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Abstract
Jacinta Cunneen

Multi-Agency Collaboration in Local Governance: Partnership or Pragmatism?

Policy makers everywhere are confronted by complex problems and public agencies strive to find effective solutions in a context of dwindling resources and increased demands. This study examines how a partnership, among Irish public agencies, was used to address anti-social behaviour on some public housing estates in Limerick City.

In 2007 the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited was established. This was the first time a multi-agency community safety partnership was formally established in the local governance context in Ireland. Government funding was provided to the Partnership to pilot and evaluate an innovative community safety intervention.

This study examines the nature and outcomes of the Partnership. The research is conducted through a single longitudinal case study. The unit of analysis is the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited. The research design includes qualitative and quantitative methods and draws on the Theory of Change as well as governance and partnership theories. Key actors, community stakeholders and service users participated in the primary research. Insights from this study and from international evidence are used to design a model of good practice for multi-agency partnerships.

The study addresses three questions: (i) is multi-agency partnership an effective governance mechanism? (ii) does the multi-agency partnership approach improve the delivery of services in local governance? and (iii) what constitutes a model of good practice for multi-agency partnership? While the research is conducted with special reference to community safety on public housing estates, the partnership model is also significant for public agencies in the delivery of other services and provides an evidence-based template for effective public policy interventions.

Although widely advocated, the research finds that in the Irish public sector, multi-agency partnership is still a relatively new phenomenon and is underdeveloped. Change is required in the traditional hierarchical bureaucratic culture of public sector organisations if multi-agency partnership is to succeed. Public sector agents themselves must accept multi-agency partnership as a new way of working and be prepared to learn how to maximise the collaborative advantage of partnerships.

The research concludes that given the appropriate environment and support, multi-agency partnership can be an effective governance mechanism which adds value, thereby improving public services for service users and increasing the effectiveness of interventions by public agencies.
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Chapter 1
Background to the Study

Introduction
The changing social, economic and political climate internationally has resulted in a paradigm shift in conceptualisation of the state from a system of ‘public administration’ to ‘new public management’ and latterly to ‘public governance’ (Osborne, 2010). This shift has implications for the way in which government programmes and interventions are delivered. One outcome from the change is that multi-agency partnership is advocated as a more efficacious means of implementing public policy and delivering public services both at national and local level. It is acknowledged that ‘wicked problems’ such as crime and anti-social behaviour can only be resolved through such a collaborative approach. There is evidence to suggest that collaborating in multi-agency partnership should and could be an antidote to the inefficiencies in public service delivery. While inter-agency partnership does not guarantee successful problem solving, it can provide an opportunity for agencies to extend beyond their own capacity to achieve public policy goals (Daley, 2008:477). However, collaborating in multi-agency partnership presents many challenges.

The Purpose of the Study
The governance paradigm promotes the use of multi-agency partnership to enhance the delivery of public services. It is generally accepted that the transition from ‘government’ to ‘governance’ has spawned many different forms of collaborative arrangements particularly at local level (Haveri, 2008:141). Despite an increased focus on partnerships and how they are formed and managed, the outcomes from collaborative arrangements have rarely been empirically examined, due mainly to the significant difficulties associated with the complex nature of the interaction (Babiak, 2009:1). Empirical evidence may be used to improve policy and practice. It may be used to design and develop public policy; to assess the impact of policy interventions; to improve policy implementation and to identify future issues (Boaz and Nutley, 2009:328). This study provides valuable insights into the challenges faced by actors involved in the delivery of community interventions, through multi-agency partnership, in local governance in Ireland. To broaden the relevance of the
findings, the researcher draws on a study which she previously conducted on anti-social behaviour on public housing estates internationally (Cunneen, J., 2008). This international dimension adds richness to the findings.

The purpose of this study is to develop a model of good practice in multi-agency partnership for the Irish local governance context. This research is worthwhile as many countries (including the US, Australia, and the UK), continue to search for new governance mechanisms for tackling ‘wicked problems’ such as crime and anti-social behaviour. The concept ‘wicked problems’ was originally mooted in 1973 in the seminal work of Rittel and Weber, both urban planners at the University of Berkeley, California. They suggest that social planning problems cannot be tackled by taking the traditional linear and analytical approach to public policy formulation and referred to these issues as ‘wicked problems’. The term ‘wicked’ is used here to denote problems resistant to resolution which challenge governance structures, skills bases and organisational capacity (Australian Public Service Commission, (APSC) 2007). These types of problems contrast with what they term ‘tame problems’ which, while not simple, can be clearly delineated and for which solutions can be identified and appropriate actions taken. They argue that solutions cannot be reached for wicked problems but rather resolutions for them are repeatedly reached (ibid:160). The drawback of using the traditional linear approach to wicked problems is that it does not take ‘the interaction between causal factors, conflicting policy objectives or disagreement on how to tackle the problems into consideration (APSC, 2007). Hence it does not recognise the social complexity of wicked problems.

Wicked problems are difficult to define as different stakeholders seldom share similar perspectives on the problem. They usually involve a range of coordinated and interrelated responses (APSC, 2007). For this reason suggesting solutions for them at an early stage, when the problem is not fully understood, may lead to unintended consequences. There is no ultimate test of a resolution to a wicked problem. Moreover ‘consequences of the solution may yield utterly undesirable repercussions which outweigh the intended advantages or the advantages accomplished hitherto (Rittel et al 1973:163). The concept of ‘wicked problems’ is therefore, a useful heuristic for capturing the contestability of problems and proposed
solutions and raising awareness of the likelihood of unintended consequences and the need for multi-faceted approaches to problem solving.

In the public domain, the concept of ‘wicked problems’ is often used as a rationale for a pluri-perspective and multi-faceted approach to problem-solving, frequently resulting in a partnership approach. Sullivan and Skelcher (2002), address the notion of ‘cross-cutting issues’ in public policy which are the remit of several agencies. They suggest that the need for this coordinated approach was brought about mainly because of the ‘hollowing out of the state’ and the organisational fragmentation that ensued. Similarly they argue that ‘cross-cutting issues are those which have a fundamental effect on citizens’ sense of well being, yet continue to defy the actions of governments and others to address them’. They cite issues such as environmental sustainability, fear of crime and social exclusion and suggest ‘they cannot be tackled successfully by a single agency, nor will disjointed action have any real effect’ (ibid:56). Sullivan and Skelcher (2002) concur with Rittel and Weber (1973), on the need for collaboration in the formulation of complex social policy.

Wicked problems are unique and while each may be perceived as having similarities with previous problems, it will have an ‘additional distinguishing property’ that is of overarching significance and these properties may override its commonalities with other problems already dealt with (Rittel et al 1973:164). An additional difficulty in dealing with wicked problems is that they are often not constant and the problem is being tackled at a time when there is no clear understanding of the problem. Resolving wicked problems often means behaviour changes and the commitment of individual citizens. It requires innovative and tailored approaches to draw out, enlist and ensure active cooperation and ‘sustained behavioural change’ (APSC 2007). An additional problem outlined by Rittel and Weber (1973:162), is that wicked problems have no ‘stopping rule’. They suggest that in tackling ‘wicked problems’, policy planners often withdraw from dealing with the issue mainly for extraneous reasons such as time, resources or resilience, rather than when the ‘correct’ solution is identified. Consequently, as Rittel and Weber (1973) argue, they are seldom solved but more often resolved. For the current study, the concept of ‘wicked problems’ is an effective motif which captures the complexity of community safety issues in Limerick and conveys the need for a holistic and cross-organisational approach.
Collaborating in multi-agency partnership, to deliver community services in local governance, can be challenging not alone for those working in the public sector, but also for the local communities. This is particularly the case in local governance where engagement with multiple actors is more significant. The study specifically explores the implementation of a multi-agency partnership approach to improving community safety on public housing estates in Limerick City.

This study explores the following question with special reference to community safety: *Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?* It explores multi-agency partnership in local governance in the following way: First, a literature review is conducted in order to establish the main theoretical concepts in the government to governance paradigm shift. A conceptual framework outlines the critical areas of change brought about by this shift. It shows how the change in the way public policy and public services are developed in the governance paradigm, impacts on public sector structures/institutions, processes and participation and how it reinforces the need to develop innovative and sustainable services. Partnership and collaboration theory is then explored to identify the ideal determinants of an effective multi-agency partnership. A conceptual model is presented, demonstrating how the governance paradigm is operationalised through multi-agency collaboration. In order to test this model, a longitudinal case study is conducted on The Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited. This case study embodies the rationale for a partnership approach in Irish local governance and elaborates on the complexities of tackling community safety from a public policy and institutional perspective.

This study is significant because the need, in recent years, for greater collaboration between public agencies has received increased attention in Limerick City as it became known as a violent city and synonymous in the media with gangland crime, which is purported to have started, and still to exist, on a number of public housing estates both north and south of the city. The narrative of criminal activity in Limerick City is well documented (cf Hourigan, 2011; Mac Intyre, TV3, 2009; *Limerick Leader*, Saturday 12 April, 2008; Fitzgerald, 2007) and is mainly associated with two feuding families and the control of an illegal drugs trade. Nevertheless, their activities have earned Limerick its reputation as ‘stab city’ or as
one of ‘Ireland’s Crime Capitals’. This reputation appears well founded based on the Garda crime statistics for 2003-2007 collated for Limerick City by McCullagh (2011:23-31) to contextualise the Limerick Regeneration Programme. McCullagh found that between 2003-2007, the period preceding this study, Limerick had a murder rate consistently higher than the national average and than other major cities such as Cork and Galway. Thirty-seven per cent (37%) of the ‘threats to murder’ recorded were for Limerick, adding to its reputation for violence. The rate of offences for explosives and chemical weapons was higher than the national average during this period. In 2003, for firearms offences, Limerick was twice the national average and by 2007, it was almost five times the national average. The number of offensive weapons crimes (mainly knives) was also above the national average. Statistics for ‘robbery from the person’ while declining nationally, increased in Limerick and during this period the highest number of recorded arson attacks in the country was in Limerick. A survey of victims for the Mid West Region (which included Limerick City and County, Clare and North Tipperary) showed that a little over forty per cent (40.2%) saw crime as a ‘very serious problem’ in 1998 which was above the national level and this figure rose to nearly fifty-one per cent (50.6%) in 2006 which indicated that perceptions of the seriousness of crime was the second highest in the country. McCullagh (2011) concludes that crime rates for Limerick are consistent with the national average except for crimes of violence such as murder, firearms offences and arson.

It was against this backdrop that the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited (the Partnership) was established and that this research was commissioned. The three agencies represented in the Partnership are Limerick City Council (as the housing authority), An Garda Síochána (the police) and the Health Service Executive (HSE). These agencies are responsible for housing, criminal justice and health policies which are critical to tackling community safety particularly on public housing estates. This case study was used to explore the governance paradigm by (i) assessing the Partnership itself and monitoring the partnership process and (ii) conducting an evaluation of the community safety intervention introduced by the Partnership to assess its impact. The findings from the case study provide primary data on the use of multi-agency partnership as a governance mechanism for
enhancing public services. It also informs the construction of a model of good practice, for multi-agency partnership, in the delivery of local public services.

The Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited, funded by the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DoEHLG), offered a PhD studentship to the researcher, at the University of Limerick (UL), to conduct the case study over a three-year period. It was intended that the research be used by the DoEHLG to inform future policy in relation to multi-agency partnership and community safety interventions in local governance. The design of the study was discussed at the outset between the Director of the Centre for Housing Research (CHR)\(^1\), the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited and UL. The research was participative and employed formal and informal processes. Involvement of key actors, community stakeholders and local authority tenants, was therefore an important feature of the research project from the outset, and a methodology that continued throughout.

As an academic study, compliance with specific University of Limerick (UL) academic regulations was needed. These regulations require that all social research, emanating from UL, be sanctioned by the Ethics Committee prior to commencement. In particular, as this study involved vulnerable groups, a detailed proposal was required, submitted to and sanctioned by the Ethics Committee in advance. Information sheets and consent forms were used in the research to inform participants of their rights of engagement. The researcher and fieldworker also required and obtained Garda Clearance.

The researcher’s previous practical and academic experience informed the study. Her academic and applied research experience, particularly in the area of community development, meant that she had knowledge of research design and methodology appropriate for this study together with practical and academic understanding of community and public policy issues and relevant publications. The study builds on previous work carried out by the researcher in relation to community safety and local governance, particularly in relation to social housing, anti-social behaviour and community restorative justice programmes. The researcher has disseminated the

\(^1\) The Centre for Housing Research has since been incorporated into the Housing and Sustainable Communities Agency established under the DoEHLG in 2010.
findings from this research in academic and local governance literature as well as presenting in the public policy and local governance arena (See Appendix 8). It is also intended that the study will add to the evidence-base, facilitate discourse on multi-agency partnership, and inform public policy in local governance. The knowledge and experience, gained by the Partnership, may assist other public sector agencies, experiencing challenges in tackling ‘wicked problems’, in their search for solutions.

Scope of the Research and Contribution to Knowledge
The literature search revealed a dearth of empirical data on multi-agency partnership working in local governance in Ireland particularly in community safety. In recent years, in the Irish context, the principles of partnership working have been widely accepted (McCafferty et al., 2005:118). Research exists on partnership and collaboration which centres on EU membership (Adshead 2005), social partnerships (Sabel, 1996), and community-driven partnerships (NESF, 2010; Pobal, 2006). Although consistently promoted in Irish public policy, with the normative assumption that multi-agency partnership is a more effective way of delivering public services, there is a dearth of evidence of the added value of the partnership approach between public sector agencies and in particular for the delivery of public services in local governance. More recently, the multi-agency partnership approach is being promoted in public policy for community safety and while international research exists extolling the virtues or otherwise of this approach, there is a lack of research available in the Irish context. There is a particular need for multi-agency partnership and ‘joined-up thinking’ to combat problems associated with social exclusion (McCafferty et al., ibid) including crime and anti-social behaviour. Indeed, it is generally the researcher’s experience, from a community development perspective, that public agencies seldom if ever collaborate in such a way as to complement the relevant agencies’ corporate plans while at the same time benefiting communities. In other words, public agencies seldom have an explicit awareness of ‘what’s in it’ for them. While there is ample evidence of support available to community activists in how ‘to do’ multi-agency partnership, there is less so for public sector organisations. This research seeks to bridge that gap.
The type of partnership explored in this study is a partnership between public sector agencies that link different types of services namely Limerick City Council (public housing), An Garda Síochána (public safety) and the Health Service Executive (public health). The research therefore primarily applies to these agencies and this type of partnership working. The research, forming the basis of this thesis, focused heavily on the role of the lead-agency, namely, the Limerick City Council. Although generalisation from single case studies may be limited, because this was an in-depth, longitudinal study, the research generated useful insights for other local authorities or public sector agencies involved in partnership working. It might also be seen as a useful companion for the best practice guide for local authorities *Preventing and Combating Anti-Social Behaviour* (Norris, 2003).

The case study showed why the act of forming a partnership is not in itself sufficient to ensure multi-agency collaboration. It also found that good practice in multi-agency partnership requires not only a system change, but also a cultural change in the partner organisations. These findings are critical in these recessionary times when resources are scarce and innovative approaches are essential for the effective delivery of high quality, sustainable services. This research was a unique opportunity to explore the case of multi-agency partnership as a governance mechanism for delivering public services in the Irish context and as such it offers new empirical evidence for use in a comparative context internally between local authorities but also with similar case studies in other states.

One of the outcomes from the research is the development of a model of good practice for multi-agency partnership working. The ultimate goal of the model is to enable agents, involved in local governance in Ireland, and particularly those delivering community services, to understand more clearly multi-agency partnership working as a process leading to collaborative advantage (Huxham, 1996) and an improvement in the delivery of public services for citizens. Insights gained in this research may pragmatically inform those collaborating in partnership and provide them with the awareness and knowledge of the need, to make explicit, the underlying theory of why the multi-agency partnership was formed in the first instance and how collaboration might be managed in order to more efficiently and effectively deliver public services.
Timescale
The longitudinal exploratory case study was carried out from October 2006 to May 2010. The research was conducted in three phases and a rigorous research methodology was employed in each phase in order to gather as broad a perspective as possible of multi-agency partnership working as a governance mechanism for enhancing the delivery of public services. The target audience for the research includes policy makers, professionals involved in community development, as well as service providers and community groups.

Outline of the Thesis
A review of the literature in chapter two provides a theoretical framework that informs the research design. It particularly addresses the conceptual domain of governance. This chapter contextualises the research by explaining the emergence of, and theoretical basis for the governance paradigm, as it evolved within the broader concept of the state. It suggests that the changing role of the state has implications for public administration as the governance paradigm advocates more holistic ways of delivering public services involving a more diverse range of actors. It explicates a number of factors that contribute to this paradigm shift including globalisation and improved technology and suggests that ‘new institutional theory’ may be used as a tool to analyse responses to these changes. The chapter concludes that the changing role of the state means that the state has become decentred with more emphasis placed on responsibility for policy development and delivery at local level. To contextualise the study further, the chapter extends analysis of governance to the Irish context. It outlines the extent to which the role of the state has shifted along the public administration to governance continuum, concluding that, while the notion of governance is now a permanent fixture in Irish politics, beyond the rhetoric, governance is not always reflected in the workings of state institutions.

Chapter three examines multi-agency partnership and collaboration, as a governance mechanism. The analysis presents a typology of ten determinants of successful partnership collaboration and provides a framework for a model of good practice which is later explored in the case study. The chapter draws the conclusion that as a governance tool, multi-agency partnership can enhance policy development and service delivery, provided there is awareness amongst the partners of the need to
incorporate the determinants of successful multi-agency partnership and to acquire the particular skills to do so.

In chapter four, the research methodology is outlined. This chapter provides an overview of the epistemological stance informing the empirical analysis of the multi-agency partnership as a governance mechanism. It clarifies the operational understanding of the core concepts of governance, multi-agency partnership and collaboration. The Partnership is examined from the perspective of structure, process and outcome. The research design is presented in three phases and the research methods used throughout the three phases in the study are explained and justified. The chapter concludes with an a priori Theory of Change (ToC) model of good practice for multi-agency partnership in local governance which is tested in the second and third phase of the research.

Chapter five introduces the Partnership as the unit of analysis in the longitudinal case study and demonstrates the validity of the case for the research. It provides an understanding of the rationale for the multi-agency partnership approach taken, both from a national and local policy perspective, situating it within the governance paradigm. It elaborates on the structures, processes and the role of the key actors. The aims and objectives of the Partnership are defined and are used in the research to determine the outcome of delivering services through the multi-agency partnership approach. To further validate the study, a more in-depth explanation of the critical elements of the research methodology is presented concluding with the limitations of the research design.

Chapter six presents the findings from the research. The findings are presented from two perspectives (i) the Partnership itself and (ii) the community safety intervention which was used as an embedded case study to further explore the degree of multi-agency partnership that took place and the value added for the service user.

A discussion of the findings is presented in chapter seven using a constructivist narrative approach. An inductive in-depth analysis of the case is presented based on the findings from monitoring the Partnership; interviews with board members; results of the Nuffield Partnership Assessment survey of board members; monitoring the operational management of the community safety intervention, and results from two
multi-dimensional evaluations of the intervention. The chapter concludes by outlining the positive and negative elements of the multi-agency partnership as a governance mechanism and the value added by taking the multi-agency partnership approach to service delivery.

Chapter eight provides a summary of the research undertaken and answers the research questions. Linking to the theoretical and conceptual discussion in chapter two and three, it draws the conclusion, reflecting experiences internationally, that multi-agency partnership is a complex process and one which requires an enabling structure, both at partnership and operational level, to overcome any negative cycles that occur. The a priori ToC programme model, initially developed in phase one of the research, and modified in phases two and three based on the research findings, is finalised in this chapter and a model of good practice is presented for multi-agency partnership in local governance for the Irish context. The chapter suggests policy and practice implications and elements of the model requiring research to further advance the Irish debate on multi-agency partnership in the public sector.

**Conclusion**

This chapter outlined and explained the rationale for the research and the approach taken in this thesis. It provided supporting evidence, of the significance of such a study for public housing and local governance in the Irish context and the search for more efficacious public policy mechanisms for improving community safety. It identified and addressed the gap in knowledge, which was recognised by the DoEHLG, regarding the effectiveness of multi-agency partnership in local governance. It made the case for a detailed study which would produce evidence-based research on multi-agency partnership. Such evidence could be used locally but also for comparative local governance and public policy studies internationally.
Chapter 2
The Paradigm Shift: Government to Governance

Introduction
Public administration, as a state apparatus for governing, has evolved and changed over time. The changes that have taken place, considered by most commentators to be modernising, have had repercussions for the way in which public services are delivered. This change is characterised in the literature as a shift in the methods used for public policy implementation and public service delivery from the bureaucratic methods of public administration, to the private-sector methods of new public management and to the more holistic methods of public governance.

In order to explicate the contemporary governance paradigm which forms the backdrop for the study, this chapter describes the changes that have occurred in the role of the state over several decades. It outlines the changes in the way public policy is made and implemented and public services delivered from the traditional public administration mode to new public management and more recently to public governance. It shows that while there have been differing modes of reform one fundamental consequence has been that government has been de-centred. There is a movement away from the bureaucratic hierarchy to greater empowerment of a range of both civil and public actors. Consequently, it has been argued, that the ‘rhetoric and the reality of governing’ have been changed and many of the traditional styles of governing are ‘delegitimated’ (Peters, 2010:36). Governing requires a balancing of control and autonomy for public organisations and public servants and a balancing act becomes more relevant within a devolved system (ibid:37).

In this chapter, changes in the role of the state and the public policy process and public service delivery, within the governance paradigm, are outlined. The concept of governance is explored to provide an understanding of the changes that have taken place in the shift from the traditional mode of government to one of governance. The theoretical perspectives presented, make an important contribution to understanding the public policy implementation and public service delivery process, operationalised in multi-agency partnership (MAP), a mechanism associated with the governance paradigm and the focus of this study. This chapter forms the basis for the first hypothesis tested in this thesis namely ‘as a governance mechanism, multi-agency
partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation’. To further contextualise the MAP, the relevance of the governance paradigm for the state and public sector in Ireland, is explicated. In chapter three the literature on MAP is examined and the findings inform a micro-conceptual framework for use in the case study conducted in this research. In chapter four the concepts of governance and MAP are operationalised in the context of this research.

The State
For the purpose of this study, it is useful here to situate discourse on governance in the broader context of the state. As a conceptual abstraction its utility should not be taken for granted (Dunleavy and O’Leary, 1987:1) as the state is regarded as essential to any social, political or economic discourse (Hay and Lister, 2006:1). The state has been described as a discrete political, administrative or legal order distinct from society or party politics (Adshead et al 2008:17). Hay and Lister (2006:5) suggest that on the one hand the modern state is characterised by its authority in the governance of a defined spatial area while on the other its separation from those it governs. The modern state is defined by Hay and Lister (2006:5) as:

an institutional complex claiming sovereignty for itself as the supreme political authority within a defined territory for whose governance it is responsible.

It is the role of government to facilitate interaction between multiple actors through what Kooiman (1993:4) calls ‘types of societal interactions’ and ‘modes and orders of governance’ in order to ensure equitable distribution of services. Nevertheless, for Kooiman no one governing agency can achieve legitimacy and effective governing:

No single actor, public or private, has all knowledge and information required to solve complex, dynamic and diversified problems; no actor has sufficient overview to make the application of needed instruments effective; no single actor has sufficient action potential to dominate unilaterally in a particular governing model.

(Kooiman, 1993: 4)

In Western Europe, especially after the Second World War, a significant amount of reorganisation of state institutions occurred, a move which has been associated with the rise of the welfare state. This phase of development led to the growth of extensive state regimes laying the foundations for the necessity, in contemporary governance, and especially during times of economic crisis, for the restructuring of
Weber’s (1921/1978:54) definition of the modern state dominates contemporary state theory. He defines the state more in relation to its *modus operandi* than its functions, assigning considerable power to the state to enforce law and order. Weber sees the state as ‘a set of institutions with a dedicated personnel’ and as holding a monopoly of power for rule-making as well as apportioning sanctions within a geographical territory (cited in Hay and Lister, 2006:8). Institutionalists have concentrated on the ways in which the state maintains this monopoly. They give particular attention to the issue of political legitimacy, the structures that maintain the notion of the state, how the state retreats and the tension between coercion and consent in modern societies. Institutionalist and Weberian theories of the state are useful for conceptualising state institutions and understanding the tension between the state and civil society (Hay and Lister, 2006:8).

The state is seen to perform a number of functions. For example it marshals the populace in defence of its territory; monitors and controls citizens; regulates the economy and acts and controls the flow of information (Hay and Lister, 2006:1). It may be observed therefore that the state has a significant role to play in society. The trend, since the 1990s, has been to open up government to greater participation by the public and while some might argue that this move lessens the power of government (Rhodes 1996, Pierre and Peters, 2000), others suggest that it might in fact strengthen it (Richardson, 1994; Mueller and Wright 1994; Marinetto, 2003). In effect, they argue, it could assist government to better understand its limitations and to work within those constraints. Some authors reject the notion that there has been a fundamental shift in the decision-making processes and how public services are produced. But Löffler (2009) disagrees, suggesting that it has particularly been the case in ‘wicked’ policy problems where coordination and joint working are key for stakeholders working in the public domain, making network management a key competence of public agencies. As Rhodes (1997:57) puts it ‘the state becomes a collection of inter-organizational networks made up of governmental and societal actors with no sovereign actor able to steer or regulate. A key challenge for government is to enable these networks and seek out new forms of co-operation’. In other words, the question is raised ‘how much state’ rather than ‘which state’ where...
there is an interaction of multiple stakeholders, each with responsibility for public decision-making (Löffler, 2009:219). Networks are just one specific mode of public governance (others include hierarchies, markets and communities). The operation of networks and the level of cooperation differ according to the power distribution between organisations (Löffler, 2009:222). This has implications for the capacity of the state.

**Capacity and the State**

Writers on the state, suggest that the role of the state has been fragmented due to internal and external factors (Rhodes, 1997; Pierre and Peters, 2000, Osborne, 2010). Internally, there is evidence of a decentralization of central functions to sub-national government, quasi-non-governmental organisations, and public/private partnerships. Attention has been drawn to the possible linkage between the changing role of the state and its external environment. The economic crisis across Europe in the 1980s brought about change in government styles and policies (Damgaard et al 1989). From this perspective, the role of the state is reduced because of the need to negotiate with domestic and international actors, there is an increased role for the private and non-governmental sector in the delivery of services and state power is challenged as it is shared with local governments and local institutions (Bresser-Pereira, 1999 in Robinson, 2008:566). Global markets have been cited by politicians as a reason for the diminution of power exercised by the state which now has to share power with other actors such as sub-national governments, networks and partnerships (Hirst, 2000:23-4). Thus the state is challenged to maintain control over its external environment because of a waning of political power internally which undermines the state’s legitimacy externally (Pierre, 2000:2). This raises the question of what new governance mechanisms can be developed, in the first place to ensure political control, but also to maintain societal support (ibid).

Over the past two decades the contemporary state has undergone fundamental transformation. Changes have occurred in the functions and structure of the state leading to new institutional practices. State capacity has been defined by Fukuyama (2004:9) as ‘the ability of states to plan and execute policies and to enforce laws cleanly and transparently’. Capacity building in the public service has been traditionally associated with up-skilling, pay incentives and upgrading tools and
systems through managerial and structural reforms (Robinson, 2008:566-7). These reforms are introduced in the main to improve efficiency and accountability by reducing the scope and functions of the state while at the same time improving the capacity of civil servants (ibid). The influence of politics on reform is recognised and Robinson (2008:567) argues that while there is no available guide to what works in what context, ‘getting politics right’ is central to ensuring positive reform outcomes in state organisations.

Different types of capacity are required for policy formation and service provision in complex organisational structures than for centralised, bureaucratic states (Robinson, 2008:567). Contemporary states, existing in the age of globalisation, need to acquire new types of capacities to facilitate connectivity with a plurality of actors and institutions globally as well as at sub-national and local levels (Pierre and Peters, 2000). Forms of governance have changed to governing through ‘a plurality of actors, sites, spatial scales, and processes’, to more ‘informal forms of power and influence rather than on formal authority’ (Kennett, 2010:25). Much of the discourse on the relationship between the government and civil society has been influenced by pluralist thinking (Smith, 2006:21). Pluralists are concerned with the way in which the state is organised in order to achieve a just and liberal society (ibid:22). They hold that power should be dispersed and not aggregated in the state. In essence, pluralists hold a distrust of the state monopoly on power and argue that as such it needs to be limited. Groups and group representation are important features of pluralist thinking which recognises them as the ‘building blocks’ of politics and the state (ibid:23). This positive view of group politics holds that group capacity can defend the individual from the government and uphold the democratic process (Murphy, 2003:20). Pluralist theory is useful for examining the distribution of power and the level of individual and/or group representation. It provides insights for exploring structure and process in multi-agency partnership arrangements.

Robinson distinguishes between two different state forms namely the ‘command-hierarchy’ approach and the ‘influence-network’ model. He describes the former as reflecting the more hierarchical, bureaucratic model that has clear boundaries, is separated from the wider society, where policy formation is a ‘state-led, linear process’ and accountability is underpinned by clear rules and responsibilities. In the ‘command hierarchy’ state capacity is reflected in the ‘competencies of government
organisations and public officials and the efficiency of the policy process’ (Robinson, 2008:568). The ‘influence-network’ model is associated with the regulatory states emerging since the 1980s. It is concerned with thick networks of relations across organisations, with inter-state and social actor dependency. It is from these complex networks that policy emerges and accountability is predicated on the quality of the outcome. State capacity takes very different forms in the ‘influence-network’ model than in the ‘command hierarchy model’.

Strengthening state capacity has focused in the main on structural and managerial reforms ‘rather than strengthening the capacity of the state to operate effectively in a very different and challenging context’ (Robinson, 2008:575). Pierre and Peters (2000) argue that because of upward movement to the global level, downward to regions and localities and outward to arm’s length governance, the authority of the state is being dispersed. In reducing the scope of the state, Fukuyama (2004:24) argues, weaknesses were exposed that demand new types of state capabilities.

Robinson (2008:575) suggests three further limitations to conventional approaches to state capacity building. These include the influence of the command-hierarchy model; structural transformations motivated by external pressure and political factors. To address these limitations, Jayasuriya (2004) expands on the notion of ‘relational capacity’. He argues that the regulatory state, which shifts its function from a direct to an indirect provision of goods and services, has changed the way contemporary states engage in multiple sites of governance. In essence the regulatory state can be described as a shift from government to governance as the function of the regulatory state is more about the governance of governance. Jayasuriya (2004) suggests however, that this does not necessarily lessen executive power. On the contrary, it may enhance and further develop policy capacity.

He contrasts this with the transformative model of state capacity which is founded on the state’s ability to produce a particular set of development or welfare outcomes, and which is generally associated with developmental or advanced welfare states. In the transformative model, state capacity is understood in terms of a particular set of attributes or ‘key endowments that a state or public agency may possess to give it a set of transformative powers over policy and structure’ (Jayasuriya, 2004:488). Jayasuriya argues that the attribute model of policy capacity, as a state-centric model
of governance, does not embody capacities relevant to emerging patterns of governance in regulatory states. This type of transformative state is becoming decentred and fragmented and includes multiple sites and the participation of a wide range of non-state actors. In these circumstances, the state no longer operates ‘as a coherent and unified centre’ but policy capacity is dispersed across a series of policy domains and actors (Jayasuriya, 2004:489).

This brief review of the literature shows that there is a change in the role of the state. In many developing states, elements of the command-hierarchy and influence-network type government are evident. Exogenous factors such as globalisation, democratisation and the free market are significant for both types and have repercussions for the capacity of the state. New forms of institutions have been set up, to enable policy development and implementation, within the changed environment involving a plurality of actors. Not least amongst these is the multi-agency partnership model which will be discussed in chapter three.

‘New Institutionalism’ and the State

‘New institutionalist’ theory is introduced here to provide a conceptual understanding of the changing role of the state within the governance paradigm, the institutional influences that inhibit such change and to demonstrate its utility as a theoretical lens through which to analyse and explain the empirical research findings in this research.

Institutionalization is both a process and a form of organisational development. As a process, ‘institutionalization implies increasing clarity, agreement and formalization of a) behavioural rules including allocation of formal authority; b) how behavioural rules are to be described, explained and justified; and c) what are legitimate resources in different settings and who has access to, or control over, common resources’ (Olsen, 2008:9). While in common parlance, ‘institution’ may refer to an abstract as well as a physical entity, for the purpose of this study ‘institution’ refers to an organised system of behavioural rules, meaning and resources (March and Olsen 1989; Kjaer, 2004). Kjaer makes the point that an institution may consist of ‘formal and informal rules, behavioural codes and norms that constitute prescriptions, ordering repeated, interdependent relations (Kjaer 2004:8-9). Institutions may therefore be ‘informal requirements and norms about what is
appropriate’ or exist more formally in written documents such as constitutions. Institutional analysis, for example, might consider how institutions affect political behaviour as well as how institutions emerge and change. Kjaer suggests that governance analysts explore these processes and the ‘changes in political practices and their implications for political rules of the game’ (ibid 2004:10).

Institutions formalise routines and procedures (Di Maggio and Powell, 1991; March and Olsen, 1989). Decisions taken by political actors are heavily influenced by their cultural environment as well as building on decisions previously taken. Institutionalists suggest that the way in which institutions are organised determines collective behaviour and outcomes (Hall and Taylor, 1996). Institutionalism holds significance for the study of public administration because of the way in which government is structured and policy developed and delivered. Lowndes (1996) refers to the notion of ‘old’ and ‘new institutionalism’ whereby the ‘old institutionalism’ is more appropriate to the more bureaucratic form of government as represented in the Weberian ‘ideal type’ model. ‘Old’ institutionalist theory focuses attention on the rules and laws for forming public sector organisations to ensure consistency with the norms and values that underpin democratic accountability in the public sector (Connaughton, 2010:4). But this view is not compatible with the new ways of doing things reflected in ‘new’ institutionalist theory introduced from the 1980s and evident in new public management and new public governance and to practices more akin to private sector management. Nor does it reflect the changing role of government from one of ‘rowing’ to one of ‘steering’ (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992), which has the effect of engaging multiple actors in the policy process. When institutions were rediscovered as independent variables whereby they could be drivers of change, barriers to change or obstacles to an individual actor’s or group’s initiative, ‘new institutional theory’ was useful to elucidate the way in which institutions affect change or the lack of change and how interests and goals are initiated and developed.

There are a number of variations of new institutionalism including ‘rational choice institutionalism’, ‘historical institutionalism’, ‘sociological institutionalism’, ‘normative institutionalism’ and ‘international institutionalism’ (Hall and Taylor, 1996; Reich, 2000). However, the three approaches discussed here as relevant to this research are rational choice, historical and sociological institutionalism. All three institutionalist approaches accept that many factors influence public policy and the
way that public institutions can determine social and political outcomes and concur on the fact that institutions affect political actions and outcomes. But they diverge in their understanding of human behaviour and whether it is pre-determined or culture-led (Hall and Taylor, 1996). Use of competing theories produces a more comprehensive understanding of different political or policy issues (Millar, 2003). This approach has been referred to as an ‘ecumenical’ approach and is seen less as a theory but more a conceptual framework (Lowndes et al, 2003:279).

Rational choice institutionalists argue that actions taken are exogenous whereas other institutionalist theorists suggest that they are endogenous (Peters, 2005; March and Olsen, 1989). Rational choice theorists are concerned with behaviour that is strategic, goal-oriented and exists within institutional boundaries. They believe that actors seek to maximise their own utility. They are engaged in bargaining and exchange. Rational-choice theory is suggested to be useful in understanding processes of regulation and inter-actor negotiation and emphasises the role of the individual in the decision-making process rather than how the institution limits individual behaviour (Reich, 2000:514).

Historical institutionalists emphasise the robustness of policies and institutions against outside pressures. They argue that policy decisions taken today are not necessarily based on current actors’ preferences but are shaped by past institutional arrangements. This view holds resonance in national history and it is this sense of continuity that legitimises the institutions from the national actor’s perspective (March and Olsen 1989). Peters (2005:76-9) refers to this adherence to the need for continuity as ‘path dependency’ which suggests that any changes that take place will be heavily influenced by past experiences. If change occurs at ‘critical junctures’ a new path emerges and actors adapt their behaviour to comply with new sets of norms, rules and regulations.

Sociological institutional theory assumes that duties and obligations influence individual behaviour (March and Olsen, 1989). Individuals understand how they should act in particular situations because of the existence of certain standards expected of them. They make informed choices based on the experience of others (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991:11). Organisations seek success through cultural norms that are accepted as appropriate and legitimate (Peters, 2005). Central to the
notion of sociological institutional theory is that life is about shared meanings and practices and institutions represent practices, administrative rituals and symbols. It differs from rational choice institutionalism because it has a broader focus on formal rules and what needs to be achieved. This type of response to the rules is referred to as the ‘logic of appropriateness’ and is seen as being natural, rightful, expected and legitimate. In sociological institutionalist theory, there is an emphasis on learning, as a change mechanism, to enable institutions adapt to changed environments even if such changes may be regarded as a threat to the ‘established pattern of behaviour’ (Peters, 2005:35).

Institutional theory is useful for the case study in this research as it elucidates the influence of institutional norms and practices on the partnership organisations.

This brief discussion on the state helps to illuminate a number of factors relevant to this study of MAP and collaboration in local governance. Firstly, it demonstrates that different perceptions of the state have implications for the public policy process and public service delivery. For example, the Weberian notion of the state draws attention to the bureaucratic, hierarchical systems within the public sector and the way in which public agents, as decision-makers, traditionally conform to, rather than disrupt, the system. How the state has evolved, especially the welfare-state, has had repercussions for the way in which institutions of the state are constituted, the relationship with civil society and the distribution of public goods. A common perception of the state is one of institutional contextualisation whereby the state is seen either in its functional or institutional capacity. This draws attention to the distribution of power between the state, political actors and civil society and the question of where power lies in the management of change. The pluralists hold a normative perspective of the state perceiving it to exist in the public interest. They uphold the notion of groups rather individuals in society as being the ‘building blocks’ of politics and state. This stance has implications for participative democracy and community participation in the public policy process and service delivery. These factors have repercussions for public administration in the state which will now be addressed.
Public Administration

As previously outlined, perceptions of the state have changed since the late nineteenth century and much contemporary discussion concerns the power of the state, where power is located and how it is exercised (Bealey et al 1999:33). These changes have impacted on the ‘policy capacity, institutional capabilities, and legitimacy’ of the state (Pierre, 2000:2) and have transformed the traditional public administration paradigm.

Public administration is a broad term used to describe the management of the public sector. It takes into account the political environment in which the management functions and processes are organised (Bealey et al 1999). Public administration provides, what Aberbach (2003:316) refers to as the continuity in a polity, when he suggests that bureaucratic institutions are designed with ‘the long haul in mind’.

Weber’s model of the efficient bureaucratic public administration is well noted with its classical structure of (1) hierarchy; (2) division of labour; (3) professional recruitment; (4) promotion based on seniority; (5) tenure; (6) discipline under predictable forms; and (7) dismissal by means of court action (Lane, 2009:12). This model was further influenced by private sector practice and organisation theory in the work of Taylor (1911) and Mayo (1933) who respectively introduced standardisation of work practices and the notion of the importance of the work environment. Ideally what these principles mean is that traditional public administration was considered a profession and that bureaucrats were assumed to be impartial. It was to ensure the separation of powers between administration and politics and thereby to improve accountability. Although, now challenged, at a point in time this model was regarded as ‘modernising’ as compared with earlier administrative structures (Hughes, 1998:25).

Traditional public administration was at its height during the era of the welfare state, when the state was expected to meet all the social and economic needs of the people and ensure equity (Osborne, 2010:3). But from the late seventies, when expenditure was outstripping public resources the inadequacies of public administration and the bureaucratic model of public management became apparent and a decline of the system proceeded (Chandler, 1991). Considered the longest standing theory of management in the public sector, traditional public administration began a change process (Hughes, 1998). These changes were more radical than mere changes in
management structures and processes. More significantly they altered the relationship between government and citizen. They challenged the fundamental principles of traditional public administration that governments should be organised in a hierarchical, bureaucratic structure as articulated in the Weberian model thus providing the single best way of managing; that the government is the only provider of public goods; that there is a separation of powers between administration and politics ensuring accountability; and finally that the professional bureaucracy means political impartiality. Once the change process got underway, those traditional tenets were challenged. Delivering public goods and services through the bureaucratic structure was no longer considered the only way. Flexible systems more akin to the private sector were introduced in the name of new public management. From the early 1980s the focus shifted from the concept of efficiencies associated with the reliable and constant traditional public administration structure to one more focused on outputs and less on means (Hughes, 1998:23). Traditional public administration was considered too inflexible and formalised for the rapidly changing social, economic and political arena. Nevertheless, while radical changes have taken place in the public sector, elements of the traditional public administration still remain.

This brief review of traditional public administration provides an understanding of the culture and ethos that prevailed in traditional public administration. It is important to recall that this system was operating for almost a century when change occurred. Therefore norms and values were embedded. The ideal traditional public administration system, while ordered and rigid, provided reliability and consistency and maintained a separation of powers between administration and politics. Roles and responsibilities were specified and there were clear lines of accountability. Change brought complexity to the system by introducing a greater degree of flexibility to the way things were done; it required organisational change; introduced new actors; and blurred the lines of accountability. The need for these radical changes, paved the way for the governance paradigm, which was influenced by new public management which is discussed next.

**New Public Management (NPM)**

As a result of the inadequacies recognised in the traditional public administration model, a new public management (NPM) emerged (Bealey et al 1999:247). The
growth of NPM from the late 1970s effected a new discussion on public policy implementation and public service delivery (Osborne, 2010:3). Several reasons were mooted for this shift internationally. With the deterioration in the world economy in the 1970s and 1980s, governments experienced a downturn in revenue. There were fewer resources available for the public sector, yet governments wanted to deliver the same level of public services, sometimes with broader functions, less financial resources and fewer staff. What made this shift stronger was the fact that it was driven by politicians rather than public servants and there was a drive towards reducing the public sector and making it more efficient (Hughes, 1998:58). The downturn in the economy and the general belief that the public sector needed reform, made it less of a political risk to implement NPM. Pollitt (1990) suggests that NPM was underpinned by two main theoretical principles – economics and private management (1990:5). The changes made in traditional public management as a result were broad. In the main they included a focus on results coupled with accountability for decisions taken.

Instead of ‘reforms’ to the public sector, NPM signified ‘a ‘transformation’ of the public sector, and its relationship with government and society’ (Hughes, 1998:59). Hood (1991:6-8) explores four reasons why NPM was well received (i) it was a popular or fashionable thing to do, (ii) the belief in NPM that the ‘cargo-cult’ phenomenon ( repetition of particular managerial practices, despite repeated failure) offers the prospect of success, (iii) it fused the historically distinct approaches to public administration namely the German tradition of state-led economic development by professional public managers and the other, the Anglo-Saxon tradition of liberal economics and (iv) it emerged as a result of social conditions. But Hughes (1998:59) on the other hand posits a much more simplistic reason namely that the traditional model of public administration just did not work anymore.

It was governments that first recognised that the traditional model needed to be transformed introducing economists into the political arena rather than depending on the generalist administrators. The OECD (1991:11) in Public Management Developments, reported that most countries had two broad reforming aims (1) to improve production and delivery of services and (2) to make greater use of private sector practices. Hood concurs (1991, 4-5) outlining seven internal changes
represented by NPM: 1) **hands-on professional management** in the public sector meaning active involvement from the top; 2) **explicit standards and measures of performance**, definition of goals, targets and indicators of success; 3) a greater emphasis on **output controls**, resource allocation and rewards linked to measured performance; 4) a shift to **disaggregation** of units in the public sector to corporatized units around projects; 5) a shift to greater **competition** in [the]public sector with a move to term contracts and public tendering procedures; 6) a **stress on private sector styles of management practice** with a greater flexibility in hiring and rewards; greater use of PR techniques; and 7) a stress on greater **discipline and parsimony** in resource use. NPM led to ‘agencification’ whereby state activities were devolved to outside agencies. Heywood and Wright describe the transformative process:

Most governments have transferred competences to subnational governments, to semi-autonomous regulatory bodies, to quangos and to ‘third sector’ organisations – voluntary, non-profit or charitable organisations which have become ‘the private agents of public policy’ (Heywood and Wright, 1997:91)

This management approach put more focus on results and individuals taking responsibility for their actions; it introduced the notion of more flexible organisations and modes of working; and emphasised the setting of organisational and personal objectives in order to identify indicators and measure performance (Rhodes, 2000:56). Underpinning these policies was, what Pollitt (1990:59) referred to, as the ‘virtuous three E’s: economy, efficiency and effectiveness’. The use of these market principles opened up the public sector to more competition and to using more business-like management instruments (Peters, 2010:39). It also meant that the way services were delivered was more diverse with some public services being delivered through private contract. This new mode of delivery reflected what Osborne and Gaebler (1992) call the separation of ‘steering from rowing’ to describe how government was involved in public service delivery.

The OECD (1995:85) review of public management reform in OECD countries *Governance in Transition: Public Management Reform in OECD Countries* concluded that, with the changing paradigm, central governments needed to develop their capacity to take a strategic rather than a controlling approach when dealing with smaller departments and agencies. Through NPM there was an effort made to
improve the quality of policy development and the relationship between public servants and politicians. In NPM there were stronger links between the public servant and the government of the day rather than being non-partisan as in the traditional public administration model. The devolution of activities from central government to agencies and engaging in more diverse forms of service-delivery reduced the political influence. This change gave managers more policy decision-making and implementation powers (Peters, 2010:39). When NPM was introduced there was a weak culture of strategic planning in public administration as it was the politicians, and not the public servants, who were responsible for policy development and strategy. As a result long-term goals did not prevail in public administration. For this reason NPM is seen as a form of political management and there is a different type of relationship with political leaders (Hughes, 1998:69). This change has meant that the public manager is required to be ‘a bureaucratic politician’ and ‘a good political player’ (ibid).

There is no doubt from this brief account of the growth of NPM that governments in the 1970s, considered the public sector ripe for change, a need driven primarily by economic circumstances. There are differing views on the virtues of NPM with some critics considering it a pragmatic approach to service delivery and others seeing it as adopting a private sector management culture within a public sector environment and therefore infringing on the traditions of the public sector. In other words NPM has a disregard for the traditional ethos of public administration such as ethics and service to the state (Hughes, 1998:53). There may be implementation problems when policies are introduced rapidly from the top. Even where change is recognised as necessary, this often leads to confusion and uncertainty at lower levels of the organisation; and overall there can be a general lack of understanding of what is meant by NPM itself as it is usually defined by its constituents such as performance measurement, incentives and budgeting (Hughes, 1998, 72-78).

Economic theories and techniques are not always regarded suitable to the political environment of the public sector. The public sector model is distinctive from, and more complex than, the private sector model. In the public sector consumers are also citizens and this difference adds to the complexity and uniqueness of the public sector (Pollitt, 1990:126). Changing from an input to an output focused organisation, as advocated in NPM, means taking ‘linked steps’ in logical
progression as outlined by Hughes (1998:73), such as ‘determining strategy and setting objectives, devising programmes to meet objectives, setting structure and funding by programme, measuring performance and evaluating achievements’. But as Pollitt (1990:121) points out, this does not represent reality in the public sector and therefore measuring results is made difficult.

Nevertheless, Osborne (2010:2) suggests that the NPM era was a relatively ‘short-lived and transient one between the statist and bureaucratic tradition of PA and the embryonic plural and pluralist tradition of the NPG’. The main changes initiated in the traditional model of public administration, under NPM, included: the shift from ‘administration’ to the notion of ‘managing’ in the public sector; new flexible forms of working were encouraged; managers were expected to become more involved in decision-making and strategic planning; there was more focus on results than process with more emphasis on transparency and accountability. While elements of NPM were hailed economical, efficient and effective and remain ingrained to the present day, commentators on public sector management reform argue that it was not broad enough to encompass the complex public sector environment. Hence in the 1990s, in an effort to bridge the gap, there was a paradigm shift from NPM to the notion of governance. It is this governance paradigm that forms the backdrop for the current study.

**Governance**

As outlined in chapter one, this study explores the following question: *does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?* Thus far, in this chapter, within the broader echelons of the state, the paradigm shift from traditional public administration, to new public management has been outlined. These public policy and implementation regimes provide the base from which the governance paradigm burgeoned (Osborne, 2010:1-2). In this section, the notion of governance will be broadly outlined as a framework within which MAP and collaboration has evolved. In chapter three, multi-agency partnership and collaboration, as a governance mechanism, will be explicated in more depth.

Kjaer (2004) draws attention to the many theoretical debates underpinning the concept of ‘governance’. She searches for a ‘core’ in the many definitions and
suggests that Rhodes (1996) uses the governance concept as a way of describing the reformation of the public sector. This type of definition Kjaer claims, can be put in the realm of public administration and public policy and that ‘scholars in this field, study the tasks, organization, management and accountability structure of the public sector’ (Kjaer, 2004:4).

Adshead and Quinn (1998:210) contend that the increase in the use of the term ‘governance’ has led to it being considered as a ‘new concept in government studies’. Traditionally government is understood as the formal and institutional processes operating at the level of the state ‘to maintain public order and facilitate collective action’ (Stoker, 1998). But governance is a departure from this notion. Writers in the field of governance agree that there is no one definition of governance that encompasses the various attributes of the concept (Jose, 2007; Olsen, 2008; Rhodes, 1996, 1997; Pierre and Peters, 2000). While there are numerous governance narratives, for the purpose of this research those explanations dominant in the literature related to political science, and in particular public administration, are represented.

‘Governance’ can be used in the ‘old’ and ‘new’ sense. The World Bank (2000a:48), for example, describes ‘governance’ as the

institutional capacity of public organizations to provide the public and other goods demanded by a country’s citizens or their representatives in an effective, transparent, impartial, and accountable manner, subject to resource constraints (in Kjaer, 2004:11)

This according to Kjaer (2004) raises the issue of how to steer and at the same time improve accountability and draws attention to the relationship between legitimacy and efficiency (Peters, 2000). Kjaer, having identified governance ‘as broadly referring to the setting and management of political rules of the game, and more substantially with the search for control, steering and accountability’, concludes that some core concepts in governance theory need to be illuminated such as legitimacy, efficiency, democracy and accountability (Kjaer, 2004:11).

Stoker (1998:18), while defining ‘governance’ as ‘eclectic and relatively disjointed’ provides a framework for understanding changing processes of governing. He outlines five propositions around which governance is structured. According to Stoker (1998:18) governance:
1. refers to a set of institutions and actors that are drawn from but also beyond government;
2. identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues;
3. identifies the power dependence involved in the relationships between institutions involved in collective action;
4. is about autonomous self-governing networks of actors;
5. recognizes the capacity to get things done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide.

What these principles suggest is that governance is broader than government as the governance process means diverse institutional modes, coordinated rather than individual responsibility for tackling issues, shared power, autonomy and flexible modes of delivery. Rhodes (1997) concurs that governance is about ‘self-organizing, interorganizational networks characterized by interdependence, resource exchange, rules of the game and significant autonomy from the state’ (1997:15).

Stoker, (2004:3) summarises a meaning of ‘governance’ in the following definition:

as a baseline definition it can be taken that governance refers to the rules and forms that guide collective decision-making. That the focus is on decision-making in the collective implies that governance is not about one individual making a decision but rather about groups or individuals or organisations or systems of organisations making decisions.

Bovaird and Löffler (2009:6) examine the notion of public governance which they define as meaning ‘how an organisation works with its partners, stakeholders and networks to influence the outcomes of public policies’. They suggest that public governance raises specific questions such as whom might have the right to influence decisions in the public domain, the underlying principles of these decisions and whether or not they are beneficial to society. It differs from new public management which focused attention on measurement of outputs both at an organisational and individual level (Bovaird and Löffler, 2009:9). It puts a focus more on the outcomes of public policy and how they are valued by stakeholders and puts an emphasis on the quality of the processes by which decisions get made (Bovaird, Löffler and Parrado Diez, 2004:3). Osborne (2010:9) provides perspectives on new public governance (NPG). He suggests that NPG takes into account both a plural state, where multiple interdependent actors are involved in the delivery of public services, and a pluralist state where multiple processes inform policy-making. Consequently NPG is focused on inter-organisational relationships and processes, where service
effectiveness depends on the interaction of public service organisations (PSOs) with their environment, for service effectiveness. The inter-organisational network, Osborne (2010) argues, is the central mechanism in NPG where accountability is negotiated at the inter-organisational and inter-personal level. He draws attention to the power inequalities in these relationships that must be negotiated for effective working. NPG therefore he observes, is both a product of and a response to the complex and plural nature of public policy implementation and service delivery in the twenty-first century.

Governance should not be regarded as a decline of the state, but rather the ability of the state to adapt to external changes (Pierre, 2000:3). Governance therefore requires change in how policies are implemented and public services delivered. In conceptualising the governance paradigm, the literature emphasises three areas where change is required. They include (1) structural/institutional change; (2) process change; and (3) change supporting innovative and sustainable services. Critical variables, relevant to these concepts, are identified in the literature, and introduced here from a broad governance perspective. They will be elaborated on from a micro-level and practice-based perspective in chapter three, when exploring MAP as a governance mechanism. They include context, culture, legitimacy, democratic participation, power-sharing, leadership, trust, accountability, and the creation of innovative and sustainable public services. These variables are critical for the effective implementation of MAP and collaborative action inherent in governance.

**Structural/Institutional Change**

**Context**

The context in which policy is implemented is significant for its success or failure. Context may be complex and sometimes influenced by international, national and local events. Governance is ‘outward’ looking. It recognises that some issues must be tackled in a broader political context, and it incorporates the added dimension of citizen engagement and informal networks in public policy making. In his study of the Anglo-governance school, Marinetto (2003:605) found that government has ‘institutionally’ entered a new phase due to external (global international economic activity) and internal (market-style public sector reforms) pressures. Thus central
government relies more on policy networks beyond the central state than on the traditional hierarchical structure. Consequently, critics suggest that central government has been weakened or ‘hollowed-out’ and that ‘policy implementation becomes more difficult because policy has to be negotiated with more and more organizations’ (Rhodes, 1997:100). Such a ‘hollowing-out’ of the state draws attention to the culture of these organisations and the way in which it may hinder or support the systems change needed.

**Culture**

Governance means a change in the way things are done and may lead to cultural changes in organisations. Schein (1985) in Parker and Bradley (2000:127), describes culture as consisting of three dimensions – assumptions, values and artefacts.

Assumptions are widely held, ingrained subconscious views of human nature and social relationships that are taken for granted. Values represent preferences for alternative outcomes as well as means of achieving those outcomes. Artefacts are the more solid or physical representation of culture that includes rituals, slogans, traditions and myths.

Osborne & Gaebler (1992) suggest that the changes brought about through governance allow for new forms of contract, franchise and regulation through a wider range of tools or changes that Rhodes (1996) describes as ‘a new process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rule; or the new method by which society is governed’ (Rhodes, 1996: 652-3). It is an approach to ‘sustaining coordination and coherence among a wide variety of actors with different purposes and objectives such as political actors and institutions, corporate interests, civil society, and transnational governments’ (Pierre, 2000:3-4). The change therefore involves multiple cultures. Discourse on organisational culture highlights its importance in the process of change. Horton (2006:533-4) suggests that as a result of the introduction of private sector management ethos, the vocational feature of the public service and the public service ethic are being replaced by public management logic with its identity and ethical framework for public servants and that individual civil servants are changing their perceptions of the ‘collective identity, the public’s perception of that identity and their own self-identity’.

Newman (1994) suggests that the public sector discovered ‘culture’ during the late 1980s when more customer friendly, entrepreneurial, innovative and flexible initiatives all emphasised culture as a key element of change. Newman outlines five
assumptions about organisational change that she draws from the business literature and compares and contrasts them to the culture that pertains in public sector organisations. The first assumption sees cultures as ‘Closed Societies’. Drawn from the anthropological traditions this suggests small-scale groups sealed off from society and therefore not impacted by it. This assumption does not hold resonance for the public sector because of the open, outward-looking nature of the system and the importance to it of the external context of change. The second assumption is that ‘Cultures are Integrative Wholes’. The literature describes organisations as ‘corporate wholes’ but Newman suggests both private and public organisations are segregated into departmental, functional and professional lines with different sets of values and practices. They could nevertheless have elements of a shared culture because of their history and traditions. Organisational cultures seem therefore to be dependent on ‘role and rank’, and stronger in some areas more than others, ‘with some basic elements of social values which may be beyond the power of reformers to change’ (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2000:126). Newman (1994) argues, however, that change to these histories and traditions will be patterned differently within each department, function or profession. The third assumption is that ‘Cultures are Consensual’. This assumption represents organisations in terms of ‘shared values’ where culture is seen as ‘a site of consensus’ where there is no political influence. Newman argues that most organisational politics is played out through the means of cultural values and norms and that cultural change itself can be a source of conflict and division between those defending the ‘old’ against the ‘new’ ways of doing things. She suggests that ‘control through culture’ can be an effective way to make change. The fourth assumption is that ‘Cultures are Leader Generated’. This assumes that culture is determined and sustained by the leader. But Newman argues that this assumption overlooks the notion of power within organisations and the complexity that organisational change involves. This assumption raises problems in the public sector where control is more political and fragmented than in the private sector, the lines of accountability are ambiguous while the lines between political control and strategic management uncertain. The final assumption is that ‘Culture is a Separate Domain’. In this assumption culture is seen as a ‘lever’ for managers to pull. It is separated from strategy and other types of change management (for example devolution and performance management). Under this assumption culture is only introduced during the implementation stage of strategy. But Newman argues
in her paper that culture is an integral part of the strategy-making process as well as the outputs of that process such as action plans.

Newman’s depiction of culture, through the use of the business literature is useful here as it demonstrates the diverse perspectives that may be taken on culture in the public sector. It shows that culture is a complex phenomenon which may be examined across functions, departments, professions and organisations all of which are underpinned by historical traditions.

Because of the centrality of culture to the change process and achieving strategic objectives, an understanding of organisational culture is important in the public sector. Parker and Bradley (2000) argue that strategies designed for change management must be developed with this awareness and must take culture into consideration in terms of fit. They developed a framework of organisational culture outlining competing values between the human relations model which is akin to the traditional, hierarchical model and a ‘group culture’ and an open systems model with a developmental and rational culture. The literature on public organisations, therefore, they suggest, reports more on the hierarchical culture of public sector organisations because of the emphasis on rules, procedures and stability rather than on the development and rational culture model because of the lack of change, risk-taking and efficiency. Writers suggest that it is difficult to evaluate cultural change and reshaping cultures is fraught with pitfalls (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000:122).

