPs had undergone PMF validation reviews nor, for those which were reviewed, whether any were 'failed'. The Audit Commission reviews included an assessment of whether a specific review of the effectiveness of the partnership had been undertaken, but do not report on whether this included an assessment of the inclusiveness of the partnership.

**Table 2: Summary of information collected from PMFs**

	LSP	PMF (incl. inclusive partnership review)	Race equality actions	Self assessment	
				Inclusive partnership	Overall <sup>5</sup>
1	Barking & Dagenham	In part	No specific racial equality references in relation to partnership No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Not given	Amber/Red
2	Bolton	NO	-	-	Green
3	Bradford	NO	-	-	Green
4	Brighton & Hove	YES (4 paragraphs)	Identifies areas for improvement on racial equality No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Amber/Green	Amber/Green
5	Bristol	YES (1 page)	Reports on work of the Equalities Action Group Details current LSP membership No specific racial equality references No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Not given	Amber/Green
6	Camden	YES (1 page)	Reports on actions to engage specific ethnic minority communities No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Not given	Green
7	Derby	YES (2 pages)	No specific racial equality references No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Green	Not Given
8	Gateshead	YES (1 page)	No specific racial equality references No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Amber/Green	Green
9	Greenwich	In part	No specific racial equality references in relation to partnership No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Not given	Amber/Green

<sup>5</sup> Overall self assessment as shown on the NRU table of NRF Performance Assessments for 2004/5

	LSP	PMF (incl. inclusive partnership review)	Race equality actions	Self assessment	
				Inclusive partnership	Overall <sup>5</sup>
10	Leeds	YES (3 pages)	Identifies specific role for BME Strategy Group No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Green	Green
11	Lewisham	YES (2 pages)	Reports that LSP has adopted an Equalities Statement Reports that ethnicity monitoring of one thematic partnership has been conducted and recommends extending this	Not given	Amber/Green
12	Newcastle	In part	No specific racial equality references No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Amber/Green	Amber/Green
13	Newham	YES (7 pages)	Reports on ethnicity of those attending community forum meetings	Green	Green
14	Plymouth	NO	-	-	Amber/Red
15	Sandwell	YES (4 pages)	Reports on work of BME Impact Group No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Scores 6 out of 10	Amber/Red
16	Sefton	YES (¼ page)	No specific racial equality references No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Green	Green
17	Southwark	YES (3½ pages)	Reports on formation of a BME Forum to link with LSP Reports on actions to address racial equality Reports on future action to review inclusivity and appropriateness of the LSP membership No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Scores 3 out of 4	Amber/Green
18	Wirral	YES (3 pages)	No specific racial equality references No ethnicity monitoring or targets	Not given	Amber/Green

## 2.3 Ethnic minority involvement

We asked all 31 LSPs if they monitor the ethnicity of their individual board members, i.e. the core LSP (question 1). 25 (81%) said no and six (19%) said yes. Of the six that said yes:

- None reported this information in the PMF.
- Four told us that they recorded this information and would be able to send it to us.
- One sent this information to us.
- One reported this information to us verbally.
- One reported that their ethnic monitoring was 'informal' and that the results were not recorded.
- One had only recently started to collect this information and did not yet have data which could be made publicly available.
- Two respondents needed to seek permission to send this information to us but we had received nothing from them at the time of going to press.

We asked all 31 LSPs if they monitored the ethnicity of the individuals involved in the wider LSP structures (question 2). 24 (77%) said no, six (19%) said yes, and one (3%) did not know. Of the six which monitored ethnicity:

- None reported this information in the PMF.
- Four told us that they recorded this information and would be able to send it to us.
- None sent this information to us.
- One had only recently started to collect this information and did not yet have data which could be made publicly available.
- One said that they had done the ethnic monitoring as a one-off exercise 18 months previously and that the results were not recorded in a publicly available format.

Most LSP respondents could give no particular reason why ethnicity monitoring had not taken place. Six said they had plans to introduce or extend this in the near future.

A small number of LSPs said they were opposed to ethnicity monitoring. This was generally on the grounds that it would serve no useful purpose. The view expressed was that if the LSP were to monitor the ethnicity of its board members and find that there were, for example, not enough Asian people on it, what could they do about that? If all the LSP members from partner organisations were white, the LSP could not instruct them to send someone Asian instead, as it is up to the partner organisation to decide who is the most appropriate person to represent them.