**Legitimacy**

Legitimacy has emerged as a critical issue in the governance paradigm. Formal or informal governance institutions represent various levels of legitimacy and accountability. There is a crisis of legitimacy of the state in most OECD countries (Bovaird and Löffler, 2002:20) and there is a growing public disparagement about the competence and motives of public service organisations. Hirst (2000, 14-19) associates governance with the way actions and activities are coordinated through ‘networks, partnerships and deliberative forums’ and involves a diverse range of actors. He gives examples of actors such as ‘labour unions, trade associations, firms, NGOs, local authority representatives, social entrepreneurs and community groups’ (ibid:19) which means levels of legitimacy and lines of accountability may be ambiguous. Rhodes (1997) suggests that, in the governance paradigm, in the interest
of flexibility, networks are loosely coordinated by government which may further blur legitimacy status. This new style of governance was described by Sabel (1996) as a source of new experiments in democratic practice. Hirst (2000) suggests that usage of the concept of governance and legitimacy raises general problems for democratic representation by elected officials and of the accountability of inside actors to the wider public and this issue will be addressed in the discussion on ‘process’ below.

In summary, context, culture and legitimacy are determinants of the type of institutions evolving in governance. They reflect complexity within the governance paradigm and are particularly relevant to MAPs. Traditional forms of government are inadequate to deal with the shift from ‘government’ to ‘governance’ and new frameworks and forms of interaction have been identified and implemented (Quinn, 2008). The involvement of multiple actors in an intervention may present problems with each actor or agency requiring universal understanding of the policies, and agreement on, the theoretical assumptions, underpinning public service. This raises the question of the extent of process change required to support such a shift.

**Process Change**

**Democratic Participation**

The question of democratic legitimacy in relation to governance has not been given adequate attention (Papadopoulos, 2003:474). State bureaucracies are usually short of resources for example in terms of ‘finance, organisation or expertise’ to resolve policy problems which leads them to become involved with and dependent on, other institutions and organisations (ibid: 474). Papadopoulos refers to Peters’ (2000:40) argument with regard to ‘old’ and ‘new’ governance and argues that while the negative aspect of ‘governance’ stresses the imposition that involvement of social groups in the policy-making process may cause, he agrees with Peters’ notion that there is value in collaboration in policy-making while recognising that there may be issues associated with accountability in complex societies. Governments are increasingly dependent on citizens to tackle more complex problems from the point of view of resources, expertise, information, technologies and legitimacy (Olsen, 2008:8). Citizen involvement is not new and has been a precondition of funding for some time (Martin, 2009:279). Unlike previous times when, other than casting their
votes, citizens in general took little interest in policy-making, public engagement is encouraged and oftentimes stipulated. Martin highlights a need to ‘reinvent the relationship between the citizen and institutions of government’ to avert a ‘crisis of legitimacy’ (ibid). Therefore, according to Boyte (2005) citizens should be viewed ‘as problem-solvers and co-creators of public goods’ and this shift should have the potential to address complex public problems ‘that cannot be solved without governments but that governments alone can never solve’. This would suggest therefore that governance requires collaboration with, and empowerment of citizens rather than hierarchy and control (Boyte, 2005:537).

The OECD (2001a:18) advocates that engaging with citizens is a ‘core element of good governance’. The benefits include:

- Better public policy by allowing government to tap wider sources of information, perspectives and potential solutions
- Greater trust in government facilitating stronger democracy between citizens and governments
- Increasing accountability and transparency which in turn increase representativeness and public confidence

The governance paradigm has changed the policy process to include a plurality of actors and activities. These changes raise issues of power-sharing, leadership and trust which are critical to the MAP process.

**Power-Sharing and Leadership**

Process-change introduced in the governance paradigm, raises the issue of leadership. In order to understand how leadership works we must understand power and organisational politics (Broussine, 2009:266). The power that leaders enjoy is normally hierarchically based and it may apply to a team, board or committee and not just an individual person. Leadership is exercised in a political environment – ‘a seen and unseen network of relations and tactics that people employ to either commit to, or dissent from, decisions that affect them’ (Broussine, 2009: 267).

‘Leadership’ is a word which regularly appears in studies on the modernisation of the public sector (Hartley and Allison, 2000:35). The governance process requires that actors at senior levels of the organisation must be capable of taking the initiative to
generate action, not alone within their own organisation but also with a broader set of stakeholders and within different sectoral environments.

The OECD (2001b:13) concluded that the managerial skills in the public sector, that have been emphasized since the 1980s are not sufficient to cope with future challenges. The report suggests, that the changing environment, requires a new type of leadership because there is a growing need to address interconnected problems in a public policy context of shared power demands. For this reason leaders need to pay more attention to policy coherence; to be cognisant that leadership is a key component to make the public sector a competitive employer; to be aware that a knowledge-intensive economy and public sector call for a new type of leadership that inspires others to create and share knowledge; and which, because there is a continuing need for public sector organisations to adapt, requires leadership, not just amongst senior managers, but amongst all public officials, elected and appointed.

Trust

Trust is a central tenet particularly for MAP in governance. Although essential to successful collaboration, it does not occur automatically. Trust facilitates interaction, information exchange and relationships that allow space for exploration of innovative solutions (Klijn, 2010:306; Huxham and Vangen, 2005). Building trust may be compromised because of the nature of the policy problems when value and policy conflicts may arise. But all actors want a say in the decision-making process which adds to the complexity of the collaboration. This is particularly the case for ‘wicked problems’ that involve numerous actors who may not be in agreement as to the nature of the problem and a possible solution. In addition in these situations, there is often a lack of knowledge regarding the problem and conflict between values and scarce resources which make it difficult to find a solution (Klijn, 2010). Dawes, in her study of New Models of Collaboration, found that trust can take two forms, public trust in the essential transparency and fairness of the initiative and interpersonal trust in the motives and competence of the participants (Dawes, 2003:1). Dawes refers to previous social studies of trust that describe three main types of trust namely calculus-based trust which relies on information-based decisions about the organisation or person to be trusted; identity-based trust which depends on familiarity and continuous interactions amongst the participants; and institution-based trust which rests on social structures and norms, such as laws and
contracts, that define acceptable behaviour. Issues related to public trust tend to highlight institutional measures while interpersonal trust may rest on all three types (Dawes, 2003).

Accountability

Accountability requires that actors with power are expected to be ‘held accountable in public for their acts and omissions, for their decisions, their policies and their expenditures’ (Bovens, 2007:182). There are many forms of accountability i.e. political, hierarchical, direct democratic, legal forms, professional and bureaucratic (Hill, 2009:284). The move towards governance has made accountability more complex and difficult to achieve. ‘The channels and instruments of accountability were far more clear-cut in traditional approaches to government, the representatives were accountable to the people and the administrators were accountable to the governors’ (Quinn, 2007:25). Until the 1980s, the archetypal organisational form in the public service was that of the professional bureaucracy which allowed for professional autonomy, judgement and practice. Together with governmental processes of representative democracy, it included systems of accountability and scrutiny. Later reforms in the twentieth century, for example NPM, changed these systems. The fragmented and dispersed nature of the organisations providing services through decentralisation, marketisation and privatisation, makes it difficult to scrutinise service providers (Clarke, 2009:200) and provides opportunity for ‘blame-shifting’ (Pollitt, 2009:255). This has repercussions for accountability and the principles of democracy (Leach and Percy-Smith, 2001:122) and blurs the lines of responsibility, accountability and control implicit in the old Westminster model of government (ibid:7). From a democratic accountability perspective, they argue, these service mechanisms may not be in the public interest (ibid:4). It is important to recognise the difference between the objectives of the public and private sector. The former holds a unique normative element of ‘representation, equality, impartiality, integrity, justice and citizenship’ and the public sector must be accountable not just to the affluent users or customers of public services who can afford to pay for their services, but to all groups and classes of citizens including low-income households (Haque, 2000:610). This responsibility holds significance for local governance where local authorities have responsibility for a broad range of services delivered through various mechanisms including non-elected bodies such as partnerships. In
the partnership approach each agency relinquishes some of its sovereignty and can claim that the partnership itself is the body held accountable and not the organisation, yet there is often no formal structure to hold the partnership accountable (Bovaird and Tizard, 2009:244). The dynamic nature of partnership has resulted in less emphasis on traditional, rigid forms of accountability and a move towards more relational, horizontal and informal forms of accountability.

Innovative and Sustainable Services

Innovation

There is an evolving role for government from one of service provider to one of co-producer and this increasingly means that public agencies must work with key stakeholders during the policy cycle. Recently there is increased professional and academic interest in innovation in the public sector. Maddock (2008:18-19) suggests that innovation is ‘about relationships and organisational design, rather than new products and a response to social problems’ and that it cannot be decreed by central government or delivered by control and demand management.

Moore and Hartley (2010:53) focus in particular on ‘innovations in governance’ which they suggest differ from those in products, services and processes in the private sector because they are formulated and implemented above the organisational level, involve networks of organisations and transform complex social processes rather than being within a particular organisation. They also differ in how they are financed and resourced, in the way decisions are made about what will be delivered and the use of normative standards to evaluate the performance of the ‘social production system’. Moore and Hartley (2010:64-69) suggest five ways in which innovations in governance are different:

- They burst the boundary of organisations and create network-based production systems
- They tap new pools of financing, material resources and human energy
- They exploit government’s capacity to convene, exhort and redefine private rights and responsibilities
- They redistribute the right to define and judge the value of what is being produced
- They evaluate the innovations in terms of justice, fairness and community-building as well as efficiency and effectiveness
Innovations in governance therefore are broader than those of government. They provide opportunity to collaborate in networks to produce goods and services and to share human and financial capital. They provide space for the involvement of public and private actors and they are also more socially orientated being concerned with the well-being of society and quality of life issues.

Since innovating is a complex exercise, why then should it be advocated in public policy. Albury (2005) addresses this question and suggests that there is pressure now to deliver more ‘personalized public services’ and that the ‘one size fits all’ services no longer suffice in an even more diverse and heterogeneous society. Albury argues that public service managers and professionals need to have the skills to innovate successfully and that innovation is no longer a luxury but is core to the public sector and needs to be institutionalised.

**Sustainability**

The concept of sustainability is regularly considered in the context of sustainable development which is often described as ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (Bruntland Report, 1987). The issue of sustainable public policy and public service is raised by Osborne (2010). He suggests that the nature of new public governance (NPG) is such that it requires more interaction with public policy and public services than the regimes of public administration and new public management (NPM). For this reason greater attention to the issue of sustainability is important, not alone in terms of public policies, public service organisations and public services but also more broadly on societal and environmental sustainability. He argues that sustainability should be considered from different perspectives such as developing sustainable income streams and funding for public services; the sustainability of public service organisations as discrete entities; the sustainability of services delivered through public service organisations and delivery systems and their impact for users and communities and the long-term effects of these public services on environmental and ecological sustainability (ibid: 418). In essence, sustainability is a broad issue and one which warrants more investigation as resources shrink in the global economy.
Conclusion
Governance has been proposed as a framework to conceptualize new forms of government which have evolved due to reform, globalisation and the loss of sovereignty (Smith, 1998:59). It has been described as a ‘search for order in disorder, for coherence in contradiction, and for continuity in change’ (Rosenau, 1992:13).

But the literature shows that the change in how policy is implemented and public services delivered from the ‘old way’ under the government paradigm to the ‘new way’ under the governance paradigm has raised a number of critical issues that require further investigation. Specifically these include the impact of internal, external and global environmental factors on governance mechanisms; how institutions, involving multiple actors, are formulated; the level of legitimacy and accountability of these institutions; and the degree of democratic representation and participation.

The governance model places an additional requirement on local authorities to engage in ‘good governance’ as well as delivering efficient public services. This often leads to the creation of partnerships for the delivery of public services. In situations where partnerships are dealing with ‘wicked problems’ it is not practical to gauge their success by measuring the efficiency of how they deliver outputs or achieve goals. In this situation partnerships are more likely to prioritise quality of life outcomes (Bovaird et al 2009:241). These authors suggest that where a partnership or an individual partner is reluctant or not willing to take responsibility for an issue over which they have little or no control, partnership working will be ineffective as this partnership or partner will not see the need to justify their performance.

Finally, while the meaning of governance may be contested, nevertheless the concept does capture the complex nature of public service delivery within a fragmented delivery system (Osborne, 2010:413). The next section reviews the evolution of the governance paradigm in the Irish context to provide a backdrop for the development of multi-agency partnership (MAP) in response to that shift.
The Evolving Governance Paradigm in Ireland: The National Perspective

As previously outlined, the state no longer functions in isolation due for the most part to economic, social and political complexity. This is particularly the case in OECD and EU countries. More than ever, state institutions, both political and administrative, are required to make efficient and effective use of resources and to adapt innovative governance mechanisms in the delivery of public services. Since the 1980’s, Ireland has seen many changes in its public administration system due mainly to the fluctuations in economic and social circumstances. A modernisation agenda underpins efforts to improve the structures and capacity of public governance however, despite the rhetoric, there is little evidence of enduring actions for sustained reforms (Connaughton, 2010:3).

In the early years of the Free State, Ireland saw the growth of a culture of paternalism, clientelism, personalism, authoritarianism and contradictory trends of centralism and localism (Hayward and Mac Carthaigh, 2007 in Connaughton 2010). The Catholic Church played a major role in Irish social culture through the provision of social services (Garvin, 2004) and played a significant role in influencing policy-making and resource allocation over many decades (Chubb, 1992; Connaughton and Quinn 2010). This political culture had repercussions for democracy and reform was advocated when a strong centralised government eroded the autonomy of local government through resource dependency (Fanning, 2007). There was some evidence of modernisation, albeit in-ward looking Government policy, between the 1930s and the 1950s with the growth of monopolies and a culture of protectionism. Commercial and non-commercial state-sponsored bodies were introduced as developmental instruments for service delivery particularly in the areas of public utilities, agriculture and the tourism industry. This had the effect of separating out the responsibility of departmental ministers from that of direct operational responsibility for the service and led to an additional administrative tier in addition to government departments and local authorities (Chubb, 1992). It also raised issues of legitimacy and accountability in public administration. In the mid 1950s, due to a recession, government initiated a policy of modernisation towards ‘outward’ looking economic strategies. While these moves were seen as innovative and constructive, they were criticised for not materialising into new institutional arrangements conducive to solid problem-solving (Adshead, Kirby and Millar, 2008). This cultural
change exposed the need for improved state capacity (Fanning, 2008). The Public Services Organisation Review Group (known as the Devlin committee), reporting in 1969, was particularly critical of the way in which government functions were organised and recommended that structures needed to be rationalised and a distinction made between those that remained subject to political direction and control and those left to independent agencies (Gaffey, 1982). The need for reform was not recognised within the civil service as a whole and those seen to promote change were regarded as obstacles for development (Chubb, 1992:238). The Department of Public Services was established in 1973 to facilitate cultural change in the public sector and in 1985 the government White Paper entitled *Serving the Country Better* was published which emphasised the need for administrative reform to ensure value for money. The Top Level Appointments Commission was established in 1984 to ensure that those, more capable of pursuing managerial roles and initiating change, were appointed to the civil service. These efforts at modernising the public sector were evidence of a shift from the traditional public sector management and resonated more with the principles of new public management NPM. The introduction of social partnership was in keeping with the NPM diktat for innovative ways of doing things. It reflected private sector business practices by ensuring compatibility between employers and employees and stimulating stability in the economy. Over time, other groups were consulted including voluntary and community groups thus introducing a more pluralistic approach to policy development. This inclusion of a range of actors, in a wide spectrum of policy elements, provided evidence that the state system in Ireland was shifting from a government to governance paradigm. This new approach was challenging for the government as it entailed ‘steering’ a network of groups rather than engaging in the traditional hierarchical approach of ‘command and control’ (Connaughton, 2010:14). But although there was evidence of some reform and innovation, change in the public sector did not represent widespread institutional change as advocated by NPM (Connaughton, 2008). In 1994, *the Strategic Management Initiative* (SMI) was launched calling for improved customer service, efficiency, value for money and more accountability within the civil service. This policy document was followed by *Delivering Better Government* in 1996 which further endorsed the NPM approach and reinforced the notion of responsibility, accountability, emphasis on an outcomes-based approach to service delivery and
engaging performance management practices. An evaluation of the SMI in 2002 (PA Consulting) found that some progress towards change had taken place more especially towards service provision. There was less evidence of internal institutional change. The OECD Report (2008) *Transforming Public Services – Citizen Centred, Performance Focused*, showed some progress towards reform particularly in relation to value for money and cost benefit analysis of capital projects but in an uncoordinated way and called for a revival of the public sector reform agenda.

Since 2008 Ireland is in the throes of a financial crisis brought on by irresponsible banking and ‘light-touch’ regulation, the collapse of an over-inflated construction sector, rising unemployment and a global recession. Consequently, the role of the public service is to assist political leadership to face these new domestic economic and financial realities, a role which has put the spotlight firmly back on public service reform again. This ‘new direction’ has repercussions for local governance and service delivery.

**The Evolving Governance Paradigm in Ireland: The Local Perspective**

Any discourse on the local government system must be mindful of the role of local authorities. On the one hand they are providers of public services with a substantial budget and responsibility to deliver efficient and effective services. On the other they represent the democratic nature of the state (Dooney and O’Toole, 2009:254).

The origin of the current system of local government is the Local Government (Ireland) Act 1898 which was underpinned by principles of democracy and efficiency. The 1937 Constitution contained no direct reference to local government and consequently its authority was undermined (Hogan and Whyte, 2002:486). Recognition of the role of local government was advocated by The Constitution Review Group (1996) and the All-Party Oireachtas Committee on the Constitution (1997) and the *Better Local Government Act* 1996. Subsequently the *Local Government Act* 2001 was enacted which forms the foundational legislation governing local government, structures, operations and functions. Under the Act, local authorities are reconstituted as corporate bodies, councils, county councils, borough councils or town councils. The Act provides that each council has an elected council with a chairperson (Cathaoirleach) and councillors. The functions of
the authorities are underpinned by legislation and outline where power lies between
the local authority, central government and ministers. Functions of the authorities
are affected by government policy of the day and due to the lack of financial
resources, tend to remain within the traditional model of public administration.

The day to day management of the local authority lies with the manager who has
responsibility for the efficient and effective delivery of services. The functions of
the local authority have eight broad headings: housing and building, roads and
transportation, water supply and sewage, planning and development, environmental
protection, recreation and amenity, agriculture, education, health and welfare and
miscellaneous. Local government therefore impacts heavily on the lives of the
public. The functions are divided into reserved functions which are executed by the
elected members and the executive functions of the manager. The reserved functions
have legal status which means that the councillors are responsible for overseeing the
work of the authority and agreeing a budget and development plans and these
functions have expanded in recent years. This development is particularly relevant
with regard to building construction and planning. Membership of the EU means
that local authorities, in carrying out their functions, must work to significant
regulatory and financial constraints.

The creation of city and county development boards (CDBs), that oversee strategic
economic and social developments has added significantly to the role of the manager.
CDBs and the Strategic Policy Committees (SPCs) that operate with the city and
county councils, involve social partners and non-state actors in policy making thus
addressing the democratic deficit. (These institutions will be further explicated in the
discussion on MAP in chapter three). The National Development Plans also
influence the work of local authorities and managers. New legislation has called for
closer integration of local government and local development. The Strategic
Management Initiative (SMI) has impacted the manager’s role with the introduction
of public-private partnerships and outsourcing of services. It also introduced a
programme-based system of management with a new layer of management, the
directors of services.

Reforms have been recommended for local government over several decades. The
changes to the management system with an integration of technical and administrative functions. The Barrington Report (1991) identified deficiencies in the system including poor structure; the lack of integration between services at the different levels of government national, regional and local; the inadequacy of political representation compared to European models; a poor delivery system and relationship at community level. The launch of Better Local Government in 1996 proposed radical reform. The foreword to the report notes: ‘Reform of local government has been on the political agenda for 25 years, although real progress and meaningful change has been limited to date. It is now time for action’. Change was needed, the report said because the local authority functions were too restricted and as a result integrated responses to problems were inhibited; the democratic role of the councillors was not being used to full effect; and over the years local development was pursued through various new approaches such as enterprise boards, partnership companies, LEADER groups, tourism committees and strategy committees. Better Local Government also asserted that the extent of central control on local authorities was limiting local initiative and autonomy and scarce resources had inhibited performance of traditional functions. There were four underlining principles in the reform programme which included the enhancement of local democracy; serving the customer better; developing and maximising efficiency and providing resources to local government. Local Government was also called on to develop strategic plans in line with government policy.

The Barrington Report (1991) and Better Local Government (1996) recommended an enhancement of the policy-making role of the councillor within new structures of corporate policy groups and strategic policies committees (SPCs). Since 1996 this partnership-style policy development structure involves representatives of business, unions and community through committee procedure.

The Local Government Act 2003 ended the dual mandate in order to make a clear division between national and local government. The intention was to allow national politicians to focus on national and international, rather than local issues. This reform has had implications for citizens as it restricts access to TDs and the TDs access to local government and the sharing of information. It has also been suggested that the dual mandate weakened political leadership in local authorities due to the loss of the skills and experience of full-time politicians (Dooney and
O’Toole, 2009:239). The management system in local government appears to work well providing it in an impartial and professional way. However, with little or no access to national politicians locally, the public are at times more inclined to turn to central government with regard to local issues.

The combination of ongoing reform and the limited resources due to budgetary cutbacks means local authorities are seeking innovative ways of delivering services, including the use of collaborative working between public sector agencies, an approach advocated in the Government Green Paper, Stronger Local Democracy: Options for Change, 2008. The embargo on recruitment within the public sector also means engaging actors from the community in the delivery of services. This new way of working, reflecting the governance paradigm, has produced a more fragmented public service and changed the culture of the public sector institutions. The Programme for Government Ireland (2011:2) pledges that ‘new ways, new approaches and new thinking will form the constant backdrop to the coalition’s style of governance’. This pledge has not, however, been supported by the necessary funding from central government, which is an on-going issue for local authorities.

**Conclusion**

The paradigm shift from government to governance appears to be taking a circuitous route in Ireland. The economic crisis of the 1980’s was the catalyst for change in the traditional bureaucracy and practices more akin to the private sector were introduced to improve efficiency and value for money. For two decades the NPM approach was taken but while it was considered by some as effective economically and socially, politically it proved less successful. Hence there was a move towards the more holistic governance approach opening up opportunities to engage a wider set of actors and opportunities. This ‘new direction’ had repercussions for local governance.

The local government structure has also felt the impact of NPM. The Better Local Government 1996 modernisation agenda and The Local Government Act 2001 underpin public policy and enhance the role of local authorities by enabling them to become facilitators rather than suppliers of services. Management of local authorities has been influenced by the SMI and with the introduction of new ways of delivering services through partnerships and outsourcing. In addition to these
endogenous factors, local authorities are impacted by exogenous factors. Membership of the EU has imposed significant regulatory and financial constraints in carrying out their functions particularly on environmental issues. These reforms reflect a shift from traditional public management to NPM but there is evidence that local government has, over time, been influenced by the governance paradigm. The democratic deficit, evident in NPM, has been tackled in the wider governance paradigm by making provision for CDBs and SPCs, ensuring a plurality of actors, and strengthening the role of politicians and citizens in the policy process. By ending the dual mandate, local councillors are expected to focus on local issues and to engage with and strongly represent communities. From a public policy perspective it would appear that governance is strongly advocated in the local context in Ireland, in chapter three the extent to which these policies are implemented will be discussed.
Chapter 3
Multi-Agency Partnership as a Governance Mechanism

Introduction
Chapter two outlines the shift from the bureaucratic style of government to that of governance which introduces a wider plurality of actors and processes. The changed approach to governing requires different modes and mechanisms. One approach that is frequently employed is that of multi-agency partnership (MAP). In this chapter the MAP is introduced as a governance mechanism and explicated from a practice-oriented theoretical perspective. This pragmatic approach is taken in view of the applied nature of the research. Partnership is defined, the rationale for, and barriers to partnership explored and the determinants of successful partnership outlined. This chapter forms the basis for the second hypothesis tested in this thesis namely ‘responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services’ and informs the conceptual framework used in the study.

Towards a Definition of Partnership
In the global sense, ‘partnership is the new language of public governance’ (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:1) and acknowledged as being central to policy development and delivery. Often used interchangeably, as in this study, MAP is a common example of collaboration. Empirical evidence on partnership practice from the past two decades, in particular from the UK, US and Australia, suggests that collaboration is complex (Jacobs, 2010; Boydell and Rugkåsa, 2007; Powell and Dowling, 2006; Corcoran, 2006; Hastings, 1996). Huxham et al, from their broad experience of facilitating collaboration and partnership in both public and private organisations, even go as far as to suggest avoiding collaboration unless it is absolutely necessary (Huxham and Vangen, 2005:37). The evidence to suggest that collaboration is more efficient, effective and leads to more focused public services is not strong (Boydell and Rugkåsa, 2007; Bauld et al 2005; Dowling, Powell and Glendinning, 2004 and Burnett and Appleton, 2004). Increasingly however, collaboration is a response to government policy or incentives. It has gained impetus because of the changing role of the state (see chapter two) and its transformation in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries when the capacity of the state was questioned (Rhodes, 1997; Pierre and Peters, 2000). It was argued then that government was restricted because
of its functional organisational design (Richards and Jervis, 1997). Collaboration and the involvement of sectors other than the public sector were seen as one response to this problem. The necessity to find new ways of working and consequently the need for a range of actors with diverse expertise and resources was recognised in the complex economic, political and social challenges facing countries. But involving new actors means a change in governance arrangements and adds to the complexity of public administration. What may be implied from these underlying governance principles is that public servants will no longer work in silos to deliver services. ‘Increasingly, organisations are finding distinct disadvantages when they are structured in silos. The disadvantages of functional silos include potential for a slow response, where there is need for coordination and collaboration across departments. Issues are referred upwards for resolution, overloading more senior managers. Decisions pile up and top managers do not respond quickly enough’ (Daft, 2001:97). Innovation is generally slower because of poor coordination and information sharing across functional silos. Barriers may also exist between different departments, hampering collaboration and teamwork (Cunneen, 2008:29).

Collaboration is a tool which necessitates working constructively with others on an issue of common interest to achieve positive outcomes. Collaboration means that actors from the public, private and community sectors work across boundaries in order to find new ways of working together to deliver public services. There are numerous forms of collaborative arrangements including community-led initiatives, public/private contracts, inter-organisational co-operation and joint-ventures (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Huxham, 1996). Nevertheless, Thompson et al (1991) suggest that all collaborative affiliations derive from one of three governance structures: contracts, networks or partnerships where contracts are often associated with delivering public services through private agencies or voluntary associations, and networks are informal associations with strong social capital particularly trust and reciprocity. In general, in the governance context, a normative view is taken of partnership but defining partnership is difficult (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002).

More recently, discourse in academia and political circles has focused on the notion of partnership (Ballock and Taylor, 2001; Glendinning, 2002) but there is still no clear definition as to what constitutes partnership or what Powell and Dowling
(2006:305) refer to as the ‘what’, ’who’, ’why’ and ‘how’ questions of partnership. It has been suggested that the term is ‘overused, ambiguous and politicised’ (Hastings, 1996:253) and that little distinction is made between different types of partnerships (Boydell and Rugkåsa, 2007; Corcoran, 2006). Partnership, as a theoretical concept, is often over-simplified (Douglas, 2009:2). They are often supported by networks that provide a context through which power and trust are negotiated. Partnerships therefore represent both formal structures as well as micro-political environments as actors work across organisational, sectoral and geographical boundaries (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:1-2). Partnerships are conceptually different from contracts and networks as they involve the partner agencies taking responsibility for the assessment of need for action, type of action required and how it will be implemented (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:5). Partnership entails a long-term commitment and mutual dependency. Lorenz (1991:189-90) suggests that:

Partnership is a set of normative rules determining what behaviour is permissible and what constitutes a violation of trust. The rules are designed to facilitate exchange in a situation otherwise open to exploitation.

Partnership working has been referred to by Cheminais (2009:5) as:

The processes that build relationships between different groups of professionals and services at different levels, to get things done. It entails two or more organizations or groups of practitioners joining together to achieve something they could not do alone, sharing a common problem or issue and collectively taking responsibility for resolving it. Partnership therefore refers to a way of working as well as to a form of organization.

Partnership is more formal than networks and necessitates commitment over time. Himmelman (2002) developed a model of partnership for service delivery which provides a useful framework to identify the extent to which collaboration is present ranging on a continuum from networking, which refers to the exchange of information for mutual benefit; co-ordination which refers to exchanging information and altering activities for mutual benefit; to co-operation which adds sharing resources to these activities and finally to collaboration which is all encompassing including exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources, and enhancing the capacity of another for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose.
The literature on partnership and collaboration shows that both these concepts must be defined in context. The definition of partnership and collaboration applied in this study will be operationalised in the methodology in chapter four.

Rationale for Multi-Agency Partnership
Partnership has emerged as a prominent governance tool and/or institution in the contemporary European state and, as already stated, is seen as the acceptable alternative to markets and hierarchies (Corcoran, 2006:401). Many states are endeavouring to respond to the growing demand for services and the perceived ineffectiveness and inefficiency of government through encouraging partnership working between the various arms of the state and between the state, the private and voluntary sector and the state and local users and communities (Rummery, 2006:223). The changing social, economic and political environment has meant that government, and in particular local government, has become increasingly concerned with complex problems and in finding ways to tackle them (Audit Commission, 1998). These so called ‘wicked problems’ have received prominence in national policy particularly in relation to community safety and social and economic regeneration (Boydell and Rugkåsa 2007; Coulson, 2005). Traditional hierarchical organisations are not able to deal with the ambiguity, complexity and uncertainty of these problems (Hudson, 2004:79). These are issues that cross traditional organisational boundaries and require the services of several agencies, working in partnership, to deal with them. Partnerships between different agencies are being promoted within the public sector to improve service delivery and provide a ‘holistic’ approach to tackle these problems (Jacobs, 2010).

Increasingly, local statutory agencies are mandated to work together. This trend has had significant implications for local authorities because of their functions and the leadership role they have in the community. The rationale for working in partnership is the added value provided by a number of agencies that could not have been provided by a single agency acting alone. This concept (which will be discussed further later on) is referred to by Huxham (1996:3) as gaining ‘collaborative advantage’. This means that otherwise independent agencies agree, or are mandated, to work together to achieve a shared objective and in so doing, they relinquish some decision-making power to ensure success. It also means that some form of
assessment is carried out on achievements. In order to gain collaborative advantage, improving performance of service delivery is critical and the views of service users and citizens are vital to the collaborative process.

It is quite common for partnership to be set up in order to access funding when funding is not available to single organisations. Working in this type of partnership setting involves risks and the fate of such partnerships is mixed (Audit Commission, 1998). For example when one organisation forms a partnership to secure resources, this organisation often becomes the dominant partner and the other organisations have no real stake in the partnership. Unless an organisation can identify ‘what’s in it for them’, or what the collaborative advantage is, there is a real risk to the partnership.

**Benefits of Multi-Agency Partnership (Collaborative Advantage)**

Several features have been put forward as advantages of collaboration. Such reasons include value for money (Tizard, 2008:28); information-sharing and access to specialist advice (Burnett and Appleton, 2004); improved dialogue (Stern and Green, 2005); and resource and policy synergy (Hastings, 1996). There are nevertheless, barriers to collaboration which suggest that the effort may not always necessarily be worthwhile.

Furthermore, when organisations undertake to collaborate, evidence suggests that there must be some benefit in it for them if the collaboration itself is to succeed and the desired outcomes reached. Huxham provides the following definition of collaborative advantage:

> Collaborative advantage will be achieved when something unusually creative is produced – perhaps an objective is met – that no organization could have produced on its own and when each organization, through the collaboration, is able to achieve its own objectives better than it could alone. In some cases, it should also be possible to achieve some higher-level ‘meta-objectives’; objectives for society as a whole rather than just for the participating organizations (Huxham, 1993: 603).

This definition stresses the fact that the advantage is in the organisation achieving an output that would not have been achieved without collaboration. There is therefore a ‘self-interest’ as well as a ‘moral imperative’ element to collaborative advantage (Huxham, 1996: 4). In particular, it is important, if an organisation is mandated to collaborate, there must be something in it for them if they are to be motivated to
make it work. There is value in the notion of collaborative advantage for legitimising the collaboration particularly for accessing financial resources.

There has been a tendency since the late nineties to give partnerships longer time-horizons to gain the contended advantage of collaboration (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:21). This was seen as necessary for areas such as health, community safety, social exclusion and regeneration (Audit Commission, 1998). These issues require long-term commitments from agencies and stakeholders to work together for a number of years (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:21). They suggest, based on UK research, that a ten year period is more the norm now and question the value of time-limited partnerships. These long-term partnerships ‘institutionalise’ the collaborative process to a much greater extent and indeed they suggest there is evidence that because of the long-term nature of these partnerships, they are now becoming more permanent organisations (ibid:22). Bauld et al (2005), found in their evaluation of the Health Action Zones in the UK, that they did not achieve the goals they identified at the start of the programmes due to the short timeframe and also because of the instability and changes caused by the Department of Health’s policies and priorities.

Realizing collaborative advantage is complex. Huxham and Vangen (2005:61-68) outline a number of concepts which need to be considered in the collaborative process including the need to identify, and agree common aims; power-sharing; trust-building; partner-fatigue; the capacity to manage an ever-changing environment; and leadership (these issues amongst others will be discussed in more detail later). They suggest that awareness of these issues in the collaborative process, can often empower managers to deal more effectively with situations when they arise. It draws their attention to situations that need to be tackled if the problem of collaborative inertia is to be minimised. Most people would accept that working with other people is not always easy. The problem may be compounded when collaborating across organisations. Huxham (1996:4-6) conceptualised this as collaborative inertia. This term was used to describe the situation that arises when expectations of the collaboration are not being reached. Several reasons have been suggested that give rise to this situation including differences in aims, language (which makes communication problematic), procedures, culture and perceived power (how tasks might be carried out differently in each organisation, the tension
that arises between autonomy and accountability) (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2002:111). Beneath different protocols and practices may be very different sets of values e.g. between professionals and community (the balance of power resting with professionals) and between professionals since collaboration can represent a threat to existing power relationships (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2002:111). These different values can be a cause of conflict between professionals and act as an impediment to collaboration regardless of whether the partnership was mandated or not (Barton and Quinn, 2001). Awareness of these issues may also legitimise ‘a degree of manipulative and political activity through the notion of collaborative thuggery’ when things need to get done. Huxham and Vangen (2005:79) use the term collaborative thuggery to describe the actions of people who are adept at manipulating agendas and playing politics to the extent that the collaborative process might be put at risk. It is quite common that people involved in collaboration do not realise how complex a working arrangement it is and find it difficult to articulate the problems that arise and the difficulties they face. The concept of collaborative naivety emerged as a way of describing such difficult collaborations (Vangen, 1998).

**Barriers to Multi-Agency Partnership**

As partnership working has been described as complex and oft times frustrating, barriers to collaboration are commonplace. These barriers often arise because of national policy or requirements which put collaboration beyond the capacity of organisations and impose performance indicators that can discourage collaboration. At the local level, because of the range of agencies, the problem is compounded because of the diverse aims, structures and ways of cooperating (Audit Commission, 1998). Operational and financial obstacles mitigate against collaborative working including limited resources to support collaboration, the rate of progress made in achieving objectives, the level of representation in the partnership and the domination by some partners (Matka et al 2002).

Collaboration will work best when organisations have similar aims, involve similar professional groups and involve organisations with similar cultures (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2002; Ostrom, 1986; March and Olsen, 1989 and North, 1990). The depth of collaboration between partners may be influenced by the compatibility of these cultural norms and values and issues of perceived power as well as tension between
autonomy and accountability all of which may be contributing factors to collaborative inertia (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:110). While these issues can be overcome, it usually takes time and they are often not anticipated or budgeted for (Huxham, 1996:6); Burnett and Appleton, 2004). In the UK, Stern and Green (2005), in their study of two ‘Healthy Cities’ partnerships found that many barriers result from power imbalances between statutory authorities.

Collaboration can be time consuming. With the growth of partnerships in the public sector, it is possible that organisations will find themselves represented on numerous alliances, partnerships or inter-agency networks, both formal and informal which can lead to ‘partnership fatigue’. Huxham (1996:6) suggests two kinds of time – the actual time it takes to negotiate mutual understanding, goodwill, ways of collaborating, all of which are related to trust-building, and lapsed time which is related to issues of accountability and administration. If these issues are not dealt with in the first place, there is a real danger the collaboration will fail. Partnership is expensive particularly when senior and middle managers are involved. For partnerships to provide value for money, it is important that benefits outweigh costs. But determining the value-added because of delivering collaborative public services is difficult (Coulson, 2005). This issue will be addressed later.

**Determinants of Successful Partnership**

Careful review of the existing research, previous evaluations and observations on partnership, shows that successful collaborative programmes have core concepts which characterise successful partnerships. These concepts were outlined in chapter two from a broader governance perspective. They are further explicated here as a micro-conceptual framework to inform the research on MAP. They are organised in a ‘practical ideal type’ as defined by Shields and Tajalli (2006) and which will be elaborated on in the methodology in chapter four. This framework guides the empirical research as well as the presentation and the discussion of findings in chapter six and seven. It also informs the model of good practice developed in chapter eight. Successful partnership determinants investigated here include:

- Context
- Culture
- Legitimacy
- Democratic Participation
- Power-sharing
- Leadership
- Trust
- Accountability
- Innovation and Sustainability in Services

**Context**

Research on collaboration shows that where there is a history of prior collaboration and especially when added value is perceived or acknowledged, the collaboration has a greater chance of success. Ansell and Gash (2007:3), in a review of collaborative governance case studies across a range of policy sectors, constructed a model of collaborative governance in which process variables were outlined which they argue are critical to the collaborative process. They suggest that the way in which the collaboration is set up and the foundations on which it is built, determine the level of trust, conflict and social capital that will either support, in the form of a resource, or impede the collaborative process. The conclusion they draw is that the collaboration process is cyclical rather than linear and reflects a cycle between communication, trust, commitment, shared understanding, and outcomes that build momentum (cf Huxham, 2003 and Imperial, 2005). Ansell and Gash conclude that:

> if prior antagonism is high and a long-term commitment to trust building is necessary, then intermediate outcomes that produce small wins are particularly crucial. If, under these circumstances, stakeholders or policy makers cannot anticipate these small wins, then they probably should not embark on a collaborative path.

(Ansell and Gash, 2007:19)

The organisational context in which the collaboration is established has repercussions for the direction that the collaboration takes. In their investigation of partnership working in Cornwall and Isles of Scilly and Plymouth Health Action Zones, Asthana *et al* (2002), suggest certain conditions should be met for successful partnership working. There must be, for example, a belief that the partnership is ‘a good thing’ and needed and it must be properly resourced for meaningful collaboration. To develop successfully, partnership needs support. The support may be tangible in the form of staff resources, formal committee structures or external facilitation or intangible in the form of long-held trust and understanding between the partners. There may be different reasons for forming the partnership. The agencies might want to improve funding and networking opportunities, conditions which would have a strong bearing on the sustainability of the partnership (IDeA, 2006:11). Networking is the ‘life line’ of partnerships. Having formal networking
structures so that the relationships can continue with the turnover of personnel is important for success. Asthana *et al* (2002) found evidence that while there was a strong network between ‘strategic actors’ and between ‘frontline agencies and staff’ there was a networking problem between different levels of the service hierarchy sometimes caused by the lack of equity between partner organisations.

Context, both geographical and political for the partnership, is significant. From a geographical sense, Asthana *et al* found that coterminosity with core services was seen as a benefit by local stakeholders who referenced the urban/rural competition when accessing funding. In the political sense they found that political instability may cause a change in original programme ideology and a shift in response from the local to the national agenda (Asthana *et al* 2002; Audit Commission, 1998). In this type of situation, to gain or retain funding, stakeholders become risk averse preferring instead to go for ‘early or small wins’. Changes in administrative structures also create uncertainties particularly in relation to accountability arrangements and changes in personnel that developed the networks with, and trust in, the partnership. In his study of a police and housing collaboration on three Australian housing estates, Jacobs (2010:7), found that a culture of knowledge sharing can help to tackle complex social problems such as crime. But when those actors, leading the partnership, leave, momentum is undermined and initial enthusiasm for the partnership wanes. Powell and Dowling (2006:306) suggest that different types of organisational settings, goal structures and management roles or activities are required for different models of partnership which they describe as ‘facilitating’, ‘coordinating’ and ‘implementing’ partnerships. Different types of organisations and governance institutions and working processes are appropriate for different tasks, objectives and strategies (Thompson *et al* 1991) and these are reflected in the culture of the organisation.

**Culture**

Partnership processes may be determined by organisational culture. A necessary prerequisite for collaboration is that partners subscribe to common values that enable the development of new ways of working, roles and relationships. On occasion such value differences will also exist within, as well as between organisations, presenting problems for collaboration (Sullivan & Skelcher, 2002:111). A review of cross-
sector partnership to address social change by Selsky and Parker (2005:851) found that when partners from different sectors collaborate, it is possible that they will think about the issue in hand differently, be motivated by different goals and engage in different approaches.

Collaboration requires the lead-agency to support a collaborative culture through delegation of decision-making powers (Alter and Hage, 1993). There is a need for a ‘transformative’ culture to underpin shared ownership and decision-making. The kind of culture that will be facilitative of collaboration is one which is strategically ‘adaptive’ and ‘responsive’ (Newman, 1994). Organisations with this kind of culture are sufficiently confident to devolve decision-making down to the front line and have a strong external orientation. A case study conducted by Burnett and Appleton in 2004 of one youth offending team and its partnership involving youth justice and social workers, found that where cultural differences were put to the test on a deeper level, there were debates about the welfare aspect of the work being lost which resulted in conflict between management and staff (cf O’Donnell and Boyle, 2008). Robinson and Cottrell (2005) in their research project investigating the reality behind the rhetoric of ‘joined-up thinking’, found that multi-agency teams, such as youth crime teams can engage successfully but this was linked to the view that participating agencies understand the structural dynamics of their partner agencies. Often the bureaucratic structure of local authorities is not understood (Asthana et al 2002), particularly the role of the elected members, and how all major decisions must be referred and heard at committee. This can make joint decision-making a very slow process.

**Legitimacy**

Mandatory partnership working is expanding internationally and is particularly advocated in the areas of health, education and community safety (Holtom, 2001, Hudson, 2004:76). Being mandated confers legitimacy on the partnership. In time, policy trends suggest, this type of partnership working will become obligatory particularly at local level (Dowling, Powell and Glendinning, 2004). Although there are many noteworthy reasons for partnership working, there are circumstances when agencies have no choice but to do so (ibid). Not least amongst these is access to financial resources which constitutes a strong incentive for most agencies.
Partnership membership also underpins its legitimacy. In deriving a working model of partnership from case studies of two health action zones in Northern Ireland – Boydell and Rugkåsa (2007:217) identified the need to have involved in the partnership, and in shaping policy, those affected by its delivery, when tackling complex policy issues. This was borne out by Jacobs (2010) in his research where a more ‘holistic’ approach was promoted to tackle complex problems.

Even when agencies are partners, it does not always mean an equitable partnership Sullivan and Skelcher (2002:112-3). Partners often complain about the differing levels of collaboration in relation to resource contribution (Sullivan et al 2002). This type of conflict can arise where there is a lack of understanding of what type of resources agencies bring to the partnership. There is an assumption that those who have more financial or political resources will have the greatest influence. More often than not, with regard to community and voluntary organisations, it is their membership in itself that bestows legitimacy on the partnership. Research shows that some key partners are either poorly represented or not represented at all at this strategic level, particularly community and voluntary groups (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002). This affects the legitimacy of the partnership.

**Democratic Participation**

There is much discourse around the involvement of citizens in governance despite the falling rates in the democratic process and the growing cynicism about government and politics (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:162). Citizens are being recognised as partners in the design and delivery of public policy and services alongside public, private and voluntary sector bodies. The involvement of citizens in collaboration raises issues of leadership, capacity and power (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:163). Gilliat et al (2000) view the citizen as consumer and on the basis of empirical research in three public service areas, argue that having the capacity to take on this shared responsibility for policy development is a critical issue in participatory democracy. Lowndes (1995) views the citizen as ‘community member’ – a citizen that has a broader rather than self-interested concern about the way in which the state impacts society. Government modernisation agendas globally advocate the involvement of community, particularly in local partnership.
Nevertheless, community involvement in local partnership varies (Geddes and Bennington, 2001). In her research on the Scottish Urban Partnerships, Hastings (1996:265) found a lack of formal community involvement but observed the informal ‘horsetrading’ which, she argues, is a feature of the relationship between the community and local authority representatives and is very much part of bureaucracies and how things get done and that the community needs to come to terms with it. Stern and Green (2005) also recorded community frustration because of the lack of commitment by the authorities. Councillors and senior managers in their case study, were found to be supportive of the partnership but not in practice. They cite examples of senior managers or councillors arriving late for meetings and leaving early, and then ‘networking’ with colleagues on more general authority business outside the meeting. It is recognised that when citizens are involved and driving community partnerships, shared responsibility for local problems and changed behaviour are encouraged (El Ansari et al 2001). In his study of partnerships, Coulson (2005:91) found that area-based partnerships in particular have become acutely aware of governance issues and how best to involve local representation in the governance of partnerships.

**Power-Sharing**

Power, or more precisely the distribution of power, is recognised as a critical issue in collaboration and many barriers result from power imbalances (Stern and Green, 2005). The power bases of statutory agencies often give them an advantage in power distribution. Statutory agencies have the authority to act in key policy and service areas and have access to resources to support it. Power is not only a core element of formal mechanisms, it is also present in informal networks between individuals in collaborations, as well as informal relationships established through common interests. From their research on inter-agency working in the area of crime, Crawford and Jones (1995) suggest that power differentials between state agencies can be a source of conflict, raising issues around confidentiality and information-sharing. Alternatively, it can be a source of creativity when senior managers or front-line inter-agency workers manage these tensions and challenges. Different professions can regard power differently and put a different value on status differences which can be a source of tension between professionals (Robinson and Cottrell, 2005; Huxham and Vangen, 1996). Research shows that power-sharing is
particularly problematic between health, social services and housing practitioners. In their study of power imbalance and potential disillusionment between statutory organisations within two very different ‘Healthy Cities’ initiatives (one in the UK and the other in South Africa), Stern and Green (2005) found it is the statutory authorities that generally initiate and therefore dominate partnerships and inviting the community to join the partnership, more often than not, is more in the interest of the statutory authorities.

Being willing to compromise is essential to drive progress in the partnership. Compromise is often required in different organisational cultures and work practices (Huxham and Vangen, 1996). While these issues are important for agency workers, they are significantly more pertinent for community representation. Although community power is experiential, and this experience affords members of the community credibility and legitimacy on the board, successive evaluations of regeneration, health and social care initiatives in the UK reveal a level of frustration when community members find themselves on partnership boards but their level of input is marginal to the outcomes of the programme (Barnes, Sullivan and Matka, 2001). Access to decision-making and participation always seems more likely for some community members than others (Huxham and Vangen, 1996). When statutory agencies are not prepared to relinquish power, it can result in an increase in community responsibility to be represented on the partnership rather than an improvement in any influence on policy they might gain.

**Leadership**

Leadership is essential to effect ownership of, and commitment to the collaborative process (Burnett and Appleton, 2004: 47). The more flexibility there is in the collaborative structure, the more important good leadership is to maintain coherence and ensure that organisations learn from one another (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002). It is also vital to encourage risk taking and innovation. Leadership determines the extent and pace of partnership development at all levels of the partnership (Evans and Killoran, 2000) and it has the capacity to mobilize others inside and outside the organisation (Broussine, 2009: 264). Attendance or non-attendance by senior staff at partnership meetings can indicate the strength or absence of support (Callaghan *et al* 2000).
Leadership can take several forms and be exercised by both people in authority as well as by others, based on their situation and expertise (Fletcher, 2003). Personality is an important dimension of leadership and good leadership can have an individual or collective source (Crant and Bateman, 2000). Huxham and Vangen (2000:1165) suggest that leadership is not always in the hands of members, but can also be concerned with ‘mechanisms that lead to actual outcomes of a collaboration’…… with what ‘makes things happen in a collaboration’. What this means is that structures and processes are as important as the participants and can be regarded as media through which leadership is practiced. Huxham and Vangen (2000) make the point that these structures can sometimes be imposed from external sources such as government, corporate headquarters or funding agencies and consequently have no internal member control.

There were similar findings from the Performance Innovation Unit (PIU) report on leadership in the UK (Cabinet Office, 2001). They found a scarcity of ‘top-level’ leaders, and the demands on leaders are growing (e.g. because of rapid technological change, greater organisational complexity, increased consumer expectations and more demanding stakeholders). Broussine (2009:271) suggests a challenging aspect of the leadership role for local authority senior management is the political dimension arguing that it ‘demands the most emotional energy and ability, and presents the greatest degree of paradox, ambiguity and risk’. Broussine gives the example from research conducted in a metropolitan borough council, which found that for some who work in public services, it is hard to grasp the notion that it is possible to have a collaborative model of political and organisational leadership.

**Trust**

Lack of trust is commonly cited as a reason why some collaborations are less effective than they might be for achieving their goals (Huxham and Vangen, 2000). Cropper (1996:95-7) is cognisant of this and suggests that in order to begin to build trust, partners need to agree modes of ‘principled conduct’ in order to provide the parameters within which partner bodies can work. But these modes of conduct cannot replace trust developed through working together but can initiate communication and understanding between partners about their respective beliefs and values and the extent to which they are shared. As problems arise, partners can
share information and agree action. Through problem-solving, trust is built and this forms the basis for further collaboration (Alter and Hage, 1993:75). Cropper argues that these exchanges help to promote ‘a sense of inclusion, of predictability or dependability, and of unequivocality in relationships’ (ibid, 1996:96). These norms of behaviour are necessary to maintain motivation for, and commitment to the collaboration (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994:110).

According to Sullivan and Skelcher (2002:102), individuals with reticulist skills are valuable to collaborations for generating trust amongst partners. In their integrative model of organisational trust, Mayer et al (1995:717-720) outline three factors of trustworthiness: ability - whereby an individual is trusted because of their technical expertise in a relevant area; benevolence - whereby the trustee is believed to want to do good in the public interest for altruistic reasons and not necessarily just for personal gain; and integrity - whereby the trustee is perceived to be adhering to principles of conduct that the ‘truster’ finds acceptable.

An issue closely associated with trust is conflict resolution. Conflict resolution and consensus-building are time-consuming particularly in relation to critical issues that may arise in the planning and implementation stage of collaboration. In tackling crime for example, Crawford and Jones (1995:25) found that conflict does need to be recognised and the manner in which it is dealt with is important. In his research, Jacobs’ (2010:9) interviewees recalled how resistance to a partnership’s goals might indicate deep-seated conflicts between and within departments. Authors agree that conflict is inevitable in organisations undergoing change and in teams where tasks may be redefined and redistributed (Robinson and Cottrell, 2005:549).

**Accountability**

Developing formal accountability relationships is problematic in partnerships particularly if there is no clear management structure with accompanying roles and responsibilities from the outset. Asthana et al (2002) suggest that partnerships should limit numbers otherwise the process becomes unmanageable and it creates problems around methods of accountability. On the other hand limiting numbers raises the issue of exclusivity which in turn has implications for access, representation and power (ibid). Huxham and Vangen (1996) in their research, link autonomy to act with accountability. They found that when a partner does not have
the authority to make a decision and must refer back to the parent organisation, it is
time-consuming and decisions are delayed. In this situation, the individuals find
themselves accountable both to their organisation and to the collaboration in which
case there is a lack of autonomy both for the collaboration and the parent
organisations. This raises issues of accountability and who is ultimately responsible
for the decision taken. Therefore initiating even small actions, which could normally
be carried out by one agency acting autonomously, or the partnership acting
autonomously, can be frustrating (Huxham and Vangen, 2005:71). If communication
is good and there is an appropriate degree of trust these problems can be minimised.

There are a number of issues that impact on accountability in collaborations. Where
complex systems of collaboration exist and where there may be a degree of
ambiguity as to the purpose of the collaboration, it is sometimes difficult for those
participating to know who the partners are and what the nature of the inter-
relationship is. Collaborative structures are ever-changing and membership cannot
be taken for granted even though the stability of collaborations is assumed. Policy
changes that affect parent organisations or the collaboration itself can have
repercussions for the accountability process as it implies a change in the
collaborative purpose. Davis (2009:321) in his discourse on public governance,
suggests that transparency is important to fight corruption and other forms of
unethical behaviour but that the degree to which stakeholders wish to be transparent
is culture-bound. He draws attention to the use of e-government as a way of
increasing transparency whereby documentation can be easily disseminated
facilitating knowledge and information transfer.

While accountability is acknowledged as valid in normative terms and goes
unchallenged, Keohane (2008:362) argues that one person’s view that accountability
is a ‘good thing’ might be counteracted by another’s that accountability means over-
regulation, meddling or bureaucratic red tape. He suggests that this tension between
a general agreement that accountability is seen as a ‘good thing’ or as a restrictive
process is not surprising as accountability is, after all, about power.

Innovation

The policy climate for innovation at the local level can either foster or constrain it
Internal obstacles include bureaucratic attitudes, turf fights, coordination difficulties, logistics, maintaining enthusiasm, burnout, implementing technology, union opposition, middle-management opposition, opposition to entrepreneurs, political environment, inadequate resources, legislative, regulatory constraints and political opposition. External obstacles may include external doubts, reaching target groups, affected private-sector interests, public opposition and private-sector competitors (Borins, 2000:504). Maddock (2008) recalls how at a Conference in 2007 organised by the National School of Government on public innovation, to encourage dialogue between social innovators and senior civil servants, social innovators recounted their stories when working with local, regional and central government. They said they experienced: ‘a lack of support from those in government; unrealistic expectations and short-termism; crushing performance management, paperwork and constantly changing priorities; exclusion from mainstream thinking; and contractual arrangements and criteria that made the adoption of innovation practices extremely difficult’ (Maddock, 2008:18-19). These views from the literature suggest that while innovation is promoted in public policy, it is a complex issue that requires understanding and support at every level if it is to take place.

As presented in chapter two, Moore and Hartley (2010:64-69) outline five ways in which innovations in governance differ from those in the private sector in order to ‘relocate and redistribute where and how socially productive activity occurs’ (ibid). The governance approach is broader whereby actors are expected to embrace working in teams, collaborate in inter-agency teamwork and develop extra organisational networks. Moore and Hartley’s notion of innovation suggests that multi-agency partnership could be an effective vehicle for innovative practice as it expands traditional boundaries by broadening the range of actors and organisations involved and thus presents opportunities for innovation.

Innovation in governance, rather than in government, therefore can potentially break down organisational boundaries; it enhances the range of resources for the delivery of services; it influences the choice of government instrument to achieve policy outcomes; it can affect the decision-making process for the distribution of resources and raise important questions about the ‘distribution of burdens and privileges’ in society. Moore and Hartley (2010:69) argue that if considering innovation in the
public sector, awareness of innovation in governance is important. In practice, what this means, Löffler et al (2009:225) suggest, is that public agencies have to:

- co-design their services and policies together with their users and other key stakeholders
- co-manage their resources with other partners
- co-deliver their services with users and their communities
- co-assess their services with their key stakeholders

Innovation and sustainability in governance therefore raises issues around knowledge management, coordination and communication, learning and evaluation and dissemination of better practice. These themes are elaborated on below:

**Knowledge Management**

Knowledge management is central to the collaborative governance process. Data exchange is required to facilitate integrated services. According to Asthana et al (2002), ownership and confidentiality of information, as well as the cost of facilitating the sharing of information through filing systems, inhibits shared information systems. Research conducted by Bellamy et al (2008) on information sharing and confidentiality practices in multi-agency arrangements (MAAs), in four policy sectors where multi-agency working had been strongly prescribed, found increasing trends towards the sharing of personal information about clients, patients and offenders being advocated by the British government to facilitate joined-up thinking in certain social policy areas. This sharing of information was seen as the ‘sine qua non’ to effectively manage cases, to use resources efficiently and to prevent unacceptable outcomes. In multi-agency teams, boundaries around specialisms are broken down, at which point, according to Robinson and Cottrell (2005:549), ‘implicit knowledge must often be made explicit’ and professionals have to find a common language to make knowledge accessible to professionals in other disciplines. This can be a particular problem where the partnership involves both professional and non-professional representation.

**Coordination and Communication**

Poor communication can induce frustration (Gant, 2003). Participants in the Huxham and Vangen (1996a:11-12) study identified three different communication
channels: communication between the people in the core group; communication between the core group and the organisations concerned; and communication and collaboration with the wider community. Language is important to good communication and the use of jargon by professionals is regularly a source of frustration for volunteers or community representations in partnerships. In collaboration, there is potential to talk at cross-purposes or to misinterpret statements. Keeping up communication between the core group and the organisations can be an issue as it is very time consuming but it may also be a way to uncover early signs of disagreement and to gain trust (ibid). For collaborations addressing community social problems, it is vital to keep the community up to date to maintain good relations (Burnett and Appleton, 2004).

Learning and Evaluation

Learning and evaluation is fostered in organisations where there is an appreciation of the importance of learning to the organisation (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002:106). In the last decade the emphasis on learning is evident in policy programmes. Research has shown that budgets for training purposes are often inadequate (Mac Donald, 2003; Robinson and Cottrell, 2005). As part of the criteria for accessing funding, most policies mandate that organisations are required to build evaluations into programmes. Sullivan and Skelcher (2002) argue that for those engaged in local partnerships, external evaluation can be irrelevant because it is of more interest to the government department that commissioned it than the collaboration itself. More often than not, these evaluations report after the lifetime of the collaboration and consequently are not in keeping with changing agendas.