## 2.4 Ethnic minority representation

We asked all 31 LSPs if the structure of their core LSP specifically included ethnic minority representation (question 3). 20 (65%) said no, 10 (32%) said yes, one (3%) did not know. For those LSPs which said yes, the proportion of ethnic minority places on the LSP board is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Number of LSP board places allocated to ethnic minority representatives**

LSP	Number of places on LSP board	Number of places allocated to ethnic minority reps	% ethnic minority places on the board	% non-white ethnic minority population in local authority area <sup>6</sup>
Bristol	31	2	6.5	8.2
Coventry	39	1	2.6	16.0
Derby	24	2	8.3	12.5
Leeds	36	3	8.3	8.1
Lewisham	20	1	5.0	34.1
Manchester	14	1	7.1	19.0
Plymouth	15	1	6.7	1.6
Sefton	34	2	5.9	1.6
Southwark	29	1	3.4	37.0

We asked all 31 LSPs if the structures of the wider LSP specifically included BME representation (question 4). 17 (55%) said no, 13 (42%) said yes, and one (3%) did not know.

Of the 13 LSPs which had specific ethnic minority representation within the wider structures:

- Five had ethnic minority representation through the Community Empowerment Network.
- Two had ethnic minority representation on every thematic group and delivery group.

<sup>6</sup> ONS figures from the 2001 Census

- Three had ethnic minority representation on key thematic or delivery groups.

This research therefore found that 32% of NRF-funded LSPs had a structure which included ethnic minority representation in the core LSP, and 42% had structures which included ethnic minority representation in the wider LSP membership. Previous research suggested that more places are actually held by ethnic minority representatives than are allocated to or designated for them, especially in the 'core' LSP. The reason for this difference between the number of places allocated to or designated for ethnic minority representatives and in response to the equivalent question in the 2004 survey of all English LSPs ('How many of the following organisations/interest groups are currently members of the LSP?'), 47% of NRF LSPs had ethnic minority groups as members of the 'core' LSP and 76% had ethnic minority groups in the total LSP membership [*National Evaluation of Local Strategic Partnerships, Report on the 2004 Survey of all English LSPs*, ODPM, March 2005]. From a separate data collection process, the LSP factsheets for August 2005, the NRU reported that, of the 55 LSP returns, 40 reported that they had 'BME representation at board level', indicating that at least 46% of LSPs (40 out of 87) had ethnic minority representatives in the core LSP.

The reason for this difference between designated representation and actual representation, is that in some cases ethnic minority representation is incidental rather than designed into the structure of the LSP. Several respondents commented that the voluntary and community sector places or faith places on the core and wider LSP were currently represented by the ethnic minority sector.

The research process did not allow for any closer examination of the role played by ethnic minority representatives within the LSPs. We are therefore unable to identify whether ethnic minority representatives felt that they had an effective voice within the LSP, or the degree to which ethnic minority communities considered that their interests were effectively represented through the existing structures. Only one of the nine respondents for the more detailed interviews was an ethnic minority representative on the LSP board. It is worth noting that he was strongly critical of the LSP, GO and NRU approach to ethnic minority representation. His views reflect those expressed by ethnic minority groups in other research undertaken by BTEG, and included the following comments:

'The LSP does not have a core function to be mindful of BME issues – there is no focus on BME engagement, no focus on BME involvement, and not enough BME people on the board.'

'The LSP is tied by the restrictions placed on it and the priorities handed to it by central government – it is not trusted to develop its own priorities and strategy. This leads to a 'tick box mentality' and 'getting BMEs on board' is one of the boxes to tick.'

‘There have been no real attempts to engage BME communities and no long-term investment in building the capacity of the BME sector to play an effective role.’

## 2.5 Retention

We asked all 31 LSPs if they monitored retention of members on the core LSP or wider LSP structures (question 5). 30 (97%) said no and one (3%) said yes. This was Nottingham LSP, but the respondent did not know if this monitoring recorded ethnicity.

Most respondents reported that turnover was very low and therefore there was no need to monitor who stayed and who left the LSP.

In the more detailed discussions with nine LSPs, most respondents said that they had not identified any issues or problems with retention of ethnic minority LSP members. Only Leeds and Lewisham reported that there had been any difficulties for ethnic minority representatives to become involved with or stay engaged in the LSP. It is interesting that these two LSPs are amongst the few LSPs in the research sample which can be described as following good practice in some aspects of their racial equality approach. This suggests that there may well be problems for ethnic minority representatives to engage with other LSPs, but that the LSPs in our survey either did not recognise these problems, or were reluctant to acknowledge them.

Both Leeds and Lewisham had taken active steps to address this issue. For example, Leeds LSP held additional briefing sessions for its non-public sector representatives (including volunteer and community bodies representing ethnic minorities) prior to LSP board meetings, to help build their confidence to contribute fully to the meeting.

## 2.6 Recruitment

We asked nine LSPs how they recruited to the core LSP (question 6):

- Two respondents were not sure what the process was.
- Two respondents said that there had not been any recruitment in the five years since the board was established.
- Four described the following process – the board was comprised of stakeholder organisations, with representation from designated stakeholders. There was no open recruitment. The voluntary and community sector elected representatives onto the board via the Community Empowerment Network (or similar body).

- One LSP said that the public sector was represented through designated places. The Board had six places for the private sector and six places for the voluntary and community sector. These places were advertised openly and recruitment was through application form and interview. This LSP conducted equal opportunities monitoring of the application and appointment processes.

## 2.7 Allocation of neighbourhood renewal funding

We asked nine LSPs what process is used to allocate NRF funds (question 7):

- Three described a commissioning process. Each thematic/strategic partnership or relevant partner was allocated money against targets.
- One said that funding was allocated through open and competitive bidding under themes linked to targets of minimum achievement, often referred to as floor targets<sup>7</sup>.
- Two described a mixture of commissioning and open application. Commissioning groups were established for each theme. These groups invited bids for part of the funding.
- One said that funding was devolved to local area partnerships to spend against priorities identified in neighbourhood Action Plans.
- Two respondents were not sure.

We asked nine LSPs whether they monitored the ethnicity of the organisations which applied for and were allocated NRF funds (question 8). Seven said no and two said yes.

The following comments were made by some of the seven LSPs which did not conduct ethnic monitoring of their NRF allocations:

‘The ethnicity of the organisations is irrelevant.’

‘The LSP has discussed this. But we consider that organisations do not have ethnicity and that it is not therefore possible to collect this information.’

---

<sup>7</sup> Floor targets are national targets introduced by central government as part of the comprehensive spending review in 2000. They set minimum standards that all areas must achieve in priority areas for the government, including education, health, crime, housing and transport. Many of these targets are specifically related to neighbourhood renewal targets (see [www.neighbourhood.gov.uk](http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk) for more information).

‘We do not focus on the delivery process – our interest and emphasis is on the outcomes which are being achieved through NRF.’

We asked nine LSPs whether they monitored the ethnicity of the outputs (target outputs and actual outputs) which NRF was achieving (question 9). Three said no and six said yes. Four of the LSPs which said yes had collected ethnicity monitoring information about the beneficiaries of funded projects and presented this information in a range of documents. The range of information collected varied. Some LSPs monitored ethnicity of all beneficiaries as part of general targets. Other LSPs monitored the achievement of specific ethnic minority targets and did not monitor ethnicity of beneficiaries of projects to meet other targets. Two LSPs had only recently started to collect this information and had not yet reported on this.

## **2.8 Racial equality resources**

We asked nine LSPs if they had used the NRU’s guidance on ethnicity monitoring (question 10).

- Two said yes (both of which took part in the ethnicity monitoring pathfinder project).
- Five said no.
- Two respondents were uncertain but thought probably not.

The sample of LSPs was too small to compare this finding with the NRU’s research finding that 48% of LSPs used the ethnicity monitoring guidance [*Report on Ethnicity Monitoring in Local Strategic Partnerships (in receipt of Neighbourhood Renewal Fund)*, NRU, August 2005].

We asked nine LSPs if they had used ORRION (an online racial equality resource available via the NRU website) (question 11).

- Four said no.
- Two were uncertain but thought probably not.
- Three said yes, although none found it useful

## **2.9 LSPs and other statutory organisations**

Four of the nine LSPs reported that they were working within the equalities framework set by the local authority and using processes and standards established for this. This included:

- using local authority equalities monitoring format and guidance; and



- working with the local authority to progress through the Audit Commission's 'Journey to Race Equality'.