Evaluative frameworks, for measuring empirically the partnership process, appear underdeveloped (Hastings, 1996). Dowling and Powell (2004) suggest that the literature supports the claim that evaluations of the impact of partnerships, with associated difficulty of attribution and causality, can be problematic. In particular it can be difficult to assess the counter-factual and suggest that the value added by collaboration between partners and its impact, as well as cost effectiveness, need to be better measured and documented - in other words to look at collaborative advantage as well as collaborative disadvantage.
Most of the literature on public sector partnerships is informed by normative assumptions about the efficacy of partnership working and its suitability as a governance mechanism (Jacobs, 2010:2). Jacobs argues that a more insightful line of enquiry would be ‘to explore the actual processes of engagement in which organizations struggle to make complex problems manageable’. The literature suggests that while there is no shortage of resources on how ‘to do’ partnership, there is very little theoretical or empirical evidence to inform policy makers about when to use partnerships and which partnerships are appropriate (Lowndes and Skelcher, 1998; Powell and Dowling, 2006) and therefore exploring a number of theoretical approaches to help understand partnership better would be helpful (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002). Rummery (2006:224) contends that the policy impetus and academic discourse on welfare partnerships has concentrated mainly on inter-organisational issues and have not adequately explored issues of governance, which might be of concern to service-users such as democratic participation, accountability and user outcomes. Rummery further contends that while policy makers have acted on the assumption that partnership leads to improved outcomes for users and communities, this assumption is unsupported by a large body of empirical studies refuting the argument that the failure of the welfare state to tackle social problems is down largely to not working in partnership.

**Sustainable Practice**

To be sustainable, the logic of the partnership must continue to make sense at different levels and over an extended period of time as this will involve change in personnel, objectives and financing. Each project undertaken by the partnership is unique and should be ‘customised to the nth degree’ Douglas (2009:131). A partnership that is formed on a vague strategy to enable partners to access external funding, but does not include an integration requirement, is unsustainable (ibid). Empowering participants in the partnership encourages them to take responsibility for, and ownership of, certain programmes which in turn may lead to long term programme sustainability and a culture of self-help (Greer, 2001:28). The issue of sustainable public policy and public service is raised by Osborne (2010). He suggests that the nature of new public governance is such that it requires more interaction with public policy and public services than the regimes of public administration and new public management (NPM). For this reason greater attention
to the issue of sustainability is important, not alone in terms of public policies, public service organisations and public services but also more broadly on societal and environmental sustainability. He argues that sustainability should be considered from different perspectives such as developing sustainable income streams and funding for public services; the sustainability of public service organisations as discrete entities; the sustainability of services delivered through public service organisations and delivery systems and their impact for users and communities and the long-term effects of these public services on environmental and ecological sustainability (ibid: 418). In essence, sustainability is a broad issue and one which warrants more investigation as resources shrink in the global economy.

Elaborating on the above determinants of successful partnership attests to the complexity of the process. The literature suggests that collaborating in partnership may not always be ‘what works best’ in a given situation. Taking a normative view, multi-agency partnership is mandated in Irish public policy for delivering public services. This current research provides empirical evidence, which will add to the understanding of the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of collaboration in multi-agency partnership, in local governance for the Irish context. The following section, on the status of MAP in Ireland, provides a backdrop for the research.

**Multi-Agency Partnership: The Irish Context**

Partnership is not a new concept to public administration in Ireland. Collaboration and social partnership came to prominence in the mid eighties in Ireland, when the social and economic situation became critical. There were high levels of unemployment, very poor fiscal returns to the exchequer and emigration levels were rising (*A Strategy for Development*, National Economic and Social Council (NESC) 1986-1990). There was dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of the instruments of the centralised welfare system to tackle the crisis (Sabel, 1996:36). New ways were sought and the government turned to the concept of governance through partnership to provide collaborative resolutions to the problems (Moseley *et al* 2001:177).

Subsequently, a number of ‘national agreements’ were negotiated between ‘social partners’ which included trade unions, business representatives and farmer organisations (Geoghegan and Powell, 2006). The purpose of these agreements was to stabilize the economy by negotiating wage agreements and preventing industrial
action. ‘Social Partnership’ was to be the vehicle to drive development in social, health and education policies, with particular reference to the socially excluded and marginalised. The latter groups were included in the social partnership wage negotiations from 1997 onwards under the ‘community and voluntary pillar’ (Callanan, 2005:917).

The development of ‘social partnership’ institutions is described by Ó’Riain, (2006:311) as ‘one of the most striking and surprising aspects’ of the transformation of Irish society and politics. The Irish model of social partnership, regarded as a distinctive mode of governance, and one which has been regarded as closely adhering to EU obligations, has been adopted by European countries as the preferred mode of regulation for the contemporary European state (Corcoran, 2006: 401).

‘Social partnership’ as it developed in Ireland, quickly became more inclusive than the corporatist model, which focused on national wage agreements. It extended to area-based partnerships with a social exclusion brief or to promote rural development, or to national fora advocating on behalf of the community and voluntary sector (Ó’Riain: 2006:312). Partnerships, as institutions, became an integral part of the policy formation and implementation process (Hardiman, 2006) and the community and voluntary pillar ensured that neo-liberal tendencies were tempered by putting unemployment and marginalisation on the partnership agenda (Larragy, 2006). Hardiman argues that with the drop-off in participatory democracy there is value in social partnership. While it has drawbacks such as its democratic legitimacy, the limit of representation and the capacity of the Dáil to discuss issues under consideration by partnerships, it has dealt effectively with difficult issues over time and supported the inclusion of a broad-base of social interests (Hardiman 2006:369). Economic growth, however, weakened this stance early in the twenty-first century when unemployment figures fell. But since 2007, with the collapse of the economy in Ireland giving rise to a recession, the focus is back on social partnership as a way of riding out the storm. While social partnership is considered an effective mechanism for bolstering a stable economy, Hardiman (2006:369) suggests, its contribution to addressing welfare gaps is more limited as the issues raised are determined by what is feasible within the partnership process. More recently in June 2010, The Public Sector Agreement 2010-2014 (Croke Park Agreement) was signed and although the deals brokered under previous agreements
proved resilient, already there is speculation as to whether *The Croke Park Agreement* will survive current recessionary times as it is likely that it will need to be reviewed due to the severity of the crisis.

Notwithstanding these reservations, social partnership was recognised as being successful at national level, and several policy initiatives were introduced by the Irish state, providing the foundation for social partnership at local level. Support was provided for underdeveloped community development groups established in the 1980s, to address poverty and disadvantage. Area-based partnerships were set up to support economic and social development. The Community Development Programme, established in 1990 is the most significant of these programmes (Geoghegan and Powell, 2006).

Area-based social inclusion measures meant providing supplementary supports to geographical areas rather than to specific sectors in society to mitigate disadvantage. This mirrored the type of response made in the US and Europe from the 1960s in the area of urban regeneration (Fahey *et al* 2011). In Europe, such initiatives were supported by EU funding opportunities. Requirements of the EU, and the ‘principle of subsidiarity’, contributed to this partnership approach. Area-based measures were introduced in Ireland from the 1980s under the Third EU Poverty Programme (1989-94) and the EU’s Urban Initiative 1994-1998. Between 1988 and 1990, the first Integrated Rural Development programme was introduced into twelve pilot areas by the Department of Agriculture (Walsh *et al* 1998). It was from these area-based measures that local ‘partnership companies’ were set up in urban and rural areas. In the rural areas, these partnerships were known as ‘LEADER partnerships’ as they were funded by the EU LEADER Initiative which was promoting a bottom-up approach to rural development (Fahey *et al* 2011). The number of these non-statutory agencies, with representation from government, business and the community sector, grew between 1990 and the early 2000s. Their brief was to address disadvantage by tackling long-term unemployment; developing local development projects to provide employment; promoting entrepreneurship and the social economy in deprived neighbourhoods and supporting initiatives for the marginalised (Teague *et al* 2004).
By 2000, there were ninety (90) area-based partnerships. With the introduction of the Local Cohesion Process in 2004 to achieve greater integration of local development companies, this number has since decreased to fifty-four (54) (Fahey et al 2011). Two large-scale area-based initiatives introduced in 2001 were RAPID (Revitalising Areas by Planning, Investment and Development) with responsibility for urban areas and CLÁR with responsibility for rural areas. By 2009, there were in excess of one hundred and eighty (180) community development projects around the country but by the end of 2010, because of the recession which took hold from 2007 onwards, that number was reduced to one hundred and sixty four (164).

Another major area-based initiative was the Community Development Programme introduced in the 1990s to fund community development resource centres in disadvantaged areas. The Community Development Programme (CDP) and the Local Development Social Inclusion Programme (LDSIP), two of the three major community programmes, were integrated in 2010 and replaced by a new programme called the Local and Community Development Programme (LCDP). This programme is currently implemented throughout the country by fifty-four (54) non-profit agencies known as Local Development Companies (LDCs) which are mainly made up of Community Development Projects (CDPs) and Partnerships. Their focus remains on unemployment, education and enterprise and more recently on initiatives to tackle social issues such as lone parents; childcare; drug misuse; health, crime and anti-social behaviour problems (Fahey et al 2011).

Multi-Agency Partnership in Local Government in Ireland
The global trend towards participative democracy and the social partnership agreements influenced the development of Strategic Policy Committees (SPCs) as ‘institutionalized’ forms of participation at local government level in Ireland (Callanan, 2005). In 1996, the Irish government policy initiative Better Local Government, A Programme for Change, supported greater participation of the elected politician and greater opportunity for local interests to be involved in the policy making process. Strategic Policy Committees were developed to facilitate this approach and to provide an inclusive framework for long-term policy development at local level (Callanan, 2005:917). SPCs were given statutory recognition under section 48 of the Local Government Act 2001 allowing SPCs to ‘consider matters
connected with the formulation, development, monitoring and review of policy which relate to the functions of the local authority and to advise the authority on those matters’. Guidelines for establishing SPCs were distributed to city and county councils from the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DoEHLG). The SPCs cover specific functions of the council. Two-thirds of the SPC comprises elected members and the remaining third represents sectoral interests. The latter group consists of representatives of social partners, community and voluntary groups and relevant local interests. The committee is supported by local authority officials. The chairperson of the SPC is nominated by the council and must be a council member. There should be a nominee from each of the following sectors on at least one committee in the SPC scheme in each local authority: agriculture/farming (for rural councils); environmental/conservation/culture; development/construction; trade union; and community/voluntary/disadvantaged. The chairperson of the council and the chairperson of each SPC form a Corporate Policy Group (CPG) which coordinates the SPCs. The CPG also has a role in corporate planning, budgets and customer service issues. In essence, the purpose of the CPG structure is ‘to create an embryonic ‘cabinet style’ structure within Irish local government’ (Callanan, 2005:920). According to Quinn (2011), structures such as CDBs, as discussed in chapter two, SPCs and CPGs ‘facilitate better policy-making and dispersed policy-ownership’ and the embedding of such networks and partnerships has permanently altered the mechanisms of local government. In theory, this framework appears to embrace the pluralistic principles of the governance paradigm, but as previously noted, beyond the rhetoric, as a governance mechanism, participatory local governance is difficult to achieve.

Perceptions of Partnership Governance
Partnership governance is a contested concept in Ireland with views on its effectiveness ranging from the more sceptical or minimalist to the more optimistic. At the more sceptical or minimalist end it has been described as a replica of the US model incorporating capitalist deficiencies of inequality and injustice (Allen 2000); ‘as state-directed organization of the economy in the name of the nation’ (O’Carroll, 2002:15); and as a facility for including non-elected bodies in democratic structures (O’Cinnéide, 1998/1999), (O’Cinnéide, Allen and O’Carroll cited in Geoghegan and Powell, 2006). On the more optimistic side it is regarded as reflecting ‘the new
localism’ which involves actors in tackling issues at local level (Moseley et al 2001:176). Although they admit that their thesis is contestable, Teague and Murphy (2004: Introduction) argue that the Irish model represents a ‘post-corporatist’ method of economic and social governance and suggest that it captures three types of development considered to be pioneering. The first is that it is innovative as it expands on the traditional corporatist arrangements that included only the trade unions and employer organisations and now includes civil society in national social agreements. The second is that it includes ‘deliberation’ by introducing new forms of decision-making into the policy process and third it includes decentralised social agreements to take cognisance of local knowledge expertise and experience. Teague and Murphy, however, suggest these arguments might be open to criticism, particularly from those with strong traditional convictions in industrial relations. They set out to provide supporting evidence for their argument in a case study of two programmes that require partnership and collaboration namely Area Development Management (established 1992 and called Pobal since 2005) and the Social Economy Programme (2002) established under the national social partnership agreement The Programme for Prosperity and Fairness (2000-2002). They conclude that local partnership arrangements have been beneficial, but on a more practical level, they have not exactly changed the face of local democracy in the Irish context either. More generally, according to Moseley et al (2001:179), partnerships facilitate local government reform so that local authorities can play a more active leadership role in the partnership process. Another positive view of partnership in the Irish context is taken by Sabel (1996) who, as referenced earlier, describes the Irish version of partnership as an exercise in ‘democratic experimentalism’ (Sabel, 1996). Sabel saw significant opportunity for learning, to enhance national socio-economic development, in this type of partnership governance and internal iterative processes, because of the inclusion of community representation. Sabel’s view, however, was later questioned by Haase and McKeown (2003) cited in Fahey et al (2011) who were not as convinced of the extent of learning that local partnership companies facilitate.

**Issues in Multi-Agency Partnership in the Irish Context**

Research has shown that the way in which partnerships are constructed raises issues for democracy including the role of local government and elected representatives
Sabel (1996:36) draws attention to a number of issues in partnerships including: (i) that of accountability, (ii) the impact of the partnership and (iii) informality of structures. Regarding accountability of those involved in the partnership, he argues that, under the Companies Act, members of partnerships are responsible to the partnership company and not the organisations they represent. This, he suggests, provides opportunity for exploitation of resources provided by national bureaucracies, social partners or community groups, as the partners are not directly answerable to these agencies. To the extent to which the partnerships avail of these opportunities, they may become a complement to, or a partial substitute for local government, yet they are ‘engaging in the kind of participatory reform of established institutions that bypasses most formal democratic procedures’ (ibid:36). On partnership impact, Sabel (1996:88) argues that it is difficult to assess the impact made by partnerships as the information provided, either informally or through marketing material is limited. Moseley et al (2001) concur suggesting that output figures can be questionable without evidence of what might have happened anyway without the programme. Sabel argues for a thorough assessment of strengths and weaknesses, to ascertain what has been learnt. Finally, the hitherto informality of structures may be problematic as an eclectic mix of partnerships is institutionalised. Sabel’s (1996:92-3) notion of ‘democratic experimentalism’ to counteract issues that arise in partnerships includes mechanisms for self-assessment and comparative assessment by the partnerships to improve the quality of programmes and initiatives and improve accountability. Overall, Sabel concludes that partnerships in Ireland, as a de-centred mechanism of governance have been effective for targeting the most disadvantaged groups and involving communities in their own regeneration (ibid, 1996:115).

To enable more efficient partnership collaboration and to allow for complex relationships, more formalised structures may be required (Moseley et al, 2001:180). Research on one such structure was conducted in 2002/3 by the Institute of Public Administration in Ireland (IPA) on the efficacy of SPCs on behalf of the DoEHLG. The research showed that the notion of partnership has been accepted by the majority of participants in the study and they welcomed the opportunity for worthwhile participation in the decision-making process. Although there was criticism of some SPCs, it was suggested that through the SPCs, members became more aware of the
constraints on local authorities and this enhanced mutual understanding and co-
operation. The research found that politicians generally did not fear being
marginalised because of non-elected membership and many regarded membership of
the SPCs as an opportunity to seek a broad spectrum of views on various topics.
They were reassured by the fact that SPC recommendations had still to be ratified by
the full council. Accountability and representativeness were raised and questions
were asked about the representativeness of certain sectoral members and the extent to
which they might report to community groups or businesses. There were concerns
around ethics and transparency and the extent to which non-elected members were
not subject to rules on freedom of information. Another issue raised was that of
equality of participation and the inclusion of marginalised groups. While efforts
were made to be inclusive, the structure and size of the SPCs means that numbers are
limited and it is difficult to have a wide variety of organisations represented and
multiple views considered. In some instances there was a perception on behalf of the
local authority staff, elected members and sectoral representatives that the
participants representing the communities were the ‘usual suspects’, namely those
who were regular contributors to public fora. The research found that where a
particular group was represented, representation was usually limited to those items of
interest to that group rather than the wider community. Maintaining public interest
in SPCs was problematic. There was a growing perception that SPCs could become
‘talking shops’ and attendance at meetings was difficult to secure unless in some
cases there was an issue of interest to the sectoral interests. The issue of costs, both
financial and time, that participation in SPCs entails was raised by many participants
as well as the need for continuity between meetings. The issues raised here in
relation to SPCs in Ireland are consistent with findings in other countries. Although
tensions arise, the research shows that institutionalising SPCs seems to have
provided an opportunity to ‘marry representative and participatory democracy at
local level’ (Callanan, 2005:927).

Recent research conducted by Adshead and McInerney for the National Economic
and Social Forum (NESF), 2010, on the challenges for local participatory
governance, using CDBs, SPCs, RAPID, LTACC and local community group case
studies, builds on this research and shows that context is significant whether the
governance mechanism is located within the local government structure, in direct
government control or as an independent entity. It also demonstrated a need for a broader understanding of local participatory governance particularly within the local electoral system; to find innovative ways to manage conflicting views; and for stronger links between representative organisations, local government organisations and the community. They suggest the need for: structures with solid foundations leading to changes in institutional culture and practice; capacity-building in collaborative practices; recognition of skills deficits; a problem-solving focus; funding to enable participation of civil society; and more collaboration amongst civil society organisations themselves to learn how to collaborate more effectively. These findings concur with the determinants of successful partnership as outlined earlier in this chapter.

**Conclusion**

Studies in the Irish context, on partnership and collaboration at the local level, reflect findings in the international context particularly in the UK, the US and Australia. The rhetoric on partnership and collaboration speaks to its efficacy. Its limitations, nevertheless, are recognised. Partnership to combat social exclusion and particularly to deal with ‘wicked problems’, has been recognised in public policy since the 1980s in Ireland and is now an integral part of the way in which public services are delivered. A number of conditions were found in the research to contribute to successful partnership working. These included the culture, and legitimacy of the partnership and the environment in which it was established; the need for partnership structures with participatory foundations; and the capacity building required for collaborative practices. The research also found that the type of partnership determines the extent of the democratic deficit and a much debated issue is that of the role of local politicians and citizens in local partnerships raising issues of legitimacy and accountability.

The literature review in chapter two identified three areas of change, related to the broad governance paradigm, for investigation in this research. These areas were further elaborated on, at a micro level, in chapter three, in relation to the multi-agency partnership as a governance mechanism.

Table 3.1 below presents the foundation of a conceptual framework based on the literature review which will be further expanded on in chapter four and five.
Table 3.1 Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance Paradigm: Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of Successful Multi-Agency Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure/Institutional Change</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Structure)</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process Change</td>
<td>Democratic Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Process and Participation)</td>
<td>Power-sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Innovative and Sustainable Services</td>
<td>Reflective Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outcome)</td>
<td>- knowledge management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- coordination and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4
Methodology

Introduction
This study explores the following question, with special reference to community safety:

Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?

The purpose of this chapter and the next is to discuss the methodological framework within which this research is undertaken. The methodological underpinnings of the research are explained and arguments made to support choices. The aim is to demonstrate the quality and strength of the research as a basis upon which the validity of this research is claimed. ‘Partnerships are organizational manifestations of institutional design for collaboration’ (Skelcher et al 2005:574). Methodological triangulation is employed to explore the narrative of multi-agency partnership and collaboration between the stakeholders in the process of public policy formulation and public service delivery. As may be seen in chapters two and three, collaborating in partnership raises questions of power, authority, legitimacy and accountability, amongst others, within collaborative spaces, and creates tensions. The research methods were selected to allow a theoretically informed empirical exploration of these and other issues. In the first instance, an outline of the research design is presented here to provide an overview of the broader research framework. In the next chapter, a description of the case study in community safety is provided and the methodology is explicated further to give thick description of the research methods. Despite efforts to ensure the quality of the research, no design is without its limitations and this study is no exception. An account of the design limitations are provided at the end of chapter five, rather than in this one, so that the reader can get a vicarious understanding of the research design as it is constructed by the researcher.

The research is conducted in the longitudinal single case study tradition. The unit of analysis for the exploration of MAP is the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited. Case studies are used extensively in public administration. They are empirical inquiries through which contemporary phenomenon, within a
real-life context, may be investigated (Yin, 1994: xiii). As the review of the literature shows, in chapter two and three, context can either impede or support successful partnerships. Case studies allow the investigation of the contextual conditions when the researcher believes they are pertinent to the phenomenon under study (Yin, 1994:13).

This was a longitudinal case study, carried out over a three year period from late 2006 (October) to early (May) 2010. The research undertaken for this project was both qualitative and quantitative. Multiple sources of evidence were used to enhance the validity of the research, through methodological triangulation, in order to allow the researcher space to explore a broader range of historical, attitudinal and behavioural issues and allow cross-referencing of data. This helped to verify conclusions and minimise bias caused by the researcher being the sole observer (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Patton, 1987: 60). However, the most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of evidence is the development of converging lines of inquiry (Yin, 1994:92). Triangulation can minimise misperception and the invalidity of the conclusions (Stake, 1995:134). The quality of this research improved by continuing to cover each of the following throughout: construct validity (by having multiple sources of evidence, establishing a chain of evidence, having key informants and validation of reports); internal validity (explanation building, time series analysis); external validity (by establishing the domain to which the study’s findings could be generalised) and reliability (by using case study protocol and developing a case study data base). Guba and Lincoln (1981) propose four analogous terms with the naturalistic paradigm to supplant these rationalistic terms: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

The research was conducted in three phases and is presented here chronologically. When a study runs over a lengthy period of time, it may be wise to consider dividing up the study into phases (Boyle, 1993). Phasing a study facilitates the production of interim reports which enable progress to be reviewed thus increasing construct validity (Yin, 1994:35). It can also break up the study into manageable ‘chunks’ which can be tackled sequentially. The analysis of chronological events is a frequent technique in case studies and adds to the strength of the case study as it allows the researcher to investigate events over time. Arranging the events chronologically permits the investigator to determine causal events (Yin, 1994:116-7). It was the
intention of the researcher to draw on a number of established theoretical frameworks, found in the academic literature, and to use them as building blocks in the research design (Eisenhardt, 1989). The overarching research for each phase is presented in a table at the end of this chapter in Table 4.5. While it is presented chronologically, this does not mean that each research tool was used sequentially in each phase. The process involved numerous iterations (Yin, 1994:111). The core research activities, such as the literature review and monitoring for example, were on-going. The multiple sources of evidence used to improve the quality of this case study included the literature review, documentary evidence, participant and process observation, in-depth interviews, meetings with key actors and note-taking and the development of a priori ToC programme model for the Partnership. An evaluation of the community safety pilot Scheme, introduced by the Partnership, was used as an embedded case study, to further explore collaboration in multi-agency partnership and in particular the benefits of MAP for improved service delivery. Incorporating a subunit (such as the Scheme in this case), can add significant opportunity for more extensive analysis and thus enhance the insights into the single case (Yin, 1994: 44). Evaluation of the Scheme included interviews, surveys, focus groups, workshops, log-book construction and analysis, SWOT analysis, review of photographic, video and web page material and field tours. The role of the researcher was to collect the data sought in Table 4.5 below. This table therefore helped to clarify exactly what information was sought and how the data was used subsequently (Yin, 1994:73).

Monitoring and evaluating the Partnership and the Scheme in the case study culminated in a validated interim and final case report which satisfied the applied rationale for the research. To satisfy the academic rationale for the research, that is to provide an understanding of the MAP approach to the implementation and delivery of public services, and to develop a theoretically informed model of multi-agency partnership between public sector agencies in local governance, the research design was heavily influenced by governance, multi-agency partnership and programme logic theory. The research methods used were selected specifically for their suitability for exploring, investigating and explaining these theories. The researcher used governance and multi-agency partnership theory to categorise and describe factors critical to the notion of governance and successful MAP. Programme logic theory, and specifically the theory of change (TOC) programme
model for the Partnership, was used to create a framework for a model of good practice to be tested in the case study. The researcher interpreted the data gathered through the social constructivist paradigm. The epistemological stance taken in the study will be elaborated on later in this chapter.

The Research Design
The research design was influenced by the rationale for the study. The first purpose, stipulated by the sponsor (the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government (now Environment, Community and Local Government), was to have the research conducted by means of a doctoral study to produce theoretical and empirical evidence, for use in policy development of MAP in the public sector, with special reference to community safety. To satisfy the latter aim, a second purpose of the research was to monitor and evaluate the pilot Scheme in community safety, delivered through a multi-agency partnership approach, which was introduced on selected public housing estates in Limerick City by the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited. Tension may arise when conducting research for applied as well as academic purposes and researchers must plan strategies to ease tensions which may arise (Rapaport, 1970:506; Marshall & Rossman, 1989:68 ). In order to satisfy both the applied and academic purposes, two approaches were made explicit between the researcher and the sponsor at the outset.

The Partnership, as the unit of analysis in the single case study, served the following academic purpose for the researcher:

1. To monitor and evaluate the Partnership and the partnership process for policy development and public service delivery;
2. To use the Scheme, implemented by the Partnership, as an ‘embedded case study’ in order to test multi-agency partnership theory in practice by exploring the value or otherwise of the MAP to providing public services for the service users;
3. To design a theoretically-informed model of good practice for multi-agency partnership collaboration in local governance.

The evaluation of the Scheme was used for the following developmental, formative and summative purposes by the Partnership:

1. To monitor and evaluate the Scheme and make recommendations with regards to its operation;
2. To produce data which adds to an understanding of the issues confronting agencies and communities vis a vis anti-social behaviour;
3. To identify the impact of the Scheme and the factors determining that impact;
4. To identify good practice and effective innovation, as well as limitations and constraints, in delivering a community safety intervention through MAP in local governance.

While there were two streams to this study (the academic and applied), they were not mutually exclusive. The overarching research framework had the advantage of allowing the researcher to extrapolate data from each stream, as the research progressed, in order to make claims and counter-claims when interpreting the findings. This iterative process added to the validity of the findings. For example, the literature review was useful for explaining events while the interim case report on the Scheme, which was presented to the Partnership after the first year of operation, was used by the researcher in phase two of the research, as further evidence to corroborate or contradict findings in relation to the added value of working in MAP. While the evaluation of the Scheme was the main focus of the research for the Partnership, although representing a significant component of the academic research, it was but one of several research tools, as outlined below, used in the case study by the researcher to explore the dynamics of the MAP approach to service delivery and to develop the model of MAP for local governance. To achieve these aims the case was evaluated from three perspectives: the Partnership structure itself, the process, and the service outcome.

**Epistemological Stance**

The arguments advanced in this work are empirical truth claims.

When a qualitative inquirer makes a claim (assertion, statement, working hypothesis, etc.) about an event, object, process, person, or so on and offers as evidence or warrant for that claim its relationship to experience (something the inquirer or respondents saw or heard), then that inquirer is engaging in empirical inquiry. (Schwandt, 2001:69)

The nature of the planned research was exploratory describing ‘how’ and ‘why’ the MAP approach might be used to advantage (Yin, 1994:7; Patton, 1987:37). The research sought to construct the partnership model by operationalising the theory. The intention was to provide an understanding of the determinants of a successful MAP model and to attempt to explicate causal linkages. For these reasons, the
research was conducted in the single longitudinal case study tradition and within the constructivist paradigm.

Constructivism seeks to explain how individuals attribute meaning to the social milieu in which they exist and contrive to negotiate a sense of social order and one which takes into account the experiential, and how ‘individuals actively engage with their social worlds in a dynamic and sometimes conflictual way’ (Franklin, 1998: 202). It is particularly useful for understanding housing management. ‘Different actors and agents construct housing management in terms of their beliefs, ideologies and status, in an attempt to create and maintain a social order and reality which makes housing management meaningful to them’. These demands and expectations derive from the context within which housing management operates (ibid:202-3).

The distribution of power is a critical factor in MAP and constructivist evaluation acknowledges this from an institutional perspective. Social constructivist epistemological interpretive methods have been used in housing research of late and this approach is particularly suitable for exploring power relations as it recognises that management is dependent on a variety of value-laden assumptions (Jacobs and Manzi, 2000).

This case study was a pilot project, a unique case, as it was the first community safety intervention to be funded by the DoEHLG for local governance in the Irish context. The participants found themselves in some instances grappling with the unknown and endeavouring to make sense of their world. Within the social constructivist paradigm:

Realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible, mental construction, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature, and dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions. Constructions are not more or less ‘true’ in any absolute sense, but simply more or less informed and/or sophisticated. Constructions are alterable, as are their associated ‘realities’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1994:110).

The social constructivist paradigm allows scope in the case study for interpretation by the researcher of these social constructions. Interpretation ‘is the act of clarifying, explicating, or explaining the meaning of some phenomenon (Schwandt, 2001:133). As the issue of generalising to other cases can be problematic in single case study research, the use of the social constructivist paradigm is useful as there is an emphasis on describing things, plans, events and people as interpreted by key
actors with most knowledge of the case. The aim is to construct a clearer and more sophisticated reality (Stake, 1995:101; Weiss, 1998). Therefore from the constructivist viewpoint, the researcher did not have to avoid delivering generalisations but instead sought to enable the reader to do their own generalisation with the evidence provided.

The constructivist approach holds that policy work ‘actually interprets and constructs the meanings of the ideas and what constitutes usable knowledge about the ideas in any given policy area’ rather than searching for the ‘right’ definition of such ideas and objectively and rationally pursuing goals (Hess and Adams., 2002:71). The conceptual framework for the research design outlines how multi-agency collaboration for service provision in the public sector can take place from the early stages of planning, design, operational management, and delivery through to monitoring and evaluation. In this sense, service provision may be conceptualised as a process of social construction in which the stakeholders negotiate rules, norms, and institutional frameworks rather than merely accepting the rules of the game (Bovaird, 2007). Social construction provides a way ‘to understand institutions, values, roles, norms, actors and preferences as constructions so that we can understand why A leads to B in some contexts and not in others’ (Dahler-Larsen, 2001:336). But the constructivist does not assert that all claims are equal, instead interprets those which have the stronger support. In this research discourse within the Partnership was crucially implicated in shaping the nature of the MAP.

Contemporary social issues are such that legitimate knowledge varies from one situation and group to the next culminating in uncertainty. Recent trends towards collaborative governing have taken policy development down the constructivist path allowing a diverse range of actors to contribute to the policy process (Hess and Adams, 2002:68). Knowledge is socially constructed through ongoing dialogue between the stakeholders. Some issues are so complex that they are beyond the capacity of any single agent to understand and react appropriately (Boxelaar et al 2006) as is the case with community safety. In these situations, the knowledge and capacity to generate insights is vested in those most directly involved and the positivist concept of objective, value-free knowledge is not relevant (Alford 2001:12 in Boxelaar et al 2006:113). The social constructivist approach takes account of this issue and provides useful space for interpreting stakeholders’ reality.
Operationalising the Key Concepts
A triangulation of theoretical perspectives underpinned this thesis and they were described in chapter two and three, namely the two substantive theories of governance, and multi-agency partnership. Programme theory will be discussed in the research design later in the chapter.

Governance
Writers on governance agree that, as a concept, governance is difficult to define. It is, nevertheless, a concept that has gained prominence in the literature on public administration and public management reform. Governance is seen as being broader than government and mooted as an antidote for the imperfections of the traditional, hierarchical model of government. Explicating the paradigm shift from government to governance, points to a normative view of governance, a concept advanced as a better way than government to respond to the impact of contemporary economic, social and political challenges. It is this normative view of governance that is taken in this study. It is seen as a process that involves a plurality of actors, located from both inside and outside government, that collaborate for policy development and employ flexible modes of delivery for public services. This governance framework underpins the MAP, explored in this thesis, as an innovative mechanism of public service delivery in local governance.

Multi-Agency Partnership (MAP)
Many different forms of partnership are presented in the extant literature. Some partnerships are categorised according to which sectors are involved such as public-private, public-public, public-voluntary and public-community partnerships. Partnerships may be formal or informal. It is the public-public and formal type of partnership that is exemplified in this study. It is a partnership formed between three public sector agencies, a local authority, An Garda Síochána and the HSE, committed to working together to tackle the ‘wicked problem’ of community safety.

Multi-agency partnership, as a governance mechanism, is seen as facilitating integration within the increasingly fragmented organisational structure of the public sector. It is acknowledged as being central to policy development and delivery. The impact of the global economic recession and the demand for more accountability and transparency underpins the MAP which is advocated in public policy as an approach
which has the potential to make better use of resources, to prevent overlapping and to minimise costs. In other words, MAP, in this study has the potential to deliver more for less.

Collaboration

As one of the more familiar forms of collaboration, terms such as MAP and collaboration are often used interchangeably, as is the case in this study, where there is a recognition between the partners of long-term commitment and mutual dependency and an expectation of gaining ‘collaborative advantage’. This means that each partner organisation expects to achieve an output that would not have been achieved without collaboration. Collaborating in this sense is more than networking which may be regarded as associating informally and having strong social capital such as trust and reciprocity. It means that partner agencies must take responsibility for assessing the need for action, deciding what type of action is required and how it might be implemented. This is how collaboration is represented in this study.

Research Questions

This research explores the following question, with special reference to community safety:

*Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?*

Two hypotheses and associated empirical questions were proposed to satisfy the academic elements of the research. They were grounded in the data and tested in interaction with, rather than against it (Maxwell, 1996:53). The conceptual framework, presented below as an aide memoire, was informed by the extant literature on governance and partnership theory in chapters two and three. This framework guided the research design, underpinned the hypotheses and focused the empirical questions. Chapter six reports the findings from the theoretically informed empirical investigation of these questions.

In chapter three the following initial conceptual framework was presented:
Conceptual Framework as presented in Chapter Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance Paradigm: Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of Successful Multi-Agency Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure/Institutional Change (Structure)</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process Change (Process and Participation)</td>
<td>Democratic Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power-sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Innovative and Sustainable Services (Outcome)</td>
<td>Reflective Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- knowledge management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- coordination and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1: Governance

As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.

Empirical Research Question:
Does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism, enhance delivery and outcome of public services? (structure)

Hypothesis 2: Public Policy Implementation and Service Delivery

Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.

Empirical Research Questions:
1. Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process)
2. Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)

As this was the first study to get underway, in the Irish local governance context, of a multi-agency partnership in community safety, the researcher sought to identify a research design that could be replicated in future local or national research or used in the future for comparative analysis with studies in other countries. For that reason the researcher drew on research tools, used successfully internationally for academic research conducted in the domain of public governance, to provide a theoretically informed empirical exploration of the research questions. The design was
sufficiently comprehensive to reflect the complex nature of MAP while at the same
time intelligible to all stakeholders, thereby satisfying both the applied and academic
rationale for the research.

To guide the conceptual framework for the research design, and to strengthen its
validity, the researcher used five techniques. First, the researcher was drawn to
academics Lowery and Evans (2004) and their work on improving the quality of
research in public administration. They proposed a model for use in empirical
research that borrowed from the work of Creswell (1994, 1998), Denzin and Lincoln
(1998) and Habermas’s (1984) four-fold taxonomy of truth claims –empirical,
normative, aesthetic and expressive, (Lowery and Evans, 2004:313-4). The model
differentiates between the paradigms on the one hand and theoretical perspectives on
the other that should guide the research project. In the model, qualitative research
methods that employ constructivist/interpretive paradigms and complementary
techniques and data sources are identified as appropriate strategies for the
examination of empirical truth claims. The researcher used this model to validate the
overall research design, ensuring each critical element was addressed including
identification of truth claim, paradigmatic stance, theoretical perspective, methods
and techniques/data sources.

Second, in order to guide the research design and provide an a priori conceptual
model of good practice in multi-agency partnership collaboration, the researcher
conducted a literature review on programme theory. Programme models were sought
that might be used to guide theory-driven evaluation research of a pilot programme
in the public sector; that would suit a complex policy context with an ever-changing
environment; and allow space for emerging themes and critical reflection. Theory-
driven evaluation ‘is based on the premise that performance should be understood in
terms of the causal model held by policy designers, which could include all actors
with a stake in the desired outcomes’ (Skelcher et al 2008:752). The two most
commonly used theory-driven evaluation models are the Theory of Change (ToC)
(Connell et al 1995) and Realistic Evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). As this
was a developing pilot Scheme, and as such was only exploring realistic aims and
objectives, the researcher selected the ToC approach over the ‘realistic evaluation’
model as appropriate. In the ToC, outcomes and activities are linked to explain how
and why desired change might be expected. It is a ‘hybrid of process and outcomes
analyses’ used without a comparison group to explore actions and activities (Sullivan, 2004). It provides more scope to construct and interpret programme meanings and realities and can be grounded in a hypothesis. Hypotheses are a rationale, informed by the research literature that shows potential to work and is therefore something worth trying. Programmes based on hypotheses are innovations (Knowlton et al. 2009). ToC models are distinct in that they include assumptions in which the how and why of the model are revealed in the strategies (either explicitly or implicitly). The most viable assumptions used to select strategies are based in knowledge which generally includes research, practice and theory. A ToC, grounded in evidence from the literature, promotes plausibility (Knowlton et al. 2009). The ToC represents a generalised construct of the programme and requires justifications at each step. When well constructed, it can ensure intellectual rigour for programme logic models. ToC is a ‘causal model’ as hypotheses about causal relationships must be articulated. It is possible, along the chain of events in the intervention, to judge the process, the achievement of the stated objectives so far and the probability of arriving at a positive outcome. ToC is useful for critical thinking, explicates the pathway for change and works best when it is necessary to design a complex initiative and when an explanation is required as to the reasons why an initiative worked or did not work, and what exactly went wrong (Clark, 2004).

Literature from the US uncovered the seminal work of Connell et al. (1995) and their work which introduced the notion of using a theory of change (ToC) approach to evaluating comprehensive community initiatives. To understand the concept further, the researcher reviewed the web-based work of Auspos and Kubisch (2004) and Anderson (2004) at the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change as well as the W.K. Kellogg (2001) and Annie E. Casey (2004) Foundations who were instrumental in spreading the use of programme logic models. The work of Rosenbaum (2002) in the US was also useful to elaborate on issues relating to the evaluation of multi-agency, anti-crime partnerships. The literature also showed that over the past two decades the ToC approach to developing and evaluating public sector programmes has grown in the UK. It has been used extensively to evaluate public programmes involving multiple agencies such as the Local Strategic Partnerships (Geddes et al. 2007), Local Public Service Agreements (Sullivan, 2004), the British Crime Reduction Programme (Tilley, 2004), and the Health Action Zones.
More recently it has been used in the UK by the Safer Sunderland Partnership to develop their strategic plan for 2008-2023.

A significant endorsement of the use of the theory of change as a tool for evaluative research is the work of Geddes et al (2007) on the National Evaluation of Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) in the UK. They found this technique especially useful for evaluating elements of the Local Modernisation Agenda and strategic partnerships from which they explicated a ‘system of assumptions’ about the role of LSPs. For example they hypothesised that a framework of strategic partnership at the local level would create more inclusive and pluralist local governance and bring together organisations and actors (from the state, market and civil society) to identify communities’ needs and to work with local people to provide them. Their initial model constituted a broad research hypothesis about the LSPs and the linked processes through which positive outcomes could be achieved. This theory of change was consistent with the perception, in the policy community, of the advantages of collaborative partnership for tackling ‘wicked problems’, and achieving effective outcomes by building trust, sharing knowledge and resources and multi-agency collaboration. By developing a ToC model for LSPs, as their longitudinal study progressed, they were able to modify the model while preserving the core features.

Use of the ToC programme model to construct a model of good practice is consistent with the social constructivist paradigm as it allows space for multiple realities and theories. At the end of phase one, it allowed the researcher to formulate an a priori model of good practice. The model was then tested throughout the remainder of the research in phase two and three and formed the basis for a final model of good practice at the end of the study. The ToC had two main benefits for this research, it provided a framework which gave coherence to the diverse elements of the evaluation and served as a basis from which key elements of the evaluation were designed. Three attributes of a good ToC, that stakeholders should confirm are present before committing to an evaluation, are suggested by Connell et al (1998:19): – the ToC should be plausible – will the activities, if implemented, lead to desired outcomes? It should be doable – will the economic, technical, political, institutional, and human resources be available to carry out the initiative and it should be testable – how specific is the ToC so that an evaluator can track its progress in reliable and
practical ways. The initial *a priori* ToC model for the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership is presented in Table 4.1 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outputs and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional/Structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short-Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Governance)</td>
<td>(Multi-Agency Partnership)</td>
<td>Indicators for community safety = the incidents in the log-book template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context, Culture, Legitimacy</td>
<td>Power-Sharing, Leadership, Trust, Democratic Participation, Accountability, Evaluation and Reflective Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem identified and contextualised (situate in local and national context)</td>
<td>Identify resources, Participation, roles and responsibilities defined</td>
<td>Launch the Scheme/Activities Activities ➔ Change Improve Community Safety by: 1. Reducing Fear of Crime and ASB; 2. Improving the Environment; 3. Raising community Spirit; 4. Creating awareness of community safety on the housing estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Partners identified (cultures recognised)</td>
<td>Strategy developed Intervention mechanisms agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership established (legitimacy)</td>
<td>Evaluation commissioned and opportunity for reflective learning in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third, in order to inform the case study, the researcher drew on the work of Shields and Tajalli (2006) and the micro-conceptual frameworks they developed to give conceptual coherence to empirical research in public administration. From their experience of teaching research methods to Masters students at the Texas State University (Capstone Projects), they argued that research in the domain of public administration can lack strong theoretical support and they developed micro-conceptual frameworks which act like maps to guide the empirical research. The framework used for this research was the ‘practical ideal type’ which Shields and Tajalli suggest can be used to gauge the efficacy of programme processes by developing criteria for this judgement and then to collect empirical evidence to contrast the reality of the programme to the criteria (ibid:324). Use of this conceptual framework required the researcher to provide scholarly support for intrinsic elements of the research design. This included supporting evidence from the literature for selecting each of the determinants of successful multi-agency partnership, providing indicators for each variable and sources of the evidence as well as proposed research methods to explore each variable. To elucidate this framework, the first section of the conceptual framework is presented in Table 4.2 below and the remainder can be found in Appendix 1.
Table 4.2 Operationalising the Conceptual Framework (Based on work of Shields and Tajalli, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance Paradigm: Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of successful Multi-Agency Partnership</th>
<th>Scholarly Support</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Evidence Supports?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Media Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher Experience</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with key actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuffield Partnership Assessment</td>
<td>Nuffield Partnership Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Scheme</td>
<td>Evaluation of Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth research technique used was evaluation. In addition to monitoring the Partnership and the partnership process, an evaluation was conducted on the Scheme as an embedded case study (Yin, 1994: 41). While monitoring involves the methodical observation of procedures and processes, evaluation is concerned with ‘judging the merit against some yardstick’ and concerns outputs and outcomes as well (Glendinning, 2002:120). As shown in chapter two and three, there is growing government commitment to governance, partnership and evidence-based policy. Nevertheless, the evidence of value-added, which partnership working espouses, is scarce (Davies, 2002; Huxham and Vangen, 2004; Dowling et al 2004). In their literature review of research examining the impact of partnership, Dowling et al (ibid) distinguished between process measures and outcomes in their study and questioned whether partnership leads to better services or improved health for users recognising the attribution problem and that of establishing causality. Partnership may also be disadvantageous for the less powerful partners particularly those from non-public sector communities (Mann et al 2004). Davies (2002) suggests that working in partnership for public governance can lead to governance failure; that costs of partnership may outweigh the benefit; and they may not always be effective in addressing the very problems for which they were established. Bauld et al (2005) reported such a finding in their evaluation of the Health Action Zones (HAZ) project in the UK.

The purpose of conducting an evaluation is to ascertain the impact of an intervention and this poses complex methodological challenges (Atkinson, 2005). Leeuw (2005) suggests three reasons for the growth of evaluation (i) the need for transparency and accountability, (ii) for organisational learning and (iii) to find out the extent to which programmes can be effective. Guba and Lincoln (1981) and Strauss and Corbin (1990), argue that it is not possible to develop objective measures for applied research or if the environment is dynamic and context-bounded. Theoretically-driven evaluations such as the ToC as outlined above and Pawson and Tilley’s (1997) ‘realistic evaluation’ models claim to take account of these complexities (Cole, 2003). Theory-driven evaluations are premised on the notion that all programmes are ‘theories’ which are usually constructed from policy documents and goals and mission statements. These theories may be implicit, but since they are important for understanding the effectiveness of the programme, the evaluator
explicates them and articulates the underlying assumptions of how the programme is supposed to work. This is called the programme theory. That theory is then tested because there is no assurance that the programme theories are valid. Leeuw (2005:246) argues that programmes may be seen as intervention chains whereby one set of stakeholders provides resources to other sets of stakeholders with the expectation (theory) that behavioural change will follow. He suggests that evaluators should probe the following questions:

1. Is this policy reaching its target population?
2. How sound is the underlying ‘theory’ of this program?
3. Is the intervention being implemented well?
4. How effective is the program?
5. What is the relationship between costs and effects of this program? (Leeuw, 2005:234)

Evaluation is an essential tool for the learning organisation and must take cognisance of contextual factors. It is important for the evaluator to give meaning to the ‘texts’ produced by the stakeholders and their perception of reality in order to reduce evaluand ambiguity (Bezzi, 2006). In this way, evaluation is useful to build social reality.

The fifth research technique used by the researcher was to conduct web-based searches for partnership assessment tools to explore the health of the Partnership itself. The underlying aim of toolkits is to link theory to practice. The results showed no shortage of resources and toolkits providing accessible advice on partnership assessment. The problem was in identifying a tool that would best fit both the applied and academic rationale for this research. The researcher narrowed the search to tools appropriate for evaluating partnership in governance and community safety. A select list reviewed includes: A Fruitful Partnership (Audit Commission, 1998) The Nacro Guide to partnership working (on-line); Partnership Working: A Consumer Guide to Resources (Markwell, 2003); Developing a Strategic Assessment: An effective practice toolkit for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Community Safety Partnerships (Home Office, 2007).

One toolkit, developed by Boydell (2007) for the Institute of Public Health in Ireland called the Partnership Evaluation Tool Questionnaire (PET) showed promise. It was of particular interest since it was an ‘Irish’ product and as such, the researcher
assumed, might bear more relevance for this research. On closer scrutiny however, it was found to be developed more for an individual’s experience of partnership rather than whole partnership reflection and was therefore discounted. While all of the above toolkits had potential, nevertheless, the researcher concluded that although they could be used satisfactorily for the applied research and to raise awareness about the key components of partnership working as well as guidelines on how to establish, strengthen and sustain MAP, they would not directly enhance the development of the theoretical model of MAP for the academic study. Consequently, a review of the academic literature followed.

Analysis of previous academic work, located in a range of disciplines including social policy, public administration and business management, drew the researcher to the work of Hudson et al (1999:236) and the original model they proposed in which ‘the collaborative imperative might be most helpfully pursued’. The model takes both the ‘optimistic’ and ‘pessimistic’ view of partnership working and emphasises their interdependencies (Jones et al 2004). Hardy et al (2003) developed that model further, and based on extensive empirical research in the health and social service areas, produced the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Questionnaire.

The Nuffield Partnership Assessment Questionnaire was developed at the Nuffield Institute for Health at the University of Leeds by Hardy et al (2003). The purpose of the questionnaire as a research tool is:

> to provide a simple, quick and cost effective way of assessing the effectiveness of partnership working. It enables a rapid appraisal (a quick ‘health check’) which graphically identifies problem areas. This allows partners to focus remedial action and resources commensurate with the seriousness and urgency of the problems……it has been designed explicitly as a developmental tool rather than as a means for centrally assessing local partnership performance.


It has been adapted for use by different types of partnerships including public/public, public/private, public/voluntary and public/private/voluntary partnerships. Examples of where it has been used include Lamie and Ball, (2010) to evaluate the performance of a Community Planning Partnership in the East of Scotland, Funnell (2006) for assessing the OEILT partnership programme in New South Wales and Halliday et al (2004) to evaluate the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly (ClioS) and Plymouth Health Action Zones (HAZ).
The researcher used the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool to evaluate the Partnership. This tool is designed for use by an external assessor and it is recommended that all partners participate.

There are six Nuffield Principles each of which contains six underlying statements. Each statement is explained in detail for the participants in the assessment. This tool served two purposes. It was used by the researcher (i) to survey the Partnership board and to gauge the health of the Partnership and (ii) as a source of information for developing areas of investigation in the partnership process. This was considered appropriate because a review of the Nuffield partnership principles, and their sub-statements, showed that they corresponded with the determinants of successful multi-agency partnership identified in the extant literature in chapter three and shown in Table 3.1. Assuming each underlying statement of the Nuffield principles as indicators of successful partnership, the researcher developed empirical questions related to each statement for use throughout the monitoring process. The Nuffield partnership principles are listed below, and an example of the empirical questions developed for the first principle is presented in Table 4.3. (The questions for the remaining principles are included in Appendix 2). The researcher triangulated the data by cross-referencing the findings from monitoring the Partnership and MAP process with the Nuffield Partnership Assessment findings to add depth to the study. Those linkages are demonstrated in Table 4.6 below.

**Nuffield Partnership Principles:**

1. Recognise and accept the need for partnership
2. Develop clarity and realism of purpose
3. Ensure commitment and ownership
4. Develop and maintain trust
5. Create clear and robust partnership arrangements
6. Monitor, measure and learn
Table 4.3 Example of Empirical Questions based on Nuffield Principles  
(Principle 1: Recognise and accept the need for partnership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
<th>Empirical Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1: Identify principal partnership achievements                               | Is there a prior record of partnership working?  
If so, are partners aware of what has been achieved jointly?  
Have these achievements been of demonstrable benefit and worthy of further development?  
Is there a clear and agreed account of what has already been achieved through partnership working? |
| 1.2: Identify factors associated with successful partnership working           | Why were the principal partnership achievements which you have identified been possible? e.g. external factors/central government and regulatory bodies; local conditions; individuals  
Are these factors known and understood? |
| 1.3: Identify the principal barriers to partnership working                    | Several types of barriers may be distinguished: structural; procedural; financial; professional; cultural and matters of status and legitimacy.  
Are the main types of barriers known and understood? |
| 1.4: Acknowledge whether the policy context creates voluntary, coerced or mandatory partnership working. | Pressure on individual’s partners to enter partnership – may be voluntary, coerced or mandatory.  
Is the degree of pressure known and understood? |
| 1.5: Acknowledge the extent of partners’ interdependence to achieve some of the goals. | Is awareness of degree of interdependency known and understood? |
| 1.6: Acknowledge areas in which you are not dependent upon others to achieve your goals. | Are the limits of agreed areas of partnership working known and understood? |

The ‘practical ideal type’ framework for the multi-agency partnership serves as a point of departure for assessing the Partnership. The framework’s categories of Context, Culture, Legitimacy, Democratic Participation, Power-sharing, Leadership, Trust, Accountability, Evaluation and Reflective Learning, are used to gauge the effectiveness of the Partnership.

Finally, the findings of the case study provide empirical evidence for use in developing the model of good practice in multi-agency partnership.
### Table 4.4 Final Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance Paradigm: Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of successful Multi-Agency Partnership</th>
<th>Scholarly Support</th>
<th>Linked Nuffield Partnership Principles</th>
<th>Nuffield Statements/Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural/Institutional (Structural Change)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Ansell and Gash, 2007; Huxham, 2003; Imperial, 2005; Asthana <em>et al</em> 2002; IDeA, 2006; Audit Commission, 1998; Jacobs, 2010; Powell and Dowling, 2006; Thompson, 1991.</td>
<td>1. The Partnership recognises and accepts the need for Partnership</td>
<td>• There have been substantial past achievements within the partnership. • The factors associated with successful working are known and understood. • The principal barriers to successful partnership working are known and understood. • The extent to which partners engage in partnership working voluntarily or under pressure/mandation is recognised and understood. • There is a clear understanding of partners’ interdependence in achieving some of their goals. • There is mutual understanding of those areas of activity where partners can achieve some goals by working independently of each other.</td>
<td>Partnership Documentation</td>
<td>Longitudinal Case Study: • Monitoring and evaluation as per Table 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Role of the Evaluator

In qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument: Her presence in the lives of the participants invited to be part of the study is fundamental to the paradigm. (Marshall and Rossman, 1999:79).

It is beyond the scope of this research to provide an in-depth theoretical review of the literature to conceptualise the role of an evaluator. A select review is presented here merely to draw attention to the complexity of the role and the related issues since it was pivotal to this longitudinal study. Conceptualising the role of the evaluator shows it to be a complex one. Skolits et al (2009:280) conclude that the role of the evaluator is not well defined or operationalised and suggest that roles are more defined by the activities the evaluator is engaged in throughout the evaluation process, the demands of the evaluation, and evaluator role responses to these demands. They provide a typology of ten primary role responses that an evaluator makes at different phases of the research including manager, detective, designer, negotiator, diplomat, researcher, judge, reporter, use advocate and learner (ibid:282-3). A similar attempt was made by Stern (2004) to conceptualise the evaluator’s role. He draws attention to the expectations that evaluators face whether explicit or otherwise and the kind of response they need to make to those who commission the evaluation and other stakeholders. Regardless of ethical codes or professional guidelines adhered to, Stern (2004:12) suggests that evaluators must face tensions and problems such as demonstrating success, calibrating the future and risk avoidance and allocating blame and assumptions about homogeneity. Rossman (1984) draws attention to the dilemma of being an insider while trying to be an outsider in conducting research. Although she raises issues that arise when the evaluator is conducting research in one’s own setting, these issues, this researcher suggests, may also occur when the researcher is involved in participant observation over a long period of time. These issues may be interpersonal, such as building trust, or structural, concerned with the position of the researcher in the organisation. Rossman (1984) highlights the importance of reciprocity in managing people and data.

The selection of the ToC as an approach to the evaluation in this study meant an intensive role for the evaluator. The role of an evaluator in implementing a modified ToC, such as that implemented in this study, was expounded by Brown (1998:102-111). Through case studies, she describes the efforts required of an evaluator to
articulate a ToC for a programme showing that the planning stage requires broad participation to enable each stakeholder’s voice to be heard, divergent needs addressed and agendas surfaced. In this situation, the evaluator becomes more of a collaborator than an outside appraiser. In a ToC approach, the evaluator may provide an opportunity for the stakeholders to engage with the ToC and this might involve multiple roles including a facilitator, meeting with each party alone on a regular basis, and helping to identify and frame priorities. It may also be necessary for the evaluator to work within competing political agendas. In this type of situation the evaluator is charged with responsibility for getting agreement on major outcomes and strategies to avoid the ToC framework being too mechanistic or irrelevant. Despite these limitations, Brown provides some lessons for establishing an effective role for the evaluator in a ToC model of evaluation. She suggests that the ToC approach demands that the evaluator establish strong relationships with the participants and to know enough about them that the ToC can be constructed collaboratively and that the evaluator needs to draw on a wide variety of skills. If they are well versed in the substance of the initiative they are better placed to challenge participants’ thinking. Group and political skills are also valuable assets as the evaluator is required to work with multiple and diverse groups of stakeholders. Finally, to resolve methodological issues that arise in constructing an evaluation framework, an evaluator should be knowledgeable about quantitative and qualitative sources of data and the importance of adequate administration techniques. Brown argues, that although the role of the evaluator in a ToC approach is not a traditional one, it may require an evaluator to engage in ‘an often messy process and become part of the action’ (ibid:108). This type of engagement can, nevertheless, improve the quality of the process and the product by playing a constructive role that strengthens the planning process of an initiative.

As outlined earlier in the chapter, a modified ToC approach was used as a research technique in this study. Because of the applied and academic rationale for the research, there were times when the evaluator was required to wear ‘two hats’ – one as the evaluator (the applied) and the other as a researcher (academic). The applied purpose required the researcher to provide an in-depth description of the Partnership programme, the activities within the programme, the participants involved in those activities and to give meaningful explanations of what was observed (Patton,
By having open-access, the researcher directly experienced the programme and this observational data gave the researcher a better understanding of the context within which the programme activities occurred and was useful for gaining information that might otherwise not be available. Immersion in the setting allowed the researcher ‘to hear, see, and begin to experience reality’ from the point of view of the participants (Marshall and Rossman, 1989:79). This was useful for constructing the Partnership’s ToC.

The nature of the observation for the study was overt. The observation had a broad focus to gather a holistic view of the Partnership itself and the partnership process. The participants were regularly made aware of the rationale for the evaluation by the researcher. This was particularly important when there was a change in personnel. The validity of the research was strengthened by the researcher’s prior experience of conducting social research. ‘The quality of observational data is highly dependent on the skill, training and competence of the evaluator’ (Patton, 1987:70). Together with academic qualifications in public administration and social research methods, the researcher had over a decade of professional experience in conducting research in local governance. The sites for most of her work included socially excluded communities and community organisations. This experience provided an opportunity to gain an in-depth knowledge of local government institutions and governance issues. Of particular relevance to this study was a working paper, produced in 2008, by the researcher for the Centre for Housing Research (now with the Housing and Sustainable Communities Agency) on tackling anti-social behaviour on public housing estates, and two evaluations of an adult community restorative justice pilot programme. The current research will build on those studies to provide evidence-based knowledge of ways of improving community safety on public housing estates. Fulfilling the academic obligations enhanced the researcher’s ongoing opportunity to view the findings objectively. As far as possible, she intentionally organised the academic meetings at the University of Limerick where the research was supervised. This had the effect of separating out the role of evaluator from that of academic researcher. The researcher also made presentations on her work to her peers in the University to invite comment.

The overall research design and hypotheses are presented in the following tables 4.5 and 4.6.
### Table 4.5 Research Design Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Developmental</th>
<th>Phase 2: Formative</th>
<th>Phase 3: Summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>End 2006-May 2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>2007-2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009-2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring:</td>
<td>Monitoring:</td>
<td>Monitoring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Research:</td>
<td>Process Observation (detailed note-taking; Meetings; Emails; Reflective Learning)</td>
<td>Process Observation (with detailed note-taking); Meetings; Emails; Reflective Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation in relation to the Partnership and the Scheme; Ethics Approval; Garda Clearance</td>
<td>Participant Observation; Personal Experience</td>
<td>Participant Observation; Personal Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Review:</strong></td>
<td><strong>a) Evaluation of Intervention (1) guided by programme logic model; attendance at board meetings</strong></td>
<td><strong>a) Evaluation of Intervention (2) attendance at board meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methodologies</td>
<td>Interviews; Workshops; Survey, Focus Groups; Log-Book Analysis; Field Tours; Photographs; SWOT Analysis</td>
<td>Interviews; Workshops; Survey; Focus Groups; Log-Book Analysis; SWOT Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Theory</td>
<td><strong>b) Interim Report (validated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>b) Final Report (validated)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Theory</td>
<td><strong>More specialised literature review to inform academic study and model of good practice</strong></td>
<td>Nuffield Partnership Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Logic Theory</td>
<td><strong>Log-Book Template</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emergent Theory of the Partnership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety and Housing Policy</td>
<td><strong>Conceptual Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identification of Partnership process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature on community safety</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identification of governance and MAP concepts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing filing system</td>
<td><strong>Outcome A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with key actors</td>
<td>Interviews with community stakeholders</td>
<td><strong>Outcome C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field tours of research sites</td>
<td><strong>Log-Book Template</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emergent Theory of the Partnership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with community stakeholders</td>
<td><strong>Conceptual Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identification of Partnership process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-Book Template</td>
<td>Emergent Theory of the Partnership</td>
<td>Final Report for Partnership (Validated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Identification of Partnership process</td>
<td>Thesis on multi-agency partnership in local governance with special reference to community safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Framework</td>
<td>Identification of governance and MAP concepts</td>
<td>Model of multi-agency partnership for local governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priori TOC programme model of the Partnership</td>
<td>Interim Report for Partnership (Validated) Elaborated version of TOC model of multi-agency partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1: Governance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2: Public Policy Implementation and Service Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.</td>
<td>Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership as unit of analysis</th>
<th>Empirical research question</th>
<th>Scheme as unit of analysis</th>
<th>Empirical research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To monitor and evaluate the MAP process for policy development and public service delivery; To use the Scheme, implemented by the Partnership, as an ‘embedded case study’ in order to test partnership theory in practice by exploring the benefit or otherwise of the MAP approach to providing public services for the service users; To design a theoretically-informed model of good practice for multi-agency partnership in local governance.</td>
<td>Does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism enhance delivery and outcome of public services? (structure)</td>
<td>To monitor and evaluate the Scheme and make recommendations with regards to its operation; To identify the impact of the Scheme and the factors determining that impact; To produce data which adds to an understanding of the issues confronting agencies and communities vis a vis anti-social behaviour; To identify good practice and effective innovation as well as limitations and constraints in delivering a community safety intervention through a MAP approach in local governance.</td>
<td>Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process) Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion
The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the methodological framework within which the research was undertaken. The methodological underpinnings of the research were explained and arguments supporting choices presented. The aim was to demonstrate the quality and depth of the research as a basis upon which the validity of this research was claimed. An outline of the research design was presented to provide an understanding of the broader research framework.

The study was conducted in the longitudinal case study tradition. The unit of analysis was the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership. The epistemological stance included empirical truth claims interpreted through the social constructivist paradigm. The substantive theories explored are governance and partnership theory. The research techniques included both qualitative and quantitative methods. Multiple sources of evidence were used to strengthen the quality of the research. The research was conducted in three phases and satisfied both the applied and academic rationale for the research. The research drew on five established theoretical frameworks for the research design including the empirical model of inquiry developed by Lowery and Evans (2004); Connell et al’s (1995) Theory of Change (ToC) programme model; Shields and Tajalli’s conceptual framework for conducting research in the domain of public administration; evaluation (Yin, 1994; Guba and Lincoln, 1981) and Hardy et al (2003) tool for evaluating partnerships – the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool. Finally, the role of the researcher was expounded as it was considered pivotal to the study.

In order to elucidate the research process further, the methodology will be further developed in chapter five. Together with a description, significance and value of the case under study, each element of the design will be further explicated and the limitations addressed.
Chapter 5
Case Study

Introduction
Chapter four outlined the research design for this study together with an explanation of the epistemological stance. This chapter provides a more in-depth description of the research methods employed. At the outset of the chapter, the case is introduced demonstrating its appropriateness as the unit of analysis. Following the case profile, each of the critical research methods employed in the three phases of the evaluation, is elaborated on. The narrative is followed by acknowledgement of the limitations of the research.

The Case: The Limerick City Community Safety Partnership
In the years leading to the establishment of the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership, there was a growing incidence of anti-social behaviour on some public housing estates in Limerick City (DoEHLG, 2010, Fitzgerald, 2007 and PAUL Partnership, 2003). On two particular sites the situation escalated to more serious crime. This development seriously impacted on the well-being of those communities resulting in a sense of fear and isolation (Hourigan, 2011). It was recognised by the relevant public agencies that targeted action was required to tackle the problems associated with crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) and to address the wider community safety issue. Research on community safety, conducted in other countries, shows that the most effective strategy in counteracting such problems is to employ a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary approach (Cunneen, J., 2008).

Limerick City Council (LCC), An Garda Síochána and the Health Service Executive (HSE) have worked together over the years, on an informal basis to tackle crime and ASB throughout communities in Limerick. But current problems, particularly in some public housing estates, necessitated that this relationship be further strengthened allowing these agencies to work towards common goals in a more collaborative way. Limerick City Council, acting as the lead agency, set out to investigate ways of tackling anti-social behaviour on public housing estates. Community safety schemes have been in existence in the UK for a number of years and are now officially an integral part of local governance there. A trip was organised to Stockport in the UK in February 2006 to review alternative models as well as transferable good practice for building safer
communities. Representatives from Limerick City Council, An Garda Síochána and the HSE participated in the review.

Resulting from their research findings, a formal partnership was established between the three agencies. The structure, namely the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited (hereafter referred to as the ‘Partnership’), was set up as a limited company in 2007. It was envisaged that all three agencies would collaborate more formally to deal with the root causes of crime and anti-social behaviour and develop interventions in line with the needs of the communities. One such intervention established under the auspices of the Partnership was the Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme (hereafter referred to as the 'Scheme')

The Partnership subscribed to the following definition of community safety as defined by Dearling et al (2006:6):

> Community safety is perhaps best seen as an aspect of ‘quality of life’ in which people, individually and collectively, are protected as far as possible from hazards or threats that result from the criminal or anti-social behaviour of others, and are equipped or helped to cope with those they do experience. It should enable them to pursue, and obtain fullest benefits from, their social and economic lives without fear or hindrance from crime and disorder.

The Partnership outlined its vision for the future of community safety in the following statement:

> Tackling crime, anti-social behaviour and unsightly environments are acknowledged as some of the prime concerns of the people of Limerick. Our vision for addressing these issues is to work together in a Partnership between Limerick City Council, An Garda Síochána and the Health Service Executive, to build and support communities, to tackle crime and disorder and to improve local environments, thereby making Limerick a better place to live and work. We are committed and determined to work closely with all communities in Limerick to ensure that the service required is provided.

(Source: Proposal to establish a Community Safety Partnership in Limerick City, 2006.)

**Aims of the Partnership**

The Partnership identified two clear aims

- To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in Limerick City
- To build safer, stronger and confident communities

Within these objectives there were three cross-cutting themes:

- Prevention
- Intervention
- Improving neighbourhoods
Limerick City Council and Community Safety Policy
Limerick City Council (LCC) drew up a *Statement of Policy on Anti-Social Behaviour* in 2004. As the lead agency in the Partnership, it was the LCC strategy that underpinned the Coordinator Scheme when it was launched in 2007. This policy document was used as a guide to determine the scope of the Scheme and the role of the Coordinators by defining ASB and setting out the manner in which the Council deals with tenant/prospective tenants involved in such behaviour. This policy statement outlines LCC’s commitment to promoting a safe and secure environment in communities so that its tenants are able to enjoy a good quality of life. The Council aims to achieve this, as landlord, by ensuring that tenants abide by their tenancy agreements and by exercising its statutory powers under the Housing Acts, in appropriate circumstances, to deal with anti-social behaviour.

The Partnership, National Policy and Community Safety

Limerick City Council
The plethora of housing policy introduced in Ireland since the early 1990s has broadened the remit of local authorities and made them key players in the delivery of public services in local governance. In 1996, the government modernisation document *Better Local Government, A Programme for Change* advocated a wider role for local authorities:

> The Government believes that a renewed system of local government can provide a more effective focus for the effective delivery of a wider range of public services, for the better development and well being of local communities, and for promoting more local development and enterprise. Partnership and participation can be fostered through local government, and local identity and local loyalties can be harnessed to foster social inclusiveness, equality of opportunity and a tangible sharing of the burdens and rewards of society.  (Government Statement – 4th July, 1995)

This statement describes the direction that the delivery of community services has since taken in local government hence the MAP approach is well-established in state policy.

Other select policies advocating collaborative service delivery include the *National Development Plan 2000-2006* (NDP) which outlined a major social housing programme introducing the RAPID (Revitalising Areas by Planning, Investment and Development Programme) in 2001. The *National Anti-Poverty Strategy* (NAPS 2002), the *National Development Plan 2007-2013 Transforming Ireland – A Better Quality of Life for All* and the *National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2007-2016* called for better co-
ordination and closer integration of the delivery of services. More recently *Delivering Homes, Sustaining Communities* (2007) supported a more holistic approach to housing provision by local authorities to take account, not only of the ‘bricks and mortar’ aspect of provision but also of social inclusion issues. Recent housing legislation, the *Housing Bill 2008* (Section 34) further supplements these policy directions by supporting local authority co-operation with other persons in dealing with anti-social behaviour.

Under the Housing (*Miscellaneous Provisions*) Act 2009, a housing authority must draw up and adopt an anti-social behaviour strategy in respect of public housing. The purpose of the strategy is to prevent ASB; to coordinate services dealing with ASB; to promote co-operation between agencies dealing with ASB in order to avoid duplication of services; and generally to support good estate management.

When drawing up a strategy, or before amending a strategy, a housing authority should consult with any joint policing committee, An Garda Síochána, the Health Service Executive, and any other person as the authority considers appropriate.

**An Garda Síochána**

In line with An Garda Síochána Act 2005, and as part of the process of implementing the goals of An Garda Corporate Strategy 2007-2009, *A Time for Change*, An Garda Síochána committed to maintaining an orderly and safe environment for all citizens and to achieving key public imperatives such as public safety, public confidence and public accountability. *An Garda Síochána Youth and Children Strategy 2009-2011* also applies in which An Garda Síochána commit to adopting an inter-agency approach to problem solving. The sections on *Ensuring a Peaceful Community* and *Working with Communities* in the Limerick Garda Divisional Policing 2010 are also relevant in the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership context.

**The Health Service Executive**

For the HSE the community safety strategy has linkages to the notion of ‘Healthy City’ and HSE strategy for Health Promotion and Early Intervention Programmes and with the Community and Continuing Care (Primary Care Teams). *The Programme for Government 2007-2012* – better recognises the position of older people in Irish society and advocates joined-up thinking on initiatives serving older people.
The vision outlined in The National Childrens’ Strategy – Our Children – Their Lives (2000: 10) is also relevant. It envisages:

an Ireland where children are respected as young citizens with a valued contribution to make and a voice of their own; where all children are cherished and supported by family and the wider society; where they enjoy a fulfilling childhood and realise their potential.

In addition to corporate strategy, all three partnership agencies must demonstrate a commitment to the fair treatment of children and young people by ensuring that the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) are reflected at all times.

Thus, the national policies adopted by all three agencies promote a MAP approach to the provision of a good quality of life for all citizens. A core element of this desired outcome is community safety.

Other Key Associated Agencies
The Partnership links with numerous community agencies, both statutory and voluntary and has close association with the ‘joint-policing’ structure in Limerick City. An Garda Síochána Act 2005 provides for the establishment of a joint policing committee in each local authority administrative area. These committees provide a forum where senior representatives of An Garda Síochána, the local authority, local politicians and community groups consult, discuss and make recommendations for community safety to the benefit of the residents. The Partnership is also represented on the RAPID (Revitalising Areas by Planning, Investment and Development) fora. RAPID operates within a set of strategic themes one of which is community safety and anti-social behaviour. A number of the public housing estates covered by the Scheme come under RAPID’s remit.

Significance of the Partnership as a Case Study
The Community Safety Partnership analysed in this study marks a new development in the local delivery of public services in Ireland. It is a pilot initiative bringing together three state agencies and is an innovative example of tackling a ‘wicked problem’ where collaboration between public agencies is considered essential. This Partnership presents an ideal vehicle for analysing and documenting the collaborative process in practice.
Although there is an abundance of literature and rhetoric on the merits of partnership as a public policy tool, there is a scarcity of documented evidence from the Irish context. This case embodies the rationale for a partnership approach in Irish local governance and elaborates on the complexities of tackling community safety from a public policy and institutional perspective. Any action on community safety would of necessity involve the local authority, the Gardaí and the health service. The targeted nature of the Limerick case enabled monitoring of both the partnership process and the intricacies of the community safety initiative introduced by the Partnership. This in turn, provided empirical evidence from a real setting and comprehensively tested the rhetoric of partnership working in practice. The timeframe and in-depth nature of the study ensured that it identified the organisational costs, benefits and consequences of using the partnership approach for a targeted intervention.

The Scheme which forms the basis for this study was supported by a central government department, the (then) Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DoEHLG). The Department’s willingness to support the pilot scheme increases its salience as an object of study so as to determine the generalisability of such interventions. The Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme, introduced by the Partnership, is the first such initiative introduced in Irish local governance, making it intrinsically worthy of analysis. The fact that the evaluation was conducted *ab initio* and was considered an integral part of the partnership process and the Community Safety Scheme is unusual. While acknowledged as worthwhile, this approach to evaluation is rare in public policy research. Thus, this study is unique in the Irish local governance landscape. Consequently, the study outcomes are of significance as baseline data for consideration of the partnership approach in the delivery of public services.

This exploratory case study of partnership, informed by a theory of change (ToC) approach to the evaluation, focuses in particular on the Partnership as an innovative and collaborative local governance mechanism for the delivery of the community safety scheme. Such an in-depth study provides fertile ground for explicating the pros and cons of such an approach particularly for the Irish public sector and increases understanding of both the potential and problems of partnership working. Monitoring and evaluating the Partnership and the Scheme over a three year period,
gave extensive opportunity, to observe at first-hand, the strengths and weaknesses of partnership working. Distinctive features of the study such as ongoing access to all the stakeholders, the iterative nature of the evaluation and the collection of multiple streams of data were only possible because of the bounded nature of the study.

**The value of studying the Partnership as a working model**

In addition to the general merits outlined above, there are a number of aspects of the Limerick case that warrant its affirmation as a model:

- It identifies and contextualises presumptions and assumptions underpinning the partnership approach
- It is an inter-agency model representative of the notion of partnership for the implementation and delivery of public policy
- It has a focus on community safety in local governance and as such is more plausible and specific as evidence for this context
- It is time-bound allowing for an empirical study and the collection of primary data
- It produces evidence of the effect of partnership working on participating agencies and in particular associated problems. It also demonstrates how multi-agency partnership working can enhance the individual agency roles to provide more focused and efficient public services

The Partnership is a local intervention, benchmarked against international criteria for successful partnership. Such information is not often available to local government agencies in the development and implementation of public policy.

**Caveats**

Despite the substantial evidence outlined above of the significance and value of the Limerick case for the study of multi-agency working, there are some caveats:

It is a single case study and although bounded and very relevant in the local governance context, its limitations for generalisation and its context-sensitivity must be noted.
As a single case study, it is relatively small scale. Nevertheless, the innovation provided a unique opportunity to comprehensively explore the value of partnership working at both macro (the Partnership itself) and micro (the Scheme) levels.

The Scheme, introduced by the Partnership is a three year pilot scheme. This is a relatively short time-frame for evaluation of its impact which must be considered when coming to any conclusions.

As with most funded innovations, there could be a tendency to overstate the benefits accruing from the initiative, particularly by the partners. Independent monitoring and evaluation of the Partnership and the Scheme lead to more cautious and nuanced assessment.

**Development of the Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme**
The proposal to introduce a Community Warden Scheme to Limerick City arose from a visit of high level officials from the Partnership to the UK in 2006. Subsequently, to learn more about such initiatives, practitioners in community safety from Stockport were invited to Limerick to make presentations and to elaborate on the concept of the warden schemes which were operating successfully on council housing areas in the UK. The presentation was well received by the Partnership and a warden scheme was considered for Limerick City. In order to implement such a Scheme, the Partnership was successful in drawing down funding from the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DoEHLG) to pilot a Scheme for two years (2007-2009). (Funding was later received for a third year). It was envisaged that, should the Scheme prove successful, other local authorities might adopt a similar model. For this reason a stipulation of the funding was that the Scheme be monitored and evaluated from the outset.

**Structure of the Scheme**
The Board of Directors comprised the City Manager, Garda Chief Superintendent and the Manager of the HSE Local Health Office together with four senior members of the housing section in Limerick City Council. The Scheme was located within LCC and LCC acted as the lead-agency in the Partnership. Overall management of the Scheme was with the Director of Services, Housing, LCC, and the day to day management of the Scheme was carried out by a senior executive officer and a project manager. The team
of Coordinators consisted of a Team Leader, six Coordinators and an administrative coordinator.

**The Project Manager**
The primary role of the Project Manager was to provide a direct communication link between the strategic and operational elements of the company such as the Board of Management and the Team Leader/Community Coordinators. It was the responsibility of the Project Manager to manage ongoing change and to promote a positive cultural environment with the purpose of ensuring strong working relationships and performance while protecting the ideals, objectives and interests of the company.

Through constant liaison with key stakeholders, the Project Manager was involved in all decisions regarding the funding, expenditure and strategic direction as well as all issues relating to corporate governance within the company.

**The Coordinator Team**
The Coordinators were responsible for implementing the Scheme. They were a uniformed patrolling presence whose role it was to improve community safety on the selected local authority housing estates. It was envisaged by the Partnership that the Coordinators' presence on the estates would make tenants feel safer, reassure them that anti-social behaviour was being tackled and that prompt action would be taken on any associated issues. Consequently the tenants might be more willing to report incidents to the Coordinators if they were perceived as being the 'eyes and ears' of the community.

The role of the Coordinator was left deliberately broad and evolved over time so that the Coordinators could be flexible in adapting to the needs of the communities. The Coordinators did not have enforcement powers. Their activities varied according to the particular needs of each area and involved for example:

- High visibility on the estates, liaising with community agencies and tenants, identifying their needs and concerns and taking appropriate actions to help reduce the fear of crime and ASB
- Acting as a source of communication between tenants, LCC, An Garda Síochána, the HSE and other agencies as required
- Reporting suspicious behaviour to An Garda Síochána
- Providing support for vulnerable members of the community, especially the elderly
- Responding to minor incidents of anti-social behaviour
• Dealing with low level neighbourhood disputes through mediation;
• Initiatives to deal with litter, graffiti and clean-ups especially in green areas to help improve the environment
• Facilitation and organisation of community activities to help build community spirit
• Working with youth and children to help create an awareness of community safety

Operating Sites
Some of the estates covered by the Scheme experienced high levels of deprivation and most were already targeted by other initiatives. Relative deprivation scores are presented in Table 5.1 below to elaborate on this point. The Relative Index Score represents the level of affluence or deprivation in an area relative to all other areas at a point in time. The score ranges from below -30 (extremely disadvantaged) to over +30 (extremely affluent). Further data on profiles of the estates are presented in Appendix 3. What may be observed from these tables is the degree of disadvantage that prevails on most of the public housing estates covered by the Scheme, particularly those in such areas as St. Munchin’s, Our Lady of Lourdes and Southill.
Table 5.1(a) Relative Deprivation Scores 1991–2006 (Source: PAUL, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>-32.3</td>
<td>-23.9</td>
<td>-21.1</td>
<td>-26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>-39.0</td>
<td>-36.2</td>
<td>-30.7</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>-27.0</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
<td>-29.7</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>-25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1(b) Relative Deprivation Scores 1991–2006: St. Saviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenworth A</td>
<td>-23.1</td>
<td>-13.5</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon B</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1(c) Relative Deprivation Scores 1991–2006: Our Lady Queen of Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galvone A</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glentworth B</td>
<td>-15.4</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estates with low levels of crime and anti-social behaviour were identified for the pilot Scheme by the Partnership board. It was a strategic decision to launch the Scheme in such areas (rather than in areas with high incidences of crime and ASB) to test the feasibility of the Scheme and to give the Coordinators an opportunity to familiarise themselves with the job and the communities. The Scheme operated on public housing estates in Thomondgate, Kileely, Watergate and Johnsgate on the north side of the City and Kennedy Park, Glasgow Park, Rathbane, Janesboro and Sarsfield Park on the south
side. (Towards the end of the pilot period, Thomondgate and Johnsgate on the Northside were removed from the Scheme and St. Mary’s Park and Ballynanty included while Garryowen was included on the Southside).

Elaborating the Critical Elements of the Research Design

Ongoing Monitoring/Observation
Monitoring as a research technique, was engaged in throughout the entire case study and served two purposes (1) it allowed observation of the collaborative activity of the partnership agencies at management and operational level and (2) it was a way of providing ongoing feedback to management on the implementation of the Scheme and to identify where modification to the process was required.

Monitoring techniques included regular meetings with key stakeholders to engage in detailed note-taking (subsequently typed) and record keeping. A substantial number of meetings took place between the researcher and key actors, the Coordinators, and administrative assistant in order to better understand the day to day management of the Scheme. In the year 2006-2007, thirty-nine (39) meetings took place, for the two years 2008 and 2009, there were seventy-four (74) meetings and from January to May 2010 there were five (5) meetings (See Appendix 4 for schedule of meetings). Over time the researcher clustered the notes from the meetings under the following themes: Management Procedures and Operational Processes. Between 2007 and 2009, the researcher facilitated seven workshops with the Coordinator team for reflective learning sessions. From October 2006 to May 2010 there were (1128) email exchanges. Monitoring was used more for explaining how and why things happened (structures and processes) both at management and operational level rather than on outcomes. It contributed to a better understanding of the internal dynamics of the Partnership itself and the partnership process. The service output and outcome were considered in the evaluation of the Scheme which will be explicated below.

2 Ballynanty, St.Mary’s Park and Garryowen are not included in this evaluation.
Case Study Research Methods: Phase One

As outlined in chapter four, the research was conducted in three phases. Phase One of the research-design was developmental and took place from the last quarter of 2006 to May 2008. The purpose of this phase of the research project was to map the contextual and cultural environment into which the multi-agency Partnership and the Scheme were introduced; to explicate the legitimacy of the Partnership by clarifying its structure and aims and objectives; to observe the operational management of the Scheme during the early phases of development and implementation and to develop a log-book template for recording the activities and actions of the Coordinator team in the delivery of the Scheme. The log-book data provided evidence that elucidated the extent to which the MAP approach enhanced the delivery and outcome of the Scheme for the service users. Informed by this research, an \textit{a priori} model of MAP was established to guide the research design for Phase Two and Three of the research.

The Literature Review

Interrogation of the extant literature was undertaken in order to contextualise the academic study and to develop a conceptual framework which was operationalised in the research design. In particular, the following theories were examined:

- Governance Theory
- Partnership Theory
- Programme Theory

These theories were appropriate since the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership was a public sector collaboration, and as such a quasi-public agency/institution of the state. The review of the literature emphasised how the functions of the state changed over the past four decades for political, economic and social reasons, and how these changes had repercussions for public administration. Changing trends in the way public policy was developed and public services delivered in the traditional public administration, in new public governance (NPM) and finally in the realm of public governance were explicated. The literature revealed how multi-agency partnership operationalises the notion of governance particularly that of changed structures/institutions, processes, modes of participation, including multiple and sometimes new actors, as well as advocating innovation in service delivery.
Data from the international experience of community safety in public housing was also investigated to inform the operationalisation of the Scheme. A count of web-based literature alone, saved to ‘Favourites’, in the researcher’s internet files showed an extensive range of documents read over the three year life of the research. This literature drew attention to the specific issues that arise for agencies collaborating to deliver community safety interventions, and helped to inform the discussion of the findings in chapter seven.

**Documentary Evidence**

Documentary evidence is a strong source of data collection because it can be reviewed repeatedly and such a review is unobtrusive, exact and can span long periods of time (Yin, 1994:80). However it has weaknesses in retrievability, biased selectivity, reporting bias and access (Yin, 1994:80). Some data protection issues arose in the evaluation with respect to accessing the housing list. These will be explained further below, under phase two, when discussing the evaluation of the Scheme. Primary and secondary data including official and published sources; websites; policy in relation to housing and community safety at both local, national and international level were collected. ‘Program records and documents serve a dual purpose: (i) they are a basic source of information about program activities and processes, and (ii) they can give the evaluator ideas about important questions to pursue through more direct observations and interviewing’ (Patton, 1987:90). This data illuminated the context and rationale for, the Partnership and the Scheme and included:

- Clarifying the research brief with the lead-agency
- Sourcing documentation relating to the Partnership and the Scheme
- Meetings with key stakeholders involved in the operational management of the Scheme to better understand the issues arising
- Applying for and receiving ethical approval from the University of Limerick Ethics Committee (ULREC 07/54) and acquiring An Garda Síochána Clearance
- Setting up a safe recording/filing/data system in UL for the research literature and data because of the sensitivity of the data as stipulated in the research brief
Baseline Workshops
Two workshops were conducted in October 2006 by consultants from the UK based Stockport Training and Resource Centre. The researcher participated in these workshops which were attended by representatives of the Partnership board, some project staff from LCC, the HSE and An Garda Síochána as well as key community stakeholders. These workshops allowed the researcher become familiar with the research sites, the community safety issues that prevailed in them, the Partnership’s aims, the objectives of the Scheme and the desired outcomes. Four themes, to be pursued in the quest for community safety, were identified from the data recorded at these workshops. These themes were later delineated by the researcher for evaluating and analysing the outcome of the Scheme. The four broad themes identified reflected the roles of the three partner agencies in the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership. For example: increasing community safety by:

1. Reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (An Garda Síochána)
2. Improving the physical environment (Local Authority)
3. Raising community spirit (HSE)
4. Creating awareness of community safety through education and information (composite)

When the workshops took place, the team of Coordinators, responsible for delivering the Scheme, were not yet employed. Subsequently the researcher arranged an early workshop with them in order to build trust between the researcher as an evaluator and the Coordinators, as key stakeholders, to outline the role of the researcher and to explain the outcome of the Stockport workshops (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). This exercise was considered practical as it was important that the Coordinators were fully informed about the aims and objectives of the Scheme and encouraged to fully participate in the research.

Development of Log-Book Template
The log-book template was developed by the researcher for programme and problem monitoring. It was broadly modelled on the Stockport Wardens’ Incident Log-Book but adapted for the Limerick context based on the feedback from the workshops. As far as the researcher could determine, no such system, for recording anti-social behaviour or follow-up, existed in the local authority at the time. (Data on anti-
social behaviour incidents were individually recorded in notebooks by tenancy enforcement staff and were not available for general use). The rationale for the log-book was threefold (i) it provided empirical evidence of the actions taken and activities engaged in by the Coordinator team and helped to explore the outcome of the Scheme, (ii) it demonstrated the collaboration required between the Partnership, statutory and community agencies in order to implement the Scheme and achieve positive outcomes and (iii) it highlighted the issues arising in delivering a community service through the multi-agency approach which later served to inform the construction of the model of good practice. The log-book allowed the researcher to track changes in service delivery, to provide qualitative information and empirical evidence with regard to the Scheme and to explore MAP. Incidents under the four themes were recorded as indicators of expected outcome. These indicators were then used in a before–after trend comparison to provide evidence of any value-added (Toulemonde et al 1998:174).

Based on the entries, ongoing modifications were made to the log-book template by the researcher, particularly in the first six months, to better report on the Scheme. This exercise was considered necessary to add to the validity of the findings because at the beginning there was a lack of consistency, due to inexperience, in the manner in which the Coordinators completed the log-book. The researcher found it necessary to recode some of the incidents. This was a time-consuming exercise but considered worthwhile for construct validity. For example incidents that were listed in the first draft (based on Stockport’s experience), and had not occurred, were removed from the template while others that had occurred, and that were not on the list, were added. In order to keep a focus on the purpose of the Scheme, namely community safety, and to prevent overlapping of services, the researcher examined the completed log-books regularly, particularly in the start-up phase. It was observed in the first year that a great number of queries could be classified under ‘housing’ rather than ‘community safety’ issues and the researcher brought this finding to the attention of management and the Coordinators. To avoid double-counting, a ‘follow-up’ category was entered for incidents that needed attention over a period of time. The research intended to compare the findings from the log-books at the interim and final stage to gauge the outcome of the Scheme. However, in 2008 a human resource issue arose that required the Coordinators to take on a more
intensive administrative role which meant spending a considerable amount of time in
the office. This curtailed their community safety role on the estates for a period of
time between 2008 and 2009. A valid comparison of log-book entries therefore was
not feasible. Instead, for the final evaluation the researcher worked with the
Coordinators to produce evidence of the activities they engaged in and the agencies
involved for 2009. An example of this data is presented in Table 6.29 in chapter six
when reporting the research findings. The log-book - as a ‘work in progress’ - was
developed in Microsoft Excel, for ease of use, so that both qualitative and
quantitative analysis could be conducted on it by the Coordinators. However, the
lay-out was designed to be compatible with the SPSS programme should a more in-
depth analysis be required at a later date if the Scheme was mainstreamed. Because
of the comprehensive nature of the log-book, a significant outcome was the evidence
produced of the extent to which collaboration was undertaken to deliver the services
and the agencies most likely to be involved. It also produced indicators for the four
themes, and how community safety might be enhanced by the Scheme. This level of
detail on the Scheme helped to minimise the attribution problem consistent with
community programmes (Fahey et al 2011).

Table 5.2 below outlines the most recent format of the log-book template as of
November 2010 and Table 5.3 presents a template of the incidents listed under each
of the four themes.

Table 5.2 Log-Book Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co. ID</th>
<th>Area Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Aims 1-4</th>
<th>Time Incident</th>
<th>Description Code</th>
<th>Details Incident</th>
<th>Action Code</th>
<th>Agency Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Some activities, such as community activities and community events appear under
all four themes. This was considered necessary to get a more comprehensive
breakdown of actions and activities in relation to each theme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Abandoned House</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Abandoned Vehicle</td>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>Community Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault on Person</td>
<td>Broken Glass</td>
<td>Follow-Ups</td>
<td>Follow-Ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td>Blocked Drains</td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td>Home Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>Broken Pavement</td>
<td>Personal Attention</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Linking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Abuse Physical</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Leaflet Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Abuse Verbal</td>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Animals</td>
<td>Dangerous Animals</td>
<td>Tenant Query</td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Users</td>
<td>Defective Street Lighting</td>
<td>Walking Group</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Ups</td>
<td>Fallen Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Patrols</td>
<td>Fires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Leak</td>
<td>Follow-Ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypodermic Needles</td>
<td>Green Area Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Person</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visit</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Giving</td>
<td>Home Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMP After Schools Programme</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost children</td>
<td>Pest Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Stray Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Activity</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected Child Abuse</td>
<td>Trolleys (Abandoned)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected Drug Dealing</td>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected Spousal Abuse</td>
<td>Water leak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Community Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Patrols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elaboration of a Theory of Change (ToC) for the Partnership Programme

As already outlined in chapter four, following the literature review, the document analysis and the workshops, a modest ToC was developed for the Partnership and the Scheme. This *a priori* ToC model for the Partnership programme was presented in Table 4.1 in chapter four.

The Outcome from Phase One of the Case Study

Phase one of the research had three main outcomes. (i) the literature review informed the development of a conceptual framework and the research design and validated the evaluation framework used in phase two; (ii) it informed a log-book template and (iii) it enabled the development of an *a priori* ToC programme model of MAP to be explored in phase two and further in phase three of the research to develop a final model of good practice.

Case Study Research Methods: Phase Two

Phase Two of the research project was formative.

The emphasis in qualitative methods is on depth and detail: in-depth interviews, detailed descriptions, and thorough case studies. Still, depth and detail are always relative. How much depth?, how much detail? Thus, in the early part of the evaluation some boundaries must be set on data collection (Patton, 1987:46).

Evaluation of Embedded Case Study

In addition to the ongoing monitoring/observation technique, there were two main elements to this empirical stage of the research which captured and analysed the view of stakeholders through the following research methods (i) an evaluation of the Scheme as an embedded case study and (ii) validation of the evidence produced in the evaluation through means of an interim case report prepared for the Partnership board.

The evaluation provided the platform to test the initial *a priori* ToC programme model and to explore the MAP process more rigorously. It provided an opportunity to investigate further, the governance and partnership theory extrapolated from the extant literature reviewed in Phase One and to assess the degree of collaboration present in the Scheme. Triangulation for phase two of the research project included the following research techniques: an embedded case study for which the unit of analysis was the Scheme, implemented by the Partnership, on nine social housing
estates. The purpose of this embedded case study was two-fold (i) direct or instrumental use for the Partnership in making specific action decisions (Rossi et al 1993) and (ii) conceptual use for the researcher, thinking about issues, gaining new ideas and perspectives on the collaborative process (Weiss, 1988 and Patton, 1987).

Evaluation of the Scheme

All evaluation studies are case studies (Stake 1995:95-96) in which the evaluator selects certain criteria or interpretations to appraise strengths, weaknesses, successes or failure. In qualitative research the evaluator usually emphasizes the quality of activities and processes, provides a narrative description and interprets the findings (Stake, ibid).

The evaluation of the Scheme was used to explore the partnership process and to assess its benefit, if any, for service users. The first evaluation was conducted between June and September 2008 and covered the operational period October 2006 to end May 2008.

The aims of the evaluation were:

- To monitor and evaluate the Scheme and make recommendations with regards to its operation
- To produce data which adds to an understanding of the issues confronting agencies and communities vis a vis anti-social behaviour
- To identify the impact of the Scheme, the factors determining that impact
- To identify good practice and effective innovation as well as limitations and constraints

Data Analysis

In order to examine the extent to which the Scheme was successful in achieving its aims, the following themes were explored with the Coordinators, community stakeholders and tenants. These themes were identified from an evaluation of community warden schemes in Northern Ireland and the UK. The Partnership had pre-selected this survey questionnaire model for the evaluation and approved the following themes for exploration and to measure success or failure of the Scheme, as
they addressed the questions outlined in the Partnership research brief\(^3\). They included questions regarding:

- Awareness of the Scheme
- Contact with the Scheme
- Improved services due to the Scheme
- New service initiatives due to the Scheme
- Inter-agency linkage
- Improved quality of life perceptions
- Best practice
- Constraints
- Improvements of the Scheme
- Expansion of the Scheme

Copies of the survey questionnaires, information leaflet, consent forms for interviews and focus groups and covering letters are attached in Appendix 5. While audited accounts were available on the running costs of the Partnership and the Scheme, it was beyond the scope of this research to carry out any in-depth analysis on them. Costs were addressed, however, during the discussions for the two SWOT analyses, one each conducted in phase two and three of the research, and the combined findings are presented in Appendix 6.

**Evaluation (1)**

The first evaluation of the Scheme included (i) *baseline feedback* on the Scheme, which was collected from the outset by means of interviews with five key stakeholders (two agency and three community) and attendance at a *public meeting* organised by the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership for community organisations and (ii) an *interim evaluation* of the Scheme conducted between June and September 2008. The evaluation included: a survey of the Coordinators; a survey of community stakeholders and a survey of tenants. The tenant survey was supplemented by tenant focus groups. Data from the stakeholders’ and tenants’ survey questionnaire were entered and analysed in SPSS. An examination and analysis was conducted on the log-books. These methods are elaborated on below.

---

Survey of Coordinators (1)

A draft questionnaire was developed, based on the *Northern Ireland Housing Executive-Evaluation of Neighbourhood Warden Service, 2003 and Research Report No. 8 – Neighbourhood Wardens Scheme Evaluation, 2003* and piloted with the team manager and the administrator. Two minor amendments were suggested and the changes made. The questionnaires were numbered for reference and no names appeared on the questionnaire (See Appendix 5 for copy of questionnaire). The Coordinators returned them directly, by post, to the researcher in the stamped addressed envelope provided. The full team of six Coordinators completed the questionnaire which contained both ‘closed’ and ‘open’ questions to allow the respondents to elaborate on certain questions. A content analysis was conducted on the ‘open’ responses and themes identified, analysed and reported on in the interim case report.

Survey of Community Stakeholders (1)

The list of community stakeholders was compiled by two means (i) the log-books were examined by the researcher to identify names of people logged as having contact with the Scheme throughout the year and (ii) the researcher asked the Coordinators to identify the stakeholders who were actively involved in the Scheme during the year.

A sample frame of thirty-two stakeholders was identified for the full survey. The stakeholders’ questionnaire was piloted with stakeholders from both Northside (4) and Southside (3). Four stakeholders responded (2 Northside and 2 Southside). These stakeholders were identified by the Coordinators as actively cooperating with the Scheme and were therefore familiar with it. Because of time and resource limitations this convenience sampling was considered practical in the circumstances for an interim study. The sampling frame, representing diverse agencies, was representative of both the Northside and Southside sites. Both postal and electronic questionnaires were distributed together with an information leaflet on the nature of the research. Two minor amendments were suggested and incorporated. The final questionnaire was distributed mid-June by post with a pre-paid addressed envelope enclosed for return to the researcher (See Appendix 5 for copy of questionnaire). The questionnaires were numbered for reference and no names requested. There was a
mix of ‘open’ and ‘closed’ questions. Where responses were not forthcoming, the researcher made a number of follow up telephone calls as a reminder. In some cases the reasons found by the researcher for non-response was because the stakeholder was on holidays or was out sick. Of the thirty-two questionnaires distributed there were fifteen responses or a forty-seven per cent (47%) response rate. One respondent had no knowledge of the Scheme while the other respondents represented a number of agencies including the Gardaí (7), community development programmes (4), education (2) and a voluntary organisation (1).

Survey of Tenants (1)
The research sites were located on the Northside and Southside of Limerick city and represented nine housing estates- four on the Northside and five on the Southside.

Compiling a list of tenants for the survey was influenced by the ‘Freedom of Information’ legislation and consequently the researcher was required to explore a number of techniques to compile the housing list. In the first instance a reference was made to the Register of Electors and the streets included in the Scheme identified. It became apparent that the sites were in different District Electoral Divisions (DEDs) which added to the task of identifying the sites.

The list of the streets was then forwarded to Limerick City Council Housing Section in order to verify whether or not there were local authority houses on those streets and some streets were eliminated. LCC confirmed the final list of local authority rented houses for the survey.

There were 2097 local authority owned houses identified on the research sites. Because of time and resource limitations, and following consultancy with the statistical unit at the University of Limerick to consider options available, a decision was taken to survey the houses in the ‘rented’ only category which was a sample of 670 houses of which there were 555 on the Northside and 115 on the Southside. (This figure was later adjusted to 606 as 64 were found to be genuinely unoccupied (in some cases burned out or vandalised). This final list of houses constituted an accurate sampling frame.

In order to pilot the tenants’ questionnaire, a pro-rata representative sample of tenants was selected in each housing area. (11 Northside and 14 Southside). The researcher
enlisted the help of the Coordinators for this exercise to ensure a response. The pilot questionnaire was posted to the twenty five tenants with an information leaflet and a stamped, addressed envelope. Nine tenants (36%) responded. The researcher followed up their responses with a ‘thank-you’ note for their co-operation. A number of amendments were suggested and the changes made to the questionnaire (See Appendix 5 for copy of questionnaire).

In developing the final questionnaire, the profile of the estates was taken into account. In particular there were more ‘closed’ than ‘open’ questions. The language and terms used were chosen carefully for ease of comprehension. An information leaflet and pre-paid addressed envelope accompanied the questionnaire for ease of response. As disclosure of tenants’ names was not allowed under the ‘Freedom of Information’ legislation, reference numbers were allocated to the houses and these references used on the questionnaire. No names were required on the returned questionnaire, but respondents were invited to put their names forward for a draw as an incentive to improve the response rate. Eighty per cent of respondents choose this option. The questionnaires were hand-delivered by the Coordinators to each of the selected houses. It was this exercise that revealed sixty four (64) houses unoccupied and therefore they were removed from the sample frame.

After two weeks, the response rate was ten per cent (10%). To improve on this response the Coordinators were asked to make follow-up calls. To lessen the possibility of bias, the researcher gave definite guidelines to the Coordinators in respect of this exercise as follows:-

- Coordinators call back to houses on the housing list that had not returned their questionnaires; (Give gentle reminder to return the questionnaire (be cautious as it may be the case that they are already returned but not yet received)
- Ask if they would like another copy of the questionnaire
- If yes, give them another copy
- Before giving them the questionnaire ensure that it has the same reference number on it as the previous questionnaire (the researcher corresponded with the administrator, who had the same list of tenant houses as the researcher, notifying her of the responses received)
- Give them another pre-paid envelope for returning the questionnaire
- Encourage them to do so as soon as possible
- Give them option of help in completing the questionnaire. The researcher was available to provide this assistance
Resources, time involved and their work schedule allowed the Coordinators to make follow-up calls to 351 houses which represented forty-eight per cent (48%) of houses on the Northside and forty-three per cent (43%) of houses on the Southside. As a result, the response rate was increased to sixteen per cent (16%) from ten per cent (10%). There were responses from eight of the nine housing estates. The ninth housing estate only had two LCC rented house and therefore did not impact the results significantly. Ninety-five tenants (95) responded which included the following estates: Thomondgate (28), Kileely (16), and Watergate (20) on the northside and Galvone (2), Janesboro (2), Rathbane (6), Kennedy Park (8), Sarsfield Park (13) on the southside. Two tenants requested help from the researcher to complete the questionnaire. Before doing so, the researcher set up an appointment with them by telephone and on visiting them carried UL and personal identification.

**Tenant Focus Groups (1)**

In order to supplement the tenants’ survey questionnaire the researcher set up six focus groups representing Northside (St. Munchin’s (3 female and 1 male) and Watergate Residents’ Groups (2 male and 1 female); St. Munchin’s Active Retirement Group (9 females) and St. Munchin’s Youth Club (6 youth leaders and 10 youths). On the Southside (Sarsfield Park Residents Group (3 male and 2 female) and Janesboro Active Retirement Group (15 females). Dates for the focus groups were set up at least two weeks in advance by the researcher to ensure that the participants could be made aware of the Scheme and the purpose of the focus group. A fieldworker was engaged to conduct the focus groups. The interview schedule included questions regarding the issues arising on the estates, tenants’ knowledge and perception of the Scheme and what their expectations were for the Scheme. The sessions were taped in all cases except the youth group where the leader requested otherwise. Participants were given information leaflets prior to participating and consent forms were signed. Where participants were less than 18 years of age, their parents’ consent was obtained before they could participate (See Appendix 5 for copies of Information Leaflet and Consent Forms).

**Interim Case Report**

In November 2008, the feedback from the first evaluation was collated and written up in an interim case report for the Partnership. The draft report was initially read
and validated by a key actor and later ratified by the Partnership board. This added to the validity of the research findings (Stake, 1995). The recommendations made in the report, presented by way of an action plan, were used by the management to effect change in the operation of the Scheme and to enhance its efficiency and effectiveness. It was envisaged that, as a result of the feedback, a more collaborative, efficient and effective service both at operational and community-level would be delivered, leading to better local governance. The report also served successfully as evidence for extended funding for the Scheme from the DoEHLG for a further twelve months.

Elaboration of the ToC
The data collated for the interim case report informed a second, more focused literature review to further develop the theoretical framework for the academic study on governance and multi-agency partnership. This further informed the ToC model of good practice.

The Outcome from Phase Two of the Research
Phase two of the research had four outcomes: (i) a more focused review of the literature which was used to expand on the conceptual framework as it pertained to governance and partnership theory, (ii) identification of the collaborative process engaged in by all the stakeholders involved in the Partnership for delivering the Scheme, (iii) an interim case report for use by the Partnership to further develop the Scheme and improve the service for users and (iv) data which was used to elaborate the a priori ToC model and to establish a conceptual framework for MAP in local governance.

The following is a summary of the research methods and results in phase two.

Evaluation of the Scheme (1)
To conduct the evaluation the following research instruments were used:

- Data from notes and records on meetings and interviews with key stakeholders collected through the observation process
- Collation and analysis of log-book data
- Survey of Coordinators and administrator (N=7: 100% response rate)
- Survey of Community Stakeholders, representing Gardaí, Community Development Workers, Education and Voluntary Organisation (N=32: 47% response rate)
• Survey of Tenants (N=606: 16% response rate)
• Focus groups with Tenants (N=6: No. of Participants = 36; and Youth Group =10 + 6 Youth Leaders ), taped and transcribed
• SWOT Analysis (1) with key actor (See Appendix 6)
• Interim Report

The Case Study Research Methods: Phase Three
Phase Three of the research project was summative. It took place during May and June 2010. The extended timeline was to allow for the human resource issue (discussed earlier) that arose in 2008 and which impacted the administration of the Scheme and hence delivery. Triangulation was conducted through the following research methods: (i) a second evaluation was conducted on the Scheme; (ii) the Nuffield Assessment was conducted with the Partnership board; (iii) a final case report was produced for the Partnership and (iv) a model of good practice for collaborative partnership in local governance was finalised.

Evaluation (2)
A second evaluation was conducted on the Scheme and included the following research methods:

Survey of Coordinators (2)
A survey questionnaire, based on the interim questionnaire, with very minor adjustments, was distributed to the Coordinator Team. Each Coordinator was asked to complete an individual question in detail followed by a Coordinators’ workshop to discuss, and agree, a final team response to each of the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator’s Questionnaire (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The questions were as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has awareness of the Scheme increased in the main agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What were the main contact mechanisms for the Scheme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the level of complaints recorded by the Coordinators increased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there a faster response now by agencies to requests through the Coordinators?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How satisfied are you with the degree of linkages between the Coordinator Scheme and the following agencies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limerick City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An Garda Síochána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Action Centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Community Resource Centres
• Community Development Projects
• Community Groups
• Tenants

6. In your opinion has the level of crime increased or decreased since the beginning of the Scheme?
7. What are the main activities in which the Coordinators are involved for each of the four action themes of the Scheme?
8. What are the advantages, if any, of completing the log-books?
9. What are your perceptions of the role of the Coordinator now?
10. In your opinion, could the Scheme be improved in any way?
11. In your opinion, could the Scheme be expanded?

Survey of Community Stakeholders (2)

To build on the 2008 interim findings, the evaluator conducted a follow-up survey with stakeholders. The questionnaire was a shorter version of the questionnaire distributed for the first evaluation. This time round, staff of LCC, as the lead-agency, and local politicians were included. Where possible, those who participated in the interim review were contacted again otherwise their substitute was surveyed. Thirty-four (34) questionnaires were distributed to stakeholders with return stamped, addressed envelopes. Sixteen (16) questionnaires (47%) were returned representing the following agencies: An Garda Síochána (2), Limerick City Council (2), HSE (2), Department of Education (3), Community Resource Centres (2), Youth (2) and Politicians (3). A semi-structured interview was held with the Northside youth leader and a survey questionnaire and telephone interview with the Southside youth leader.

Survey of Tenants (2)

A survey questionnaire was delivered to tenants that had responded to the interim survey. They were representative of the Northside and Southside sites. The survey questionnaire was distributed to ninety-five (95) tenants with stamped, addressed envelopes for responses (64 Northside and 31 Southside). These tenants were selected because they had responded to the first evaluation. Although the number was not a large sample, it did represent all the areas covered by the Scheme. Thirty-three tenants (34%) responded (Northside: Thomondgate x11, Kileely x3, Watergate x10 and Southside: Galvone x 2, Kennedy Park x2, Sarsfield Pk. x2, Rathbane x2 and Janesboro x 1), the returned questionnaires were also representative of the research sites.
Tenants’ Focus Groups (2)

In order to supplement the survey, the researcher conducted four focus groups. The focus groups included elderly groups and residents’ associations interviewed previously for the first evaluation. Two Northside, St. Munchin’s Active Retirement (19 Females) and Watergate Residents’ Group (1 Male and 2 Female) and two Southside, Janesboro Active Retirement (21 Females) and Sarsfield Park Residents’ Group 2 Males and 3 Females). Time and resources did not allow for taping of these sessions but the researcher, through careful note-taking during and after the sessions, recorded the participants’ observations.

The Partnership Assessment

The outcome from the research conducted in phase one and phase two highlighted the need to illuminate the Partnership board itself as a governance mechanism. As discussed in chapter four, the definition of governance and MAP, adopted in this research led the researcher to use the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool as the most appropriate research technique having rejected several others. In order to test the Partnership’s commitment to collaboration, the researcher surveyed the board members to supplement the assessment of the collaborative process conducted through the monitoring and evaluation exercise. This Nuffield questionnaire was selected by the researcher as a research tool for its academic rigour and because each principle was explained in detail thereby minimising any ambiguities or misunderstandings for respondents.

To gather support for this element of the research, before embarking on the assessment of the Partnership board members, the researcher provided a copy of the Nuffield assessment survey questionnaire to two key actors, who were members of the board, to ascertain their views on the feasibility of distributing it for completion by the full Partnership board. Having received their support (and enthusiasm!) for this procedure, the researcher subsequently arranged interviews with board members. There was considerable turnover of individuals on the board from its foundation. At the time of this research, fifteen (15) board members had already been nominated to the board. However, three of them had no opportunity to participate as no board meetings were held during their tenure. The researcher tried to contact them for comment but despite repeated telephone follow-up, she could only contact one of
them who declined to participate as she felt she was not well informed regarding the Partnership. An hour-long, semi-structured interview was held with the remaining twelve (12), eight (8) of whom were full current board members and four (4) past members. One was a telephone interview. The purpose of the interview was mainly to garner support for participation in the Nuffield survey but also to get feedback on their perception of the Scheme and particularly the MAP approach to delivery (see Appendix 7 for interview schedule).

Following the interviews, a copy of the questionnaire, together with a covering letter and stamped addressed envelope for return to the researcher, was posted to all board members (N=15, consisting of 8 current and 7 past members including the 3 who had no active role but were included for the record should they wish to participate but they did not respond). The questionnaires were not anonymous. Whilst this might be considered a deterrent to full disclosure, it helped the analysis more in the long-run as will be discussed in the findings in the next chapter. All but one of the current board members (7) completed the questionnaire plus two of the past members. The two past board members who did not respond had been interviewed previously by the researcher and the data from those interviews were noted.

In order to explore the governance and partnership theory further, the board members’ responses to the questionnaire were compared with the empirical data collected through the monitoring/observation and evaluation processes. To conduct this exercise, the researcher disaggregated the assumptions under each of the six Nuffield principles into empirical questions (as outlined in the conceptual framework in Table 4.4 in chapter four and Geddes et al 2007).

This triangulated process revealed how well each of the key determinants of good governance and MAP had been honoured by the Partnership.

**Final Case Report**

Data from the interim and final evaluations and the Nuffield Partnership Assessment were collated to produce a final case report for the Partnership. As with the interim report, a draft of the final case report was examined by a key actor and the findings subsequently ratified by the board.
Elaboration of Final ToC

As suggested in chapter four, every policy is a theory of change (ToC). The researcher had elucidated a modest ToC for the Partnership in phase one and elaborated on it in phase two with the findings from an expanded literature review and the first evaluation of the Scheme. In order to invite comment on the ToC framework for a model of good practice, the researcher presented a paper on her ToC conceptual framework at the MOPAN (Multi-Organisational Partnerships and Networks) Conference in Maynooth in June 2009 to invite comment. The conference was attended by such prominent authors on collaboration as Helen Sullivan, Arthur Himmelman, David Zink and Chris Huxham. Subsequently, on a visit to Boston, USA, on the 4th December, 2009, the researcher arranged an interview at Harvard University with Carol Weiss. Weiss has published copious research on the ToC method of evaluation which is recognised as authoritative in academia. The ToC framework made explicit what was implicit in the aims and objectives of the Partnership and the Scheme. To address the issue of ‘who owns the ToC (Sullivan et al 2006), and to validate once again that the researcher’s interpretation of the aims and objectives was consistent with that of the Partnership, the researcher discussed the model with two key actors at a meeting held in UL on 26th March, 2009.

The findings from monitoring and evaluating the Partnership and the Scheme, together with the literature review, provided the empirical evidence for the final model of good practice for MAP in local governance which will be presented in chapter eight.

The Outcome from Phase Three of the Research

Phase three of the research had three outcomes: (i) a final case report for the Partnership, (ii) a ToC model of good practice for multi-agency partnership in local governance and (iii) a PhD thesis for the researcher.

The following is a summary of research methods and results in phase three:

Evaluation of the Scheme (2)

To conduct this evaluation the following research instruments were used:

- Survey of Coordinators and administrator (N=7: 100% Response Rate)
• Collation and analysis of log-book data
• Survey of Community Stakeholders (N=34 representing An Garda Síochána, LCC, HSE, Education, Community Resource Centres, Youth and Politicians. 47% Response Rate)
• Survey of Tenants (N=95; 34% Response Rate)
• Focus groups with Tenants (N=4: No. of Participants = 48, untaped)
• SWOT Analysis (2) with key actors (N=2)  (See Appendix 6)
• Final Case Report

Limitations of the Research Design

Environmental Factors
The research was conducted in the longitudinal single case study tradition and the number of key stakeholders was small. Providing anonymity therefore made the write up in the discussion more difficult. During the researcher’s preliminary discussions with these stakeholders, questions were asked regarding the use of the research findings and where they would be disseminated. Because of the sensitivity of the research topic and the associated data protection issue articulated in the terms of reference of the Partnership, as well as the uncertain public safety conditions that prevailed in Limerick City during the research period, particularly on two particular public housing estates, the researcher formed the opinion, based on experience, that there was a strong possibility that cooperation would not have been as forthcoming had the researcher not confirmed that anonymity would be guaranteed. It also meant that interviews held with key actors were not taped but careful notes were taken and typed shortly afterwards and stored in a locked cabinet in UL. These notes were used in the final case report for the Partnership and comments used from the notes were validated by the key actors. The sensitivity of the research also meant more attention to vocabulary used. For example, the common use of the research term ‘informant’ when reporting findings took on a whole new meaning and the researcher was requested to use actors/key actors instead.

Another factor that might have been a source of limitation concerned the HSE. When the Partnership was set up in 2007, it was at a time when radical change had taken place in the structure of public health services in Ireland with the formation of the Health Service Executive that drew the eight regional health authorities into one national agency. This reorganisation radically changed the structures and processes
in use for decades to provide public health, but more importantly also appeared to impact negatively on the morale within the organisation as staff were uncertain about their new roles and responsibilities. This problem is ongoing and became obvious in this research when the first HSE representative on the Partnership board left and three replacements were nominated, two of whom had no active engagement with the Partnership at all and the third did not appear to show ‘buy-in’. Similarly, while community health workers on the estates cooperated with the Coordinators, despite numerous telephone follow-ups, participation in the surveys was weak. This might demonstrate that the communication from the HSE to the community health workers, of the role expected of them because of the HSE’s involvement with the Partnership, was either poor or non-existent.

The Theory of Change (ToC) Approach

Evidence suggests that developing a ToC for any initiative is a time-consuming and expensive exercise (Sullivan et al 2002), and it was not in the brief for this study to provide space for this exercise with the Partnership. Ideally the construction of the ToC should involve all stakeholders e.g. from policy developers to service beneficiaries, to seek agreement on activities and desired outcomes, bearing in mind any contextual factors. In fact, the original ToC approach was developed in the US to allow active community participation in programme planning. It was later developed for use in public sector evaluations. The ToC for this Partnership programme was constructed by the researcher from the outset as a technique to inform the development of a model of good practice for MAP. It could be considered a modest ToC, interpreted by the researcher, and influenced by the multiple realities of the stakeholders participating in the research and particularly the workshops organised by the Stockport trainers. The role of the evaluator/researcher was not therefore impartial or objective. Weiss (1995), as referenced earlier, argues that while consensus is essential for the overarching theory of the programme, it is not essential for the initial theories that point to different ways of achieving outcomes. In Weiss’s view, it might even be counterproductive to limit the inquiry to a single set of assumptions until better evidence is accumulated, a point consistent with the extant literature on tackling ‘wicked problems’ (cf Rittel et al 1973). Weiss reiterated this point when the researcher met her in Boston in 2009. The Partnership’s ToC was primarily used as a framework to guide the evaluation of the
Partnership and to generate hypotheses and questions for the qualitative and quantitative research which was undertaken. It was tested and further developed in the different phases of the research through monitoring the Partnership and two evaluations of the Scheme, and this added to its validity as a framework for a model of good practice.

The Nuffield Partnership Assessment

Heavy reliance was placed by the researcher on the Nuffield Assessment Tool as a useful conceptual guide for successful multi-agency partnership. This was deemed appropriate for three reasons. Firstly, the decision to use the Nuffield tool came about twelve months into the case study. At that stage it was becoming apparent that the Partnership lacked certain critical elements if it was to be successful. The researcher examined the extant literature for evidence that these weaknesses were common in partnerships, particularly those in the early stages of development. The literature supported the findings and an assessment was planned to gauge the ‘health’ of the Partnership. Secondly, a search for appropriate partnership assessment tools found the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool to be the most appropriate because the themes, investigated in that questionnaire, were correlated with those needing investigation in the Partnership. Thirdly, the Nuffield Assessment has also been used extensively for academic studies and could be considered useful for comparative purposes for future research. But it has limitations.

While the Nuffield Assessment Tool provides a comprehensive framework for successful partnership, it does not differentiate between inputs, processes and outcomes of successful MAP. Trust, for example, which is key to partnership working, could be regarded as an input, a process and an outcome of successful MAP (Asthana et al 2002:783). This may be the case because the process can be ‘iterative and cumulative rather than sequential’ (Hudson et al 1999: 237). To counter this limitation, the use, by the researcher, of the ToC approach to the evaluation (namely explicating the programme’s structure, process and outcomes), provided a holistic framework within which the Nuffield Principles, such as trust, could be considered a change mechanism at any stage. This option was considered to reinforce the model of good practice.
Partnerships are increasingly seeking tools for use in assessing the effectiveness of the partnership and to provide a framework for development. It is argued that formal assessment tools can be extremely valuable in terms of learning from the process and outcomes of the assessment. The conclusion reached however by Halliday et al (2004) is that a stand-alone device, such as assessment tools, may be misinterpreted and unlikely to be constructive other than in those partnerships prepared to invest the necessary resources in a broad-based evaluation. Halliday et al (2004) identified a difficulty with the Nuffield assessment that they argued could detract from its validity if it were used for benchmarking rather than reflection and discussion. To prevent this type of misunderstanding as to the purpose of the assessment, in addition to the individual interviews with each board member, the researcher provided an accompanying information letter with the Nuffield Assessment questionnaire when distributed (See Appendix 7). It should be noted here however that board members are busy people, as indeed these people were. Nevertheless, other than one person, whose reason for non-participation could be explained by environmental reasons as explicated above, they were all very cooperative and interested to know the results of how ‘healthy’ their Partnership was.