To explore the links between the LSP and the lead statutory organisations further, we asked Leeds and Lewisham LSPs how involved the local authority (the lead statutory body in both cases) had been in developing their racial equality approach (question 13). In both cases, the local authority was described as 'very involved' but the LSP had developed their own racial equality approach rather than adopted the local authority's. The local authority was considered to have a more rigorous and prescriptive approach than was appropriate for the LSP. Leeds LSP is aiming to take a 'lighter touch' than the City Council and has not, therefore, adopted all aspects of the City Council's ethnic monitoring framework.

Similarly, Lewisham LSP wanted to develop an ethnic monitoring process which was 'tailored to the LSP and which all partners would be able to work with' [LSP respondent]. Lewisham LSP has tried out different models for ethnicity monitoring and has taken advice from Lewisham Council's Policy Unit Diversity and Equality Team on how these should be developed and implemented. As a result, Lewisham LSP's ethnicity monitoring process is customised to meet its specific objectives. For example, the Primary Care Trust monitors key local health targets by ethnicity, but because the LSP has set specific health targets for Lewisham's older African Caribbean community, the LSP is monitoring relevant health indicators by both ethnicity and age.

Both Leeds City Council and the London Borough of Lewisham have undertaken race equality impact assessments of the LSP.

We asked Leeds and Lewisham LSPs to describe the links between the LSP PMF process and the Council's performance management processes (question 14). There are links between the two processes in both cases, which are best described as 'aligned' rather than 'integrated'. The LSP is reviewed as part of the Councils' Comprehensive Performance Assessment CPA process for the Audit Commission - the Director of the Leeds LSP has been interviewed as part of previous CPAs. For both Leeds and Lewisham LSP, the PMF process is specific to the LSP and follows the NRU requirements and guidance, rather than the local authority performance management process.

## 3. Conclusions

### 3.1 Performance management frameworks

The PMF is the main way in which LSPs provide an account to their partners, the GOs and the wider public of what steps they are taking to ensure that their partnerships are inclusive of ethnic minority communities and represent the diversity of their local areas. For some LSPs in our survey, the PMF appeared to be the only way in which this information was reported. However, none of the PMFs examined provided a robust account of how the LSP ensured that ethnic minorities were included within all aspects of partnership working.

With only one exception (Lewisham), the PMFs showed no evidence that LSPs had followed any of the NRU's guidance on how to monitor their success in involving ethnic minority communities. It is difficult to understand how these LSPs had assessed themselves as 'green' on the inclusivity criterion, and even more difficult to see how any external body could use the information in the PMF to review the LSP's performance on this criterion, as the GOs were doing.

It is not clear whether the integration of LSP performance management with LAA performance management will see the core requirement for partnership review continued. There is no apparent requirement that LAA performance management should include this.

#### Recommendations

- The LSP performance management framework needs to be improved; the existing one is not adequate for assessing whether ethnic minorities are involved in LSPs.
- LSPs should continue to be required to include reviews of their partnership work as part of their PMF. The core requirements for PMFs should be strengthened to include a more robust assessment of the LSP's involvement of people from ethnic minorities, and a requirement for the LSP to carry out a race equality impact assessment on their functions and policies.

### 3.2 Number of ethnic minority people involved in LSPs

This research was not able to determine what proportion of individuals involved in the LSPs were people from ethnic minorities. The NRU's guidance on ethnicity monitoring advises LSPs to carry out simple monitoring of the ethnicity of the board members and members of any sub-groups. Only five of the 31 LSPs did this, while one LSP monitored the ethnicity of board members only and one LSP

monitored sub-groups only. Only two of these LSPs were able to report this monitoring information to us.

There appear to be somewhat mixed messages from the NRU on the value of monitoring the ethnicity of individuals participating in the LSP. The NRU's ethnicity monitoring guidance clearly advises that this should be done and states that 'incorporating ethnicity into monitoring is an essential tool in achieving racial equality' [*Ethnicity Monitoring: Involvement, Guidance for Partnerships on Monitoring Involvement*, NRU, 2004]. However, the NRU's report on ethnicity monitoring in LSPs asserts that 'tokenistic head counting of BME people in the LSP' does not constitute evidence of representation, and suggests that such head counting is 'misleading and inaccurate as BME members on LSPs overwhelmingly do not view themselves as representing their specific community or the BME population in general' [*Report on Ethnicity Monitoring in Local Strategic Partnerships (in receipt of Neighbourhood Renewal Fund)*, NRU, August 2005].