It is recognised that self-assessment profiles, designed to be completed by individuals in the partnership, could benefit from professional support to explore each partner’s individual concerns or any inconsistencies in responses or perceptions. There was no scope for such in-depth assistance in this study but the researcher was available for any follow up queries that partners might have. Her assistance was not sought.

The composition of the board was such that results from the assessment had to be regarded as skewed. But this was recognised at the outset. There were eight board members, six of whom represented the lead-agency which was the site of most Partnership activity. The level of involvement and support from one partnership agency was poor. However, this member presented for interview and points raised by him were noted in the findings. Despite this limitation, as the use of the Nuffield assessment was exploratory, seeking to get insight into the health of the Partnership from the board members, the researcher, to triangulate the data, considered the Nuffield assessment a rich source of evidence.
Evaluation
There are competing tensions acting on evaluation and the model of an objective, value-free observer and analyst is not appropriate (Boyle, 1993:2). The ability of the evaluator to serve multiple users is constrained by the original purpose of the research and the need to answer the questions posed by the primary user (Boyle 1993:23). To avoid misunderstandings, the aims and objectives of the research, both for the Partnership and the researcher were made explicit at the outset and ratified by the Centre for Housing Research.

There is a risk when incorporating an ‘embedded case study’ in the research design, that this case study might become the main unit of analysis in the study (Yin, 1994:41). There were two streams to this research project – the applied and the academic. Having a dual purpose ensured that the overall programme was monitored and evaluated and that the Scheme, as the embedded case study was used to triangulate data.

Initially, monitoring and evaluation of the Partnership was to be conducted between 2007-2009, the period for which funding was received. However, it became obvious during 2008 that there was a low-level of ‘buy-in’ from the board which was evidenced in the small number of board meetings that took place. In fact, there were no board meetings at all in 2008. The rate of personnel turnover both at board and operational level could be considered high. To maintain the construct validity of the research, the researcher ensured that any newly-joined key actors were fully aware of the rationale for the evaluation, their expected role in the research and how the results would be used.

The year 2008 was problematic for the partnership. Board support for the Scheme appeared to wane and leadership was not evident. This presented a number of limitations from the evaluation point of view: because board activity in relation to the Scheme was practically non-existent, no plans were in place regarding continued funding for the Scheme beyond the two years; it was quite a possibility that the Scheme might not be continued and the Partnership terminated. This uncertain situation required the researcher to review the research methodology for the second evaluation. In time, using evidence produced from the results of the interim evaluation case report, funding was received for a further year from the DoEHLG.
The advantage of the additional funding was that it provided the researcher with an opportunity to continue to explore the Partnership and the Scheme, although within a narrower scope. The uncertainty, however, attached to the funding had repercussions for the feasibility of the research design. For example, the Coordinators were key players in the evaluation, but the security of the Coordinators’ jobs was at stake and their perception of a lack of ‘buy-in’ from the board for the Scheme, impacted on their morale. From an ethical point of view, and the perspective of tenants on the housing estates, the researcher was conscious of the possibility that conducting a second survey, to gather perceptions of the Scheme, might create false expectations regarding its permanency amongst the tenants. As the Scheme was proving particularly beneficial to the elderly and the young, two vulnerable groups in the housing estates, the researcher ensured, through the research design not to give false expectations by ensuring that the Coordinators highlighted the pilot aspect of the Scheme wherever and whenever possible, particularly in their newsletter.

In 2008, when the human resource issue arose, it necessitated a change in the role of the Coordinator. It meant that they spent considerably more time, over a six month period, in an administrative role rather than providing a presence on the housing estates. This meant that any results from a comparison of the data from the log-books at the interim and final stage would not yield reliable results. Instead, to produce the next most significant data to gauge the impact of the Scheme, at the end of 2009, the Coordinators prepared a table of the activities they engaged in around the four programme themes, outlining the agencies involved and the numbers of people who participated in the activities. In some ways extrapolating data and presenting it in such a table might be seen as an advantage as, together with log-book data, it provides a holistic picture of the Coordinators’ activities to improve community safety.

As the Scheme was the first such pilot community safety Scheme to be funded by the DoEHLG there was a dearth of research to draw on in the Irish context. The researcher placed heavy reliance on international experience and data, particularly from the UK but also the US, Australia and some European countries. Community safety is well developed in these countries and therefore the researcher, when engaging with this literature had to be mindful of the embryonic stage of the
Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited and to manage expectations of the level of collaboration between the partnership agencies when designing the research.

When confirming the research brief, the researcher discussed the possibility of having a control group which could be used to observe any outcome the Scheme might have on the housing estates. The Scheme was a pilot intervention that incorporated flexibility in service delivery. This meant that the Partnership reserved the right to move the Coordinator team between or from areas and to adapt the actions and activities as needs arose, a right that was exercised. Therefore incorporating a control group, while useful at a later stage of development, would serve no worthwhile purpose at this early stage of exploratory research.

Another common problem that arises in relation to social studies in communities is that areas may at times overlap district electoral areas and this makes it more difficult to provide an accurate profile of the research sites. In this case study, there is more information available on some areas than others, particularly if they come under the remit of the PAUL Partnership. Although in the socially disadvantaged category, there is a dearth of data on Watergate (Northside) and Sarsfield Park (Southside), as they are somewhat removed from the main socially disadvantaged areas which are already well served by community programmes. To counteract this problem the research drew on previous empirical research, conducted locally, to profile the estates and which data also informed the Coordinators’ activities.

**Conclusion**

This chapter introduced the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership as the case under study. In order to validate the Partnership as the unit of analysis, it explained the rationale for the Partnership describing its origins, structure, aims and objectives. It explained the policy context for the Partnership from a national and local perspective for each of the partner agencies and outlined its significance and value as a study in MAP. It went on to describe the structure and basis for the Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme which was used as an embedded case study to further explore the MAP approach to service delivery.
Chapter four explicated the primary elements of the research design including the ToC, the Nuffield Assessment and the evaluation. In order to add rigour to the research design and improve the validity of the research, the second part of chapter five elucidated the critical elements of the case study for each of the three phases of the research. Finally, the limitations of the research were discussed. In chapter six, the research findings are presented.
Chapter 6
Research Findings

Introduction
This study sets out to explore the following research question with special reference to community safety:

_Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?_

Informed by the review of the literature on the changing role of the state and the evolution of the governance paradigm and elucidation of the determinants of successful partnership, the following hypotheses were developed.

**Hypothesis 1: Governance**
As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.

**Empirical Research Question:**
Does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism, enhance delivery and outcome of public services? (structure)

**Hypothesis 2: Public Policy Implementation and Service Delivery**
Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.

**Empirical Research Questions:**
1. Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process)
2. Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)

Chapters four and five outlined the methodology selected for exploring these hypotheses using the longitudinal case study tradition. In this chapter, results from the case study are presented. There is no attempt to discuss the research findings here. Instead, the discussion on the findings will take place in chapter seven where interpretation of the researcher’s and stakeholders’ realities will be presented. Exploring the case study provided evidence for the construction of the final model of good practice for multi-agency partnership and collaboration.
In order to test the first hypothesis, the researcher used the data collated from monitoring the Partnership process, the interviews with board members together with the data collated from the Nuffield Partnership Assessment. In order to test the second hypothesis, the researcher collated data from monitoring the implementation of the Scheme for the first empirical question and data from the two evaluations which included feedback from the Coordinators, community stakeholders, tenants and log-books, to address the second question. To address the latter question, the tenants’ feedback, as the service users, is presented in this chapter and the feedback from the Coordinators and community stakeholders is used to elucidate the discussion of the findings.

**Findings for Hypothesis 1: Governance**

*As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.*

**Empirical Research Question:**

Does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism, enhance delivery and outcome of public services? (structure)

**Findings from Monitoring the Partnership 2006-2010**

Data from monitoring the partnership process and the interviews with Board members will be used to supplement the discussion of the findings in chapter seven. The data from the Nuffield Assessment are presented below.

**The Partnership Assessment**

Findings from monitoring the Partnership were supplemented by data from the Nuffield Partnership Assessment questionnaire which was distributed to board members and the results are presented below. In order to explicate the layout of the findings and to aid an understanding of the results, a brief resume of the survey questionnaire is presented here.

The Nuffield Partnership Assessment outlines six partnership principles that are necessary for successful collaboration (See Appendix 2). For each principle the participant is asked to consider six statements and with the use of the likert scale to indicate to what extent they agree or disagree with them. They may also add
additional comments. The answers range from strongly agree to strongly disagree and score as follows:

Strongly Agree (SA) =4; Agree (A) =3; Disagree (D) =2; Strongly Disagree (SD) =1

The maximum aggregate score for each principle is 24 (6x4). The scores for each principle have the following significance:

**Principle 1: Recognise and accept the need for partnership**
19-24: Very high recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership
13-18: The need for partnership is recognised and accepted
7-12: Recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership is limited
6: Recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership is minimal

**Principle 2: Develop clarity and realism of purpose**
19-24: The purpose of the partnership is very clear and realistic
13-18: There is some degree of purpose and realism to the partnership
7-12: Only limited clarity and realism of purpose exists
6: The partnership lacks any clarity or sense of purpose

**Principle 3: Ensure commitment and ownership**
19-24: The partnership is characterised by strong commitment and wide ownership
13-18: There is some degree of commitment to, and ownership of, the partnership
7-12: Only limited partnership commitment and ownership can be identified
6: There is little or no commitment to, or ownership of, the partnership

**Principle 4: Develop and maintain trust**
19-24: There is well developed trust amongst the partners
13-18: There is some degree of trust amongst partners
7-12: Trust among partners is poorly developed
6: There is little or no trust among partners

**Principle 5: Create clear and robust partnership working arrangements**
19-24: Partnership working arrangements are very clear and robust
13-18: Partnership working arrangements are reasonably clear and robust
7-12: Partnership working arrangements are insufficiently clear and robust
6: Partnership working arrangements are poor

**Principle 6 Monitor, measure and learn**

19-24: The partnership monitors, measures and learns from its performance very well
13-18: The partnership monitors, measures and learns from its performance reasonably well
7-12: The partnership monitors, measures and learns from its performance poorly in some respects
6: The partnership monitors, measures and learns from its performance poorly in most respects or not at all

The results are aggregated (results will range between 144 and 36 and broken down into four scoring segments A (109-144), B (73-108), C (37-72) and D (36). If scores fall into the ‘A’ segment the assessment suggests that the Partnership is working well. If the score is in ‘B’ the assessment suggests that the Partnership is working well in some parts but weaknesses exist. If the score is in ‘C’, then the assessment highlights significant areas of concern while ‘D’ denotes that the Partnership is working badly in all respects. The degree of action required depends on the outcome of the assessment ranging from the requirement of a regular review at the higher end to urgent remedial action at the lower end of the scale. It must be recalled here again that only two of the three agencies participated in this survey. Because the lead-agency out-numbered the other two agencies by a ratio of 6:2 on the board, the results of the aggregate part of the exercise are not as representative as they might otherwise be. The assessment is used here to triangulate data and add richness to the overall findings and not as a stand-alone assessment. Therefore to minimise bias, the researcher averaged the score of each of the agents in the lead-agency. The results of the survey are supplemented by the semi-structured interviews with the board members, the data gathered through monitoring the Partnership and from the evaluation of the Scheme. Using the aggregate score for LCC and the score from An Garda Síochána therefore could only give an early indication of the health of the Partnership.

The researcher also had a secondary use for the Nuffield Assessment. Because monitoring the Partnership process and the interviews with board members revealed a deficit of knowledge of successful MAP working, the Assessment also served as a
learning tool, to raise awareness, among the board members, of the complexity of the MAP process.

**Results of the Partnership Assessment Survey**

The quantitative results, for each statement, are presented here without discussion. In chapter seven, in order to give a more holistic picture of the Partnership, these findings are analysed together with the data from monitoring the Partnership.

**Principle 1: Recognise and Accept the Need for Partnership**

The results show that there is recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership. (1xSA; 3xA, 3xD). In the lead-agency there was strong agreement with this statement from senior management. All members of the Partnership were in agreement that the factors associated with partnership working, as well as the barriers to successful partnership, were known and understood (7xA in both cases). The circumstances (for example whether voluntary or mandated) in which Partnership agents participated were recognised and understood by the majority of agents while one disagreed (6xA; 1xD). The majority of agents disagreed with the statement that there was a clear understanding of interdependence between agencies to achieve their goal (5xD; 2xA). On the other hand the majority of agents agreed that there was a mutual understanding of how the agencies could work independently of one another to achieve some goals (1xSA; 5xA; 1xD).

**Principle 2: Have Clarity and Realism of Purpose**

The Partnership agents unanimously agreed that the Partnership had a clear vision with shared values and agreed service principles (7xA). All members of the lead-agency disagreed that there were clearly defined joint aims and objectives while the other Partnership agency strongly agreed that there were (6xD; 1xSA). This raises a question regarding clarification of ‘joint’ aims as well as each agent’s motive for joining, engaging with the Partnership in the first place and what ‘was in it’ for their organisation. Members of the lead-agency were divided on the statement that the joint aims were realistic (1x SA, 3xA; 3xD). In the lead-agency senior management agreed they were realistic while operational management disagreed. The other Partnership agency strongly agreed that they were realistic. The scores show the majority of members disagreed that the service outcomes were clearly defined with
only one senior member of the lead-agency concurring with the statement (5xD; 1xSA; 1xA). The other partnership agent agreed with the statement. The rationale for participating in the Partnership was not widely understood or accepted (1xA; 2xSD; 4xD). Members of the lead-agency either strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement while the other partner agent agreed. A narrow majority of members agreed that areas where early Partnership success might be likely had been identified (4xA; 3xD).

**Principle 3: Ensure Commitment and Ownership**

Only senior agents strongly agreed that there was commitment to partnership working while the majority of agents either disagreed or strongly disagreed (2xSA; 2xSD; 3xD). All agents in the lead-agency disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that there was widespread ownership of the partnership process while the other partner agent strongly agreed with the statement (1xSA; 4xD; 2xSD). There was strong disagreement in the lead-agency that the commitment was strong enough to withstand any threats to its working while the other partner agent strongly agreed (1xSA; 2xSD; 4xD). The majority of agents agreed that networking was recognised and encouraged but they were divided on whether or not the Partnership was not dependent for its success solely upon individuals with networking skills with a narrow majority disagreeing with the statement (1xSA; 5xA; 1xD) and recognising networking as an important function of partnership working (3xA; 4xD). There was strong disagreement in the lead-agency that not working in partnership is discouraged and dealt with while the other partner agency agreed with this statement (1xA; 2xSD; 4xD).

**Principle 4: Develop and Maintain Trust**

All but one of the agents (a senior member of the lead-agency) agreed that the structure of the Partnership is such that the value of each partner’s contribution is recognised and valued (1xSA; 5xA; 1xD). The majority of agents agreed that each partner’s contribution was recognised in the Partnership’s work (5xA; 2xD). There was a mixed response to the statement that benefits derived from the Partnership were fairly distributed with almost half disagreeing with the statement while one agent strongly disagreed (3xA; 1xSD; 3xD). The majority of agents agreed that there was sufficient trust within the Partnership to survive any mistrust that might arise elsewhere (6xA; 1xD). However they disagreed that levels of trust were high enough
Principle 5: Create Clear and Robust Partnership Arrangements
There was general agreement that the financial resources each partner brought to the Partnership were clear (2xSA; 4xA;1xD). In this case, the pilot project was entirely funded by the DoEHLG for the duration of the pilot period. Resources, other than finance, were not as clearly understood with the majority of agents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with this statement (2xSD; 3xD; 1xSA;1xA). There was little understanding of each partner’s areas of responsibility with the majority disagreeing with this statement (1xSA; 2xA; 4xD). There was a mixed response to the statement that there were clear lines of accountability for the performance of the Partnership as a whole with a little more than half agreeing with the statement (4xA; 3xD). The majority of agents agreed that the Partnership’s operational arrangements were simple, time-limited and task-oriented (1xSA;5xA;1xD). All the agents agreed that process, outcomes and innovation were the principal focus of the Partnership (1xSA; 6xA).

Principle 6: Monitor, Measure and Learn
A small majority of agents agreed that the Partnership had clear success criteria in terms of service goals and the Partnership itself. Three agents, at operational level, either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (4xA; 2xSD;1xD ). The latter agents also disagreed with the statement that the Partnership had clear arrangements to effectively monitor and review the success of the service aims and objectives (4xA; 1xSD; 2xD). A small majority agreed that there were clear arrangements to monitor and review how the Partnership itself was working while three agents disagreed with this statement (4xA; 3xD). The majority agreed that there were clear arrangements to ensure that monitoring and review findings were shared and disseminated amongst the partners while two agents disagreed with the statement (5xA; 2xD). All but one of the agents agreed that partnership success was well communicated outside the Partnership (6xA;1xD). The majority of agents agreed that clear arrangements were in place to ensure that the Partnership’s aims
and objectives were reconsidered and revised based on the monitoring and review findings (5xA;2xD).

The following table presents the scores out of a maximum of 24, recorded for each of the six principles.

**Principle 1** Recognise and accept need for partnership  
**Principle 2** Develop clarity and realism of purpose  
**Principle 3** Ensure commitment and ownership  
**Principle 4** Develop and maintain trust  
**Principle 5** Create clear and robust partnership arrangements  
**Principle 6** Monitor, measure and learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>AVG(A)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G(B)</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg</td>
<td><strong>88.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the two agencies (identified as (A) and (B) above, the scores indicate:

Prin 1: A) The need for partnership is recognised and accepted (13-18)  
B) The need for partnership is recognised and accepted (13-18)

Prin 2: A) There is some degree of purpose and realism to the partnership (13-18)  
B) The purpose of the partnership is very clear and realistic (19-24)

Prin 3: A) There is some degree of commitment to, and ownership of, the partnership (this is borderline) (13-18)
B) The partnership is characterised by strong commitment and wide ownership (19-24)

Prin 4 A) There is some degree of trust among partners (13-18)

B) There is well developed trust between partners (19-24)

Prin 5 A) Partnership working arrangements are reasonably clear and robust (13-18)

B) Partnership working arrangements are very clear and robust (19-24)

Prin 6 A) The partnership monitors, measures and learns from its performance reasonably well (13-18)

B) The partnership monitors, measures and learns from its performance reasonably well (13-18)

Aggregate scores for agencies (a) and (b)

(A) = 88.5 Assessment suggests Partnership is working well in some parts but there are concerns about others. Partners need to decide how to address these areas of concern.

(B) = 120 Assessment suggests Partnership working well. Partners need to consider how often to build in a regular review.

Significance of each of the 6 principles held by the Partnership board

This table presents the findings from the Partnership agents on how significant they regard each partnership principle ranging from more to less significant.

Significance of Principles of Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More significant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Less Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recognise and accept need for Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 1</th>
<th>B;E</th>
<th>A;D;G</th>
<th>F;C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Develop clarity and realism of purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle 2</th>
<th>A;G</th>
<th>D;E</th>
<th>F;C</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Ensure commitment and ownership

| Principle 3 | B:D:E; F;G | C | A |

Develop and maintain trust

| Principle 4 | G | D | C | A:B | E:F |

Create clear and robust partnership arrangements

| Principle 5 | A:B | G | D:E:C | F |

Monitor, measure and learn

| Principle 6 | G | A:B; C; D | E:F |

Giving their perceptions of how significant they considered each of the principles were to the Partnership, the agents responded: that recognising and accepting the need for partnership; developing clarity and realism of purpose and ensuring commitment and ownership were significant principles. There was no strong perception of the significance of trust, robust partnership arrangements or monitoring and evaluation.

Finally, with regard to the overall statement from the Partnership agents on whether:

‘The partnership is achieving its aims and objectives’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>A; B; C; D;</td>
<td>E; F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One agent strongly agrees that the Partnership is achieving its aims and objectives. While senior management on the board agree with the statement, those involved in the operation of the Scheme, disagreed.

The findings of the Nuffield Assessment will be discussed in detail in chapter seven. The next part of this chapter presents the findings for the second research hypothesis.
Findings for Hypothesis 2: Public Policy Implementation and Service Delivery

Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.

Empirical Research Questions:

1. Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process)
2. Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)

In order to address the first question is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? findings from monitoring the implementation of the Scheme were explored. A summary of the main findings are presented below.

Findings from Monitoring and Evaluating the Scheme 2006–2010

Context is a critical characteristic of a successful MAP. In order to contextualise the Scheme, a brief history of the context in which the Scheme was implemented is presented here. A more in-depth discussion will take place in chapter seven.

The Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme was the first pilot community safety initiative to be funded by the DoEHLG to deliver community safety interventions in local governance. Wardens’ schemes have since commenced, for example in Cork and in Sligo, but Sligo differs from the Scheme in that the wardens in that location have enforcement powers. Community-led community safety initiatives are also present in Tallaght West and Tralee. It was recognised at the outset by the Partnership that establishing the Scheme might present challenges. Not least among these was gaining support for this innovative approach to community safety from statutory agencies, community groups and politicians. It was evident, during the efforts made by the Partnership to establish the Scheme in the communities, that a degree of scepticism existed as to its potential for tackling ASB. Some people already working for community agencies saw it as just another initiative that would overlap rather than enhance their activities. This perception was evident at a public meeting held in LCC before the Scheme was launched and was borne out in baseline interviews with key community stakeholders at the time. There was a lack of understanding regarding the
role of the Coordinators and in some cases it was argued that the money would be better spent on developing existing initiatives. The ‘powers’ of the Coordinators were an issue and community agents enquired if the Coordinators would have better access to LCC services than they enjoyed. They queried if LCC could ‘fast track’ the Coordinators’ queries over theirs? There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that these issues, as well as the contention that not enough local representation was involved in running it, were a cause of some resistance to the Scheme. Key community stakeholders suggested that the Scheme should start out with a small number of objectives so that any successful outcomes would be easily recognised by members of the community. In the interest of good working relationships they should also choose less controversial objectives, for example, to work with vulnerable groups such as the elderly or youth. The notion of having the Scheme monitored and evaluated from the outset was generally regarded as a worthwhile exercise provided the communities were made aware of the outcome.

The first evaluation in 2008 showed, that over time resistance to the Scheme appeared to lessen as the Coordinators met with politicians, community agencies, members of community groups and tenants. The Coordinators’ high visibility on the ground, and their uniforms helped to create an awareness of the Scheme. This research showed that, while the environment in which the Scheme was introduced was somewhat discouraging, the early efforts of the Coordinators were reasonably successful in linking with other community agencies and tackling anti-social behaviour.

A second evaluation was undertaken in 2010. This evaluation built on the research undertaken for the Interim Case Report 2008 to provide a Final Case Report 2010 on the process, outputs and outcome of the Scheme for the Partnership. Feedback from these evaluations is presented below.

As a result of the monitoring process, the researcher found that the issues identified could be divided into two broad areas:

a) Launching the Scheme
   - Workshops
   - Naming the Scheme
   - Location of Scheme

b) Managing the Scheme
• Management
• Staff Turnover
• Operational Plan
• Budget
• Service Level Agreements
• Training
• Publicity

Launching the Scheme

Early Workshops

The main purpose of the workshops was:

- To identify issues in local authority housing estates in Limerick which could be tackled by the Coordinator Scheme
- To draw up a plan of action
- To draw up a business plan

The workshops were held before the Scheme was launched. As the Coordinators had yet to be recruited, they were not in attendance. Consequently when the Coordinators commenced duties, they were not familiar with the outcome of these workshops. Attendance would have helped put their brief in context.

Naming the Scheme

The Scheme was a Community Safety Partnership intervention. When the Scheme was first mooted, the draft aims and objectives were very much ‘safety oriented’ for example there was more emphasis on terms such as ‘anti-social behaviour’, ‘victims’, ‘eyes and ears of community’. By the time the Scheme was rolled out, the policies for tackling ASB were more 'environmental' than 'community safety' oriented. This had consequences for the perception of the Scheme and the role of the Coordinators in that it allied the Scheme closely to the role of LCC as distinct from the Safety Partnership. If the term ‘safety’ appeared in the title of the Scheme it might have helped to clearly delineate it from other community initiatives and prevented confusion and scepticism. Stakeholders might have 'bought into it' more – possibly identifying initiatives with a ‘safety’ theme themselves in which to co-operate with the Scheme. This would have had a two-way effect. The Coordinators could show that they were ‘linking’ with current community organisations and the community organisations could demonstrate co-operation with the Scheme.
Location of the Scheme/Office Space

The Scheme was administered from Limerick City Council (LCC) offices. Working out of LCC made it difficult to ‘separate out’ the Scheme from other LCC departments and programmes. For example the Coordinators were often perceived as working for the housing department as tenant liaison officers. This was a factor in making the ‘safety’ objective of the Scheme more evident.

The office space was small with very little storage area. Proximity to other LCC departments, while convenient for follow-up on issues, were a drawback for administrative purposes particularly as the Coordinator team convened there on a daily basis for reporting purposes and this had noise level implications for other people working in the vicinity.

There were only two computers one of which was used constantly by the Administrating Coordinator. This made it difficult for other Coordinators to gain access to a computer particularly for research purposes.

Managing the Scheme

Overall management of the Scheme was the responsibility of the Partnership, with LCC as the lead agency. There was a significant operational management changeover in LCC. This had repercussions for the Scheme. Throughout the first year of operation, senior management in the partner agencies appeared to be somewhat removed from the Scheme resulting in a lack of clear structures of engagement between the various levels.

The Project Manager responsible for the ‘day to day’ management of the Scheme did not initially reside in the LCC building. The fact that he was not in the building appeared to be a disadvantage from the point of view of facilitating day-to-day administration of the Scheme. As a result communication between the Project Manager, the team leader, the Coordinators and evaluator was inadequate at times. It also led to problems for the evaluator for the on-going monitoring of the Scheme.

\[4\] Since November 2008 the newly appointed Project Manager is based in LCC.
Staff Turnover

At the outset there were seven Coordinators (5 females and 2 males), one team leader and one administrator. At the time of writing up the first evaluation, the two male Coordinators had left. One Coordinator had moved to another department within LCC, one coordinator was out on extended sick-leave and one out for personal reasons. The administrative position was vacant and there was one Coordinator appointment made. This resulted in a lot of change in the team. Originally there was no panel of Coordinators in place to call on at short notice. However a panel was later drawn up for interviews for the part-time position. When employing a Coordinator, there are legal requirements around Garda Vetting and Health Checks as well as ensuring Coordinators had necessary vaccinations. This can involve a time delay and had to be considered when advertising vacancies or maintaining a panel.

Operational Plan

There was no formal operational plan in place before the Scheme was initiated. The actions were deliberately left ‘loose’ to allow them ‘evolve’. This approach had both positive and negative repercussions for the Scheme, but the negative ones outnumbered the positive.

Pros

- The Coordinators had 'carte blanche' regarding their role
- It allowed the Coordinators use their initiative and creativity
- It fostered team co-operation

Cons

- There was no expertise in the team for formulating an operational plan
- There was no expertise in the team for formulating a business plan
- The Coordinators were unsure of their role going out into the communities
- This was noticeable particularly to community stakeholders
- The Coordinators did not have enough relevant work experience e.g. community development work, warden work, safety work, to handle the ‘politics’ of working in the community
- The Coordinators had to ‘assume’ a role and this caused them problems e.g.
  - They were uncertain about the scope of their job
  - This led to uncertainty in commitments to activities
  - They were uncertain as to how much support they would get within LCC
- Stronger members of the team might have stronger views and be more persuasive and this was not conducive to good teamwork
- The lack of a defined role may have made the community stakeholders a little sceptical - in other words was the Scheme just another community initiative with no thought given as to how it might enhance current initiatives or introduce new ones?
- Not all community stakeholders were as co-operative as they might have been. There was anecdotal evidence to suggest that they were concerned the Coordinators were moving in 'on their patch'

**Budget for the Scheme**

The Scheme was funded by the DoEHLG for two years at €1m. The Scheme had to be funded by the Partnership agencies after that time if the Scheme was to continue. No effort was made as the pilot period drew near to end-date, to secure more funding. Insecurity in relation to future funding impacted the tenure of the Coordinators. The Coordinators were constantly concerned about their job security.

Insecurity of tenure led to the Coordinators at times seeking out other opportunities to expand the Scheme (for example into other areas such as Garryowen and Ballynanty). They commenced work in Ballynanty. Garryowen was still under review. The Coordinators took on responsibility for the Rented Accommodation Scheme (RAS) for a six-month period. In so doing there was a danger that they were 'creating a need' for the Scheme and that resources would be stretched too far leading to 'quantity' rather than 'quality' of output. It also moved the focus away from the 'safety' role of the Scheme to a 'housing' role.

These developments may have had the effect that the objective of the Scheme, namely community safety, was reduced to the extent that it might get lost amongst the other many community initiatives and be seen as another 'housing' programme.

**Service Level Agreements**

There were no Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in place. This was a serious drawback. It impacted on delivery of the service as well as inter-agency cooperation.
Training of Coordinators

Although they received some training initially, it was recognised that the Coordinators could benefit from a trip to Stockport or some such Warden Scheme in the UK for benchmarking purposes. There was no opportunity for such a trip.

Publicity for the Scheme

Mainly the publicity for the Scheme was provided through an Information Leaflet and the Website. A newsletter was distributed on the first anniversary of the Scheme. There was a video explaining the aims and objectives of the Scheme with testimonials from tenants and community representatives. Both the newsletter and video were very well received. However, the following observations were made:

- The Coordinator’s Business Cards said – Limerick City Community Safety Partnership, Housing Department, LCC, with no reference to Limerick Community Coordinators
- The Information Leaflet - ‘Putting community spirit back on the map’ – did not openly demonstrate the ‘link’ with community safety

In summary, at the interim stage in 2008, there was evidence that the Scheme, as a pilot intervention, was making some impact on community safety on the estates. Survey feedback from the Coordinators, community stakeholders and tenants showed a perceived reduction in the fear of crime and ASB, an improvement in the environment, an increase in community spirit and a greater awareness of community safety on the estates where the Scheme was operating. However since the first evaluation was conducted when the Scheme was only in operation twelve months, which is considered a very short period in the life of a programme, the results were regarded very cautiously.

Notwithstanding this outcome, the research exposed operating weaknesses in the system that required attention in order to ensure the future sustainability of the Scheme. At the interim stage a recommendation was made to review the following areas in order to improve the service for the service users. These issues will be further discussed in chapter seven:

- Future Funding
- Management Structure
- Clarity of Aims and Objectives
- Development of Service Level Agreements and Protocols
- Administrative Site
• Appointment of a team leader and administrator
• Recruitment of panel of Coordinators
• Training and development schedule for the Coordinators
• Log-Book Template
• Development of Operational Plans
• Publicity Tools and the website

These issues were addressed as the Scheme evolved and are discussed in detail in chapter seven.

By the end of 2010, it was evident that the operational management of the Scheme had become more streamlined and the service was focused to better respond to community needs. Monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the Scheme showed that an improvement in community safety on the housing estates had been achieved. There was evidence to suggest that the MAP approach enhanced the service and ensured more use of the partnership agencies resources. While it was not possible to infer definitively that the improvement was achieved solely as a result of the Scheme, there was strong evidence of the outcome of the Scheme as provided by the log-book data and photographic-evidence.

**Hypothesis 2: Question 2**

*Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user?*

This question was addressed through the two evaluations conducted on the Scheme, the first in 2008 and the second in 2010. Data derived from an analysis of the log-books together with feedback from the tenants’ surveys and focus groups in both evaluations are used here to explore this question.

**Feedback from Evaluation (1)**

The interim evaluation was conducted in order to get early feedback on the impact of the Scheme and to review the operational processes for efficiency and effectiveness. It took place between June and September 2008. While the timeframe and resources were restrictive, every effort was made to gather as much feedback from as broad a range of stakeholders as possible during this process. As the sample size could be considered small for each participating group in the research (as outlined in chapter five), every effort was made to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. It must be noted here that this was an interim study, a 'work-in-progress' and the outcome
represents merely a ‘snapshot’ of the Scheme at the midway stage. It was however extremely useful for the following reasons:

- To re-examine the aims, objectives and outcomes to-date
- To review the operational processes
- To document procedures for setting up a community safety scheme

Review of the Log-Books

Six months into the Scheme it became clear that a pattern was forming. Analysis of the log-book started with a review of, and in some cases a re-coding, of early entries to provide consistency in the data. The incidents requiring action were in turn categorised under the four main aims of the Scheme. An examination of these incidents and actions taken, provided a basic guideline as to the direction the Scheme was taking. The Table 6.1, presented below, includes the list of incidents/actions used for analysis at the interim stage of the Scheme.
Table 6.1  Log-Book template used at interim stage of the Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASB</th>
<th>Reducing Fear of Crime</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Fire</th>
<th>TCI</th>
<th>Travelling Community Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Assault on Person</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Green Areas</td>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Coordinator Abuse Physical</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Coordinator Abuse Verbal</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Drug Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS</td>
<td>Damage to Bus Shelter</td>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>HN</td>
<td>Hypodermic Needles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPB</td>
<td>Damage to Phone Box</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pest Control</td>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Information Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>Damage to Street Furniture</td>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>Rubbish for Collection</td>
<td>JUMP</td>
<td>JUMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Road Obstruction</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Leaflet Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Theft from Person</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Stray Animals</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Queries</td>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Trolleys abandoned</td>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Rented Accommodation Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Water Leak</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Racial Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Theft from vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raising Community Spirit</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Sex Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>BEG</td>
<td>Beggars</td>
<td>SDD</td>
<td>Suspected Drug Dealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Van Patrol</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dangerous Animals</td>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>Truancy Observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates highlighted text in the table.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WLK</td>
<td>Walkabout</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Improving Environment</strong></td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Homeless Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Shops/Advertising Boards</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Illegal Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Abandoned House</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Lost Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Lost Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINS</td>
<td>Bins Overflowing</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Noise Nuisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Broken Glass</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Personal Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Blocked Drains</td>
<td>RTA</td>
<td>Road Traffic Accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Broken Pavement</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Suspicious Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Dangerous Materials</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Suspected Child Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL</td>
<td>Defective Street Lighting</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Fallen Trees</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Suspected Spousal Abuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Data from Log-Books (1)

#### Table 6.2  Actions to help reduce the fear of crime and ASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>Southside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Assault on Person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Coordinator Abuse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Coordinator Abuse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS</td>
<td>Damage to Bus Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPB</td>
<td>Damage to Phone Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>Damage to Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Theft from Person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Queries</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Van Patrol</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLK</td>
<td>Walkabout</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first aim of the Scheme was to reduce the fear of crime and ASB. Under this heading various types of incidents are listed above which, it was assumed, if addressed by the Coordinators, might have the effect of achieving this aim.

By far the greatest number of entries in this section was for tenancy queries. An examination of these queries showed that more focus should have been put by the Coordinators on ‘community safety’ rather than ‘housing’ queries. The number of tenancy queries in Northside was more than three times higher than in Southside but the number of tenancies in Northside vis à vis the Southside might account for this. The following list provides an indication of the type of incidents reported regarding tenancy queries:

- Queries re: place on housing list
- Follow up on painting/housing repairs
• Requests housing/smoke alarms
• Leaks
• Voids
• Fencing/gates/walls
• Broken windows
• Rats
• Aids for special needs
• Telephone installation
• Heating System problems
• Clean-up of estates
• Rubbish removal
• Waivers

In 2007 the number of ASB incidents recorded is far greater in Northside than those reported in Southside. However, in 2008, the number of incidents reported in both areas is more balanced. Examples given of ASB are as follows:

• Broken Window
• Trees cut down
• Health problems as a result of ASB
• Youths gathering in occupied house
• Youth caught in the act of graffiti
• Youth driving at high speed/joy riding
• Youth using ‘petrol bombs’
• Children trying to gain access to building using truck for leverage
• Street drinking
• Letting off fireworks
• Riding horses in prohibited areas
• Drug use on stairwell

There were also incidents of ‘vandalism’ reported, twenty (20) throughout the year. However, when reviewed, examples of ‘vandalism’ included broken windows or damaged flowers and these could as well be clustered under ASB. Combining the ‘ASB’ and ‘Vandalism’ categories was later considered.

Originally, in 2007 the Coordinators did not log their foot and van patrols. But the necessity to account for the time spent on these patrols was realised early on because it was considerable. Logging the foot and van patrols was also helpful in drawing up rosters and work schedules.
In this section ‘illegal dumping’ accounted for the vast majority of incidents reported with Northside (256 incidents) experiencing a greater problem than Southside (105 incidents). Graffiti is also listed (63 incidents) but compared to ‘illegal dumping’ could not be regarded a big problem even though it was often raised by tenants in the survey as contributing to their poor quality of life. Incidents of ‘rubbish for collection’ and ‘abandoned trolleys’ were also reported in both Northside and Southside. There were twenty-three (23) ‘abandoned vehicles’ reported. There were almost twice as many ‘abandoned vehicles’ reported in 2008 than 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Year Northside</th>
<th>Year Southside</th>
<th>Year Northside</th>
<th>Year Southside</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Shops/Advertising Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Abandoned House</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Abandoned Vehicle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINS</td>
<td>Bins Overflowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Broken Glass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Block Drains</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Broken Pavement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Dangerous materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL</td>
<td>Defective Street Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Fallen Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Fly Posting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Green Areas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pest Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>Rubbish for Collection</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Road Obstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Stray Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Trolleys/Abandoned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Water Leak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.4 Actions to help raise community spirit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>Southside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEG</td>
<td>Beggars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dangerous Animals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Homeless Person</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Illegal Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Lost Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Lost Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Noise Nuisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Personal Attention</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
<td>Road Traffic Accident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Suspicious Activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Suspected Child Abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Suspected Spousal Abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section a large majority of entries were recorded as ‘personal attention’. This category was included in 2008 only but the number of ‘personal attention’ logged for Northside far outweighed that given in Southside (26). Examples of ‘personal attention’ entries are shown in the list below:

- Arranged meetings
- Attending meetings
- Telephone calls to community agencies
- Telephone calls to community groups
- Attended Summer Camp
- Organising community day
- Accompanied groups on outing
- Dropping off rubbish
- Taking photographs
- Installing smoke alarms
Table 6.5 Actions to create more awareness of community safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Northside</th>
<th>Southside</th>
<th>Northside</th>
<th>Southside</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating an awareness of community safety through education &amp; information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Drug Users</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>Hypodermic Needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Information Giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMP</td>
<td>JUMP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Leaflet Drop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Rented Accomm.Mgmt</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Racial Crime</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Sex Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDD</td>
<td>Suspected Drug Dealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>Truancy Observed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be seen from this section, that ‘Administration’ was included from late 2007 onwards. In addition to the time spent by the Administrating Coordinator at the base in LCC, inclusion of ‘administration’ was necessary to account for the time taken on a daily basis by the Coordinators to make log-book entries and conduct any other business that required follow-up by them. It was also helpful when drawing up rosters and work schedules.

‘Information giving’ accounted for a large majority of incidents recorded in this section. The entries under this heading were similar to those given under ‘personal attention’. Examples are shown below:

- Attended coffee morning
- Attended youth club
- Visited Health Centre
- Gave information over telephone
- Called to Crèche
- Called to local business
- Letter drop
- Letter follow-up
- Took group on a trip (e.g. children to Marine Rescue)
As may be seen here, there was an overlap between ‘personal attention’ and ‘information giving’ so these two categories were later reviewed and entered under each of the four themes to more accurately identify under which of the four themes these activities occurred most often.

A review of the combined sections of the log-book showed that there were incidents in each section suitable for entry in other sections. For example ‘street drinking’ under ‘Raising Community Spirit’ might also be entered under ‘ASB’ which was listed under ‘Reducing the Fear of Crime’. It was evident that no finite list of incidents could be developed for each section and that overlapping might occur. It was also observed that for some incidents, there were no entries at all or very few. These incidents were re-clustered and put with broader incidents where appropriate.

Over time, at the request of LCC, the Scheme diversified into other types of activities namely the Rented Accommodation Scheme (RAS) and conducting ‘Leaflet Drops’. The RAS involved dealing with tenants who had acquired houses from LCC under this scheme. The Coordinators were also involved in ‘leaflet drops’ for other departments in LCC. In order to facilitate such activities, it was suggested that protocols may be required as expanding into such activities, not directly related to the objective of the Scheme, had repercussions for the work schedule of the Coordinators.

Overall, refining the categories and entry-system over the first year of operation was very informative. The first six months were the most difficult as it was necessary to log every incident in more detail to illustrate the type of incidents and actions the Coordinators were experiencing. As a result of monitoring and modifying the log-book system throughout the first year, a shorter and more user-friendly version of the log-book continued to be developed which more accurately reflected the service provided by the Scheme.

**Survey of Tenants (1)**

Data from tenants was collected in two ways – firstly through survey questionnaires and secondly through focus groups. The themes analysed in the surveys included the following:
• Awareness of the Scheme
• Contact with the Scheme
• Improved services because of the Scheme
• New service initiatives due to the Scheme
• Inter-Agency Linkage
• Quality of Life perceptions
• Best practice
• Constraints
• Improvement of Scheme
• Expansion of Scheme

All but one of the estates covered by the Scheme was represented in the feedback. There was no response from Johnsgate where there were only two local authority houses rented. The breakdown of responses from each estate is presented in Table 6.6 below.

Table 6.6 Breakdown of responses from each housing estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Estate</th>
<th>Total No. of Houses</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galvone</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathbale</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Park</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarsfield Park</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Houses</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notwithstanding the low response rate, it is worth noting that the response rates from Sarsfield Park and Watergate were relatively high at twenty-five and twenty-one per cent respectively. This might be due to the fact that these housing estates are spatially defined areas and therefore any impact of the Coordinator Scheme might be more apparent to the tenants. Table 6.7 presents an age-profile of the respondents.

Table 6.7 Age profile of tenants and location of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>18-25 Years</th>
<th>26-35 Years</th>
<th>36-45 Years</th>
<th>46-55 Years</th>
<th>56+ Years</th>
<th>No Resp.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galvone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathbale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As may be seen from this table, most responses came from the 56+ age group, followed by the 26-35 and 36-45 groups.

Table 6.8 Breakdown of responses by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there was a greater response from female tenants, the number of responses from men was relatively high. From the researcher’s experience, this is a point worth noting. There may be several reasons for this including the age-group of respondents. For example, if the Scheme offered support to the elderly, and a couple responded, the male might complete the form. Or it may be that the overall purpose of the Scheme, namely to reduce anti-social behaviour, is of more interest to males than other issues might be. This finding might be significant for the activities of the Coordinators for enlisting more male cooperation.

The age profile of the respondents might be directly related to the type of activities engaged in by the Coordinators. For example the response was high between the ages of 26-45 years. If there were parents in this age group whose children were involved in activities organised by the Coordinators, it might be more likely they would respond. In the same way for the ‘+56’ group if the Coordinators were involved in activities for the elderly.

The tenants were asked how they first heard about the Scheme. The responses are presented in Table 6.9 below:
Table 6.9 Tenants’ awareness of Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How tenants first heard of Scheme</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Coordinator</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents association or community group</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour/Friend/Relative</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Newspapers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Newsletter</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Leaflet</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other /Met on street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total response</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of tenants had first become aware of the Scheme through personal contact with the Coordinators by means of house visits or meeting them on the street. The next most common conduit was through residents’ associations and community groups while the Coordinator Leaflet was the third most common response.

For safety reasons the Coordinators did not wear identity badges. This might have influenced the tenants’ responses to this question. It is interesting to note however that the two spatially defined areas namely Sarsfield Park and Watergate, have a high number of tenants unfamiliar with the Coordinators’ name. The Coordinators' names were not well known in Kileely and Thomondgate but this might be explained by the size of the estates covered by the Scheme in these areas. How well the tenants knew the Coordinators is represented below in Table 6.10 and Table 6.11.

Table 6.10 Tenants’ knowledge of Coordinators’ names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Yes/No</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11 Tenants’ knowledge of Coordinators’ names by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galvone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarsfield Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.12 below outlines the methods used by tenants to contact the Scheme.

### Table 6.12 Tenants’ contact with Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact with Scheme</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calling to Coordinators Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By phoning them at City Hall</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By writing a letter to them</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to meet on Street</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Way/Business Card</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no idea how to contact them</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent method of contacting the Coordinators was by letter or personally meeting them. Calling to their office in City Hall and the use of the Business Card were the least frequent. Of those who responded, the number of tenants who said they had no idea how to contact the Coordinators was high at sixteen (or twenty per cent).

When asked how aware they were of the role of the Coordinator, forty-eight respondents said they were aware of the role of the Coordinators, while twenty-eight were not and nineteen did not respond to this question.

The tenants were asked to select from a list, what they perceived the role of the Coordinator involved. In some instances more than one activity was noted.

Table 6.13 outlines the role of the Coordinators as perceived by the tenants.

### Table 6.13 Tenants’ awareness of Coordinators’ role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Repairs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving information on housing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information on other support groups e.g. Limerick City Council, Social Services, Active Retirement Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helping with local groups namely the youth and elderly was seen by tenants as a major part of the Coordinators’ role. ‘Cleaning up graffiti and litter as the next most important followed closely by ‘providing information’. ‘Reporting Repairs’ was seen as the next most important job. The tenant who responded with ‘other’ suggested that ‘painting walls’ was part of their job while a high percentage, seventeen respondents said they had no idea what the role of the Coordinator is. This could be considered high.

The number of tenants who made contact with the Scheme is represented in Table 6.14 below.

Table 6.14 Number of Tenants who made contact with Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made Contact with Coordinators</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty two tenants had made contact with the Coordinators with an issue, sixty had not and thirteen did not respond to this question. Of those who had made contact and choose to disclose the reason on the questionnaire, queries or issues dealt with for them by the Coordinators were mainly housing problems/repairs, examples of which include the following:

- Fitting of fire alarms
- Providing fencing around houses
- Providing gate to house
- Had toilet fixed
- Anti-social behaviour
- Repair of damage caused by ASB
- Clean up of green area
- Completing forms for grants, waivers

When asked how satisfied they were with the response they received they responded as follows:
Table 6.15 Tenants’ rate of satisfaction with Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who were very satisfied felt they had prompt follow-up to their problem.

Examples of their comments include:

‘they got the jobs done that they said they would’

‘the coordinators listened to what a person had to say if they had a problem and phoned back when they said’

‘they did a great job for me and make it safer around here’

‘Very quick, nice and polite’

‘I was happy to be contacted by phone from them to say don’t worry it will be sorted out and it was. It’s a great comfort knowing they are out there keeping a look out. I live on my own. It can get very tense at times. They are a great bunch of people’

A reason given for dissatisfaction or ‘don’t know’ includes:

‘I only saw them once when they came to the door to introduce themselves. I haven’t heard from them since. This is the only time I heard from them’.

The tenants were asked to select activities from a list of options that they felt the Coordinators were involved in. The activities were divided into the four broad themes underpinning the aims and objectives of the Scheme namely:

- Reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour
- Improving the Environment
- Strengthening Community Spirit
- Improving the quality of life through education and training for community safety

Table 6.16 Tenants’ knowledge of Coordinators activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The elderly feel a bit more secure because of seeing the Coordinators on a regular basis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is less anti-social behaviour in the community because of the presence of the Coordinators 15 80 16
There are fewer gangs hanging around because of the presence of the Coordinators 14 81 15

**Improving the environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removal of graffiti</td>
<td>35 60 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of litter</td>
<td>34 61 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing illegal dumping</td>
<td>21 74 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of abandoned/burned out cars</td>
<td>14 81 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengthening community spirit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators attend youth clubs and help organise activities for the youth in the community</td>
<td>34 61 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators attend residents’ meetings and report any issues raised there to Limerick City Council if needed</td>
<td>36 59 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators attend active retirement clubs and listen to and act on concerns that the elderly might have</td>
<td>23 72 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators get good publicity for the area</td>
<td>20 75 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improving the quality of life through education and training in community safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators visit schools and talk to pupils about how they could improve their community</td>
<td>12 83 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators provide information on safety and other issues to residents</td>
<td>20 75 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators work with other support agencies to improve the quality of life in the community</td>
<td>28 67 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About one-third of the tenants (34%) said that the elderly feel more secure for seeing the Coordinators on a regular basis. A low percentage (16%) felt there was less anti-social behaviour because of the Coordinators presence with fifteen percent (15%) saying there were fewer gangs around because of the Scheme.

In relation to the environment, more than a third of tenants (37% and 36% respectively) had observed the removal of graffiti and litter. Twenty-two percent felt the Coordinators had helped prevent illegal dumping while a lower percentage was aware of the removal of abandoned/burned out cars.

Figures were higher for ‘raising community spirit’. Over one-third (38%) were aware that the Coordinators attended residents’ meetings. Similar numbers (35%) knew that they attended youth clubs. Those familiar with the fact that Coordinators attended active retirement clubs was smaller at twenty-four per cent (24%). A low
percentage of tenants (21%) were aware that the Coordinator Scheme got good publicity for their areas.

A relatively high percentage of tenants (29%) were aware that the Coordinators linked with other agencies to improve the quality of life through education and training. Twenty-one percent (21%) knew that they provided information on safety issues. But a low percentage (13%) of tenants were aware that they visited schools to talk to pupils but this might be due to the fact that the majority of respondents were in the 56+ age category.

The tenants were asked if the Coordinators were a help to them in any other way. Thirty-two tenants responded to this question. Examples of other ways that they felt the Coordinators helped are clustered in themes and presented below:

**Working with younger children and youth**

‘There[sic] very good with the children and the area is lovely and clean’

‘Look after the youth’

‘I think that they’ve organised dancing classes for teenagers in the centre’

‘Yes, they help to motivate the kids which gives the kids great confidence and believe (sic) in themselves’

‘Yes, the kids feel the pressance [sic] and know not to throw litter on the ground and it is a good idea when they got the kids to clean up the area with them’.

**Helping with community activities**

‘Organised litter picks and painted over graffiti and powered washed walls’

‘They helped out at the Christmas dinner last year’

‘Yes, they organised a sports /social day for the neighbourhood’

‘Yes, they held a BBQ in the area. It was most enjoyable for children, adults they did a wonderful job. A lot of credit must go to them’

**General help and presence**

‘Yes, help to make application form for burglar alarm in my house’

‘Yes, they give time to any resident that they speak to and are never in so much of a hurry that they cant give time and advice to those that need it – they are wonderful people’

‘Yes, it is a much nicer area to live in now because people care about the area and come together to sort problems that occur’
‘Yes, the co-ordinators do a very good job around. They have time to talk to people and very friendly towards the community and are good listeners’

‘Yes, they are trying to make things better for the community’

The tenants were asked how useful they thought the Scheme was for improving the quality of life in their area. The findings are presented in Table 6.17 below.

Table 6.17 Tenants’ perception of improvement in quality of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness of the Scheme/Quality of Life</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total sixty-three per cent of tenants felt that the Scheme was very useful or useful. This was a very high response rate. However thirty-four per cent had no opinion or did not respond. This could indicate that there was a need for more dissemination of information regarding the Scheme and activities in which the Coordinators were engaged.

The following are examples of comments made by those who said that the Scheme was ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ to them:

‘They are very welcome in the area you always know that there (sic) present and that makes me feel safe. He always stop (sic) to make sure everything is all right’

‘Get the youth to clean up’

‘You can see them on the streets and approach them for any queries’

‘because they help the elderly who have no one else to help them’

‘I see them most every day and I think they are very accessable [sic] if you wanted to contact them’

‘they can help out other departments who are understaffed’

‘ because the area looks nice and clean and tidy and its nice to walk through and see all the graffiti gone off the walls and if everyone picked up there [sic]litter it would be great’

‘It makes our neighbourhood so much cleaner and nicer to live in. Helps the younger generation to respect it too and to get involved and help’

‘ have noticed the quality of life has improved in the area. More peaceful. Elderly not afraid, going out more’
'If I'm correct in assuming that they organised the sports day, then the usefulness of this means of socialising comprises; 1 community spirit increases, 2 neighbours get to know one another and it’s a healthy outlet for both parents and children alike

‘they are an extra tool, have done some good and could build on it’

‘anything that helps to curb the anti social behaviour in the area must be a useful exercise’

‘at least now we know people care about our neighbourhood and it is not going to the dogs’

‘I just think its comforting to have these young friendly people about the place. I know I could approach them if I had a problem’

‘they patrol the area very regular and they seem very keen on their work’

‘because if you wanted to deliver a message or tell someone something, trust me they will do that, and call back with the answer’

Other tenants had reservations regarding the Scheme saying:

‘because they disrupt the local resident group by going over their heads’

‘there are still a lot of teens on drugs’

‘like I said, spoke to them once and that was it. Maybe there[sic] more interested in the elderly people in my area. Not that I’m against that. I think its actually good for the elderly’

Two tenants had very negative views. One said ‘they don’t do anything for people’ while the other said ‘quality of life does not mean picking up a few papers 3 times a year’

While most tenants were positive about the Scheme, one tenant was more tentative saying

‘ they have shown that they can help. We await to see how their involvement develops’.

When asked which part of the Coordinators’ work they found most useful in their areas forty-two tenants responded. The responses are clustered as follows ranging from the most to the least useful

- Tackling ASB
- Clean up of area
- Improving Community spirit
- Helping elderly
- Housing
- Presence
- Providing information
- Working with children
- Working with youth

When asked what areas of the Coordinators work they found the ‘least useful’, two tenants gave the following examples:
‘Sometimes they just sit in the van and don’t seem to do anything’

‘It is such a small community it wouldn’t be needed on a large scale’

The tenants were asked what groups they felt benefited most from the Scheme and their responses are presented in the Table 6.18 below.

**Table 6.18 Tenants’ perceptions of groups that benefit from Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of People</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly people</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People younger than 18 years</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman’s Groups</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from ethnic minorities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Group in particular</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenants responded that the elderly benefited most from the Scheme with children or youth less than eighteen years of age the next group that benefited most. Community groups and people with disabilities were regarded by an almost equal number of tenants at seventeen and fourteen respectively as the next two groups that benefited most from the Scheme. Women’s groups and people from ethnic minorities were not considered by the tenants as benefiting much from the Scheme.

When asked if there was anybody in particular in their household that could benefit more from the Scheme, twenty-two responses were received. The groups listed for more attention are included in Table 6.19 below.

**Table 6.19 Tenants’ perceptions of groups of people who could benefit more from the Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of People</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child (up to 11 years)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (12-18)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be seen from these figures, the age-group up to eleven years was the group that most tenants responded could be benefiting more from the Scheme.
The tenants were asked if they felt the Coordinators could be doing more. Twenty tenants gave ways in which the role of the Coordinator could be expanded. Their comments were clustered into themes and examples given below:

**Children and Youth**

‘Yes, get the youths + teens something to do while of [sic]school’

‘Yes, I think they should be pushing for a park for the children of Thomondgate. There is a so called park on the quarry which contains not one swing or slide’

‘I have 3 boys my two oldest boys go to the club sometimes. But it would be great if we could have something for the younger kids’

‘Yes, I think the co-ordinator could open some nursery for the single mother’s of Watergate flat would really be helpful to them for there is a lot of young children that are not over the age of 11 years and need looking after when mothers needs time to do housework or shopping’

‘Yes, there is [sic] still kids hanging around and there [sic] very loud and nobody is moving them except for one lady. She moves them any time she passes fair play to her’

**Presence**

‘Just not stay in one area of the community could move around more’

‘We would like to see them more often in the area’

‘More contact with residents’

‘Yes, they could also be visiting more people in the home especially the old and the mentally ill and disabled’

**Community Involvement**

‘Meet with the local residents group already fighting to improve the area!!!’

**Housing Queries**

‘Help with housing problems’

‘Yes, to organise clean up in areas and report illegal dumping’

**Anti-social behaviour**

‘Yes, there is still anti-social behaviour going on on our block’

‘Yes, could help a lot more with anti-social behaviour and with elderly people’

Some tenants were satisfied with the work of the Coordinators at present stating:

‘the coordinators do enough for every one in Watergate, they are very good and very obliging’

‘No, given there [sic] few numbers they’ve done amaazeing [sic] things and had a positive impact everywhere they’ve been’
The tenants were asked if they would be more or less willing now to report anti-social behaviour since the introduction of the Scheme. They responded as follows:

**Table 6.20 Tenants’ level of willingness to report ASB because of Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Anti-Social Behaviour</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot more willing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little more willing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half the respondents said they would be more willing to report ASB now since the introduction of the Scheme. This is a high number of tenants even though nearly half of those said they are ‘a little’ rather than ‘a lot’ more willing. However the ‘don’t know and ‘no response’ categories together are high at thirty five per cent (35%).

If reporting ASB, the tenants were asked to whom they would *first* report it.

Seventy–three (73) tenants responded. Their responses are presented in Table 6.21 below.

**Table 6.21 Agencies to whom tenants would report ASB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Per Cent (%) of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City Council Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardai</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda Station</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the Coordinators and the Garda Station were the main agents identified by the tenants as those they would contact in the first place if they had an issue. LCC and Community Gardaí were the next agencies selected. The HSE was not selected at all. Asked why they might contact one agency over another, the following are examples of reasons given for selecting each agency.


**Coordinators**

‘Because they are getting used to the children and adults and I would hope that they would resolve the matter in a quite [sic] way then no-one would get hurt or I wouldn’t feel afraid in the situation’

‘Because they give time and genuinely take everything on board – but more so because they give feedback every time. Don’t know community guard – before it would be Garda’

‘they are willing to listen and easier to deal with. No hassel [sic]. Don’t feel fobbed off’

‘because I could talk more freely to them’

‘confidentiality’

‘it is a little easier to making direct contact with the perpetrators [sic] of ASB. Complaining to statutory agencies tends to break community spirit

‘they are always around’

‘easy to talk to, very understanding, show a lot of caring [sic] in ways, can discuss things at ease and they give back assurance and comfort’

‘because they seem to be more accessible and available’

‘I don’t want the Garda involved’.

‘because they keep emphasising the fact that they are here to help in any way that they can and that is very reassuring’

‘first line of communication for tenants’

**Garda Station**

‘because they might do something about it. The Co-ordinators can do nothing about it’

‘only people around at time’

‘because they are the law’

‘because the Garda work 24 hours’

‘because the gardai are always on duty night and day’

‘because they are the only number I know’

‘because they would take notice of the Gardai’

>Easier access for out of office offences’

‘I didn’t know I could report them to anyone else’

‘ringing the garda I think would be the right thing to do. But, you don’t want some people seeing a garda at your door’

‘no red tape and faster’

‘the coordinators don’t be around at night when trouble starts. The garda are available at night and the community coordinators are not. Sometimes there are 30-40 youngsters in gangs’
they have the power to act

Open all hours can report at any time, don’t have to wait for office

they would be able to deal with the matter much faster then any other anti-social behaviour starts at any time

Limerick City Council

the staff in the City Council can act on it straight away. The Gardai only come and say don’t do it again at least the city hall can threaten them with eviction

it is a rented council house so it would make more sense to report it to them

I have always dealt with the city council in the past and found them most helpful but I would have no hesitation in reporting it to the coordinators as well

City Council own this area. I find Gardai coming around area its all about hand [sic] out parking tickets etc.’

‘tried and tested’

they have anti social staff

because there [sic] renting in Council property and Council have the right to hear whats goin on

Community Gardai

because they are there to look after the people of any location in Kennedy Pk

there would be less A.S.B. with gardai involvement

because they attend our local residents meetings

I cannot contact them (coordinators) first because the times of which the antisocial behaviour occurs is outside of there [sic] hours, and depending on the type of individuals involved it would involve a more firm and autoritive [sic] hand, callin [sic] in the co-ordinators in these cases could put them in very serious danger

Specialist local knowledge

they would be the fastest to respond

Its their job to patrol the estate

because the community guard is always around

Any anti-social behaviour is a bad thing at the moment and yes I would contact the Garda and a member of the County Council such as xxx or higher than him

HSE

No tenant said they would contact the HSE

The tenants were asked to agree or disagree with the following statements in relation to the main agencies. The responses are represented below.
The Coordinator Scheme has helped improve the image of Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE.

Table 6.22 Tenants’ perceptions of improved agency image because of Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I Agree</th>
<th>I Disagree</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>37 (39%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>23 (24%)</td>
<td>32 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardaí</td>
<td>13 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>56 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>12 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>60 (63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-nine per cent of those who responded agreed that the Scheme helped to improve the image of LCC for tenants. Fourteen per cent agreed that the image of the Gardaí had improved for the tenants while thirteen per cent agreed that the image of the HSE had improved.

The Coordinator Scheme has helped improve access to Limerick City Council staff, the Gardaí and the HSE.

Table 6.23 Tenants’ perceptions of improved access to agencies because of Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I Agree</th>
<th>I Disagree</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>35 (37%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>18 (19%)</td>
<td>39 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardaí</td>
<td>15 (16%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>20 (21%)</td>
<td>53 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>11 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>18 (19%)</td>
<td>62 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-seven per cent of the tenants agreed that access to LCC had improved since the introduction of the Scheme. Sixteen per cent agreed there was an improvement with access to the Gardaí while twelve per cent agreed there was an improvement in access to the HSE.

The Coordinator Scheme has helped improve the relationship between tenants and Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE.

Table 6.24 Tenants’ perceptions of improved relationship between tenants and agencies because of the Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I Agree</th>
<th>I Disagree</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>28 (29%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>14 (15%)</td>
<td>47 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardaí</td>
<td>15 (16%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>57 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>12 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>21 (22%)</td>
<td>58 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-nine percent of tenants agreed that the relationship between tenants and LCC had improved since the introduction of the Scheme. Sixteen percent agreed that the relationship between the Gardaí and tenants had improved while thirteen percent agreed that the relationship between the HSE and tenants had improved.

The Coordinator Scheme has helped improve the relationship between local community groups and Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE.

Table 6.25 Tenants’ perceptions of improved relationship between the agencies and the local community groups because of Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I Agree</th>
<th>I Disagree</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>26 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>19 (20%)</td>
<td>45 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardaí</td>
<td>17 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>21 (22%)</td>
<td>53 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>12 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>22 (23%)</td>
<td>58 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty seven percent of tenants agreed that there was an improvement in relationships between LCC and local community groups. Eighteen percent agreed there was an improvement between Gardaí and local groups while thirteen percent of tenants agreed there was an improvement in the relationship between community groups and the HSE.

One tenant had a further comment to make:

‘For the coordinators to improve the image of LCC, Gardai or HSE would prove impossible. There(sic) bad reps are earned because of the years of deliverate [sic] indifference to the communitys [sic] that has allowed them to degenerate into the situations that has brought [sic] our great town down. But everything else they do is happening and possible and there (sic) doing great work’

There was a high percentage of ‘don’t know’ or ‘no response’ to these questions. The ‘newness’ of the Scheme might be a causal factor in this level of response. It should be noted however that the percentage of ‘don’t know’ and ‘no responses’ was higher for the Gardaí and the HSE. But the percentage of agreement has the same trend for each of the questions. For example more people were aware of the relationship between the Coordinators and LCC than with the Coordinators, the Gardaí and the HSE respectively.

The tenants were asked if they felt it might be difficult at times for the Coordinators to do their job in the communities. Sixty-nine tenants responded.
Table 6.26 Tenants’ perceptions of risk attached to Coordinators’ job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of those who responded (58%) saw no reason why it might be difficult for the Coordinators to do their job while thirty-six percent (36%) stated there might be difficulties.

Some of the reasons given that might make it difficult for the Coordinators to do their job included:

‘Yes, the job in question mightn’t be in their power’

‘It’s just a sign of the times’

‘Possibly through people not interested in the work they carry out’

‘Anti social behaviour from youths on estates’

‘Because of the job they are faced with not all tenants[sic] are easy to deal with no matter who you are’.

‘Different opinions exist about various community problems. I have attended community meeting and left feeling that my voice wasn’t heard. I stated the problems and was told in no uncertain terms that even though a person makes a threat, they won’t be evicted. Like all legislation in this country, its there but never implemented. I’m a college graduate who has a degree with Law and am more then aware of contract and criminal law. So am perplexed as to how breaches of this nature are not dealt with appropriately’

‘Trying to help the people believe in themselves and take part and help out cannot be easy but they succeed’

‘Yes, because of anti-social behavior [sic] patrols need to be after 7pm on a regular basis’

‘Yes, general bad attitude of some people’

‘Yes, people are afraid to report things’

‘Yes, parents fault. They don’t care’

‘Yes, with youngsters hanging around the flats it can be intimidating’

‘Yes, I’d say it can be a very hard job approaching people, trying to communicate with people who have no interest’

The tenants were asked if they felt the name of the Scheme was appropriate. Their responses are presented in Table 6.27 below.
Table 6.27 Tenants’ perceptions on the name of the Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a large majority of tenants were satisfied with the name of the Scheme, there were two suggestions made for an alternative name which were:

- Limerick Community Action Group
- ABC Scheme = A Better Community Scheme

The tenants were asked if they thought the Scheme should be set up in other housing estates they responded as follows:

Table 6.28 Tenants’ perceptions on expansion of Scheme to other areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of tenants would like to see the Scheme extended to other housing estates.

A number of additional points were raised, in responses to this question, for inclusion in the feedback and clustered as follows:

- Extension and reorganisation of timetable should be considered. For example, work with the elderly in the morning and children in the afternoon or evening. Include weekend work. The following quotes demonstrate:

  ‘if there was organised clubs…. But if you have someone to organise something for them at night time. I think there is a huge role for people like that because the day that I suppose the person who will do it for nothing is gone, the day of the volunteer is gone. They are terrified of legal issues or you know whatever and insurance’ …

  ‘I’m out all day cos I work in town all day and when I come out I….. they have set hours and ‘I haven’t seen them now for the last few months but back when they started first ….. I met them cos there was a lot of trouble in my area at the time but it has calmed down now since
the park .... but I think they’re around when the kids are at school and you don’t really need
them, everyone is at work in the mornings in Thomondgate, Kileely, it’s a very quite place in
the mornings cos people are very, very busy and the streets are gone very quite in the
morning but I think they are gone then at five, are they and that’s when the kids.. they start
between ten at night and eight…that’s when the activity starts….

‘…the place is quite[sic] and it was the same in the mornings, the activity comes from about
five o’clock until about eleven isn’t it that’s when the kids come around you know’.

‘So, if the wardens were maybe more flexible, work in the mornings and someone else in the
afternoon and kinda concentrate in the youth in the afternoon and the elderly in the morning.
I mean they are doing a fabulous job with the elderly like, you could not find fault with them’

• Deployment of Coordinators – ratio of coordinators to activity

‘I mean five people is a bit of a waste of resources.  Now the other thing I think is a waste of
resources I’m sorry now but this is how I feel, there are five of us who go on a walk and we
could have four coordinators, that’s nearly one for each one.  I honestly think for their
education all that kind of thing it could be better used than taking a few old age pensioners
for a walk’…..  Now we could have one of them or two cos they need two for company, but I
think for the walks and the book club we are kind of over staffed’

• Footpatrols

‘It might be better if they came in …took their time and got out of the van and take a little
walk around and give people a chance to kind of approach them’

Feedback from tenant focus groups (1)

There were six focus groups conducted to supplement the survey questionnaires. All
the sessions were taped except the youth group. Three sessions were held Northside
and three Southside. The groups represented tenants, the elderly and youth. The
interview schedule was based on the survey questionnaire. The findings from the
tenants’ survey were endorsed in the focus groups particularly in relation to the
following themes:

• Awareness of the Scheme
• Contact/Follow up
• Improved services due to Scheme
• Quality of life on the estates
Suggestions for activities and initiatives for youth

- Amusement Centre
- Better relationships with Gardaí and young people
- Better transport in the area (more buses).
- Bowling alley
- Cinema
- Late evening club
- More people to work with sports and youth clubs.
- Park
- Play ground
- Soccer pitch – indoor/ outdoor
- Swimming pool

One youth made the point that if they were involved in drugs and crime they would be taken on trips and given loads of amenities, but because ‘they are good and don’t break the law they get nothing’: ‘if we had shootings here, we would get loads of facilities as well’ [XXX, aged 11 years].

In the following section data from the second evaluation is presented.

**Feedback from Evaluation (2)**

A second evaluation was conducted on the Scheme during May and June, 2010, to supplement the first evaluation. The research methods were a more modified version of the first evaluation due to resource limitations as outlined in chapter five.

**Log-Book Data (2)**

As explained in chapter five, a staff problem arose between 2008-2009 which meant that the Coordinators were unable to spend as much time as previously on the estates. Consequently, entries into the log-book were affected as the change in schedule meant less time spent by the Coordinators on ‘community safety’ issues on the estates and more time on administration. It was not therefore possible to make a comparison between the 2008 and 2010 log-book figures. Instead in order to collate data for activities engaged in by the Coordinators 2009-2010, the researcher asked them to compile a table, from their diaries, of their community activities for this period. This information supplemented the log-book data for the 2009-2010 evaluation report (See Appendix 10 for Log-Book 2009 Data). These Coordinator activities are presented in Table 6.29 below.
Table 6.29 Coordinator Activities 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agency Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 + 4 Reducing fear of crime and ASB and Improving community safety awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting ASB</td>
<td>57 reports made</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána; LCC/Tenancy Enforcement; Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td>27 reports made</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot and Van Patrols</td>
<td>Average of 41 hours per month spent patrolling. 28% of work time each month is spent on the ground doing foot/van patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Information sessions delivered to 112 residents</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Safety</td>
<td>53 Safety Chains and 151 smoke alarms fitted in 139 homes across the city</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td>162 visits made to 36 residents on the home visiting list</td>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens Safety Pack</td>
<td>Distributed to 317 senior citizens</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Audit</td>
<td>52 defective street lights reported</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-School Programme ‘Club Spark’</td>
<td>8 children participated in 35 sessions</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-School Programme ‘JUMP’</td>
<td>58 children participated in 31 sessions</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Activity Programme</td>
<td>24 children participated in 3 sessions</td>
<td>LCC; Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Eyes Open’ Community Safety Programme</td>
<td>Delivered to 51 children</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána; LCC; Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Copping On’ Crime Prevention Prog.</td>
<td>4 sessions delivered to 12 teenagers</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas ASB Prevention Programme</td>
<td>182 children from 8 schools involved in the project</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Meeting</td>
<td>Information-sharing</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána; HSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Improving the Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agency Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental logs made</td>
<td>691 incidents reported</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental referrals</td>
<td>3 referrals</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray horses logged</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litterpicks x 9</td>
<td>172 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti Removal Project Thomondgate</td>
<td>8 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Green (Southside)</td>
<td>17 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litterpick Awards (Northside)</td>
<td>70 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Box Projects</td>
<td>45 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens Project</td>
<td>33 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of residents who participated</td>
<td>345 people involved</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Raising Community Spirit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agency Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBQs Watergate</td>
<td>90 residents and 2 Gardaí involved</td>
<td>Residents Association; An Garda Síochána</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBQ Sarsfield Pk.</td>
<td>73 residents and 5 Gardaí involved</td>
<td>Wheelchair Association; Sarsfield Pk. Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundays (Southside)</td>
<td>167 residents and 2 Gardaí involved</td>
<td>An Garda Síochána; Old Christians GAA Club; Red Cross Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Club (Northside)</td>
<td>6-8 residents involved (1 day per week over 36 weeks)</td>
<td>Active Retirement Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Club (Northside)</td>
<td>8-9 residents involved (1 per month over 9 months)</td>
<td>Active Retirement Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Aging Events x 2</td>
<td>33 senior citizens involved</td>
<td>HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mural</td>
<td>11 residents involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Event</td>
<td>60 residents involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Information provided by Coordinators from Log-Books and Diaries May 2010)
Tenants’ Survey (2)

In the second evaluation a survey questionnaire was distributed to ninety-five (95) tenants with stamped, addressed envelopes for responses. These tenants represented those that had responded to the tenants’ survey for the Interim Report as outlined in chapter five. Although the number was not a large sample, it did represent all the areas covered by the Scheme and the returned questionnaires were also representative. A synopsis of these findings is presented here mainly to indicate the continuing trends for each of the themes. Observing the trends was significant for streamlining the Scheme to better deliver the service for the service user, namely community safety for tenants on public housing estates. The following is a breakdown of responses from each housing estate.

Table 6.30 Breakdown of responses from each housing estate (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Estate</th>
<th>Total No. of Houses</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galvone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarsfield Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Houses</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a profile of the tenant respondents:

Table 6.31 Age profile of respondents (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56+</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.32 Breakdown (2) of responses by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The age-group and gender of respondents corresponded to those in 2008 with the majority in the 56+ category followed by 26-45 age-group. Similar to what was found at the interim stage, more females than males responded.

Twenty (20) respondents felt that tenants on their estate were very aware of the Scheme, ten (10) said that tenants had some idea while three (3) said that tenants had no idea. Although the sample was small, these findings might indicate a growing awareness of the Scheme.

All the respondents were aware of the kind of work in which the Coordinators were engaged. They gave the following examples, presented below, in order of frequency which generally corresponded to the 2008 findings for improving tenants’ quality of life. Some of the comments made included:

**Improving the Environment**

‘They organised a clean-up of the area and organised the upkeep of the area’

‘They improved the area greatly. They planted flower beds and they are always approachable and they always have time to talk to you’

‘We have gotten rid of graffiti’

**Raising Community Spirit**

‘They call often to visit me to find out do I need anything to be done’

‘I belive(sic) that they tried very hard to give people a since(sic) of pride in were(sic) they live’

‘Arrange days out, litter picking, gardening, clubs for kids, bouncing castles, BBQ, door chain for elderly’

**Creating awareness of Community Safety**

‘Visiting and contacting older residents, providing smoke alarms and door chains and instaling (sic) same…….’

‘They got me security lights and a safety chain for the front door’

**Reducing fear of crime and anti-social behaviour**

‘Security in my home’

‘They helped by giving me peace of mind when I moved into my new home, always listened’
There were some negative comments also including:

‘Patrol in cars. Should be seen more often walking in the area especially where elderly citizens are living’

The final tenant evaluation concurred with the 2008 findings whereby the majority of respondents, twenty-four, (24), thought that the Coordinators’ activities improved community safety in their area, eight (8) saw no improvement and one (1) person did not respond. The reasons given for evidence of improvement included:

‘There is a lot of community awareness as a result of this programme. I think the community has really benefited from this scheme’

‘By calling to locals they get to know them and people trust them and if they have any problems they tell them plus they … their wellbeing. I know if I had a problem I could talk to them because they are so understanding and friendly’

‘I consider their presence positively, though difficult to equate with safety. But did make for a better quality of life’

Those who felt that the Scheme did not improve community safety commented:

‘The anti-social behaviour has got worse in the area I live in the last few years’

‘Have seen no sign. Only last week-end I had empty wine bottles thrown and broken into my garden’

‘Because the children are constantly on my roof and out in my back, breaking the brickwork off my wall out the front’.

Fourteen (14) respondents had contacted the Coordinators while sixteen (16) had not and three (3) did not respond to this question. The following are examples of the reason why they contacted the Coordinators:

‘To help in getting rid of graffiti’

‘A motor cycle which was considered a safety hazard’

‘For my children they have been great for clubs and general information’

‘Security lights outside on the house. Also chain for front door’

‘To have the gutters on the roofs cleaned or to contact City Hall to have them cleaned’

When asked for suggestions of other activities in which the Coordinators could be involved to improve community safety on their estates, twenty (20) respondents made suggestions. Activities identified may be clustered as follows:
Increased Community Safety Awareness

‘Most of the anti-social behaviour happens at night so they don’t see half of it
‘Make more of a presence because I’ve never met one locally’
‘Visible presence’
‘Be seen more in our area – Canon Breen Park especially An Garda either walking, on motor cycles and squad cars’
‘We need more guards to patrol the area’
‘To get An Gardai more aware and have more of a presence in the community’
‘Only to be around more often, I feel as if someone is looking out for me’

Increased Community Safety measures

‘If they advise more of the more vulnerable people on door locks and general home security. Which I am sure they are already trying to advise the people they meet with already’.

Increased Community Spirit

‘Maybe something for kids. As we live in an area where we have a lot of road space and also a dead end its drawing children from all over, children who don’t live here up causing trouble. Maybe if they could get signs telling to drive slowly coming into estate I have young children (talk to corporation)’
‘Live in a culdsac wher(sic) there is small children, cars come off the main rd very fast very dangerous, some neibours have washin(sic) out in there front railings doesn’t look nice. Plus rubbish out in front garden. The majority(sic) of us keeps our places nice and clean’
‘More visits to check on vulnerable residents’
‘They might have a discussion with the students unions of 3rd level colleges to try and have noise and litter reduced at night. But I realise this could be very difficult. A community garda at night would benefit maybe’
‘The Coordinators could do more events for younger kids like (games, planting flowers) more (clean-ups) as the children in our area enjoyed it last Summer. An indoor football pitch would be great for the boys and girls’

The tenants were asked if they were aware that the Scheme was run jointly by LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE. Twenty (20) tenants were aware, nine (9) were not and four (4) did not respond to this question. When asked if they thought that the Scheme improved how the tenants felt about these agencies the following replies were received:
Table 6.33 Tenants’ follow-up perception of improved image of agencies because of the Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Improved Perception</th>
<th>No Difference</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Garda Síochána</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tenants reported an improvement in their perception of the partner agencies although the number of ‘no responses’ was high. Nevertheless the perception had improved since the 2008 findings.

The tenants were given an opportunity to add further comments. The majority of comments were positive towards the Coordinators and the Scheme with a minority of negative responses. The following are examples of comments received:

On a positive note, the tenants said:

‘My opinion of the coordinators is they are great people. They always have time to listen and never hurry when they are with any one individual. They inspire peace and confidence which no money could buy’

‘Its great to see them involving the children and the youth of the community with clean ups and sports, events and social gatherings. Also on hand with any local or government phone numbers they might need’

‘For once Limerick City Council get something right’

‘This project is a good idea because these coordinators are very friendly and approachable. Some people there are quite timid and not so open would be able to talk to these and they in turn could talk to An Gardai if any social behaviour. They also help keep the neighbourhood clean and give people a sense of responsibility in keeping the place nice. The only problem I have is undesirables coming in from outside, hanging around and shouting and roaring causing trouble so I am so concerned with outside youths bringing trouble to the area and my own children cant play but thanks to An Garda and coordinators they have been very helpful’

‘The local night clubs need to be made aware of the noise levels. Create awareness of noise they produce late at night as most of the tenants living nearby are an older age-group plus the litter problem they cause by letting people leave with bottles etc. a lot of the students also bring in the cans and bottles from their homes in taxis and buses’

‘If you could supply cigarette butt containers like the ones outside pubs on the balconies of the walkaway the Watergate flats it would probably put a stop to people throwing the cigarette ends on the gardens below’
However, one tenant felt that the Scheme made no difference to his area.

‘We are living in Flanker Court nearly 16 years. In the last two years the anti-social behaviour has gotten out of hand totally we would move if we could but we have nowhere to go’

‘Any change in my area being safer….there’s no youth center or activities to keep them busy. Most of the children are bullies and aren’t actually living in Parkview but they just hang around the area’

**Tenant Focus Groups (2)**

Four focus groups were held, two tenants groups and two active retirement groups. These groups had participated in the evaluation for the *Interim Report* and were therefore familiar with the Scheme. Findings from these focus groups built on the interim feedback. The interview schedule corresponded to the tenants’ survey questionnaire and generally the comments concurred with those of the survey respondents. Awareness of the Scheme was high within each group. However, as was the case at the interim stage, a very small number of participants attending the active retirement groups were not living in areas covered by the Scheme and were not in a position to comment except that they would like such a Scheme to operate in their areas as well. Those who lived in areas covered by the Scheme understood the work of the Coordinators to be mainly activities that involved environmental issues such as litter and graffiti, tenancy queries, home security and activities with children and youth. The majority felt strongly that the Scheme improved community safety in their areas especially for the elderly who felt safer for seeing the Coordinators around the areas on a regular basis. The high visibility of the Coordinators contributed to a feeling of security. However a small minority disagreed with this opinion commenting that they never or seldom saw them. Their blue uniforms were easy to see and they often referred to them as ‘*The Blue Girls*’ or the ‘*Blue Coats*’.

Some participants felt that the uniforms were a deterrent for children involved in anti-social behaviour.

The residents’ groups had mainly contacted the Coordinators for the following reasons: to arrange clean ups (litter and graffiti) and organise children’s activities. While the actively retired tenants’ main reasons for contact included housing queries and community safety queries requesting safety chains and locks for the doors.

When asked what other activities the Coordinators could introduce in their areas, the participants made the following suggestions: Give more help filling in forms; Another participant suggested that if they had dog-warden powers it would be helpful and one
participant felt the Coordinators should work ‘after hours’ as that was when most anti-social behaviour incidents occurred. Another group suggested that help with re-activating the residents’ association would be useful.

Approximately half of the participants in the active retirement groups were aware that the Scheme involved partner agencies but the majority did not perceive the Scheme as helping to improve the image of any of the agencies.

Extra comments made by the participants regarding the Scheme and the Coordinators included that the Coordinators should visit the elderly in their homes more often particularly in the Winter-time when they were unable to leave their homes as often as they might during the Spring and Summer months. A majority commented that they were only now becoming familiar with the Coordinators and the purpose of the Scheme to the extent that they could make more use of it. Others suggested that some of the areas were too broad for two Coordinators to cover.

Some comments made were negative. A minority of participants perceived the Coordinators as not patrolling sufficiently on foot. One participant commented that the Coordinators had attended an event that she had organised but that they could have been more helpful – such as giving more help preparing and providing the teas. There was a suggestion that some of the activities that the Coordinators engaged in overlapped with those already being provided. The example given was that of the safety chain activity. The participant commented that this service was already being provided in their community but that funding had run out and therefore they were unable to continue the service. One participant suggested that the Coordinator jobs should be given to locals who were unemployed and pay the good salaries to them instead of the Coordinators.

Overall, the final evaluation covering the period 2009-2010 reflected the findings in the Interim Report 2008 producing evidence that the Scheme was making a positive impact on the estates in relation to the quality of life and community safety on the housing estates.

Conclusion
Delivering community services in local governance through a multi-agency partnership approach can be fraught with difficulty as previously published research shows. This initiative appeared to be no different. This chapter presented findings from monitoring
and evaluating the Partnership and the Scheme to address three empirical questions (1) does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism enhance delivery and outcome of public services?; (2) is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership?; and (3) does multi-agency partnership enhance public services for service users?. The data collated here identified both the positives and some negatives but also demonstrated considerable potential in the MAP approach for tackling ASB and improving community safety, given active engagement by all agencies. Chapter seven presents a discussion of these findings.
Chapter 7
Discussion of Findings

Introduction
This study explores the following overarching question, with special reference to community safety:

Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?

The purpose of the research is to construct a theoretically and empirically informed model of good practice for MAP for delivering public services in local governance. Because the research was conducted in the longitudinal case study tradition, and over a period of three years, the model is more than a general framework for collaborative partnership. It provides in-depth practical guidelines for implementing and delivering partnership in a way that optimises the work of agencies.

The research question was explored in four ways, (i) by reviewing the extant literature on governance and multi-agency partnership; (ii) by monitoring the Partnership process, (iii) assessing the Partnership itself and (iv) evaluating the Scheme as a partnership initiative.

A narrative approach is used in this chapter to discuss the findings of the case study, (Schwandt, 2001:169), which are interpreted through the social constructivist paradigm as outlined in chapter four. The discussion is more a qualitative than a quantitative analysis as it reflects the multiple realities of participants in the research rather than providing in-depth statistical analysis. The discussion includes links to key literature presented in chapter three dealing with the themes, thereby providing scholarly support for the practical outcomes.

The conceptual framework in chapter two outlines the three main areas of change perceived to have occurred in the apparatus of the state, as a result of the paradigm shift from government to governance. These areas include structural/institutional change; process change and a change in emphasis to innovative and sustainable practice. Chapter three showed that determinants of successful MAP are analogous to the governance paradigm and acknowledged as being central to policy development and delivery. The conceptual framework in chapter three presented ten
determinants for successful MAP. The methodology in chapter four explained the use of the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool to assess the ‘health’ of the Partnership in relation to these variables and to determine the level of success the Partnership achieved. Table 7.1 below recalls the linkage between governance, multi-agency partnership collaboration and the Nuffield Partnership Principles. This conceptual framework formed the basis for the hypotheses and the empirical questions explored in this study. It also guides the discussion of the findings in this chapter.

Table 7.1 Recall of Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance Paradigm: Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of Successful Multi-Agency Partnership</th>
<th>Linked Nuffield Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Structural Change</td>
<td>Context, Culture, Legitimacy</td>
<td>Principle 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognise and accept need for partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Change/New Actors</td>
<td>Democratic Participation, Power-sharing, Leadership, Trust, Accountability</td>
<td>Principles 3,4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure commitment and ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and maintain trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create clear and robust partnership arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative/Sustainable Practice</td>
<td>Monitor, Measure and Learn Reflective Learning</td>
<td>Principles 2 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity and realism of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor, measure and learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two hypotheses were tested in this study, one which relates to governance and the other to service delivery through multi-agency partnership.

**Hypothesis 1: Governance**

*As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.*

**Empirical Research Question:**

Does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism, enhance delivery and outcome of public services? (structure)
Hypothesis 2: Policy Implementation and Service Delivery

*Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.*

**Empirical Research Questions:**

1. Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process)
2. Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)

The ten determinants of MAP, as presented in the conceptual framework, are used as a guiding framework for the discussion, in the first part of this chapter, to explore the empirical question for Hypothesis (1) namely:

**Hypothesis 1: Question 1**

*Does the use of multi-agency partnership (MAP) as a governance mechanism enhance the delivery and outcome of public service?*

An analysis of the findings is presented to elucidate the extent to which the Partnership met the criteria for a successful multi-agency partnership and hence that of a governance mechanism that enhances the implementation and delivery of services. Commentary from key actors from interviews and the Nuffield Assessment, is added to support the findings. This part of the discussion informed the governance element of the model of good practice.

**Structural/Institutional Change**

This section of the chapter discusses the structural/institutional changes observed to facilitate collaboration in the MAP in this case study. It does so by analysing the context, culture and legitimacy of the Partnership, using the statements underpinning Principle 1 of the Nuffield Partnership Assessment ‘recognise and accept the need for partnership’, to guide the discussion. This section incorporates the findings from monitoring the Partnership process, semi-structured interviews with the board members as well as board members’ responses to the Nuffield Partnership Assessment survey questionnaire. Each of the concepts analysed has scholarly support from the literature as presented in chapter four.
Context, Culture and Legitimacy

*Nuffield Principle 1: Recognise and Accept Need for Partnership*

The desk research showed that the Partnership was established at a time when perceived and actual anti-social behaviour problems were on the increase in Limerick City and particularly in some local authority housing estates. Previous efforts to tackle the problems had not been successful. In fact, agencies, responsible for addressing them, generally agreed that little progress, if any, had been made to improve the situation. There were, therefore, significant reasons for considering innovative ways to counteract these problems. Senior staff in LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE formed a partnership with a view to dealing with the problem through a multi-agency approach. This type of collaborative mechanism was promoted in national and local government modernisation policy to reduce costs of public services and to support a holistic approach for dealing with quality of life issues in communities. It was anticipated that this change in policy would, because of having ‘joined-up’ thinking, improve the effectiveness of the services, as well as decreasing overall costs.

There was, previously, a history of informal partnership between the three agencies for dealing with community safety (Ansell and Gash, 2007). The terms of reference for the Partnership however showed that it was intended to be more than a networking or knowledge sharing- partnership, rather it was formed as a strategic partnership in response to government policy and community safety issues.

It was in this context that the Partnership sourced funding from the DoEHLG to introduce the Scheme in Limerick City. Context, both geographical and political, is significant for a partnership (Asthana et al 2002). The Scheme satisfied the main criteria for innovative policy initiatives. It was responding to an escalating ‘wicked problem’; three agencies were collaborating to deliver the service; and it was delivered on the ground close to the community. As well as using the expertise of the statutory agencies to plan the service, the Partnership drew on knowledge of the community in order to deliver an appropriate service to tackle the problem.

The Scheme, however, did not get a blanket welcome from the communities. This reaction was evident at a public meeting (26.09.2006) organised by the Partnership, and borne out in interviews held with key stakeholders in the communities before the
Scheme was launched. The housing estates, where the Scheme was introduced, were chosen because of the low levels of crime and ASB that prevailed on them. In fact, none of the estates, where the Scheme was introduced initially, had serious criminal activity. Some tenants in the survey suggested, that in their areas, the level of ASB was low anyway and wondered about the need for the Scheme on their estate. These communities, the majority of which were designated socially disadvantaged, with high levels of unemployment and poor levels of educational attainment, had, over the previous twenty years, been recipients of major community development funding. Work undertaken with this funding had achieved some social and physical improvements and strengthened community empowerment. Before the Scheme was introduced, community representatives at the public meeting strongly argued that, as residents on these housing estates, they were in the best position to inform the Scheme, yet they were not represented on the Partnership board (Boydell and Rugkåsa, 2007; Jacobs, 2010).

Housing estates, with lower levels of ASB were selected in order to allow the Coordinator team, delivering the Scheme, to become familiar with the communities and ASB problems that prevailed and to minimise risk (Hastings, 1996). Their brief was left deliberately broad to allow a certain amount of flexibility in the delivery of the service. This was a cause of some ambiguity amongst community development groups, some of whom argued that the Scheme was duplicating other existing activities or overlapping with other services. Reactions such as these are not uncommon when new community programmes are introduced. Time is a major factor in the success of any programme and can therefore be problematic for short-term (e.g. three-year) pilot projects such as the Scheme in this research (Burnett and Appleton, 2004). Trusting relationships must be established between the service providers and the communities and these must be built up over time. When the Scheme was introduced there was a certain amount of scepticism in the communities as to its potential. But as the Scheme progressed, because of the high visibility of the Coordinators, this trust developed, as evidenced in the improved relationships the Coordinators had with the tenants and stakeholders.

The Scheme however was overtaken by other events. In 2007, the Limerick Regeneration programme got underway amid widespread publicity (Fitzgerald, 2007). This programme operated on public housing estates with more serious levels
of crime and ASB and community safety was a major issue in the social regeneration of these estates. As the Regeneration Agencies were working with the three agencies in the Partnership, (i.e. LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE), there was an element of confusion as to the location of the Scheme in relation to Limerick Regeneration. For example, the Coordinators often found it necessary to clarify who was responsible for the Scheme. While funding, allocated by the government for the regeneration project, was considerable initially, over time it was curtailed due to the growing economic recession in the state. However, Limerick Regeneration appeared to be regarded in the communities as an overarching and authoritative agency for physical and social regeneration and it seemed to dwarf any other initiatives underway across public housing estates.

The next section of the chapter will address the underlying statements and corresponding empirical questions drawn up by the researcher for each of the Nuffield principles.

(Statement 1:1) Having prior experience of working together is helpful in advancing the partnership process as it provides knowledge of what partnership working involves as well as an understanding of why it might be necessary to partner in particular situations. It also elucidates the degree of dependence agencies might have on one another to achieve organisational goals (Robinson and Cottrell, 2005).

Although more than half of the board members agreed that there were substantial past achievements within the partner agencies, the research showed different levels of partnership working had been experienced by those involved in the Partnership. Comparing them to Himmelman’s (2002) continuum of collaborative working (networking, coordinating, cooperating and collaboration) it was not evident that full collaboration had previously taken place. A key actor suggested that mostly the type of collaborative working he was engaged in was more like ‘networking’, mainly information sharing (followed by a cup of tea and sandwiches!). At middle management level, an actor elaborated on how public servants regularly collaborate internally with colleagues in other departments and because of the nature of the work, informally on a regular basis with public servants in other agencies. Over time, the actor said relationships are established and people tend to seek out those they find it easier to work with and that personality is an important factor in
successful collaborative working (Crant and Bateman, 2000). Another actor in the lead-agency suggested that historically, at operational level, departments, particularly housing and environment, co-operate with the partner agencies both in a voluntary and mandated capacity and where sharing of resources is concerned, there have been issues around cost-sharing from time to time.

There was no strong evidence in this research that partnership working was regarded as a skill to be developed. There is a partnership development programme available, organised for work-based collaboration, which is driven mainly for work-related practices (LANPEG) but not for the type of partnership under study. While all the board members agreed that factors associated with successful partnership working were known and understood, none of the partners received any formal training for the Partnership. Overall, the evidence suggested, both from the interviews with board members and monitoring the Partnership process, that partnership was regarded as something, one actor said, ‘that doesn’t work’, is difficult to achieve and very time consuming. (Statement 1:2) The agents recognised that there were benefits to successful collaborative partnership (Statement 1:3) but also recognised, through previous work, that barriers also existed. Whilst barriers to partnership working were recognised by all board members, particularly by those with experience of some level of partnership working at senior level, it is at operational level that the risks created by barriers, alluded to by key actors, manifested themselves in this case study.

This research found a number of risks to this Partnership. A significant barrier is the turnover in personnel (Jacobs, 2010). There was considerable turnover of individuals for the three agencies, on the Partnership board. When the board was set up, the senior representatives of the three agencies had previous experience of cooperating. However, in cases where replacements are co-opted, the latter may have differing opinions or may not have similar interest as had the ‘driver’ of the initiative. Hence, to maintain the same level of commitment may be difficult. In this Partnership, between the years 2006-2010, An Garda Síochána had three different representatives; of the original representatives, LCC made two changes out of six representatives; and the HSE had four different representatives. Changes in representation and differing levels of commitment can have the effect of destabilising the partnership, as
happened in this case particularly in 2008, which subsequently drew attention to the issue of knowledge transfer which will be addressed later in the chapter.

Another barrier is the concern partner agencies have when they are not fully aware of the benefit each organisation will get from the partnership (Huxham, 1996). If all the partners are not clear ‘what they are getting out of it’ then the level of commitment is likely to be compromised. In this case study one agency (HSE) representative was not altogether convinced that there was ‘added-value’ in his organisation’s involvement in the Partnership. The majority of board members said that the extent of partnership engagement they were involved in, whether mandated, voluntary or under pressure, was recognised and understood. One actor said his organisation was already co-operating in some instances with other agencies because they were mandated to do so (Holtom, 2001; Hudson, 2004).

(Statement 1:4) The majority of board members disagreed with the statement that there was a clear understanding of the partners’ interdependence in achieving some of their goals. This might have been due to the fact that no strategic plan was drawn up by the Partnership, aspects of which might reflect each agency’s functions. Although the activities of the Scheme were closely aligned to An Garda Síochána community policing plans, and for the lead-agency LCC with the housing and environmental policy, alignment to strategic policy in the HSE on the other hand was not as explicit. (Statement 1:5) Not being clear about how each agency is dependent on the other to deliver services through the multi-agency approach, can impact on relationships within, and commitment to, the partnership. (Statement 1:6) In this case study, the majority of board members agreed that there was a mutual understanding of the activities the partners could engage in independent of one another to deliver the Scheme but not of how they could work together strategically (Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002). Linking to each organisation’s strategic plans would identify where interdependence might be beneficial.

**Process Change**
The discussion in this section draws on the findings from monitoring the Partnership process and the Partnership board members’ responses to the Nuffield Assessment: Principle 3: ensure commitment and ownership; Principle 4: develop and maintain trust and Principle 5: create clear and robust partnership arrangements. It explores
the MAP determinants of democratic participation, power, leadership, trust and accountability.

**Democratic Participation**

*Nuffield Principle 3: Ensure Commitment and Ownership*

(Statement 3:1) Evidence suggests that commitment, particularly at senior level, is vital for the development of the partnership process (Callaghan *et al* 2000). This research showed poor commitment from senior management on the Partnership board. This was borne out in the survey where the majority disagreed with the statement that there was a clear commitment to partnership working at senior level. However the Garda Síochána member strongly agreed that there was commitment, and evidence from monitoring the Partnership process supported this claim. Even if there was interaction between the senior representatives of the three agencies on the board, this was not evident at operational level. A number of key actors in the lead-agency made reference to the lack of commitment. One actor said ‘originally there was buy-in but it wasn’t translated to the ground-floor’. While another said ‘most of the work of partnership is carried out at operational level. At top level there is only buy-in into the notion of partnership working’. A key actor suggested that ‘buy-in could be solidified by a significant financial commitment by all partner organisations ‘(i.e. something to lose if the company does not perform)’. Compounding the problem was the fact that very few board meetings were held where such a rapport might be strengthened (Callaghan *et al* 2000). For example in the first year (2007) only two board meetings were called, in the second year (2008), no meetings were held. A key actor on the board suggested ‘ownership and leadership are not one and the same thing’ giving the example that a representative on the board may have decision-making powers at a senior level but if the representative’s boss overrules his decision, then he can do nothing about that (Huxham and Vangen, 1996). Representatives, he claimed, are very ‘territorial about their services’. However, change-over in personnel in the third year (2009) and four board meetings, provided a fresh impetus to the Partnership.

(Statement 3:2) Ownership of the partnership is essential for collaboration (Burnett and Appleton, 2004). The majority of the board disagreed that there was widespread ownership of the Partnership across all partners. In this case, the Scheme was a pilot
one, delivered for all intents and purposes by the lead-agency, LCC, with practically no costs (financial or non-financial) to the other two agencies. As a pilot project, under the management of a company limited by guarantee (the Partnership), yet housed in the local authority building, equal commitment and ownership could be problematic for all three agencies. The logistics alone are not conducive to knowledge-sharing. In most instances it might just be easier to ‘get on with the job’ with little consultation with other partner agencies. Another consequence of these working arrangements is that actions taken for the Scheme might begin to resemble the functions of, for example in this case, the local authority, and the Scheme might become another ‘arm’ for delivery of community services. Early in the delivery of the Scheme, this problem did manifest itself but because the actions and activities of the Coordinators were recorded in the log-books, it was identified early and measures were taken to deal with it.

(Statement 3:3) Commitment can take different forms (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994). At senior level a partner might be committed in writing, but remain a silent, absent partner; a partner might be committed to the vision of the partnership, involved but unable to commit to resources. Another partner might be expected to commit because of government policy but lack true commitment. In other words commitment takes different forms based on the degree of involvement. At operational level, where responsibility is delegated, sometimes with or without decision-making authority, then commitment can take a different form. No doubt commitment might be stronger where incentives are offered. In this research, although board members strongly disagreed that there was strong commitment to the Partnership, evidence from monitoring the Partnership showed that there was strong commitment at operational level for the Scheme. This was the case, despite considerable turnover of personnel at board, operational and team level, as well as a precarious funding situation that restricted any forward planning.

(Statement 3:4) The majority of board members agreed that networking skills were recognised and encouraged by the Partnership (Asthana et al 2002). The notion of ‘networking’ or having a ‘networker’ in this case study, however, must be discussed in context. To recall the structure of the Partnership—there was the Board, operational management and a team delivering the Scheme. The relationship between the Board and the operational management was weak with the operational
management working autonomously in most instances. The lead-agency led, developing operational plans without consultation with the other two agencies once the Scheme got underway. There was a considerable amount of work involved, leaving little time for networking or boundary spanning. A key actor observed ‘at operational level the actual networking can be limited’ – an observation may be made here that ‘networking’ is perceived more as a function of senior management. The research has shown that it is important for the sustainability of the Partnership that it is not solely reliant on these individuals but a culture of cross-boundary working should be established to sustain partnership-wide relationships. Monitoring the Partnership did not show a strong networking culture in the Partnership. The pilot Scheme was time-limited but if it were mainstreamed, a key actor suggested, having a ‘networker’ or boundary-spanner would be useful for more active collaboration.

(Statement 3:5) It is important that partnership working is encouraged from senior management level down (Fletcher, 2003). If there is no belief in, or commitment to partnership working at that level, the partnership ethos will not permeate the organisation. As observed in this research, delivering a community service through a partnership approach is a complicated process, time consuming and work intensive. It is usually undertaken as additional responsibility to an existing role. It requires numerous personal skills and a suitable personality (PIU, 2001; Broussine, 2009). Depending solely on a person with networking skills to sustain the partnership is a risk. In the survey three board members agreed with the statement that the Partnership was not dependent for its success on individuals with networking skills, while four disagreed, which might indicate no strong recognition of the value of ‘networking’ to sustain partnership-wide and cross-boundary relationships.

(Statement 3:6) Unless partnership working is an integral part of the culture of the partner organisations, there is little chance that partnership working will be undertaken, not to mention succeed. It must be seen to be engaged in actively by senior management, encouraged at all levels of the organisation and reflected in the processes and procedures. As there appeared to be no strong culture of partnership working in the partner agencies, this deficit merited attention and subsequently led to the Partnership assessment.
Power, Leadership and Trust

Nuffield: Principle 4: Develop and Maintain Trust

Trust is important for the establishment and development of partnerships (Cropper, 1996; Huxham and Vangen, 2000). It brings with it an openness to explore broad interests, to share resources and expertise. It is needed to enable an agreed vision, aims and objectives and to clarify each organisation’s reason for participating in the partnership. It is particularly relevant for innovative initiatives where there is an element of risk taking (Alter and Hage, 1993). In this research where one partner appeared less committed, his trust in the Partnership seemed weak. This was particularly apparent at a board meeting where a discussion regarding resources for the sustainability of the Partnership took place.

(Statement 4:1) In order to value each partner’s contribution, it is necessary in the first place to recognise what each partner brings to the partnership and in what situations (Dawes, 2003). Indicators to establish this contribution should be outlined in strategic plans and the time taken for all partners to agree the contribution expected of them. Knowing roles and responsibilities builds trust between partners. In this case study, all but one of the board members agreed that the Partnership valued each partner’s contribution. However, in this context, it was the lead-agency LCC, which, to all intents and purposes, delivered the service and held a majority on the board. This may have skewed the response to this statement. Engagement with the other Partnership agencies was mainly through their agents at community level. The log-books provided feedback on this contribution where a record of linkages with other agencies, including the partner agencies, was recorded. This evidence was available to the Partnership at board meetings. Monitoring the Partnership showed that over time it became clear what type of contribution each partner was most likely to make and this informed actions and activities undertaken by the team of Coordinators when delivering the Scheme.

(Statement 4:2) The perception of ‘fairness’ helps to build trust in partnerships. In a situation where there is a designated ‘partnership worker’ in an organisation or a ‘boundary spanner’ engaged by the partnership, it makes it easier to be ‘fair’ with regard to certain elements in partnership working which are important to the notion of ‘fairness’ (Dawes, 2003). The majority of board members agreed that each
partner’s contribution to the work of the Partnership was recognised. In this case, where there was a lead-agency with almost sole responsibility for delivering the Scheme, ensuring ‘fairness’ in relation to the organisation of the Partnership’s work was more difficult. But evidence from monitoring the Partnership and evaluating the Scheme, showed that in the interest of efficiency, time and convenience, it was more realistic for the lead-agency to make such arrangements although in the broader interest of the Partnership, consultation might have been more appropriate.

The way in which the business of the Partnership is dealt with at meetings can also build trust. In this case study however, because the Partnership was between three public sector agencies, language or protocol did not pose a problem. Although the composition of the board, with LCC having a majority, could have posed a problem, this did not appear to have been the case. The Scheme was the only activity engaged in by the Partnership and that was usually the main item on the agenda. At board meetings attended, the researcher observed, that the partner with a weak interest in the Partnership, contributed less to the discussion.

(Statement 4:3) Another way of building trust is to ensure that benefits derived from the partnership are fairly distributed. The board members differed in their response to this statement with those at senior level agreeing with the statement and those at operational level disagreeing. Again, this finding must be put in context. If, like in this situation, the lead-agency is heavily involved in the Partnership, bearing most of the costs whether financial, human or otherwise, where only one of the other two partners appeared committed to the Partnership, it makes it difficult to ‘share’ benefits (Robinson and Cottrell, 2005). A key actor noted ‘what each partner gains is directly related to the effort/time/resources put into the Partnership’. In this research in public relations activities, all three agencies were given recognition for their involvement in the Partnership. Having photographs in local newspapers, of members from each partner agency involved in an activity organised by the Coordinator team, helped to publicise the Partnership aspect of the Scheme. Initially, the multi-agency approach to delivering community safety was not publicised enough but this short-coming was rectified once it was identified when evaluating the Scheme. One partner however was less involved than the others and the opportunity to use the media to reflect positively on the Partnership as a multi-agency approach to service delivery was not as effective as it might have been. The
less active partner representative queried the level of benefit his organisation gained from the Partnership. For example, he suggested, that the Scheme was associated with LCC and that ‘the HSE was peripheral to that’ and that other multi-agency committees may be more appropriate for the HSE….‘except maybe the Scheme could be a vehicle for HSE strategy.’ But strategic areas where this might happen were not posited.

(Statement 4:4) Even where there are relatively small or no problems at all, partnership working can be problematic. When a more serious problem arises, the level of trust may be seriously tested (Crawford and Jones, 1995; Jacobs, 2010). A large majority of board members agreed that there was sufficient trust to survive mistrust elsewhere. In this research, a problem arose in the management of the Scheme, which required special expertise to deal with it. It was important, for the sustainability of the Scheme, to contain the problem and therefore external expertise was sought. The fact that the Partnership was a public sector partnership model helped because each partner organisation had similar protocols for dealing with problems and reverting to ‘path dependency’ was useful for the Partnership. Despite the fact that there were heavy financial costs involved, each partner agreed the expenditure and there appeared to be sufficient trust between the partners to survive the incident.

The Scheme, undertaken by the Partnership, was a pilot project with a specific amount of funding for a specific period of time. (Statement 4:5) Consequently the level of risk was not considered high and therefore the level of trust was not tested to any great extent. An understanding of the level of risk, when undertaking collaboration, was raised by a key actor, as being important. He gave examples of the type of risks involved such as: how time-consuming operational management of the Scheme was; taking on extra work-load on top of current work-load and the gap between the operational and executive management of the Scheme. Taking these risks into consideration, he queried the ownership of the Scheme in this case study because, as the lead-agency, service developments were mainly driven by LCC and planned at operational level within that agency. Trust between the partner agencies therefore seemed less of an issue.
(Statement 4:6) Trust may also be strengthened by having the right people, in the right place at the right time (Hastings, 1996; El Ansari et al 2001). As previously indicated, how and why the partnership is established will impact on opportunities for having the ‘right’ people involved. It is possible to have a partnership champion but they may not necessarily be the ‘right’ person to be actively involved in the partnership. In other words, people can play different roles. For example, if a senior or politically influential member of an organisation is seen to ‘champion’ the partnership this can be very beneficial. Being an obvious ‘champion’ of the partnership and its activities might mean complimenting the work of the partnership at outside events such as at conferences or at high level strategic meetings. A key actor concurred saying that ‘the Partnership would perform better if there were clear/dedicated ‘champions’ from each partner agency’. In this research a member of senior management on the board, while appearing not to actively engage in general with the Partnership, was a ‘champion’ for the Partnership and the Scheme at a prestigious conference for housing practitioners using the title ‘Innovation in Practice, Community Safety and Tenant Involvement in Limerick City (2010) for his presentation while not necessarily publicising he did so.

Representation on the board can be problematic too. The board members gave a mixed response to the statement that the right people were in place. In this case study, the issue of trust became obvious when observing the composition of the board. A key actor suggested that politicians or community development workers, but not both should be represented on the board saying ‘if the politicians delivered locally, there would be no need for community development workers’. There was no community representation or politician on the Partnership board. When probed further on the omission, the rationale given for the omission by a key actor was that community safety was a very sensitive issue and discussions could at times, maybe for security reasons, be of a confidential nature. For this reason the board considered it necessary, for the pilot period of the Scheme, to have no community representation. It was also suggested that some members of the board were also members of the Joint Policing Committee and the RAPID Community Safety fora, where they were in a position to gather information for the Partnership on community safety on the estates where the Scheme was operating. This exchange also provided opportunity to create awareness of the Partnership.
Accountability

*Nuffield Principle 5: Have Clear and Robust Partnership Arrangements*

It is important that the partnership structure is not too rigid or cumbersome (Asthana *et al* 2002). The structure should be such that it enables the process and outcome. Usually Schemes are financially bound where accessed funding is concerned and in this case the project was also time-bound. In the survey, the majority of board members agreed with the statement that each partner was clear about their financial commitments. But this was to be expected because the agencies had initially to make no financial commitments. The Partnership received funding to operate the Scheme for two years at the end of which time they applied for, and received additional funding to retain the Scheme for a further six months. (Statement 5:1) Transparency is important to fight corruption and unethical behaviour (Davis, 2009). There was adequate transparency about financial resources in the Partnership. The accounts were audited annually and financial statements made available for board members. As the funding was running out, discussions were underway at board level to establish what resources each agency could bring to the Partnership if the Scheme was extended. In the context of these recessionary times, all three agencies were in financial difficulty with funding from national government sources at an all time low. Commitment to giving financial resources therefore was not forthcoming from two of the partner agencies and the lead-agency sourced funding within the local authority.

(Statement 5:2) There are resources, other than finance, that partners may bring to the partnership and in this survey the majority of board members stated that resources, other than finance, were not understood and appreciated (Sullivan, Barnes and Matka, 2002). Each agency contributed human resource facilities in different ways. For example, the lead-agency appointed a project manager at operational level while the other two agencies were more involved at community level through linkage with, and complementing the services provided through the Scheme. The lead-agency took responsibility for IT services in administering the Scheme as well as managing the website. The project management involved in the Scheme had considerable experience in providing public services and an in-depth knowledge of the public sector system. Likewise the senior board representatives of the other two agencies had similar experience. However this Scheme was a pilot project in
community safety and there was no previous experience to draw on which directly related to community safety. It was for this reason that the Stockport trainers were engaged so that those involved in the Partnership, as well as the team delivering the Scheme, could learn from Stockport’s experience.

(Statement 5:3) Understanding each partner’s area of responsibility helps to clarify the extent of accountability and is an important feature of partnership working. As previously outlined, funding was not an issue for the duration of the pilot project as the DoEHLG had provided funding. There was a mixed response from the board members to the statement that areas of responsibility were clear and understood. As the lead-agency, the local authority took responsibility for expenditure and arranging an audit of the accounts each year. Project staff was assigned by the local authority to operate the Scheme and the team delivering the Scheme was employed by the Partnership. The other two partner agencies were not called on to provide funding, staff to work directly for the Partnership, or administrative services. In essence their role at management level was to give legitimacy to the Partnership and to ensure that members of their organisations cooperated with the team delivering the Scheme on the ground.

Knowledge of roles and responsibilities of members in each organisation was essential to delivering the Scheme efficiently (Burnett and Appleton, 2004). As a pilot project in community safety, there was no prior knowledge of the type of actions that might be required. Therefore Standard Operating Procedures (SOPS) were adapted as the Scheme progressed. There were no Service Level Agreements (SLAs) between the three agencies. If such agreements existed it might have helped, to make more explicit, what each agency brought to the Partnership (Robinson and Cottrell, 2005). A key actor suggested that the Scheme could be improved if there was a division of tasks between agencies and lack of clarity of roles, particularly externally, ‘can cause suspicion’.

(Statement 5:4) Accountability is a critical element of the partnership process (Huxham and Vangen, 2005, Keohane, 2008; Coulson, 2005). A small majority of board members agreed that there were clear lines of accountability. As most of the activity involved the lead-agency, lines of accountability were to that agency. For example the project managers were lead-agency staff, they were accountable to the
Director of Services and the Director of Services was also secretary of the Partnership board. With regard to the Partnership itself, there was no clear accountability process for the performance of the Partnership as a whole.

(Statement 5:5) As previously stated, for successful partnership working it is important that arrangements are not too complex, are bounded by time and task specific. The majority of board members agreed that this was the case for the Partnership. In this situation the focus of activity was at operational level in the delivery of the Scheme.

(Statement 5:6) Monitoring the Partnership process showed that the Partnership was focused on delivering a community safety Scheme with process, outcomes and innovation taking precedence over how the Partnership itself functioned per se. All the board members in the survey concurred.

**Innovative and Sustainable Practices**

**Innovation and Sustainability**

*Nuffield Principle 2: Have Clarity and Realism of Purpose*

Having ‘clarity and realism of purpose’ defines the scope of the project. It identifies if there is common ground on which to work together as well as shared understandings. It clarifies if there are specific aims and objectives and whether or not they are considered realistic (Asthana et al 2002; Maddock, 2008).

(Statement 2:1) All the board members agreed that there was a clear vision, shared values and service principles and these were made explicit in the terms of reference of the Partnership. The fact that this was a partnership between public sector agencies meant that the ethos pertaining to the public sector underpinned the Partnership and the Scheme. An explicit linkage, however, from that vision to delivering the Scheme, was not immediately apparent in the research.

(Statement 2:2) The majority of board members disagreed with the statement that the Partnership had clearly defined aims and objectives. Success criteria were not made explicit for the Partnership itself. This may have been because partners did not consider the Partnership as an ‘output’ in itself. The focus was on delivering the Scheme. The aims and objectives of the Partnership, as stated in the terms of
reference, were broad and included a community safety goal. Therefore in answering this question, the Partnership agents had to consider first the aims and objectives of the Partnership itself and then those of the Scheme. In relation to the first, the Partnership did fulfil its aim by delivering the Scheme. Where the Scheme was concerned, trainers from Stockport in the UK ran three workshops, that involved key stakeholders (community and statutory) in establishing aims and objectives for the Scheme. This ensured that a broad spectrum of opinion was considered before they were agreed. The aims and objectives of the Scheme linked to the functions of the three Partnership agencies. For example, reducing fear of crime and ASB was linked to An Garda Síochána, improving the environment to LCC and raising community spirit to the HSE. Creating awareness of community safety issues was common to all three agencies. Aims and objectives of the Scheme therefore were more explicated than those of the Partnership itself.

(Statement 2:3) Establishing the aims and objectives of the Scheme through the process, outlined above, ensured that they were realistic and time-bound and a small majority of board members agreed with this statement. From a financial point of view, the aims were considered to be manageable given the budget, human resources and non-financial resources, available from LCC, such as office space and administration facilities.

(Statement 2:4) Identifying realistic outcomes for service recipients can be problematic (Albury, 2005; Hartley, 2005). The majority of board members disagreed with the statement that there were clearly defined service outcomes. In this instance where the Scheme was a pilot project on the estates, there was no prior evidence of outcomes that might be achieved. A key actor commented ‘there are some operational measurements but these are primarily focused on monitoring the team members and their outputs rather than on the strategic goals of the Partnership’. In order to establish a record of activities undertaken by the team delivering the Scheme, the researcher, together with the Coordinator team, developed a log-book in which a daily record was kept of incidents dealt with by the team, what actions they took and the outcome of their actions and whether or not the issue was resolved. Where community programmes are concerned it is impossible to claim definitively that any changes come about as a direct result of a particular programme because so many other programmes and activities may be underway at a given time (Audit
Commission 1998). The log-book, used in this research was innovative, as data for a community safety Scheme did not exist previously. Based on the information gathered by the team in the log-books, the action-plans were changed or modified, when considered necessary, to ensure that the outcomes from the Scheme were maximised for the service users. Over time, certain incidents, occurring under each of the four aims of the Scheme, became more obvious, and it was possible to streamline the Coordinator activities accordingly. In this way, more effective services were delivered.

(Statement 2:5) As addressed earlier, recognising why an agency is involved in the partnership is important in order to recognise the ‘what’s in it for me’ question (Huxham, 1996). The majority of board members disagreed that the reason why they were engaged in the Partnership was understood. In relation to crime and ASB, current policy in Ireland suggests the involvement of these three agencies in a Partnership for community safety. Originally, between the three partner agency representatives, there was evidence of a shared interest in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. Research has shown that these problems cannot be resolved by one agency alone as the problems are complex (Audit Commission, 1998). With LCC as the lead-agency in this Scheme providing most of the resources, it might be argued that this community safety Scheme could have been delivered without establishing a multi-agency partnership structure at all. But since government is advocating partnership structures for accessing funding for schemes, anecdotal evidence suggests this might have been part of the rationale that the original initiators of the Partnership had for establishing it (Hastings, 1996). As may be seen later, establishing a partnership to avail of funding opportunities, but not necessarily to actively engage from senior level down in a partnership Scheme, can cause problems at operational level. Notwithstanding this observation, the research showed that a very positive aspect of delivering the Scheme through MAP was that it provided legitimacy at local level. This status allowed the Coordinators access to the resources of all three agencies; it enhanced their actions and activities and generally made their job easier and more effective. The Scheme also acted as a conduit for each agency to provide their services more efficiently.