The NRU has attempted to collect ethnicity monitoring information from LSPs in the past, but reported to us that GOs and LSPs did not provide accurate and up-to-date information and that the system was abandoned several years ago. The NRU now uses a 'factsheet' return to collect information about the make-up of LSP boards, including the proportion of 'BME representatives'. However, this data does not record the ethnicity of individual board members.

There does not appear to be any expectation from either the NRU or from GOs that LSPs should be conducting ethnicity monitoring of LSP participants. No robust explanation has been provided by the NRU, GOs or LSPs as to how the LSP self-assessment of inclusivity in partnership working can be undertaken without this information. None of the PMFs reviewed for this research included information about the ethnicity of LSP participants. Only one PMF referred to ethnicity monitoring of LSP participants.

Most LSPs could give no particular reason why ethnic monitoring had not taken place. The most probable reason is that they are advised rather than required to do this and a majority have opted not to follow this advice. It also appears that LSPs are being encouraged by the NRU and GOs to focus on outcomes and impacts, rather than on inputs and processes. It seems likely that ethnicity monitoring is being viewed as a process in itself (rather than as a means of identifying, for example, whether the outcome of local representation has been achieved) and is being overlooked in order to concentrate on identifying impacts.

It would only be possible to identify the number of ethnic minority people involved in LSPs if LSP members provided information about their ethnicity (i.e. by asking each member of both the core and wider LSP to identify their ethnic group in order to create an accurate picture of membership, as advised by the NRU ethnicity monitoring guidance). It would be possible to undertake this as an

external research project, although this would be costly and time consuming to do.

#### **Recommendation**

- Statutory government bodies such as the NRU and government offices should take a far stronger approach to ensuring that LSPs follow the NRU's guidance on monitoring ethnicity.

### **3.3 Race equality duty of statutory partners**

The lead statutory body on the LSP (usually the local authority) is bound by the requirements of the statutory duty to promote race equality and good race relations (referred to as the race equality duty) under the Race Relations Act 1976 as amended (RRA). To meet the race equality duty, local authorities have had to develop ethnicity monitoring systems for the work they carry out. This research suggests that, in a majority of cases, the local authorities' approach to racial equality, including ethnicity monitoring, is not being followed through into the LSPs which they lead.

#### **Recommendation**

- The CRE and CEHR should use every opportunity to ensure that local authorities and other statutory partners in LSPs understand that the race equality duty applies to their role as partners.

### **3.4 Ethnic minority representation within LSPs**

The prevailing view (from the NRU, GOs and LSPs) is that most LSPs include good and effective ethnic minority representation. Some respondents considered that this view was evidenced by the findings of the 2004 survey of LSPs, which found that 47% of NRF LSPs had ethnic minority groups as members of the 'core' LSP and 76% had ethnic minority groups in the total LSP membership.

Our research, however, suggests that a lower number of LSPs incorporated ethnic minority representation into their structures. Less than one third (32%) of LSPs had a structure which included designated places in the core LSP for representatives of ethnic minority communities, and 42% included designated places within the wider LSP.

Clearly, the level of ethnic minority representation within LSPs cannot be used as a proxy for assessing the effectiveness of the LSP's approach to racial equality. This research produced limited anecdotal evidence that some ethnic minority organisations thought LSPs, including those which have ethnic minority

representation built into their structures, were inadequately addressing racial inequalities. This is an area where further research would be useful.

#### **Recommendations**

- The NRU and government offices should advise LSPs that having a structure which specifically includes ethnic minority representation should represent good practice.
- Future surveys and evaluations of LSPs should distinguish between the number of ethnic minority representatives involved in LSPs and the number of designated places for ethnic minorities in LSPs. Information should be collected on both, bearing in mind, however, that the former will be higher than the latter.

### **3.5 Recruitment and retention**

No figures are available to enable any analysis of ethnic minority recruitment and retention onto LSPs.

Only one of the nine LSPs interviewed operated an open recruitment process for some of its board places. Recruitment to the other eight was through a mixture of designated places for partner/stakeholder organisations, and elections held within specific sectors (most commonly from the voluntary and community sector). There did not appear to be any specific approaches which were taken to recruit ethnic minority individual or representatives to the LSP.