(Statement 2:6) It is a fairly common practice in the delivery of community programmes to try to achieve ‘quick wins’ early on in order to garner support for the
programme. It is also suggested that starting ‘small’ rather than trying to make major changes, or effect major results too early, can be a drawback in the long run. In this research the Partnership was conscious of trying to achieve some ‘quick wins’ and a small majority of board members agreed that areas of early wins were identified (Ansell and Gash, 2007). However, allowing flexibility in the aims and objectives of the Scheme made this result a little more difficult. It is worth recalling here how most of the communities, where the Scheme operated, were a little sceptical at the outset of what the Scheme could achieve and they were perceived by the Coordinators as not being fully cooperative initially and ‘looking after their patch’. Establishing a ‘quick-win’ therefore was not easy.

**Evaluation and Reflective Learning**

*Nuffield Principle 6: Monitor, Measure and Learn*

This principle concerns the reflective component of partnership working. It is particularly important, to make levels of commitment clear as well as the costs and benefits of membership to the partners. Clarifying these concerns is important where membership of the partnership is not seen as core business for the partner organisations. Monitoring, measuring and learning has a dual purpose – it provides evidence of the performance of the partnership and in so doing builds commitment and trust. It also improves sustainability (Cropper, 1996). A small majority of board members agreed that there were clear arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the Partnership itself. The interim case review, delivered at the end of year one when the Scheme was evaluated, drew attention to the health of the Partnership as an output of the partnership process. This feedback suggested that the Partnership itself was not working effectively and the finding was examined when the Partnership was assessed in the second evaluation.

(Statement 6:2) A small majority of board members agreed that there were clear arrangements effectively to monitor and review how the Scheme was working and that the service aims and objectives were met. One member strongly disagreed with this statement. (Statement 6:3) The log-book was used to record all activities engaged in by the team of Coordinators delivering the Scheme. It provided a substantial amount of data including team member ID, area code, date, incident code, time of incident, action code, brief description of the incident, solution/action
required and linkage agency. Daily records were kept in Excel files. As the Scheme progressed the log-book was modified and made more applicable. It was intended that in time the minimum amount of writing would be required by coding as much information as possible. This also enabled statistics to be collected from the data. It was also envisaged that this data would provide information to be used in calculating costs and benefits of the Scheme. While the time-scale for this project was short and insufficient to get a comprehensive analysis, a considerable amount of data was collected to inform the Partnership.

(Statement 6:4) As a pilot project, it was a very active learning environment (Bellamy et al 2008; Robinson and Cottrell, 2005). The majority of board members agreed that arrangements for disseminating information from reviews of the Partnership and the Scheme were clear. Specifying that monitoring and evaluation would take place throughout the pilot period by an independent researcher ensured that lessons learnt were formally documented. Data from this research were used at conferences, in presentations and for workshops internally and with external organisations.

(Statement 6:5) Public relations efforts grew as the Scheme progressed and the majority of board members agreed with the statement that successes were well communicated outside of the Partnership (Gant, 2003; Huxham and Vangen 1996a). An information leaflet and two newsletters were published and a website developed. Heavy use was made of local newspapers, particularly the use of photographs. Local radio provided an opportunity, for interviews and advertising, to draw attention to the multi-agency partnership approach taken.

The Scheme was originally rolled out in nine public housing estates. In time it was moved, based on need, from some of these estates to other estates. The knowledge, experience and lessons learnt informed the introduction of the Scheme into new sites and in some cases, where protocols were developed for certain core activities, the transition was more straightforward.

(Statement 6:6) This was a short-term pilot project (3 years) with a high level of activity throughout. The original aims and objectives were maintained for the duration of the project. The activities associated with them were changed or modified based on experience gained. If additional funding was received and the
Scheme continued, a review of the aims and objectives would ensue. The majority of board members agreed that a review of the Partnership and the Scheme would take place should the service be maintained.

To summarise, the foregoing section addressed the question: *does the use of MAP as a governance mechanism enhance delivery and outcome of public services?*

This question was addressed by exploring the Scheme and addressing each of the variables identified for successful MAP collaboration including awareness of context; the culture of partner agencies; the legitimacy of the MAP; agreement on power-sharing; evidence of trust; democratic participation; accountability; leadership and engaging in reflective learning through monitoring and evaluation.

The monitoring exercise showed that in the early stages of the Scheme there were a number of weaknesses that inhibited the partnership process. Between 2006-2008 for example there was a lack of clear structure of engagement between various levels of management; the location from where the Scheme was administered; representation at Stockport workshops; lack of business plans; changes in roles and responsibilities in management; there were no Service Level Agreements in place; there were funding limitations and a large turnover in personnel. Between 2009-2010 many of these shortfalls were dealt with which helped to improve the efficacy of the Partnership process and enhance the delivery of the Scheme. Follow-up actions included modifying the log-book; putting protocols in place for expanding the Partnership and Scheme into other estates and for dealing with complaints. There was also a review of the Coordinators’ role which included capacity-building.

The findings concur with the literature that the social, economic and political context at national and local level in which the partnership is established is significant to its success in particular for accessing resources and legitimising the partnership; the culture of the partner agencies can strengthen the partnership; that power–sharing is a necessary pre-requisite for successful MAP which raises the issue of trust. Trust can be improved by defining roles and responsibilities, having in-built transparent funding arrangements and accountability mechanisms, having an ethos of fairness ensuring inclusive board membership and arrangements for meetings, ensuring democratic representation by including politicians and members of the community and sharing benefits overtly.
In the next section, the second hypothesis is addressed.

**Hypothesis 2: Public Policy Implementation and Service Delivery**

*Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.*

**Empirical Research Questions:**

1. Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process)
2. Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)

To address the empirical questions for the second hypothesis, four research methods were used. Findings from monitoring the operational process of the Scheme and the SWOT analyses (Appendix 6) are exploited in the discussion to examine question one. The findings from evaluating the Scheme and data from the log-book analysis are elucidated in the discussion to examine question two. Commentary from community stakeholders and tenants is added to enhance the discussion.

As discussed in chapter three, because of the attribution problem, attempting to assess the advantage, or the value-added, by collaborating in a multi-agency partnership to deliver public services, is an ambitious exercise. Forming a partnership might be of added value to the service users but not necessarily to the partners, unless clearly explicated, as evidenced to an extent in this research.

The first question for Hypothesis 2 is addressed below:

**Hypothesis 2: Question 1  Is the process of public policy implementation in local governance enhanced by multi-agency partnership (MAP)? (process)**

Monitoring the operational management of the Scheme provided evidence of the positives and negatives of delivering public services through MAP. These results are discussed in narrative form here to demonstrate, how over time, the Scheme was developed through the MAP process. As may be observed in the previous discussion, issues arising at partnership and management level have repercussions at operational level. The fact that some of these issues are raised again here in the findings from monitoring the operational process provides further evidence of their significance and hence their importance to the MAP model of good practice.
Monitoring the Scheme: Operational Management 2006–2010

Overall management of the Scheme was the responsibility of the Partnership Board of Directors which included senior representatives of LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE. The Scheme was located in LCC, which also acted as the lead-agency, and came under the remit of the Director of Services, Housing. Responsibility for the day to day management of the Scheme was with a project manager. Key stakeholders and Coordinators indicated that there were human resource issues in the operational management of the Scheme in the early stages.

Throughout the first year of operation, a lack of clear structure of engagement between the various levels of management was perceived. This was apparent in the small number of board meetings that took place in the early period although this situation improved considerably from 2009 onwards. Records show that meetings were held in April, 2007, February 2009, October 2009, December 2009, February and April 2010. There were no board meetings held in 2008. Because of the lack of board meetings, there was no formal facility for the regular systematic review of the Scheme, at executive level, which would have ensured that all three agencies were kept up to-date on developments and given an opportunity to contribute to the on-going operation of the Scheme.

Locating the administration of the Scheme within LCC was perceived to have advantages and disadvantages. The advantages included a greater awareness of the Scheme in LCC; proximity to LCC staff allowed the Coordinators to follow up most tenancy queries with little difficulty and it meant that the Coordinators were not working in isolation. The disadvantages were that the office space was limited and may not have been suitable for the administration of this type of Scheme. Also having a base in LCC meant that the Coordinators, in order to fulfil their administrative duties, were restricted to LCC hours. This had repercussions for the Scheme with regard to rosters and hours worked in the community.

Consultants from the Stockport Training & Resource Centre facilitated workshops in LCC before the Scheme was launched. The Coordinators however, were not yet recruited at that stage. The workshops were important as they allowed key Partnership stakeholders the opportunity to meet with representatives from agencies involved in community safety and to get background information regarding issues arising on the
estates that might be tackled by the Scheme. The evolving role of the Coordinators showed that attendance at these workshops would have benefited them.

The Stockport trainers also facilitated workshops on developing business plans. However, these plans were not operationalised when the Scheme was launched (although later developed for 2008 and 2009). This presented some issues for the operation of the Scheme particularly in relation to desired outcomes, how the aims and objectives might be met, the role of the Coordinators, the budget and public relations. So while it was planned originally to allow a certain amount of ambiguity and flexibility in this regard, which gave the Coordinators scope to develop the activities of the Scheme as the need arose, having no jointly agreed business plans at all in place was not practical for the on-going operation of the Scheme. It also made it difficult for the Coordinators to articulate the purpose of the Scheme to members of the communities. This led to confusion amongst community members regarding the role of the Coordinator which may have been a factor in some community agents not collaborating very well initially and appearing to resort to minding ‘their own patch’. To demonstrate, one community stakeholder said:

Before this project was even rolled out by City Council we were briefed by XX, we were given a job description of what they were to do, they were supposed to work hand and hand with us. Unfortunately, their job description is much the same as mine …. and they are doing the same thing as I am at this point. I have no issue with it, I have done the XXX with them, I have helped them in other ways…. I have contact with them on a regular basis, I have no problem with them at all. I give them the keys of this place, they had them for a week, I have no issue with them. But the one thing I would say is they were supposed to be coordinating in such a way that they would be around from 9 in the morning till 9 in the evening. But that didn’t happen and its gone back to office hours 9 to 5 (general agreement). Its not an out of hours service.

Changes in roles and responsibilities took place at LCC management level during this time. This appeared to result in poor ‘hand-over’ practices. There was a perception at a point in time, of an absence of leadership in the Partnership which seemed to impact on the morale of the Coordinators.

There were no Service Level Agreements or protocols in place to help linkage and cooperation between the three agencies directly involved in the Scheme, either at board or operational level. This was regarded as a drawback leading to confusion regarding the roles and responsibilities of individuals, at operational level, particularly in the main agencies LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE.
The Scheme was funded as a pilot project for two years. After that time, it was stipulated by the DoEHLG, that the cost of its continuation would be borne by the three Partnership agencies. Eighteen months into the pilot period, no arrangements were in place for future funding to ensure continuation of the Scheme. This meant that (i) the long-term sustainability of the Scheme was in question and (ii) the future of the Coordinators’ jobs was uncertain.

There was a large turnover of staff in the Coordinator team. At the time of writing the interim report, two coordinators had already left, another Coordinator moved jobs within LCC, one Coordinator was out on extended sick leave and one on leave for personal reasons. During the year, when one Coordinator took Summer-leave to travel, she was replaced by a Coordinator on a temporary contract who was later made permanent. This movement of staff made it more difficult at times to formulate patrol schedules. It also brought into question the necessity to have a panel of coordinators to call on as the job required Garda Clearance and Health Checks and the provision of training. It also raised the question of gender-balance in the team of Coordinators. Initially the breakdown was 4:2 in favour of females. Then for a period of time, it was an all-female team. Currently there is one male team member.

Up to 2008, the evidence of MAP collaboration at operational management level appeared poor and this had repercussions for the delivery of the Scheme which will be discussed below. As time went on, knowledge of the operation of the Scheme was growing amongst key actors as the aims and objectives of the Scheme became more defined. Continuing to monitor the operational management of the Scheme, the researcher communicated with the project management team and the Coordinators. This phase of the research covered the period 2009 to mid-2010. As the Partnership process and the Scheme evolved, other issues arose that were noted by the researcher and which when addressed ensured improved effectiveness in policy implementation and service delivery such as (i) follow-up action required on the interim findings; (ii) protocols for expanding the Scheme to other locations;(iii) modification of the log-book template and protocols for dealing with complaints; (iv) overview of the role of the Coordinator; and (v) capacity-building for the Coordinator. These issues will be discussed below.

The Scheme continued to operate out of the LCC base. The research findings suggested that this location still gave the impression that the Scheme was an LCC sole initiative.
rather than a multi-agency activity. Ownership of the Scheme remained with LCC as the lead-agency. While evidence, especially the log-book, suggested that An Garda Síochána were actively involved in the Partnership at community level, there was less evidence of active involvement at board and operational level from the HSE.

**Follow-up Actions Taken on Interim Findings**

A number of recommendations were made at the interim stage to enhance the MAP approach to delivering the Scheme and were acted on as follows:

- Funding was applied for and granted to operate the Scheme for a third year.
- The operational management of the Scheme was reviewed and changed. Giving two senior housing-officers responsibility for managing the Scheme was constructive as there was significant interaction between them and the Coordinators. The level of decision-making responsibility given to the housing-officers was reflected in the smoother operation of the Scheme. However, active commitment, on the part of the board, appeared weak. For example there were no strategic plans; no agreed roles and responsibilities, except for the Coordinators and administrator; while Standard Operating Procedures (SOPS) were put in place, no Service Level Agreements were developed between the agencies or a formal ‘communication procedure’ in place.
- An administrator was appointed. The administrator also acted as a team leader. This development had a positive impact on team dynamics and work output.
- A panel of Coordinators was established.
- Skills shortages were identified for the role of the Coordinators and training was provided.
- The Log-Book was regularly modified to more appropriately reflect the needs in the communities and activities covered by the Scheme. It also provided a record of any linkages made by the Coordinators to other agencies, in particular An Garda Síochána and the HSE. This record informed the development of a matrix of organisations operating in the communities and with which the Coordinators had established linkages (See Appendix 9)
- Operational Plans were drawn up in 2008 and 2009 by the Coordinators.
- Efforts were made to improve PR for the Scheme: A video was recorded of the Coordinators’ workday. A second newsletter was distributed. Newspaper
Protocols for Expanding the Scheme to Other Locations

When it was launched, the Scheme operated in nine local authority housing estates. The Coordinators were divided into Northside and Southside teams. The Northside team covered Thomondgate, Kileely, Watergate and Johnsgate. The Southside team covered Janesboro, Rathbane, Kennedy Pk, Glasgow Park and Sarsfield Park. Between 2008-2009 the Scheme was extended into Ballynanty on the Northside. Later it was extended into St. Mary’s Park (an area which is zoned for regeneration) and in late 2009 into Garryowen on the Southside. The decision to expand the Scheme had the following implications:

Because of the small team, expanding the Scheme into other housing estates raised the following issues:

- A cut-back of services in the existing locations;
- A change in the distribution of resources;
- A loss of effectiveness by operating in areas with higher levels of ASB;
- A necessity to work with the Regeneration Agency.

Notwithstanding this expansion of the Scheme, the operational management of the Scheme had improved considerably for the following reasons:

- The senior housing-officers were very committed to ensuring the Scheme operated well by investing a lot of time in the team members, exploring any issues and making the required operational changes
- Having a full-time administrator allowed the Coordinators to concentrate on community rather than administrative activities and they were able to spend more time out on patrol
- The full-time administrator provided linkages between all stakeholders and this prevented duplication and ensured good follow up on queries
- Having the full-time administrator located close to senior housing officers was an efficient use of time and resources
- By perceiving more commitment to the Scheme at senior management level, the Coordinators appeared more confident in their work
Ongoing Modification of the Log-Book Template

The log-book was a valuable source of information for the operation of the Scheme, in particular for accountability and transparency purposes. It provided a comprehensive record of the incidents arising on the housing estates, the actions the Coordinators took to deal with them and any linkage activities with other agencies in which the Coordinators were involved to resolve the issue. They were used to inform the development of operational plans and to ensure an efficient and effective service. The log-book included the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co. ID</th>
<th>Area Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Aims 1-4</th>
<th>Time Incident</th>
<th>Description Code</th>
<th>Details Incident</th>
<th>Action Code</th>
<th>Linkage Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

At the interim stage the log-book had already been refined to a high degree. However some inefficiencies in the service continued to be noted by the evaluator and Coordinators and the log-book was modified accordingly.

As a result of initial experiences in the pilot phase the following changes were made to the log-book which provided a more accurate record of community needs and hence a more focused service (See Appendix 11).

- Incident categories that were seldom or never recorded were removed from the log-book.
- Additional description codes were included to cover incidents that arose that had not been previously included.
- Entries for housing queries were broken down in more detail to reflect more clearly the community safety aspect of the problem (rather than tenancy/housing queries) that required follow-up.
- An extra column was included to allow a record of the agencies to which the Coordinators linked and to help build an organisational chart.
- Protocol for Dealing with Complaints drawn up

Protocols for dealing with complaints

Trends had been noted in relation to the type and frequency of complaints lodged to the Coordinators. These trends appeared to be affected by seasonal celebrations such as Halloween, Christmas and other holidays. Complaints were high when the Coordinators first appeared on the estates. They decreased as the Coordinators dealt with them on an on-going basis while some problems were almost eliminated over time. This was particularly the case in relation to graffiti and litter. Awareness of these trends helped inform the development of operational plans. The growing knowledge that the
Coordinators and stakeholders had of each others’ jobs and roles helped to streamline the complaint reporting process for the Coordinators and this appeared to accelerate response time to complaints from other agencies on the estates. The Coordinators perceived that having LCC staff members on the board, who also managed the Scheme at operational level, was a useful link for keeping the board informed about the Scheme and improving communications between the partner agencies. Linkages with the stakeholders (e.g. LCC, the An Garda Síochána, the HSE, Community Action Centres, Community Resource Centres, CDPs, Community Groups and Tenants) had improved overall.

**Review of the Role of the Coordinator**

The first year of operation was an exploratory time for activities. There were some well-established ones such as JUMP, an after-school activity, the Walking Club and Annual Fun Days. However, feedback at the interim stage suggested that some actions undertaken by the Coordinators duplicated some services already covered by existing statutory and community agencies. In some instances, particularly in LCC, this created operational problems. For example, because of the rationale for the Scheme, its success heavily depended on the cooperation of LCC functional departments e.g. housing, roads and environment. The Coordinators were reporting all incidents to each department which meant duplication of reporting and a source of some concern that the Coordinators were seen to be constantly following up on LCC staff.

In 2009 a revised process was put in place to restructure the reporting of issues to LCC staff. The Coordinators were each delegated responsibility for a council functional area and this ensured the minimum duplication of actions. During the second year the Coordinators ensured that:

- A lot of attention was paid to ensuring the least amount of duplication of services on the estates
- Where possible, protocols were put in place for activities to ensure good knowledge transfer amongst the team
- A rapport was consciously built up with community stakeholders and tenants in the housing estates
Coordinator Team: Capacity Building

The Partnership board recognised the Coordinator team as critical to the success of the Scheme and consequently provided on-going review and appraisal for them. Each Coordinator had regular one to one meetings with the project manager. Through the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) their roles and responsibilities were clarified. This system allowed them the opportunity to develop competencies in order to carry out their role more effectively. The availability of training allowed them greater flexibility in their role and scope to try new activities and approaches.

By the end of 2009 the Coordinators had received training in the following areas:

- Facilitation Skills
- Communication Skills
- Introduction to Counselling Skills
- Role Playing
- Train the Trainer
- Conflict Resolution
- Manual Handling

Hypothesis 2: Question 2  
Does multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhance public services for the service user? (outcome)

In order to address this question, findings from evaluating the Scheme are reported here to examine whether or not services were enhanced for service users because of the MAP approach. The Scheme had four aims each of which reflected the corporate strategies of the Partnership agencies. These activities were found in the literature to enhance community safety. Separately, they were also identified in the Stockport workshops, by the community stakeholders, as appropriate for the communities where the Scheme was operating. The actions and activities engaged in by the Coordinators reflected these themes as demonstrated in data from the log-books presented in Table 6.1 to Table 6.5 in chapter six. They were:

- To reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (An Garda Síochána)
- To improve the environment (LCC)
- To raise community spirit (HSE)
• To create awareness of community safety through education and information (composite)

This discussion is based on the two evaluations which were conducted on the Scheme. These evaluations included interviews with key actors and community stakeholders; surveys of community stakeholders and tenants and focus groups with community groups.

In demonstrating the outcomes and impact of the Scheme below, the degree of MAP collaboration that existed, becomes evident. As with the discussion on the operational management of the Scheme, the discussion on the outcome is presented chronologically. It gives a clearer sense of how the service evolved and the changes that took place in order to enhance service delivery for users.

Outcomes and Impact of the Scheme 2006–2010
In the interim case evaluation the following themes were investigated to further inform development and outcome of the Scheme. These themes were identified from a comprehensive evaluation – Evaluation of Neighbourhood Warden Service that was conducted by the Northern Ireland Housing Executive in 2003. They included getting feedback on public awareness of the Scheme; the main methods of contacting the Scheme; the perceived improved services due to the Scheme; any perceived new service initiatives due to the Scheme; identifying inter-agency linkage; exploring the impact of the Scheme on tenants’ quality of life and collating any suggestions for improvements and expansion of the Scheme. A second evaluation followed with similar themes. A synthesis of feedback gathered from both evaluations, including Coordinators, community stakeholders and tenants is presented below.

Awareness of the Scheme
The Coordinators were very satisfied that awareness of the Scheme had grown. Apart from meeting representatives of various community groups during their induction programme, they made a concerted effort to introduce themselves to community agencies and groups on the ground and called to tenants in their homes. Public presentations, an information-leaflet, a newsletter and at a later stage, a web site, were helpful in disseminating information on the Scheme. Wearing a uniform also gave the Coordinators higher visibility. The level of awareness grew quickly within LCC
because of the nature of the work, such as dealing with environment and housing issues. The Coordinators felt that the Community Gardaí had a strong awareness of the Scheme. They shared information with them and this cooperation was helpful in tackling ASB in particular. They felt that there was less awareness of the Scheme at senior HSE level. However, HSE staff, working in the community, were more informed and cooperated with the Coordinators when necessary. The Coordinators suggested that more effort was required to make senior HSE management aware of the Scheme. The Coordinators also felt that awareness of the Scheme had grown within community statutory agencies and community groups as evidenced in their growing number of approaches for assistance from the Coordinators.

The stakeholders also felt that awareness of the Scheme had grown. They had heard about the Scheme mainly from the Coordinators or through inter-agency sharing of information in particular with LCC. Improved tenant awareness was most evident in the increased number of queries and tenants’ attendance at activities organised by the Coordinators. The tenants stated that in addition to meeting the Coordinators on the street, they became aware of the Scheme through house visits made to them by the Coordinators. They also met the Coordinators through the residents’ associations or community groups. Overall this research found a growing awareness of the Scheme in the wider community.

**Inter-Agency Linkage**

The Coordinators agreed that there was improved linkage with other agencies since the Scheme was launched. In particular there was a strong link with LCC and the Community Gardaí while they had less linkage with the HSE. The main reason given by the Coordinators for this situation was that the HSE is a large organisation which made it difficult for them to access key people at upper levels to provide them with information. Links with Community Action Centres and Community Resource Centres were not well developed initially but improved over time. The link with the Community Development Projects (CDPs) was slightly stronger. Having no Service Level Agreements or protocols in place for the operation of the Scheme meant that the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders were not clarified making it difficult at times for the Coordinators to know who best to contact when following up queries.
Contact with the Scheme
The Coordinators, stakeholders and tenants agreed that the use of telephone contact was the primary method of contacting the Scheme. This was followed closely by personal contact such as waiting to meet the Coordinators on the street. Little use was made of the community centres, letter or the website to contact the Scheme.

Improved Services due to the Scheme
The Coordinators reported that services had improved because of the introduction of the Scheme. This was evidenced in the growing number of queries received by them from the tenants and the follow-up given. The tenants had, they found, built up a trusting relationship with them and were using the service to make contact with other agencies. The Coordinators were very satisfied with the response they got from LCC on tenant issues. They worked closely with the Community Gardaí and found them very responsive to any issues they reported to them. HSE staff, working in the communities, had also been very helpful in following up on tenant queries particularly in relation to form filling and information on health clinics. The Coordinators found that, as the Scheme developed, community statutory agencies and community groups followed up more promptly on their queries.

The research found that the stakeholders saw environmental clean-ups as the main service provided by the Scheme, followed by facilitating inter-agency linkage and giving information on LCC housing policies. Tenants perceived the services as mainly helping with the elderly and youth, providing information on supports and reporting housing repairs.

The majority of stakeholders and tenants who made contact with the Coordinators with an issue or query said they were satisfied with the response they received.

New Services due to the Scheme
The majority of stakeholders were unaware of any new services introduced by the Coordinators or had themselves no involvement with the Coordinators in providing a new service. A small minority were aware of the higher-profile initiatives introduced by the Coordinators such as the JUMP After-Schools Programme, Litter-Picks, Operation Green(clean up of green areas in housing estates) and installing security rails and door-chains on the homes of the elderly. Two stakeholders were involved with the Scheme in
a new service, one of which was a parent/toddler group, and the other a youth club activity. There was general awareness of the Coordinators’ involvement in established services such as Neighbourhood Watch and Active Retirement Groups.

**Quality of Life Perceptions**
The Coordinators, stakeholders and tenants were asked if they perceived an improvement in the quality of life (for example a reduction in the fear of crime and ASB, an improvement in the environment, raised community spirit and a growing awareness of community safety) on the housing estates since the Scheme was introduced. The Coordinators reported feedback received by them, that the activities provided by the Scheme improved the quality of life on the estates. They gave examples of their presence on the ground, rapid reporting of ASB, giving fire and security talks to tenants and the prompt removal of graffiti, as helping to reduce the fear of crime and ASB. The examples given of environmental activities included litter-picks, graffiti removal and Operation Green. They focused on improving community spirit by organising community fun days and having seasonal activities at Halloween and Christmas. More awareness of community safety was created through the school programmes and by attending the youth clubs to give talks on various topics related to safety.

The stakeholders and tenants concurred with the Coordinators. A third of stakeholders perceived a reduction in the fear of crime and ASB. This, they reported was due mainly to activities that the Coordinators were engaged in such as calling to the elderly in their homes, installing smoke alarms and putting security chains on their doors, working with An Garda Síochána to pass on information and having a Coordinator presence on the streets. They were aware of some activities that the Coordinators had undertaken to reduce vandalism such as removing graffiti repeatedly until such time as it no longer occurred.

While there was evidence to suggest a reduction in the fear of crime and ASB amongst the tenants (because there were more instances of reporting ASB to the Coordinators and the Community Gardai), both the stakeholders and tenants felt that there were no obvious signs that ASB in itself had decreased. A tenant commented: 'they are very welcome in the area you always know that there (sic) present and that makes me feel safe. He always stop (sic) to make sure everything is all right’. While another had
reservations saying: ‘like I said, spoke to them once and that was it. Maybe there [sic] more interested in the elderly people in my area. Not that I'm against that. I think its actually good for the elderly’. However it may also have been due to the fact that the Scheme was operating, in some instances, on estates with low levels of ASB in the first instance. The tenants had observed fewer gangs hanging around and reported feeling more secure because of the presence of the Coordinators on the ground.

More than half the stakeholders saw an improvement in the cleanliness of communal green areas and less litter on the streets. The tenants also observed an improvement in the environment noting less graffiti and litter. One tenant said ‘because the area looks nice and clean and tidy and its nice to walk through and see all the graffiti gone off the walls and if everyone picked up there [sic]litter it would be great’. They also perceived that the Scheme helped to prevent illegal dumping and burnt out cars.

The stakeholders and tenants perceived an improvement in community spirit. They gave examples of the litter-pick activities, community fun days, activities for school children and the elderly and attending local meetings, particularly the youth and active retirement clubs, as activities they felt improved community spirit.

They also reported evidence of more community safety awareness that was provided during visits by the Coordinators to the schools, youth and elderly clubs where they made presentations or gave talks on community safety. Linking the Scheme with other agencies working in the communities was seen as very important to create an overall awareness of community safety on the estates. The tenants were aware of this linkage also but mainly in relation to groups with which they themselves were associated. For example the elderly were aware of the Coordinators’ linkage to the active retirement and residents’ groups while the younger tenants were more aware of the Coordinators’ activities with the children and youth.

**Improving the Scheme**

The stakeholders listed ways in which the Scheme could be improved. They mainly reflected continued development of current activities such as having more involvement with local community committees and community development groups, more contact with An Garda Síochána, having higher visibility and improved dissemination of information on the Scheme. They also added that it would have helped to have more
Coordinators employed and to spend more time organising events for groups of people which were not the remit of other groups. One tenant observed:

‘I mean five people is a bit of a waste of resources. Now the other thing I think is a waste of resources I’m sorry now but this is how I feel, there are five of us who go on a walk and we could have four coordinators, that’s nearly one for each one. I honestly think for their education all that kind of thing it could be better used than taking a few old age pensioners for a walk’….. Now we could have one of them or two cos they need two for company, but I think for the walks and the book club we are kind of over staffed’.

The tenants suggested that the Coordinators should re-organise their timetable to work with the elderly in the morning and the children and youth in the afternoon. They also suggested more foot-patrols would be helpful.

**Expanding the Scheme**

The Coordinators, stakeholders and tenants saw potential for expanding the Scheme to other areas. Particular aspects of the Scheme they perceived that might be helpful in other estates included: visibility of the team on the ground, low cost initiatives to improve community spirit, litter-picks, graffiti removal, a protocol for handling tenancy queries in relation to crime and ASB, and the use of the log-book system for maintaining a record of community safety issues on individual housing estates. Stakeholders commented:

‘Yes, they are visible in the community and can therefore ensure community safety’.

‘They are a visible presence and along with the community gardai people feel they can approach them with a question or an issue of concern’.

‘I believe this Scheme has served to raise awareness and pride within the community which has improved safety in return’.

‘A level of trust has been built up between Tenants and the Co-ordinators’.

‘They visit the Senior Citizens Club on a regular basis and have been helpful in organising speakers on safety and other matters e.g. safety chains for front doors and personal alarm buttons. The elderly in our community are the most vulnerable and benefit greatly from this type of support’.

‘The co-ordinators provide a link between the public and various public services. They provide an early warning system for emerging problems’.

‘They are not seen as law enforcers but more a ‘friendly face’”

‘They (tenants) were more inclined to go to the Coordinators than to people working in the Action Centres as they found the Coordinators confidential when they didn’t want their neighbours to know their business. The Coordinators were a point of contact’.
Not everybody felt the same however, one stakeholder said ‘as somebody involved in the local community they have made no impact on peoples’ lives’.

The research also exposed weaknesses in how the service was delivered. The main issue that arose was the non-representation of the community on the board. The key stakeholders argued it was a pilot project, and as such the absence of a community representative was not an issue. Members of the board were involved in other partnerships in the communities such as the Joint Policing Committee and RAPID and therefore considered they were well versed on the community safety issues that existed on the housing estates. The community members did not agree with this stance and raised this point as an issue at a public meeting regarding the Scheme before it was implemented. Likewise, there was no political representation on the board but this issue did not seem to attract as much attention. In May, 2008, when the Coordinators organised a public meeting and invited the local politicians very few of them attended demonstrating a certain lack of interest in the Scheme.

**Enhancement of Public Services**

Bearing in mind that this research was conducted on a short-term pilot multi-agency partnership, it is too early to make any comprehensive statements as to its impact either from a governance or public service delivery point of view. Overall findings, from this research, nevertheless, indicate the following outcome for the service users:

*Reduction in Fear of Crime*

The tenant surveys found that actions taken by the Coordinators such as the installation of ‘safety-chains’ and ‘safety-railings’ reduced the fear of crime and ASB particularly amongst the elderly. The Coordinators’ uniformed presence on the housing estates also contributed to this reduced fear.

*Improvement to the Environment*

Stakeholders and tenants reported, that improvements made by the Coordinators to the local environment, helped to reduce the fear of crime and improve the quality of life on the housing estates. This outcome was reported by the stakeholders and the tenants and through evidence obtained from ‘before’ and ‘after’ photographs of problem areas as well as from the log-book data. Improvements were particularly observed in terms of
graffiti and fly-tipping. The elderly were very positive about the environmental impact and a significant finding was the interest and involvement of younger children in the litter-picks organised by the Coordinators. A noteworthy impact of the Scheme was the strengthening of relationships between environmental services and the tenants on the estates.

Improvement in Community Spirit
The survey of tenants found that community spirit had improved on the estates. This outcome was observed in the increasing numbers of tenants attending activities organised by the Coordinators, such as the Fun Days and seasonal events. The elderly were very willing to partake in outings and trips while the young children were regular attendees at after-schools clubs and Sports Days. A good rapport was particularly built up by the Coordinators with existing community agencies involved in activities for the elderly and children.

Increased Awareness of Community Safety
Overall awareness of community safety had increased. Although it was a short-term pilot Scheme, comparing the findings at the interim and the final evaluation stage showed this impact particularly amongst the elderly. The Coordinators collaborated with the HSE public health agents to identify vulnerable groups or persons. This action was significant for the elderly and single parents. A finding in the final phase of the evaluation was the increase in the number of young females with children who were making contact with the Scheme. They were very positive regarding the actions taken by the Coordinators to involve children in community safety activities. It is also worth noting the participation of men in some of these events and activities. The Coordinators created awareness of community safety amongst the children by collaborating with An Garda Síochána to visit schools and youth clubs. An Garda Síochána were generally positive about the role of the Coordinators in community safety. Actions taken by the Coordinators such as encouraging tenants to report anti-social behaviour, improving the tenants’ perceptions of An Garda Síochána, being the ‘soft’ interface between the tenants and An Garda Síochána and proactive in preventing anti-social behaviour through early reporting of incidents, contributed to this response.
Creating Linkages
An essential element of the Coordinator Scheme was ‘linking’ with other agencies to provide the service. A review of the log-books found that, as the Scheme matured, the level of inter-agency co-operation at operational level increased the efficiency of the service. The Coordinators were particularly successful in their role as ‘linkers’ between tenants and service agencies.

Improved Quality of Life
The quality of life was perceived to have improved on the estates. This finding was borne out both at the interim and final stage of the evaluation through the stakeholders’ and tenants’ surveys and the focus groups. Tenants, particularly the elderly, reported feeling safer because of the high visibility of the Coordinators. They also reported not seeing as many gangs of youth ‘hanging about’ or coming into their estates from other areas.

Conclusion
This chapter discussed the research findings in respect of the following overarching research question:

*Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users?*

In order to address this question two hypotheses were explored:

**Hypothesis 1: Governance**
*As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.*

**Hypothesis 2: Public Policy Implementation and Service Delivery**
*Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.*

In relation to Hypothesis 1 and governance, the evidence suggests there are positive and negative aspects to MAP as a governance mechanism.

Table 7.2 below represents the outcome of the discussion. These empirical findings inform the model of good practice presented in chapter eight.
Table 7.2 Evidence of how MAP, as governance mechanism, enhanced public policy implementation and public service delivery 2006-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006-2008</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community safety problem identified and acknowledged as a ‘wicked problem’ in Limerick City and particularly on some public housing estates</td>
<td>Different problematisation of the issue by the three partner agencies leading to possibility of bias in service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership board established, with terms of reference, giving it legitimacy</td>
<td>Lack of clear structure of engagement between various levels of management Initially a small number of board meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of locating administration of the Scheme in LCC Access to LCC staff for following up on queries</td>
<td>Identification with LCC rather than all three agencies Restriction on Coordinators’ working hours Limitation of office space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional approach taken. Stockport Trainers facilitate workshops providing opportunity to engage with community development organisations to identify community safety issues on the estates</td>
<td>Representatives of Stakeholders present But the Coordinators were not appointed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport trainer facilitated workshop on developing business plans</td>
<td>No plans put in place until end 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in roles of LCC staff delivering the Scheme</td>
<td>Poor ‘hand-over’ practices Lack of continuity in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC as lead-agency with sole responsibility for operational management of the Scheme</td>
<td>Extra workload for LCC staff without compensation No Service Level Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding received initially for two years extended to three</td>
<td>Short-term funding – limits strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment of Coordinators Garda and Health Clearance received</td>
<td>Heavy turnover of Coordinators Initially no panel to work from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active follow up to recommendations in interim case review Operational management of the Scheme is streamlined and more efficient</td>
<td>Expanding the Scheme results in less resources for distribution on each estate Rationale for selected sites not clearly articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme expanded to other housing estates in areas with higher levels of crime and anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>New LCC operation managers responsible for the Scheme also have responsibility for regeneration issues. This aligned the Scheme with the Regeneration Agencies which may have added to a confused public perception as to the location of the Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in operational management structure to improve delivery of the Scheme</td>
<td>Human resource issue impacted on the time the Coordinators could spend on the estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-Book modified to more accurately represent community safety issues on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
housing estates because of extra administrative duties

New protocols established between the Coordinators and LCC staff for dealing with complaints

Role of the Coordinator left broad

Ambiguity in the community regarding the role of the Coordinator leading to ‘suspicion’ and community agencies watching their ‘own patch’

Coordinators receive appropriate capacity building

In relation to Hypothesis 2, Table 7.3 below outlines the observed contributions and the value-added to service delivery because of the MAP approach.

Table 7.3 Evidence of MAP’s contribution to enhanced development, delivery and outcomes of a public service initiative promoting community safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing Factor</th>
<th>Value-added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness of and Contact with Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of the Partnership representing three public bodies</td>
<td>Communities assured that community safety problems are being taken seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared information between the partner agencies on the nature of the problem to be addressed</td>
<td>Improved dialogue, more information and specialist advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership strategy for inter-agency collaboration and delivery of the Scheme on the ground, in the communities. Links to communities which helped refine the scheme to respond to local needs.</td>
<td>Coordinator Team trained for the job Daily presence of the Coordinator team helping to reduce the fear of crime and ASB Level of trust developed between Coordinators and tenants Opportunity for tenants to meet Coordinators on their estates Direct opportunity to provide information or raise issues Sense of security enhanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved Services due to Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to partner resources</td>
<td>Cost efficiency; effective use of professional expertise. Targeting of interventions in response to insights from Scheme. The Coordinator Team not affiliated to any one organisation/non-partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Service Initiatives due to Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Partnership applied for and succeeded in accessing financial resources to implement the Scheme</td>
<td>No funds required from the community or from the Agencies for the pilot Scheme. More funding for community initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-Agency Linkage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement between the partner agencies on the nature of the problem</td>
<td>More focus on specific aspects of the problem to be addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A ‘joined-up’ thinking approach influenced by changing policy priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved Quality of Life</th>
<th>The Scheme’s focus on low-level ASB made a difference to the daily life of citizens and communities. The Partnership factored monitoring and evaluation of the Scheme in from the beginning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Scheme was adapted and made more relevant to communities and community safety because of on-going feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved Services due to Scheme</th>
<th>A four point plan agreed by the Partnership to improve community safety based on the UK experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Scheme is planned for and launched Benefit of the UK experience to avoid pitfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As part of the collaborative process, Coordinators served as a conduit between tenants and public service agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More efficient response to issues because of Coordinators’ advocacy Better coordination of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Scheme has an established data-base, using an original log-book template, tracking trends on issues, and information on actions and activities to inform on-going strategic planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical evidence of successes and failures Evidence of incidents, actions and activities Less overlapping of services More focus on community safety initiatives Reactive to change in public policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators act as buffer between community and staff of LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevents overlapping in complaint reporting Reduces risk of duplication. Contributes to streamlined responses to problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansion of the Scheme</th>
<th>The Scheme is sustainable and the evaluation has meant that the learning from the pilot has been documented and the Scheme has been refined and modified in response to the insights from implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viewed in the community as having potential and a certain amount of success to-date and therefore attracts support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Scheme is innovative because it was a pilot community safety scheme in a local authority area: the first DoEHLG funded multi-agency partnership approach to community safety; reinforcing and supplementing LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tried and tested initiative which resulted in a model of MAP which can be applied to other ‘wicked problems’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These research findings inform the model of good practice presented in chapter eight.
Chapter 8
Summary and Conclusions

Introduction
This research explored multi-agency partnership (MAP) in the delivery of public services in local governance with particular reference to community safety. In Ireland, the government’s modernisation agenda for the public sector, advocates the use of MAP to improve the quality of public services while making the best use of resources. But little is known about how MAP, as a governance mechanism, actually contributes to improved services in the Irish context. This research sought to bridge that knowledge gap between policy aspiration and outcome by exploring the efficacy of MAP. It sought to explore (i) MAP as a governance mechanism, (ii) how MAP improves delivery and outcome of services for service users and (iii) the core elements of a MAP model of good practice.

The thesis tested two hypotheses. The first related to MAP as a governance mechanism and the second related to the added value of MAP in public policy implementation and service delivery.

The purpose of the research was to explore the MAP approach to community safety interventions with particular reference to public housing estates in Limerick City. When the research commenced, this ‘wicked problem’ was escalating in the City and the authorities were concerned that existing approaches to tackle it were not proving effective. The Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited (the Partnership) was established in 2007, and funding was provided by the DoEHLG, to pilot a community safety initiative, called the Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme (the Scheme). The Scheme was evaluated from the outset in order that the lessons learnt might be applied and later used should a similar scheme be introduced in other local authority areas. These lessons formed the basis for a model which can be applied to other issues.

Summary of Research
This chapter summarises the study and presents final conclusions. It reviews the purpose and outcome of each chapter, in order to demonstrate how the thesis was structured, the arguments marshalled and the conclusions reached.
Chapter one outlined the rationale for the study and identified the gaps in knowledge. The chapter concluded that, while public policy advocates the use of the MAP approach, little evidence exists as to its efficacy in the Irish local governance context. Consequently, this study created new knowledge on how community safety improved on public housing estates by taking a collaborative approach. Although positive effects were noted with regard to service delivery and low-level ASB, one of the important lessons from implementing the Scheme was the realisation of the need to focus on the core business of the Partnership namely, in this instance, community safety, in order to reap full advantage of the collaboration and add value to the work of the organisations.

It is recognised that there has been a shift from government to governance and this implies a changing role for the state. In chapter two, this change was explicated and the paradigm shift from government to governance outlined. It traced the move from traditional public administration and the bureaucratic style of government to new public management (NPM) that incorporated private sector practices, to the holistic notion of governance which embraces both formal and informal arrangements in public decision making and policy implementation. As the literature showed, governance involves institutional/structural, process adjustment and participation changes, and involves a plurality of actors in the policy process. MAP is recognised as a legitimate governance mechanism and is widely advocated for service delivery, although the merit of such an approach is contested. In the paradigm shift from government to governance, local government has become an enabler rather than a supplier of services and more innovative and sustainable ways of doing things are required. To contextualise the study, the chapter demonstrated the impact on the Irish state of the shift from government to governance. It showed that bureaucratic structures were adapted to counteract the impact of globalisation, advanced technology and the need for better communication.

If the MAP approach is contested, what then constitutes a successful MAP? Chapter three elaborated on the concept of MAP as a governance mechanism and analysed what constitutes successful partnership. It identified ten determinants, drawn from a range of countries, that empirical research shows are critical factors, namely: the context in which the MAP is established; the culture of partner organisations; the level of legitimacy; democratic participation; power-sharing arrangements;
leadership; trust; accountancy, evaluation and reflective practice. Drawing on the international literature, the chapter concluded that MAP is complex and needs a lot of time, effort and resources to succeed. To make it worthwhile some level of added-value, for engaging the MAP process, must be recognised. The chapter closed by providing a background to the growth of MAP in local governance in Ireland, demonstrating how it has been firmly embraced as a mechanism of governance for policy development and public service delivery and how, as such, it warrants deeper understanding, a gap which this study seeks to address.

Chapter four elaborated and justified the social constructivist/interpretivist paradigm and research methodology selected for the thesis. It operationalised the substantive governance and partnership theory underpinning the research and provided justification for conducting the study in the single, longitudinal case study tradition. The Limerick City Community Safety Partnership Limited was used as the unit of analysis for the case study.

Chapter five elaborated on the case study and the research design while also addressing the limitations of the research. It introduced the Partnership as the unit of analysis in the case study and outlined its significance as an appropriate example of a MAP. It described the structure of the Partnership that involved three main agencies – LCC, An Garda Síochána and the HSE; the aims and objectives of the Partnership; and the pilot community safety Scheme, introduced by the Partnership. The linkage of the aims and objectives to the corporate strategies of each partner agency was demonstrated, namely reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (An Garda Síochána); improving the environment (LCC); raising community spirit (HSE) and creating awareness of community safety, which was relevant to all three agencies.

The Partnership was used to explore the critical elements of MAP over a three year period. The Scheme, introduced by the Partnership, was evaluated as an embedded case study to examine how the service was developed and improved overtime for the service user by utilising the MAP approach. The research was carried out in three phases. To ascertain validity and ensure rigour, research methods were triangulated. The research methods included: monitoring the Partnership process, attendance at board meetings, meetings with key actors, note-taking, interviews with board
members, assessment of the Partnership, SWOT analyses, collecting, recording and analysis of log-book data; interviews with key actors; surveys of community stakeholders and tenants and focus groups. The first phase of the research was developmental and provided a contextual framework for the research. A Theory of Change (ToC) conceptual framework was used to guide monitoring of the Partnership process and the evaluation of the Scheme. The second phase of the research was formative, and included the first evaluation, culminating in an interim report, which was used by the researcher to examine the value-added for service users because of the MAP approach. These findings informed and improved service delivery during the remainder of the Scheme. In the third phase of the research, which was summative, the Partnership itself was assessed using the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Toolkit and a second evaluation was carried out on the Scheme. The primary data, collated from monitoring the Partnership process and both evaluations of the Scheme, were used to construct a model of good practice for delivering community services through a MAP approach.

Chapter six presented the findings from monitoring the Partnership, the Nuffield Partnership Assessment and both evaluations of the Scheme. In chapter seven these findings were analysed and discussed and based on the evidence produced, tables were presented, the first outlining the positive and negative aspects of MAP as a governance mechanism and the second outlining the value-added, by using MAP, for public policy implementation and service delivery. Finally, in this chapter, based on these research findings, an evidence-based model of good practice is presented.

**Reflection**

On reflection, because of the short-term nature of the Scheme (originally two years extended to three), one evaluation at the end of the pilot period may have sufficed. If that were the case however, because of the human resource issue that arose in 2008, the research would not have given a fair representation of the outcome of the Scheme.

On a personal level, this study enhanced the research career of the researcher by providing her with an in-depth understanding of the multi-agency process as a governance mechanism to enhance community safety on public housing estates. The knowledge acquired through this research, not least that there is a dearth of research available in the Irish local governance context, has reinforced her academic interest in,
and previous research on these topics, and justifies her rationale for expanding the topics further.

Conclusions
This study explored the following question: Does collaborating in multi-agency partnership enhance policy development and implementation in local governance and improve services for service users? In order to address this question two hypotheses were developed:

**Hypothesis 1**  As a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership (MAP) is a responsive tool for public policy implementation.

**Evidence supports this hypothesis but with caveats**

With significant reservations, which will be addressed in the model of good practice later in the chapter, the research found, that as a governance mechanism, multi-agency partnership collaboration is a responsive mechanism for public policy implementation and public service delivery in local governance.

**Hypothesis 2**  Responsive multi-agency partnership (MAP) enhances the development, delivery and outcome of public services.

**Evidence supports this hypothesis**

The following table assesses the evidence from the research on both hypotheses and suggests the Partnership, while having strong potential, has encountered practical and institutional problems recognised in the literature as problematic when collaborating to tackle a ‘wicked problem’ through multi-agency partnership (MAP).
Table 8.1 Research Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of successful MAP</th>
<th>Linked Nuffield Partnership Principles</th>
<th>Evidence Governance Multi-Agency Partnership (MAP)</th>
<th>Evidence Improved Service &amp; Policy Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural/Institutional (structure)</td>
<td>Context Culture Legitimacy</td>
<td>Principle 1 Recognise and accept need for partnership</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Participation (process)</td>
<td>Democratic Participation Power-sharing Leadership Trust Accountability</td>
<td>Principles 3 + 4 + 5 Ensure commitment and ownership Develop and maintain trust Create clear and robust partnership arrangements</td>
<td>Very weak initially but over time got stronger</td>
<td>Weak initially but there was clear evidence over time that the MAP approach to the Scheme added value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative and Sustainable Services (outcome)</td>
<td>Evaluation and Reflective Learning</td>
<td>Principles 2 + 6 Have clarity and realism of purpose Monitor, measure and learn</td>
<td>Weak mainly due to funding uncertainty</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to governance and institutional/structural change, both the Partnership itself and the Scheme could be regarded as being in a ‘strong’ position. In relation to process, the Partnership process could be considered very weak while the Scheme was weak but improved over time. From the perspective of innovation and sustainable services, the Partnership was weak but the Scheme was strong. The Scheme was a pilot project evaluated over a three year period. As such it provided fertile ground for learning and through on-going reflective practice ensured that in-depth knowledge was gained and used for the on-going enhancement of the service. The successful aspects of the Partnership, the process and the outcome, together with measures to counteract the shortcomings, which should assist public agencies in maximising collaborative advantage, are incorporated into the model of good practice below.

**A Model of Good Practice in MAP for Local Governance**

Primary data from the case study underpin this model of good practice in MAP. In chapter four an *a priori* ToC framework was constructed for the Partnership and
explored in the case study. Specifically the following determinants of successful partnership working (as identified internationally) were explored:

- Context
- Culture
- Legitimacy
- Democratic Participation
- Power-sharing
- Leadership
- Trust
- Accountability
- Evaluation and Reflective learning

Based on the evidence from the case study, the researcher has designed a model that provides a structure flexible enough to enable the establishment, implementation and clear outcomes from multi-agency partnership in various situations. There are two aspects to the model, namely, governance and service delivery. The model, presented in this format, is for use as a generic tool for MAP and only requires modification to adopt it for a specific service being delivered by the MAP. The critical steps of the proposed model follow the governance framework outlined in chapter two namely (i) structure, (ii) process and (iii) service outcome. In addition to the multi-agency partnership success determinants listed above and supported in the literature, the model is further informed by the empirical findings from this research, which are incorporated into the model to further enhance the utility of this evidence-based model for the Irish local governance context.
### Table 8.2 Model of Good Practice for Multi-Agency Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure and Institutions</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Innovation and Sustainable Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leader identifies problem</td>
<td>• Assessment of Needs conducted</td>
<td>Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme with the following aims:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leader builds coalition of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>• Operational Plan developed</td>
<td>1. To reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A shared understanding of issue (e.g. community safety) between partners</td>
<td>• Budget and sources of funding agreed</td>
<td>2. To improve the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreement to formalise a partnership approach</td>
<td>• Performance Indicators agreed</td>
<td>3. To raise community spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic aims and objectives are set that are tied to each agency’s strategy</td>
<td>• Data collection and analysis tools developed (e.g. Log-Book)</td>
<td>4. To create awareness of community safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Terms of Reference agreed</td>
<td>• Standard Operating Procedures developed</td>
<td>Enhanced partner interventions in the Limerick City Community Safety Partnership communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding and resource commitments of each agency clarified and agreed</td>
<td>• Roles, responsibilities and contracts for project manager and staff defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roles and responsibilities allocated to each agency</td>
<td>• Project Manager appointed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Board appointed</td>
<td>• Staff with appropriate competences appointed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management Board established</td>
<td>• Performance and Development Review System in place for Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service Level Agreements adapted</td>
<td>• A coordination and communication plan adapted (Appoint Boundary Spanner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reporting and Accountability Procedures agreed</td>
<td>• Protocols for monitoring and evaluation instituted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competence in, and commitment to, partnership working for all levels developed (e.g. training)</td>
<td>• Training provided as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication and publicity protocol in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Output (Short-Term)                                                                         | | Outcome (Short-Term)                                                                         |
|                                                                                             | |                                                                                                     |
| 1. Tenants reported feeling reduced fear of crime, particularly among the elderly.          | | 1. Tenants reported feeling reduced fear of crime, particularly among the elderly.               |
| 2. Stakeholders and tenants reported improvement in local environment.                       | | 2. Stakeholders and tenants reported improvement in local environment.                           |
| 3. Improvement in community spirit with increased numbers of tenants attending activities and seasonal events organised by the Coordinators. A good rapport particularly built up with existing community agencies involved in activities for the elderly and children. | | 3. Improvement in community spirit with increased numbers of tenants attending activities and seasonal events organised by the Coordinators. A good rapport particularly built up with existing community agencies involved in activities for the elderly and children. |
| 4. Overall awareness of community safety increased.                                          | | 4. Overall awareness of community safety increased.                                              |
| 5. Targeted service responses identified by Partners for community needs.                    | | 5. Targeted service responses identified by Partners for community needs.                      |
| 6. Stronger local governance observed.                                                       | | 6. Stronger local governance observed.                                                          |
Explanation of Good Practice Model

Structure/Institution
Leadership is critical to the success of partnership. Once a need is identified, a leader, who believes that a MAP approach is needed, should take responsibility for forming a coalition of appropriate partner agencies. Once formed, there must be a uniform understanding amongst the coalition partners of the issue to be tackled, for example in this research, it was community safety. Once agreement is reached that the MAP is the approach to be taken, the partnership is formalised.

The partnership should then set strategic aims and objectives. In order to satisfy the ‘what’s in it for me’ question, these aims should correspond to each partner agency’s functional areas. In this way the organisational purpose of both the partnership and that of the parent organisations can be met, thereby adding to the legitimacy and effectiveness of the partnership.

Once the aims and objectives are agreed, terms of reference should be established for the partnership and include stipulations on resources including funding (from where, from whom and individual agency contribution); human resources (provision of staff, policies and procedures); and accommodation. Once resources are clarified, roles and responsibilities for actions should be defined explicitly.

At this point, the partnership should appoint an executive board and a management board. The function of the executive board should be to govern the organisation by establishing broad policies and objectives and overseeing the management of the Partnership. The management board should consist of representatives (with decision-making authority) of partner agencies; political representatives; community representatives; a facilitator (a boundary-spanner) and a project manager. Service Level Agreements should be agreed between the partner agencies including accountability procedures.

Process
In order to develop an operational plan, an assessment of specific needs should first be conducted. The assessment and the budget will determine the feasibility of appropriate operational plans. In conjunction with the plans, performance indicators should be agreed for inputs, outputs and desired outcomes of the service. This may
be difficult where quality of life is being measured but it is possible to collect data which may be used indirectly to support claims of such an improvement. In this research, log-book data was used to monitor actions and activities selected to improve community safety. In order to ensure efficiency and continuity in service delivery, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) should be drawn up. These are particularly useful for knowledge transfer where there is a turnover in personnel. The role of the project manager should be defined and a project manager appointed. At this point the roles and responsibilities of staff should be defined. It is important that staff contracts are appropriate to the nature of the project to avoid unnecessary staff turnover. Ensuring staff competence is essential and a performance management scheme (e.g. PMDS) should be put in place. The adoption of a formal coordination and communication plan is paramount to the success of the partnership and programme. In order to ensure that the appropriate service is delivered and reaching the appropriate community, protocols should be put in place to monitor and evaluate the initiative preferably *ab initio*. Finally, to ensure partnership success, competence in, and commitment to partnership working should be developed at all levels through appropriate training.

**Innovative and Sustainable Services**

*Output*

In order to ensure a sustainable service, the aim/s agreed for a given period (for example, short, medium or long-term) should be reached. In this research, in addition to establishing the partnership as an output in itself, the Partnership introduced an innovative short-term pilot project namely the Scheme. The Scheme had four aims: (1) to reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour; (2) to improve the environment; (3) to raise community spirit; and (4) to increase awareness of community safety. Incidents under these headings were recorded in the log-book as well as actions taken to deal with them. By taking these approaches, it was assumed that community safety would be improved on the housing estates.

*Outcome*

The outcome provides evidence of whether or not the initiative was successful in its aims. Through the use of monitoring and evaluating protocols, put in place during
the start-up phase, feedback should be gathered from the service users and the level of success of the initiative gauged. This information informs the on-going process and ensures that the initiative is doing what it is supposed to do and reaching the target audience. For instance, from a service perspective, which in this research was to improve community safety, the feedback reported a reduction in the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour particularly amongst the elderly; improved perception of the local environment amongst stakeholders and tenants; raised community spirit as more tenants attended community activities; and overall, a greater awareness of community safety issues. These findings are corroborated in research on community safety in Limerick City public housing estates conducted in 2011 (Power and Barnes, 2011). Although it was suggested in chapter seven that the lead-agency could possibly have launched and managed the Scheme independent of the other two agencies in the Partnership, the research showed the benefit of having three agencies collaborating to enhance community safety by incorporating their functions in the four themes of the Scheme and subsequently in the actions and activities undertaken by the Coordinators. It could be argued otherwise that the Scheme might have ended up as merely another arm of the housing department in LCC and dealing in the main with housing rather than community safety issues. From the partnership perspective, delivering the Scheme through collaborating in MAP, enhanced the effectiveness of each partner agency’s interventions in each of the participating public housing estates and thus improved local governance as well as creating a positive perception of the agencies among residents. It also exposed weaknesses both at partnership and service level which were brought to the attention of the Partnership board and acted on to improve the value-added of the Partnership over the duration of the Scheme.

**Contribution to Knowledge**
The main outputs from this study include the following and as such claim a modest but valuable contribution to governance and MAP theory:

Primary outputs:

- Evidence-based model of good practice for MAP in local governance
- Primary data (theoretical and pragmatic) on MAP for local governance in the Irish context and the generation of an evidence base which supports greater use of partnerships and collaborative working for community safety
- Log-book development providing empirical evidence
• Baseline data on community safety on public housing estates

Secondary outputs:
• Applied research in Public Administration
• Innovative use of research methods accepted by peers in academia
• Use of the Theory of Change (ToC) as an evaluation approach
• Work manuals and protocols for community safety initiatives
• A linkage from UL to wider community, bringing the realm of theory to the reality of practice

Although generalisability can be problematic when the research is conducted in the case study tradition, because of its bounded nature, the findings from this study may be generalisable to the delivery of other public services in local governance.