None of the 31 LSPs interviewed conducted ethnicity monitoring of people who left the LSP, and only one of these monitored drop out rates in any way.

#### **Recommendation**

- The CRE and CEHR should take whatever steps possible to promote ethnicity monitoring of recruitment and retention as good practice which non-statutory agencies and partnerships should adopt.

### **3.6 Allocation of neighbourhood renewal funding**

The common view (from NRU, GOs and LSPs) is that there is little need to focus on where NRF funding goes or how it is used, and that the emphasis should be on evidencing the impact in achieving floor targets and other outcomes. It is therefore unsurprising that only two of the nine LSPs in our survey monitored the ethnicity of where NRF funds were allocated.

## Appendix 1: LSP respondents

	<b>LSP</b>	<b>Local authority area</b>
1	Barking & Dagenham Partnership	Barking & Dagenham
2	Vision for the Future Partnership	Bolton
3	Bradford Vision	Bradford
4	2020 Community Partnership	Brighton & Hove
5	The Bristol Partnership	Bristol (EM pathfinder)
6	Camden	Camden
7	Coventry Partnership	Coventry (EM pathfinder)
8	Derby City Partnership	Derby
9	Gateshead Strategic Partnership	Gateshead
10	Greenwich Partnership	Greenwich
11	Team Hackney	Hackney
12	Hastings and St Leonard Strategic Partnership	Hastings
13	Leeds Initiative	Leeds
14	Leicester Partnership	Leicester
15	Lewisham Strategic Partnership	Lewisham
16	Liverpool First	Liverpool
17	Luton Forum	Luton
18	Manchester Partnership	Manchester
19	The Newcastle Partnership	Newcastle
20	Your Newham	Newham
21	One Nottingham	Nottingham
22	Plymouth 2020	Plymouth
23	Partners in Salford	Salford
24	Sandwell Partnership	Sandwell
25	Sefton Borough Partnership	Sefton
26	Sheffield First	Sheffield
27	Southwark Alliance	Southwark
28	Sunderland City Partnership	Sunderland
29	Tower Hamlets Partnership	Tower Hamlets
30	Walsall Borough Strategic Partnership	Walsall
31	Wirral Local Strategic Partnership	Wirral

## Appendix 2: LSP research sample

Respondent Number (see appendix 1)		Ethnic minority population (%)	NRF allocation 2005/6 (£m)
	<b>EAST (2 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
17	Luton	28.1	1.510
	<b>EAST MIDLANDS (7 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
14	Leicester	36.2	8.377
21	Nottingham	15.1	9.246
8	Derby	12.5	3.250
	<b>LONDON (20 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
1	Barking & Dagenham	14.8	1.633
6	Camden	26.9	4.219
no response	Croydon	29.8	0.581
10	Greenwich	22.9	3.881
11	Hackney	40.6	11.765
no response	Haringey	34.4	5.335
no response	Islington	24.6	6.270
15	Lewisham (EM pathfinder)	34.1	2.453
20	Newham	60.6	13.332
27	Southwark	37.0	7.912
29	Tower Hamlets	48.6	10.624
	<b>NORTH EAST (14 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
9	Gateshead	1.6	4.643
19	Newcastle	6.9	6.843
28	Sunderland	1.9	7.164
	<b>NORTH WEST (21 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
2	Bolton	11.0	5.426
18	Manchester	19.0	20.595
16	Liverpool (EM pathfinder)	5.7	20.133
23	Salford	3.9	5.441
25	Sefton	1.6	5.631
31	Wirral	1.7	5.075
	<b>SOUTH EAST (4 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
4	Brighton & Hove	5.7	1.369
12	Hastings	3.0	1.375
	<b>SOUTH WEST (4 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
5	Bristol (EM pathfinder)	8.2	3.565
22	Plymouth	1.6	2.114
	<b>WEST MIDLANDS (7 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
no response	Birmingham	29.7	22.043
7	Coventry (EM pathfinder)	16.0	5.290
24	Sandwell	20.3	8.051
30	Walsall	13.6	7.122
	<b>YORKSHIRE &amp; HUMBER (8 NRF LSPs in region)</b>		
3	Bradford	21.7	9.812
13	Leeds	8.1	8.396
26	Sheffield	8.8	9.581