Furthermore important policy implications are highlighted. The research exposed a number of issues related to the governance paradigm and multi-agency partnership: (i) the importance, from an institutional perspective, of clarifying lines of accountability; (ii) that the change process needs to consider developing new roles, the use of incentives, how new skills required might be achieved and how knowledge of community development might be deepened. The structure of the partnership should allow for meaningful participation by politicians and members of the community; and (iii) that cognisance should be taken of financial and human resources as well as time and flexibility limitations. The following recommendations emerge from the study:

**Recommendations**

**General Policy**
• Wider use of structured multi-agency partnerships for local implementation of national policies
• Alignment of organisational strategies in order to maximise the added value of the multi-agency partnership approach
• Dissemination of the evidence, insights and learning from the use of partnerships for delivering community services in local governance
• Application of a model such as the one designed in this study to exploit the potential and benefits of the partnership approach to tackling wicked problems and to ensure effective partnership composition, dynamics and processes
• Recognition of the need for cultural change in organisations involved in multi-agency partnerships and the provision of appropriate training
• The inclusion of comprehensive evaluation mechanisms in the design of public interventions in areas such as community safety
Local Policy

- Establish a broader Safer Limerick Partnership Board and develop a county-wide Safer Limerick Partnership Plan
- Develop indicators for use in measuring success of community safety initiatives
- Identify sites with varying community safety needs for initiatives
- Use ‘control sites’ for comparative purposes
- Facilitate tenants to draw up a ‘community safety contract’ to be signed by all households regardless of tenure type
- Establish a monitoring and evaluation template, based on the approach of this study

Future Research

- There is a dearth of research on community safety in local government in the Irish context. Knowledge, information and lessons collected through previous studies, should be collated on a central data-base to allow access for future studies, to avoid duplication and to inform public policy
- Development of indicators against which to benchmark community safety interventions
- Conduct a comparative study of multi-agency partnership in community safety initiatives in local governance internationally to inform good practice
- Good practice guidelines for working in multi-agency partnership in local governance should be further developed and promoted

The longitudinal case-study on which this thesis is based has analysed institutional responses and encapsulated the reality of the collaborative governance dynamic, specifically the use of MAP to enhance the delivery of public services. This policy relevant and evidence-based study explored and documented the practical implications of engaging in such collaboration in the sphere of community safety. It extrapolated from the academic literature the key elements of partnership and the merits and problems of collaboration; it gathered unique data from stakeholders at every level and benchmarked outcomes and developments in Limerick City against international insights. This evidence and analysis was used to devise a model of good practice in multi-agency collaboration which can be used to enable other public agencies to create effective MAP and benefit from Limerick’s learning. The insights from the study and achievement of the recommendations can contribute to better policy strategies and ensure that future multi-agency partnerships are truly more collaborative than pragmatic.
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Appendices
## Appendix 1 Operationalising the Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance Paradigm: Areas of Change</th>
<th>Determinants of successful Multi-Agency Partnership</th>
<th>Scholarly Support</th>
<th>Linked Nuffield Partnership Principles</th>
<th>Nuffield Statements/Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural/Institutional (Structural Change)</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Ansell and Gash, 2007; Huxham, 2003; Imperial, 2005; Asthana et al 2002; IDeA, 2006; Audit Commission, 1998; Jacobs, 2010; Powell and Dowling, 2006, Thompson, 1991.</td>
<td>1. The Partnership recognises and accepts the need for Partnership</td>
<td>• There have been substantial past achievements within the partnership. • The factors associated with successful working are known and understood. • The principal barriers to successful partnership working are known and understood. • The extent to which partners engage in partnership working voluntarily or under pressure/mandation is recognised and understood. • There is a clear understanding of partners’ interdependence in achieving some of their goals. • There is mutual understanding of those areas of activity where partners can achieve some goals by working independently of each other.</td>
<td>Partnership Documentation Official documentation Local Studies Literature Review Media Reports Researcher Experience</td>
<td>Longitudinal Case Study: • Monitoring and evaluation as per Table 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Selsky and Parker, 2005; Alter and Hage, 1993; Newman, 1994; Burnett and Appleton, 2004; O’Donnell and Boyle, 2008; Robinson and Cottrell, 2005; Asthana et al 2002.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Holtom, 2001; Hudson, 2004; Dowling, Powell and Glendinning, 2004; Boydell and Rugkäsa, 2007; Jacobs, 2010; Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation (Process Change)</td>
<td>Democratic Participation</td>
<td>Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Gilliat et al 2000; Lowndes, 1995; Geddes et al 2001; Hastings 1996; Stern and Green, 2005, El Ansari et al 2001; Coulson, 2005.</td>
<td>3. Ensure commitment and ownership</td>
<td>• There is a clear commitment to partnership working from the most senior levels of each partnership organisation. • There is widespread ownership of the</td>
<td>Monitoring the Partnership Process Outcome from evaluation of</td>
<td>Longitudinal Case Study: • Monitoring and evaluation as per Table 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partnership across and within all partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td>the Scheme Nuffield Partnership Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to partnership is sufficiently robust to withstand most threats to its working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The partnership recognises and encourages networking skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The partnership is not dependent for its success solely upon individuals with these skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not working in partnership is discouraged and dealt with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-sharing</td>
<td>Stern and Green, 2005; Crawford and Jones, 1995; Robinson and Cottrell, 2005; Huxham and Vangen, 1996; Barnes, Sullivan and Matka, 2001.</td>
<td>4. Develop and maintain trust</td>
<td>• The way the partnership is structured recognises and values each partner’s contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Huxham and Vangen, 2000b; Cropper, 1996; Alter and Hage, 1993; Ring and Van de Ven, 1994; Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Mayer et al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Innovation in Service Delivery | Innovation | Newman, 2001; Borins, 2000; Maddock, 2008; Moore and Hartley, 2010; Bovaird et al 2009. | 2. Develop Clarity and Realism of Purpose | • Our Partnership has a clear vision, shared values and agreed service principles.  
• We have clearly defined joint aims and objectives.  
• These joint aims and objectives are realistic.  
• The Partnership has defined clear service outcomes. | Monitoring the Partnership Process  
Outcomes from evaluation of the Scheme  
Nuffield Partnership | Longitudinal Case Study:  
• Monitoring and evaluation as per Table 4.5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>Ashtana et al 2002; Bellamy et al 2008; Robinson and Cottrell, 2005.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Coordination | Gant, 2003; Huxham and Vangen, 1996; Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Davis, 2009; Keohane, 2008. | 5. Create clear and robust partnership arrangements | • It is clear what financial resources each partner brings to the partnership.  
• The resources, other than finance, each partner brings to the partnership are understood and appreciated.  
• Each partner’s areas of responsibility are clear and understood.  
• There are clear lines of accountability for the performance of the partnership as a whole.  
• Operational partnership arrangements are simple, time-limited and task-oriented.  
• The partnership’s principal focus is on process, outcomes and innovation. |  |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Learning and Evaluation</th>
<th>6. Monitor, Measure and Learn</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Mac Donald, 2003; Robinson and Cottrell, 2005; Hastings, 1996; Dowling and Powell, 2004; Jacobs, 2010.; Lowndes and Skelcher, 1998; Powell and Dowling, 2006; Rummery, 2006.</td>
<td>• The partnership has clear success criteria in terms of both service goals and the partnership itself. • The partnership has clear arrangements effectively to monitor and review how successfully its service aims and objectives are being met. • There are clear arrangements effectively to monitor and review how the partnership itself is working. • There are clear arrangements to ensure that monitoring and review findings are, or will be, widely shared and disseminated amongst the partners. • Partnership successes are well communicated outside of the partnership. • There are clear arrangements to ensure that partnership aims, objectives and working arrangements are reconsidered and, where necessary, revised in the light of monitoring and review findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Practice</td>
<td>Douglas, 2009; Greer, 2001; Osborne, 2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vangen, 1996a; Burnett and Appleton, 2004.

• The reason why each partner is engaged in the partnership is understood and accepted.
• We have identified where early partnership success is most likely.
## Appendix 2 Empirical Questions Based on Nuffield Partnership Assessment

### Principle 2: Develop clarity and realism of purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
<th>Empirical Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1:</td>
<td>Is there a broad vision for the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2:</td>
<td>Are aims and objectives sufficiently clear and understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3:</td>
<td>Is there adequate collaborative capacity (incl. funding, status, autonomy) to sustain the partnership and achieve tasks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4:</td>
<td>Is it clear how partnership will lead to improved outcomes for service recipients?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5:</td>
<td>Are partner motivations for engagement in partnership, whether self-interest or narrow organisational pressure, known and understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6:</td>
<td>Is there a sense of strategic direction to the tasks undertaken by the partnership?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principle 3: Ensure commitment and ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
<th>Empirical Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1:</td>
<td>Is there senior inter-agency commitment to the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2:</td>
<td>Is there a willingness to share inter-professionally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3:</td>
<td>Is the level of support for the partnership consistent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4:</td>
<td>Are networking skills recognised and encouraged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5:</td>
<td>Is there a dependency on these networking individuals in the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6:</td>
<td>Is partnership encouraged through incentives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principle 4: Develop and maintain trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
<th>Empirical Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1:</td>
<td>a) Is each partner’s contribution valued equally irrespective of resource input? b) Is this represented in the governance arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2:</td>
<td>Are the governance arrangements of the partnership such that all partners have a fair opportunity to contribute e.g. place and time of meetings, agenda, language of the partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3:</td>
<td>Are the benefits from the partnership (individual and organisational) fairly and transparently distributed amongst the partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4:</td>
<td>Do the governance arrangements allow for the partners to invest various amounts of time/resources? – openness and honesty about level of commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5:</td>
<td>Is there sufficient trust among the partners to take significant (political and financial) risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6:</td>
<td>Are the right people in the right place at the right time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principle 5: Create clear and robust partnership arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1: Transparency in the financial resources each partner bring to the partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Is each partner clear about the level of financial commitment each partner brings to the partnership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2: Awareness and appreciation of the non-financial resources each partner brings to the partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Is there awareness of what each partner brings to partnership? e.g. human resources; facilities; IT services – tangible knowledge; experience; power and legitimacy – community groups give local legitimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3: Distinguish single from collective responsibilities and ensure they are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Are partner roles and responsibilities clearly outlined and understood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4: Ensure clear lines of accountability for partnership performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Are there clear lines of accountability for (i) partnership work to own organisation? and (ii) to the partnership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5: Develop operational partnership arrangements which are simple, time-limited and task-oriented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Are the partnership working arrangements adequate- not unduly complex/restrictive but at the same time reflect urgency and a sharp focus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6: Ensure the prime focus is on process, outcomes and innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Is there a prime focus on process, outcomes and innovation-rather than on structures and inputs?

### Principle 6: Monitor, measure and learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1: Agree a range of success criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** a) Are success criteria for the partnership, e.g. aims and objectives agreed? b) Are success criteria for the service, i.e. aims and objectives agreed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2: Develop arrangements for monitoring and reviewing how well the partnership’s service aims and objectives are being met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Are there monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3: Develop arrangements for monitoring and reviewing how effectively the partnership itself is working.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** a) Is there a mechanism in place to monitor and review the partnership itself? b) Is there a mechanism in place to monitor and review the service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4: Ensure widespread dissemination of monitoring and review findings amongst partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Is there a process in place to facilitate dissemination of results of monitoring and review to partner organisations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5: Celebrate and publicise partnership success and root out continuing barriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Have successes achieved through the Partnership been adequately publicised?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6: Reconsider/Revise partnership aims, objectives and arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empirical Question:** Were aims, objectives and arrangements considered for revision?
Appendix 3 Issues on the Estates: Insights and Data from Previous Research

In order to profile the estates in which the Coordinator Scheme operated, in addition to minor work conducted by the Coordinators to profile estates, heavy use was made by the researcher of relevant published research. These findings further supported the Partnership’s objectives and informed the Coordinators’ activities. In particular the following studies proved useful:

Assessment of Needs, Our Lady Queen of Peace and St. Saviour’s Parishes (J. Cunneen, 2001); Quality of Life Study (Clarke and Eustace, 2003 for the PAUL Partnership); Public Housing in Limerick City: A Profile of Tenants and Estates (McCafferty and Canny, 2005); A Matrix of Community Based Service and Support Provision in the Limerick City Centre RAPID Area (Clarity for RAPID AITs, 2007); RAPID in ACTION: Community Safety & Physical Environment Case Studies (weblink see below); Selected Area based Statistics (Calculated from the 2006 Census of Population Small Area Population Statistics (SAPS), (PAUL Partnership 2008 and 2010) and baseline profile data provided by the Coordinator Team.

The main findings from this body of research prioritised the following needs for improving the quality of life on local authority housing estates in Limerick City and in particular those issues relevant to community safety:

Assessment of Needs, Our Lady Queen of Peace and St. Saviour’s Parishes (J. Cunneen, 2001)
Main areas of need in both parishes: For the elderly – alarms and security, neighbourhood watch, Garda patrol, improved roads, community information. For the youth, sports activities, education and training programmes.

Quality of Life Study (Clarke and Eustace, 2003 for the PAUL Partnership);
The top five quality of life themes identified by this research were health, employment, safety, education/training and community spirit/sense of belonging. The household survey conducted for this study mirrored many of the concerns expressed at the focus groups with communities in this research particularly in relation to safety, housing and the quality of the environment.

The key indicators for the quality of life themes were outlined as follows:

Safety: Crime levels; number of Neighbourhood Watch Schemes; Garda presence; availability of Public Order Special Unit; confidence level in Gardaí; number of local youth committees and youth workers; adequacy of sports and leisure facilities for youth; number of drugs awareness programmes; number of Parenting Skills programmes; willingness of doctors to respond to house calls; propensity to report crimes witnessed and/or expected; and sense of safety.

Community Spirit: Voting in elections; local newsletter circulation rates; level of community pride; perceptions of area to live in; perceptions regarding care of the...
elderly; perceptions regarding the willingness of local people to continue living in the area.

Environment: Number and maintenance of green spaces; number of litter fines; frequency of street cleaning; level of illegal dumping; cost of waste collection; number and usage of recycling facilities; level of sulphur dioxide and smoke emissions; number and cost of Wheelie Bin services; awareness of environmental issues and perception of local cleanliness.

Housing: Number of local authority houses purchased by tenants; number of vacant local authority houses; number of refurbished local authority houses; number of houses on local authority planned maintenance/refurbishment list; speed with which derelict or vacant houses are dealt with; level of pride in homes and perceptions regarding local house values.

Public Housing in Limerick City: A Profile of Tenants and Estates (McCafferty and Canny, 2005)
This report provides a profile of the tenants of Limerick City Council, as well as an assessment of conditions in Council housing estates. It gives a broader perspective on the issues pertaining to LCC public housing. These houses are located throughout the City and to facilitate spatial analysis of the data, are allocated to 20 distinct estates or groups of estates, defined in areas where there is the greatest concentration of LCC tenants households, as well as a residual ‘other’ category that covers households in areas with lower proportions of LCC rented housing. The highest concentration of individuals covered by this study is in the Moyross area, which accounts for 27 per cent of the total. There are also significant numbers in O’Malley Park, Southill (11 per cent of the total) and St. Mary’s Park (9 per cent). Two main data sources were used for this research (i) rent assessment records held by the Council, which were used to generate a demographic and socio-economic profile of tenants and tenant households; and (ii) interviews with key informants living or working in housing rented from LCC, which offered insights into estate-wide issues and problems. The findings considered relevant to this research are:

Limerick City has one of the highest percentages of social housing among local authority areas in Ireland. Public housing is spatially concentrated in the PAUL Partnership’s five target parishes of Southill, Moyross, St.Munchin’s, St.Mary’s and Our Lady of Lourdes, all of which exhibit high levels of social and economic deprivation.

The age profile of tenants was very youthful, with 36% aged less than 15 years, and more than half aged below 25 years particularly (2002 Census).

The most common type of household was a single adult with children (one third of the total).
The labour force participation rate at 34% is significantly below the City rate (55%) while the unemployment rate is almost four times higher (53% compared to 14%). Only 16% of those aged 15 years and over who were living in LCC tenancies were employed compared to 47% of the population of Limerick City. 62% of those persons aged between 15 and 24 were without work.

Welfare payments are predominantly the main source of income for individuals in LCC tenancies with a very high percentage depending on one-parent family payment. In the St. Joseph St. area, the older age profile means these tenants are particularly dependent on age related pensions which were also the most important income source in Rathbane, Thomondgate, and the northern part of Prospect centred on Bourke Avenue (Prospect 2).

The research found that there were variations between estates in terms of socio-economic characteristics, including relative poverty risk, which were reflected in differences in residential desirability. Nevertheless, a number of general and problematical issues impinging on quality of life in LCC estates were consistently identified in interviews carried out for the research. These were: (i) the perceived rise in anti-social behaviour and intimidation, and the associated decline in aspects of social capital such as neighbourliness and involvement in community/voluntary activity; (ii) problems with litter, illegal dumping and environmental degradation; and (iii) lack of services and amenities at the local level. The existence of these problems added a further area-based dimension to the concentration of social disadvantage and poverty described in the associated quantitative analysis, and underlined the magnitude of the task facing policy makers and service providers concerned with Limerick’s public housing estates.

(2005:5)

Additional select information useful to this study

While the sense of community and neighbourliness was strong, there was evidence it had declined in most estates. The rise of anti-social behaviour and vandalism had impacted community spirit. There was a consensus amongst key informants that the nature and extent of the problem had changed and had now extended to anti-social and criminal behaviour. There was a view that anti-social behaviour needs definition as it can range from general nuisance to criminal behaviour and that a lot of anti-social behaviour goes unreported. LCC was in the process of drawing up a strategy to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour and early intervention will form an important element of the plan.

Illegal dumping was seen as the second biggest issue in the estates after anti-social behaviour. It was felt this has escalated with the introduction of bin charges. The research suggested that the problem of rubbish and illegal dumping can impact negatively on community development, resident’s pride in the area, and on getting residents involved in their communities.
The research drew attention to issues arising in multi-agency collaboration. For example, ‘the rent supplement scheme is an instrument of increasing significance in the area of social housing’ (p.101). The rapid increase in rent supplement meant that the community welfare section of the HSE had become increasingly involved in this area, to the detriment of other areas of community welfare. A HSE representative indicated that the community welfare officers (there were 30 covering Limerick City and County) were devoting approximately half their time to administering rent allowance.

Conclusion reached in the report:

Interviews with key informants suggested that while there were many positive developments on the local authority housing estates e.g. estate management and partnership working between LCC, other agencies and the communities, there were still significant problems that needed attention (pp. 110-118) such as:

- The need for all agencies to become more visible on the estates particularly LCC, the HSE and the Gardaí
- The need for LCC to be more proactive in inspecting its rented properties, dealing with ‘anti-social’ tenants and working with the local community to combat illegal dumping
- The need for LCC, as the lead-agency, to ensure better data collection and record keeping in order to respond to local needs
- The need to address accessibility issues in areas with a high proportion of elderly such as St. Joseph St, Rathbane and Kennedy/Glasgow Park
- The need for LCC to improve relations with the communities through a public relations campaign to break down barriers
- The need to foster multi-dimensional partnership approaches based on ‘joined-up’ working to combating the problems associated with social exclusion

A Matrix of Community-based Service and Support Provision in the Limerick City Centre RAPID Area (Clarity for RAPID AITs, 2007)

This report was produced to facilitate the development of a more co-ordinated approach to the new RAPID Plan for Limerick City. It attempts to define the matrix, or environment, within which significant service improvement can occur with reference to seven themes: crime and community safety; family support; physical environment; education; youth; health; employment and training.

In relation to crime and community safety, the research found that it was a focus for almost all participating groups, except for Watergate Flats Community Council, whose limited resources did not allow for such a focus.

In relation to the environment, the research found that most groups were concerned with work relating to the physical environment, although it was a primary focus for St. Mary’s Aid as they provide J1 workers who carry out small scale maintenance projects across the area.
They found the presence of all key target groups, such as women, youth, long-term unemployed, early school leavers, older people, lone parents and people with disabilities, in each of the RAPID areas.

**RAPID in ACTION: Community Safety & Physical Environment Case Studies**


This report outlined eleven case studies of the ‘RAPID Programme, RAPID in Action: Learning By Doing’ including Northside and Southside, Limerick City. These cases gave examples of practical approaches taken in relation to community safety and were useful to get a nationwide perspective on the issue.

**Limerick City Community Safety Coordinators**

Information collated on the profile of the estates


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL Areas</th>
<th>EDs</th>
<th>Coordinator Estates</th>
<th>EDs Coordinator Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Munchin’s</td>
<td>Kileely A</td>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td>Kileely A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kileely B</td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td>Kileely B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castle A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castle B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castle B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>Johns A</td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>Custom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johns B</td>
<td>Johnsgate                &amp; Part of Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johns C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abbey C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>Ballinacurra B</td>
<td>Sarsfield Park</td>
<td>Dock C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospect A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospect B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glentworth C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glentworth B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>Galvone B</td>
<td>Galvone</td>
<td>Galvone A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td>Kennedy Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>Galvone A</td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glentworth B</td>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td>Glentworth B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Population

### Total Population, 2006 v. 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>4110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>4236</td>
<td>4288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>2702</td>
<td>2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>4091</td>
<td>4337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>3276</td>
<td>4006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>3107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>3257</td>
<td>3476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>59,790</td>
<td>60,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>4,239,848</td>
<td>3,917,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage Change in Population, 2006-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage Change 2002-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>-20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>+8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Female Population 2006</th>
<th>Male Population 2006</th>
<th>Gender Ratio F/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>52%/48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>52%/48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>51%/49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>53%/47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>53%/47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>52%/48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>52%/48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>44%/56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>30,481</td>
<td>29,309</td>
<td>51%/49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2,118,677</td>
<td>2,121,171</td>
<td>50%/50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>11,499</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>17,939</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>864,449</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>632,732</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>1,345,873</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Under 15s & Over 65s, 2006 v. 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>12,062</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>7037</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>864,449</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>827,428</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>467,926</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age Dependency

The **Age Dependency Rate** is the level of the total population who are termed “dependent”.

It is calculated as follows:

**No. of people aged under 15 years + No. of People aged 65 years and over**

**Total Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Age Dependency Rate 2006</th>
<th>Age Dependency Rate 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**People with Disabilities by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>393,785</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Older Persons Living Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Private Households 2006</th>
<th>No. of Persons Living Alone, Aged 65+ 2006</th>
<th>% Persons Living Alone, Aged 65+ ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>22,177</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1,469,521</td>
<td>121,157</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Older Persons Living Alone as a Percentage of Total Aged 65+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Persons living Alone, aged 65+ ³</th>
<th>% Persons Living Alone, Aged 65+ ⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lone Parents

The CSO and Pobal calculate the Lone Parents Rate, as per government policy, as follows:

The percentage of lone parent family units with at least one dependent child under the age of 15 years as a proportion of all family units with at least one dependent child under the age of 15 years ⁸

---

³ As a percentage of total private households
⁴ As a percentage of total population aged 65+
⁵ As a percentage of total population aged 65+
⁶ This is to ensure that a family unit comprising of an elderly parent living with their adult child is not included in the lone parent rate. However, it also means that the official lone parent rate is

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Lone Parent Rate 2006 %</th>
<th>Lone Parent Rate, 2002 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Munchin’s</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Unemployment, 2006 v. 2002**

The Unemployment Rate is calculated as follows:

No. of People Unemployed + No. of 1st Time Job Seekers

No. at Work + No. of People Unemployed + No. of 1st Time Job Seekers

(i.e. the labour force)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Unemployment Rate, 2006 %</th>
<th>Total Unemployment Rate, 2002 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

much higher than they would be if it was calculated based on all lone parents as a proportion of all family Units.

9 Galvone A = 22.4 Glenworth B = 23.6

10 Abbey D = 27.0 Singland A = 31.7

11 Glenworth A = 33.3; Shannon B = 65.1
Household Occupancy

A Permanent Private Household is defined as a private household occupying a permanent dwelling, such as a dwelling house, flat or bedsit.

Nature of Household Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total No. of Permanent Private Households</th>
<th>Local Authority Housing %</th>
<th>Private Rented Houses %</th>
<th>Owner Occupied Houses %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryowen</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviours</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>22,127</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1,462,296</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Deprivation Index Scores 1991–2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyross</td>
<td>-32.3</td>
<td>-23.9</td>
<td>-21.1</td>
<td>-26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>-39.0</td>
<td>-36.2</td>
<td>-30.7</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>-27.0</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
<td>-29.7</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>-25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Deprivation Index Scores 1991–2006: St. Saviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenworth A</td>
<td>-23.1</td>
<td>-13.5</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon B</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Deprivation Index Scores 1991–2006: Our Lady Queen of Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galvone A</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenworth B</td>
<td>-15.4</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey D</td>
<td>-24.6</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singland A</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
<td>-14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4 Schedule of Meetings and Research Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>08.01X2</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>03.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07.11</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>07.02</td>
<td>06.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>22.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>10.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02.03X2</td>
<td>01.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05.03</td>
<td>09.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06.03</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04.04</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>06.06</td>
<td>16.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>07.06</td>
<td>27.07x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06.06</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07.06</td>
<td>21.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>25.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>18.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08.08</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03.09</td>
<td>22.09x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.09</td>
<td>23.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>16.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Day</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>02.04</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>26.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>01.10</td>
<td>21/2.05</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09.10</td>
<td>03.10</td>
<td>03.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>03.04</td>
<td>05.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Correspondence</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>16.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2006-2010 (1,218)</td>
<td>02.04</td>
<td>01.10</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5 Evaluation of Embedded Case Study

EVALUATION (1) OF
LIMERICK CITY COMMUNITY CO-ORDINATORS SCHEME
COORDINATORS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Ref. No: ____

Where applicable Tick ✓ boxes as requested

Attach an additional sheet if required. All responses are confidential.

1. Awareness of Scheme

1(a) Knowledge of Scheme

In your opinion have the following stakeholders become more aware of the Coordinator Scheme in the last year?

Limerick City Council  YES  ☐  NO  ☐ Please explain your answer

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The Gardaí  YES  ☐  NO  ☐ Please explain your answer

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The HSE  YES  ☐  NO  ☐ Please explain your answer

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Community Statutory Agencies  YES ☐  NO  ☐ Please explain your answer
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Community Groups  YES ☐  NO  ☐ Please explain your answer
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Tenants  YES ☐  NO  ☐ Please explain your answer
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Other? Please explain your answer:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

**Contact with Scheme**

1(b) Contact with the Scheme can be made in the following ways. How satisfied are you with these methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Fairly Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1(c) The Scheme has been publicised as follows. Please rank in order of importance what you consider the most effective method? 1=most effective, 8= least effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Leaflet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Improved Service Delivery due to the Scheme**

2(a) Has the level of complaints increased since your appointment?

YES ☐  NO ☐

If YES, why do you think this has happened?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

2(b) In your opinion, is there a faster response now to legitimate requests from tenants for assistance from the following stakeholders than prior to the introduction of the Co-ordinator Scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>YES ☐  NO ☐  Please explain your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City Council</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gardaí</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Inter-Agency Linkage

3(a) How satisfied are you with inter-agency linkage between the Co-ordinator Scheme and the following stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Fairly Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3(b) If you are not satisfied with the degree of linkage with any of the above stakeholders, please identify which stakeholder (or part thereof) and explain why.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

3(c) In your opinion, are there agencies now working in partnership on the public housing estates as a result of the Co-ordinator Scheme that previously worked in isolation? YES ☐ NO ☐

If YES, can you identify these agencies?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

4.  **Quality of Life**

4(a) Perception of quality of life

What was your perception of the following quality of life issues in each of the public housing estates *at the outset* of the Scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life Indicators</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Fairly High</th>
<th>Neither high nor low</th>
<th>Fairly low</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Crime</td>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime</td>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarsfield Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Graffiti</th>
<th>Kileely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy Pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow Pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarsfield Pk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Local Environment</th>
<th>Kileely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kennedy Pk
Glasgow Pk
Rathbane
Janesboro
Sarsfield Pk

*The condition of the local environment (e.g. litter, voids, abandoned cars, damaged lighting)

4(b) What is your perception of these quality of life issues **now (12 months since the Scheme began)** in each of the public housing estates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Fairly High</th>
<th>Neither high nor low</th>
<th>Fairly low</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Crime</strong></td>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarsfield Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of Crime</strong></td>
<td>Kileely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomondgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnsgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow Pk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rathbane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janesboro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to improve the quality of life on public housing estates, four key themes have been targeted for the Co-ordinators’ attention by the Community Safety Partnership. These include (i) improving the physical environment, (ii) raising community spirit, (iii) reducing the fear of crime and (iv) creating an awareness of these aims through education and information.

*The condition of the local environment (e.g. litter, voids, abandoned cars, damaged lighting)
4(c) Under each of the four themes, please list any initiative/s you have personally led since your appointment as a Co-ordinator? (For assistance in answering this question please see attached the breakdown of these themes in the log-book).

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. **Best Practice**

5(a) Please indicate, in order of importance, (1 being most important and 6 least important) what you feel are the most important aspects of a Co-ordinator's job with regard to best practice.

Having appropriate knowledge

(e.g. legislation, functions of other agencies) ☐

Building trust and credibility with tenants ☐

Being fair in all situations ☐

Having appropriate training ☐

Being a ‘link’ to Limerick City Council ☐

Other ☐

Please explain:____________________________________________________________

5(b) Please indicate, in order of importance, (1 being most important 10 least important) what you feel are the most important attributes of an effective co-ordinator?

Good communicator ☐

Good administrator ☐

Good appearance ☐

Good health ☐

Good motivator ☐

Trustworthiness ☐

Reliability ☐

Friendliness ☐
Energetic  □
Other       □
Please explain:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5(c) Were you satisfied with your experience of the recruitment process for Co-ordinators? YES □ NO □
Why do you say that?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5(d) Is there any particular aspect of the co-ordinator’s job that you think needs attention (e.g. rota, SOPs, training, uniforms)? YES □ NO □
If YES, please explain:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. **Constraints**
6(a) Do you think you are restricted *internally* in your role as Co-ordinator?
YES □ NO □
If YES, please explain your answer:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6(b) Do you think you are restricted *externally* in your role as Co-ordinator?
YES □ NO □
If YES, please explain your answer?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
7. **Expanding the Scheme**

7(a) In your opinion are there aspects of the current Co-ordinator Scheme that could be successfully implemented elsewhere? YES ☐ NO ☐

If YES, please identify which aspects:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

7(b) What information or statistics do you think should be used to monitor and evaluate the Co-Ordinator Scheme and why?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

7(c) In your opinion is the name of the Scheme i.e. The Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme suitable for the Scheme?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Please explain your answer:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

7(d) On the first anniversary of the Scheme, do you think that the Scheme could be improved in any way?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Please explain your answer:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

8. Are there any additional comments or observations that you wish to make? If so, please include here:

____________________________________________________________________

Please return the completed questionnaire to Jacinta Cunneen, c/o Service Desk, Postgraduate Research Centre, Foundation Building, The University of Limerick.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. If you have any additional comments you would like to make, please do so on a separate sheet and attach to the questionnaire on return.
UNIVERSITY of LIMERICK
OLLSCOIL LUIMNIGH
EVALUATION OF
LIMERICK COMMUNITY CO-ORDINATOR SCHEME (LCCS)
PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I am currently conducting an evaluation of the Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme. As part of the evaluation I will be distributing a questionnaire to tenants living in the housing estates where the Scheme is operating. I will also survey people who are working in these estates on behalf of statutory agencies who have contact with the Scheme.

In order to get a good response to the survey, I need to make sure that the questions on the questionnaires are clear, easy to understand and answer. Therefore I am piloting a draft of the questionnaire in advance of the full survey.

I would appreciate it if you could complete the enclosed draft copy of the questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped addressed envelope provided before XXXXXX. In particular, I am interested in finding out the following information and an extra sheet is included for your comments regarding same:

- Your impression of the layout of the questionnaire;
- The length of time it took you to complete it;
- If you found any particular question confusing or difficult to answer;
- If any particular question was left out that you feel is important and should be included.

I look forward to hearing from you. Many thanks for your time.

__________________________________________

Jacinta Cunneen c/o Service Desk,
Postgraduate Research Centre
Foundation Building
University of Limerick.
Limerick. Tel: MOB 087-6886703     Email: jacinta.cunneen@ul.ie
1. **Awareness of Scheme**

1(a) Are you aware of the Community Co-ordinator Scheme?

   YES □   NO □

   If No, please go to Q.7

1(b) How did you first become aware of the Scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ordinator called to me</th>
<th>Through local residents’ association/community group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbour/Friend/Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limerick City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-ordinators’ Leaflet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-ordinators’ Website

Other (please specify)

1(c) If you wanted to contact the Community Co-ordinators, how would you contact them? Tick ✓ the way that would suit you best.

- By calling into their office in City Hall
- By phoning them at City Hall
- By writing a letter to them at City Hall
- By waiting to meet the Co-ordinator in the street
- Through the Co-ordinators’ website on the computer

Another way?
Please say how:

I have no idea how to contact the Co-ordinators

1(d) Can you tell me what you think the services of the Community Co-ordinator Scheme include in the area/estates where you work?

Tick ✓ relevant boxes

- Providing advice on Limerick City Council housing policies and procedures
- Reporting Repairs
- Environmental clean-ups
- Facilitating inter-agency linkage on the housing estates
- Other (Please specify)
- Don’t Know
2. Introduction of New Services

2(a) Are you aware of any new service/s which have been introduced by the Co-ordinators in the area/estate where you work?

YES □   NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these services are?

2(b) Have you been involved in setting up any service in your area/estate with the Co-ordinators? YES □   NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these services are?

2(c) Are you aware of any services which have been introduced by the Co-ordinators in your area/estate in collaboration with other agencies?

YES □   NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these services are?

3. Inter-Agency Linkage

3(a) Which of the following agencies are you associated with? Tick ✔ relevant box

Limerick City Council □, the Gardaí □, the HSE □, Estate Management □, Community Development, Education □

Other: please explain:

__________________________________________________________________________________________
3(b) Are you aware of any improvements that have come about in your area/estate as a result of inter-agency co-operation facilitated by the Co-ordinators?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If YES, can you please tell me what these improvements are?

3(c) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the Community Co-ordinator Scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Org.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped <strong>improve the image of</strong> Limerick City Council, the Gardai, and the HSE</td>
<td>Of City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of the Gardai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of the HSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped <strong>improve access to</strong> Limerick City Council staff, the Gardai, the HSE</td>
<td>To City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the Gardai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the HSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped <strong>improve the relationship between tenants and</strong> Limerick City Council, the Gardai, the HSE</td>
<td>And City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the Gardai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the HSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped **improve the relationship between local community groups and** the Limerick City Council, the Gardai, and the HSE.

The Co-ordinator Scheme has made an important contribution to improving the quality of life on the estates where they operate.

Having Co-ordinators on the estates has not made any real difference to tenants.

### 4. Improvement in quality of life in the community

4(a) In your opinion, has there been a noticeable improvement or disimprovement in any of the following activities since the introduction of the Community Co-ordinator Scheme in your area/estate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Improved a lot</th>
<th>Improved a little</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Disimproved a little</th>
<th>Disimproved a lot</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean up of greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communal areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Physical environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. security gates, pedestrian crossing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of illegal dumping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4(b) Are you aware of *any other* environmental improvements/ initiatives that have occurred since the introduction of the Community Co-ordinator Scheme?  
YES □  NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these improvements are?

4(c) Are you aware of any activities facilitated by the Community Co-ordinator Scheme that have led to an increase in community spirit shown by tenants (e.g. litter picks, trips for elderly) in your area/estate?  
YES □  NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these activities are?
4(d) Are you aware of any activities undertaken by the Community Co-ordinator Scheme that have led to a reduction in the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour in your area/estate? YES □ NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these activities are?

If YES, can you please tell me what these activities are?

4(e) Since the introduction of the Community Co-ordinator Scheme in your area/estate, would you say there have been more or less incidents of anti-social behaviour in your area/estate?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4(f) Are you aware of any activities undertaken by the Community Co-ordinator Scheme that have led to a reduction in vandalism in your area/estate? YES □ NO □

If YES, can you please tell me what these activities are?

4(g) Are you aware of any activities undertaken by the Community Co-ordinator Scheme that have led to a reduction in graffiti in your area/estate? YES □ NO □
If YES, can you please tell me what these activities are?

4(h) Are you aware of any social/community activities undertaken by the Community Co-ordinator Scheme that have led generally to improvements in the quality of life in your area/estate?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If YES, can you please tell me what these activities are?

5(a) Have you ever had any specific reason to have to contact the Community Co-ordinators?

YES ☐ NO ☐ If NO, please go to question 5(b).

If YES, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the way in which the Co-ordinators dealt with the matter?

Very satisfied
Satisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied
Don’t know

5(b) Do you think the Co-ordinator Scheme benefits all sections of your area/estate equally?
5(c) If NO, which groups of people in your area/estate do you feel benefit most from the Co-ordinator Scheme? *Tick relevant boxes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elderly people</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People less than 18 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman’s groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from ethnic minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5(d) Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the Community Co-ordinator Scheme?

| Very satisfied |   |
| Satisfied |   |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied |   |
| Dissatisfied |   |
| Very dissatisfied |   |
| Don’t know |   |
5(e) Why are you dissatisfied?

5(f) Are you aware of any specific reasons why it might be difficult for your local Co-ordinator to do his/her job?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If YES, Can you tell me what these are?

5(g) Do you think the Co-ordinator’s role could be further developed?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If YES, in what way?

5(h) What recommendations would you make for improving the service provided by the Community Co-ordinator Scheme?
5(i) What do you think is the main **advantage**, if any, of having a Community Co-ordinator Scheme?


5(j) What do you think is the main **disadvantage**, if any, of having a Community Co-ordinator Scheme?


5(k) Do you think the Co-ordinator Scheme should be developed in other local authority housing estates?

   YES □  NO □

   If YES, where would you suggest?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. **General**

6(a) Do you think that the name - The Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme is a suitable name for the Scheme? YES □  NO □

   If NO, what name would you suggest?

____________________________________________________________________

6(b) Are there any other comments that you would like to make about the Community Co-ordinator Scheme?
YES □ NO □

If YES, Please explain (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

7. Would you like to learn more about the Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme?

YES □ NO □

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-paid envelope before Thursday 31st July, 2008

Jacinta Cunneen,
c/o Service Desk,
Postgraduate Research Centre,
Foundation Building,
The University of Limerick
Dear

Re: Evaluation of the Limerick Community Coordinator Scheme

I’m currently evaluating the Community Co-ordinator Scheme which is a two-year pilot community safety project. In order to do so, I’m conducting interviews, focus groups and a survey of people living and/or working in the areas where the Scheme operates.

I understand that you have had contact with the Scheme in the past twelve months and would appreciate any feedback you might have to offer regarding your experience.

I’m enclosing a questionnaire, together with an information leaflet, on the evaluation and a pre-paid addressed envelope for replying. I would really appreciate it if you could take the time to complete the questionnaire for me. It takes about twenty minutes to do so.

As this is a general questionnaire for stakeholders working in the areas where the Scheme is operating, there may be some questions that are not applicable in your situation. If this is the case just mark ‘not applicable’.

I look forward to hearing from you and appreciate your co-operation and input.

Yours sincerely,

__________________

Jacinta Cunneen
Evaluator

encl.
**EVALUATION (1)**

**LIMERICK COMMUNITY CO-ORDINATOR SCHEME**

**TENANTS’ QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Awareness of Scheme**

1. Do you know about the Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme that is in your area? (The Co-ordinators wear a blue uniform, drive a white van, and work daily Monday to Friday).
   - YES ☐
   - NO ☐
   Tick ✓ one box

(If NO, please go to the last question)

2. If YES, how did you **FIRST HEAR** about the Scheme? Tick ✓ **ONE** of the following boxes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Co-ordinator called to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through local resident's association/community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour/Friend/Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Do you know the names of the Co-ordinators working in your area?
   YES ☐ NO ☐ Tick ✓ one box.

4. Do you know what the Co-ordinators do in your area?
   YES ☐ NO ☐ Tick ✓ one box

**Contact with Scheme**

5. If you wanted to contact the Community Co-ordinators, how would you contact them? Tick ✓ the way that would suit you best.

   | By calling into their office in City Hall |   |
   | By phoning them at City Hall              |   |
   | By writing a letter to them at City Hall  |   |
   | By waiting to meet the Co-ordinator in the street |   |
   | Through the Co-ordinators’ website on the computer |   |
   | Another way? Please say how: |   |
   | I have no idea how to contact the Co-ordinators |   |

6. What do you think the Co-ordinators’ job is in your area? Tick ✓ any box that you think applies

   | Reporting Repairs |   |
   | Giving information on housing |   |
   | Providing information on other support groups e.g. Limerick City Council, Social |   |
Services, Active Retirement Group
Cleaning up graffiti and litter

Helping with local groups e.g. youth, elderly

Other (please say what other jobs)

Don’t Know

**Delivery of Services by Co-ordinators**

7. Have you ever contacted a Co-ordinator when you had a problem?
   
   YES □ NO □  Tick ✔ one box

   **If your answer is NO go on to Question 11**

8. If YES, would you like to say what type of problem it was? e.g. housing, anti-social behaviour, litter etc.

9. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the way in which the Co-ordinators dealt with your problem? Tick ✔ ONE box only

   | Very satisfied |   |
   | Satisfied     |   |
   | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied |   |
   | Dissatisfied  |   |
   | Very dissatisfied |   |
   | Don’t know     |   |

349
10. Why do you say that? Use this box to say why.


11. Tick any of the following activities you think the Co-ordinators are involved in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aim 1:</strong> Strengthening Community Spirit in the community</th>
<th><strong>Aim 2:</strong> Improving the Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinators attend youth clubs and help organise activities for the youth in the community</td>
<td>Removal of graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinators attend residents’ meetings and report any issues raised there to Limerick City Council if needed.</td>
<td>Removal of litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinators attend active retirement clubs and listen to and act on concerns that the elderly might have.</td>
<td>Preventing illegal dumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinators get good publicity for the area.</td>
<td>Removal abandoned/burned out cars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aim 3:</strong> Reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour</th>
<th><strong>Aim 4:</strong> Improving the quality of life through education and information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The elderly feel a bit more secure because of seeing the Co-ordinators on a regular basis</td>
<td>Co-ordinators visit schools and talk to pupils about how they could improve their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is less anti-social behaviour in the community because of the presence of the Co-ordinators</td>
<td>Co-ordinators provide information on safety and other issues to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are fewer gangs hanging around because of the presence of the Co-ordinators</td>
<td>Co-ordinators work with other support agencies to improve the quality of life in the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NONE OF THE ABOVE HAS HAPPENED**

**DON’T KNOW SO CAN’T ANSWER**
12. Have the Co-ordinators been a help in your area in ANY OTHER WAY?

YES ☐ NO ☐ Tick ✓ONE box only

13. If YES, in what way? Use this box to say in what way.

14. How useful do you think the Limerick Community Co-Ordinator Scheme is for improving the quality of life in your area? Tick ✓one box only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Why do you say that? Use this box to say why.

15. What part of the Co-ordinators’ work do you think is the most useful in your area?

16. What part of the Co-ordinators’ work do you think is the least useful in your area?

17(a) To which of the following age-groups do you belong? Tick ✓ box

18-25 ☐ 26-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56+ ☐
17(b) Gender: Male □ Female □

18. Which group/s of people on your estate do you feel benefit most from the Community Co-ordinator Scheme? Tick ✓ any box that applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elderly people</th>
<th>People with disabilities</th>
<th>Community Groups</th>
<th>People younger than 18 years</th>
<th>Woman’s groups</th>
<th>People from ethnic minorities</th>
<th>Other (Please specify)</th>
<th>No group in particular</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. Is there a particular person in your household that could benefit more from the Scheme? YES □ NO □

If Yes, is it any of the following group?

Child (up to 11 years) □ Youth (12 to 18 years) □ Elderly □

Disabled □ Other □

If ‘Other’ what group would that be?

________________________________________________________________________

20. Do you think that the Co-ordinators could be doing more?

YES □ NO □ Tick ✓ one box

21. If YES, in what way? Use this box to say in what way.
22. Because of the introduction of the Community Co-ordinator Scheme in your area would you be more willing or less willing to report anti-social behaviour than in the past? Tick one of the following boxes only.

- A lot more willing
- A little more willing
- About the same
- A little less willing
- A lot less willing
- Don’t know

23. If you wished to report anti-social behaviour at present, who would you first report it to? Tick one of the following boxes only.

- Co-ordinators
- Limerick City Council staff
- Community Gardaí
- Garda Station
- HSE
- Other: Please say who this would be.

24. Please say why you would contact them first.

25. Do you agree or disagree with the following opinions regarding the Community Co-ordinator Scheme? Tick one box for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I Agree (Yes, it has)</th>
<th>I disagree (No, it hasn’t)</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped improve the image of Limerick City Council, the Gardai, and the HSE</th>
<th>Of City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of the Gardai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of the HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped improve access to Limerick City Council staff, the Gardai, the HSE</td>
<td>To City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the Gardai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To the HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped improve the relationship between tenants and Limerick City Council (LCC), the Gardai, the HSE</td>
<td>And City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the Gardai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the HSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinator Scheme has helped improve the relationship between local community groups and the Limerick City Council, the Gardai the HSE</td>
<td>And City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And Gardai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-ordinators have helped to improve the quality of life on the estates where they work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Co-ordinators on the estates has made no real difference to tenants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Do you think it might be difficult at times for your local Co-ordinator to do his/her job in your community? **YES** □ **NO** □ Tick ✓ one box

If YES, please give the reasons in this box.

27. Do you think that the name - The Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme is a suitable name for the Scheme? **YES** □ **NO** □ Tick ✓ one box

If NO, what name would you suggest?

______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

28. Do you think the Co-ordinator Scheme should be set up in more housing estates?

**YES** □ **NO** □ Tick ✓ one box

29. Would you like to know more about the Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme in your area?
YES □ NO □ Tick ✓ one box

If YES, please provide your contact details in the space below.

NAME:__________________________________________________________

ADDRESS:________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________ Email:__________

TO SHOW OUR THANKS TO THOSE WHO HAVE COMPLETED AND RETURNED THEIR QUESTIONNAIRES, WE ARE HOLDING A DRAW FOR €100 WORTH OF ‘ONE 4 ALL VOUCHERS’.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE ENTERED FOR THE DRAW PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS ABOVE.

To ensure you are included in the draw, please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-paid, addressed envelope before

Friday 4th July, 2008.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.
Jacinta Cunneen
C/o Service Desk
Postgraduate Research Centre
Foundation Building
The University of Limerick.
LIMERICK COMMUNITY COORDINATOR SCHEME

STAKEHOLDERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In your opinion how aware are members of your organisation/agency of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box

   [ ] They are very aware  [ ] They have some idea  [ ] They have no idea

2. In your opinion how aware are tenants on the estates in your area of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box

   [ ] They are very aware  [ ] They have some idea  [ ] They have no idea

3. Can you say what kind of work the Coordinators are involved in?

   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

   If Yes, can you say what kind of work that is?

   ________________________________________________________________

4. Do you think this type of work improves community safety on the housing estates in your area? Yes  [ ] or No  [ ]

   Please explain your answer:
5. Have you contacted the Coordinators at any time? Yes ☐ or No ☐
   If Yes, would you like to say for what reason?

6. Do you think a Scheme like the Coordinator Scheme is of benefit to communities to improve community safety? Yes ☐ or No ☐
   If Yes, can you say in what way?

7. Can you suggest what the Coordinators could do in your area to improve community safety?

8. The Scheme is run jointly by Limerick City Council, The Gardaí and the HSE. In your opinion has the Scheme helped to improve the image of these agencies in your community? Tick one box ✓
   Limerick City Council ☐ or No ☐
   Gardaí ☐ or No ☐
   HSE ☐ or No ☐

EXTRA COMMENTS

If you would like to make more comments please do so here:
Re: Evaluation of Limerick Community Coordinator Pilot Scheme

The Limerick Community Coordinator Scheme is a three-year pilot community safety programme which has been operating on selected local authority housing estates in Limerick City since May 2007. It is managed by the Limerick Community Safety Partnership Board which comprises representatives of Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE.

The Scheme is nearing the end of the pilot period now and the Board would like to find out if the Scheme had any impact on community safety on the estates. I understand from the Coordinators that they were in contact with you in the course of their work and in order to get your perceptions of the Scheme’s impact on community safety, I am attaching a short questionnaire.

As the idea behind the Scheme was to try new and different ways of tackling anti-social behaviour through a multi-agency approach, your comments as a stakeholder would be most helpful to the Board. I have enclosed a stamped, addressed envelope for you to return the questionnaire to me, if possible, by Monday 24th May, 2010.

Should you have any questions, I can be contacted on my mobile phone at 087-6886703. All information provided will be treated in confidence by me at the University of Limerick. I look forward to your feedback.

Yours sincerely,

__________________
Jacinta Cunneen
BA Public Admin, MA, MA Sociology
FG 178 Foundation Building
University of Limerick.
18th May, 2010.

Dear

Re: Evaluation of Limerick Community Coordinator Pilot Scheme

The Limerick Community Coordinator Scheme is a three-year pilot community safety programme which has been operating on selected local authority housing estates in Limerick City since May 2007. It is managed by the Limerick Community Safety Partnership Board which comprises representatives of Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE. The Scheme is nearing the end of the pilot period now and the Board would like to find out if the Scheme had any impact on community safety on the estates.

You kindly participated in an interim evaluation of the Scheme carried out by me in 2008. Now, as the Scheme is nearing the end of the pilot period, I am carrying out a final evaluation. As a follow-up to the last questionnaire you completed for me, I am attaching a short questionnaire to get your current feedback on the Scheme and your perceptions of the Scheme’s impact on community safety in the communities in which you work.

As the idea behind the Scheme was to try new and different ways of tackling anti-social behaviour through a multi-agency approach, your comments as a stakeholder would be most helpful to the Board. I have enclosed a stamped, addressed envelope for you to return the questionnaire to me, if possible, by Monday 24th May, 2010.

Should you have any questions, I can be contacted on my mobile phone at 087-6886703. All information provided will be treated in confidence by me at the University of Limerick.

Yours sincerely,

__________________
Jacinta Cunneen
BA Public Admin, MA, MA Sociology
FG 178, Foundation Building
University of Limerick.
(THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WAS SENT TO THE POLITICIANS)

CONFIDENTIAL

Ref. No: ____

UNIVERSITY of LIMERICK
OLLSCOIL LUI M NÍ GH

EVALUATION (2)

LIMERICK COMMUNITY COORDINATOR SCHEME

KEY STAKEHOLDERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In your opinion how aware are politicians of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box ✓
   They are very aware ☐ They have some idea ☐ They have no idea ☐

2. In your opinion how aware are tenants on the selected local authority housing estates of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box ✓
   They are very aware ☐ They have some idea ☐ They have no idea ☐

3. Can you say what kind of work the Coordinators are involved in?
   Yes ☐ or No ☐
If Yes, can you say what kind of work that is?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

4. Do you think this type of work improves community safety on the selected housing estates?

Yes □ or No □

Please explain your answer:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. Can you suggest any other type of work the Coordinators could do to improve community safety on the selected housing estates?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. Have you contacted the Coordinators at any time? Yes □ or No □

If Yes, would you like to say for what reason?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

7. Do you think a Scheme like the Coordinator Scheme is of benefit to communities to improve community safety? Yes □ or No □ If Yes, can you say in what way?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

8. The Scheme is run jointly by Limerick City Council, The Gardaí and the HSE. In your opinion has the Scheme helped to improve the image of these agencies in any way? Tick one box ✓
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Limerick City Council  Yes ☐ or No ☐

Gardaí  Yes ☐ or No ☐

HSE  Yes ☐ or No ☐

EXTRA COMMENTS

If you would like to make additional comments please do so here:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
1. In your opinion how aware are members of your organisation/agency of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box

- They are very aware
- They have some idea
- They have no idea

2. In your opinion how aware are tenants on the selected local authority housing estates of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box

- They are very aware
- They have some idea
- They have no idea
3. Can you say what kind of work the Coordinators are involved in?

Yes □ or No □

If Yes, can you say what kind of work that is?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

4. Do you think this type of work improves community safety on the selected housing estates?

Yes □ or No □

Please explain your answer:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. Can you suggest any other type of work the Coordinators could do to improve community safety on the selected housing estates?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

6. Have you contacted the Coordinators at any time? Yes □ or No □

If Yes, would you like to say for what reason?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

7. Do you think a Scheme like the Coordinator Scheme is of benefit to communities to improve community safety? Yes □ or No □ If Yes, can you say in what way?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
8. The Scheme is run jointly by Limerick City Council, The Gardaí and the HSE. In your opinion has the Scheme helped to improve the image of these agencies in any way? Tick **one** box ✓

- **Limerick City Council**  Yes ☐ or No ☐
- **Gardaí**  Yes ☐ or No ☐
- **HSE**  Yes ☐ or No ☐

**EXTRA COMMENTS**

If you would like to make more comments please do so here:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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EVALUATION (2)

LIMERICK COMMUNITY COORDINATOR SCHEME

TENANTS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In your opinion how aware are tenants on your estate of the Coordinator Scheme? Tick one box ✓
   - They are very aware ☐
   - They have some idea ☐
   - They have no idea ☐

2. Can you say what kind of work the Coordinators do in your area?
   - Yes ☐ or No ☐
   If Yes, can you say what kind of work that is?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. Do you think this type of work improved community safety in your area?
   - Tick one box ✓
   - Yes ☐ or No ☐
Can you explain why you gave this answer?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

4. Have you contacted the Coordinators at any time?

Yes ☐ or No ☐ Tick one box ✓

If Yes, would you like to say for what reason?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

5. To which of the following groups do you belong? Tick one box ✓

18-25 Years ☐ 26-35 Years ☐ 36-45 Years ☐ 46-55 Years ☐ 56+Years ☐
Male ☐ Female ☐

6. Do you think a Scheme like the Coordinator Scheme is of benefit to your community with regards to community safety?

Yes ☐ or No ☐

7. Can you suggest what the Coordinators could do more in your estate to improve community safety?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

8. Are you aware that the Scheme is run jointly by Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE. Yes ☐ or No ☐

If YES, has the Scheme helped to improve what people in your estate think of these agencies? Tick one box ✓

Limerick City Council Yes ☐ or No ☐
Gardaí Yes ☐ or No ☐
HSE Yes ☐ or No ☐
Returned questionnaires will be entered for a draw. The prize is a One 4 All Card worth €50. If you **DO NOT** want to be entered for the draw please tick ✓ this box ☐

**EXTRA COMMENTS**

If you would like to make more comments please do so here:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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What is the Limerick Community Co-ordinator Scheme?

The Limerick Community Coordinator Scheme (LCCS) is a two-year pilot project operating in selected public housing estates in Limerick City since May 2007. The Scheme is managed by the Limerick Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) which is a private limited company managed by representatives from Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE. The Coordinator Scheme operates on the north-side of the city in Kileely, Thomondgate, Johnsgate Village, Johns St. and Watergate and on the south-side in Janesboro, Rathbane, Glasgow Park, Kennedy Park and Sarsfield Park.

The Community Coordinator Scheme aims to tackle anti-social behaviour and improve the quality of life within local authority housing estates by:

1. Strengthening community spirit within local communities;
2. Improving the physical environment in neighbourhoods;
3. Reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour;
4. Improving the quality of life through education and information.
What is the evaluation for?

This Limerick-based Scheme is the first scheme of its kind operating in local authority housing estates in Ireland. If the Scheme proves effective, similar schemes will be set up by other local authorities nationwide. In order to evaluate its effectiveness the Community Safety Partnership has commissioned the University of Limerick to conduct an evaluation over the two year period of the Scheme.

What happens next?

You will be invited to participate in the research either through a focus group, an interview or a survey questionnaire. For the focus groups researchers from the University of Limerick will contact your representative organisation over the coming weeks to arrange a suitable date and venue. Arrangements for the interviews with stakeholders will be made by telephone and the survey questionnaire will be distributed to houses in the participating estates.

What’s in it for you?

As the Scheme is designed to complement existing community development activities, the organisers need to know how best the Scheme can benefit the individual needs of your community. Your knowledge of community issues is essential to the Scheme in planning, designing and modifying the role of the co-ordinators. Feedback from the communities will improve the usefulness of the Scheme and ensure maximum benefit for your community.

What happens to the information?

Information derived from this research (either written or taped) is the property of the researchers and will be held in a locked filing cabinet at the University of Limerick. Permission will be sought beforehand should the researchers wish to tape interviews or focus groups. Persons participating in any part of this research will not be individually identified. Where necessary, the permission of the parent/legal guardian will be acquired. All data collected will be treated as confidential.

While we really need and would appreciate your feedback, you are not obliged to participate in this evaluation and you are free, at any time, to decide not to participate.
Where can I get more information?

If you have any questions in relation to this evaluation you may contact the following researchers at the University of Limerick who are conducting the evaluation:

Jacinta Cunneen

c/o Service Desk, Postgraduate Research Centre, Foundation Building,
University of Limerick.
Phone: UL: 061-233206 MOB: 087-6886703       Email: jacinta.cunneen@ul.ie

Catherine Browne

c/o Service Desk, Postgraduate Research Centre, Foundation Building, University of Limerick.
Phone: UL: 061-213061       Email: catherine.browne@ul.ie

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent, you may contact:

The Chairman of the University of Limerick Research Ethics Committee
c/o Vice President Academic and Registrar’s Office
University of Limerick
Limerick.

Tel. (061) 202022
I, the undersigned, declare that I am willing to take part in this evaluation.

- I declare that I have been fully briefed on the nature of this study and my role in it and have been given the opportunity to ask questions before agreeing to participate.
- The nature of my participation has been explained to me and I have full knowledge of how the information collected will be used.
- I am also aware that my participation in this study may be recorded and I agree to this. However, should I feel uncomfortable at any time I can request that the recording equipment be switched-off. I am entitled to copies of all recordings made and am fully informed as to what will happen to these recordings once the study is completed.
- I fully understand that there is no obligation on me to participate in this study and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without having to explain or give a reason.
- I am also entitled to full confidentiality in terms of my participation and personal details.

_____________________    _______________
Signature of participant     Date
CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

I,_______________________________ agree to take part in an evaluation of the Limerick City Community Co-Ordinator Scheme which is operating as a pilot project in eight local authority housing estates for two years.

The purpose of the focus group is to:

- gather feedback on the perceptions and expectations of the Scheme from community groups and residents in these estates; and to
- monitor the progress of the Scheme during the pilot period.

The focus group is not structured around a formal questionnaire but will involve the discussion of certain topics. It may be tape-recorded and transcribed. With your permission, we may reproduce anonymous quotes from the transcriptions in the course of writing up the research.

At all times our aim is to protect your anonymity. At no time will your identity or any identifying details, for example your name, be visible within the report. The material, tapes and transcription will be held confidentially by the researcher in the University of Limerick and destroyed once the final report has been submitted.

The purpose of signing this form is to gain your consent to use information gathered from you. You may decline to take part or withdraw at any time.

I agree to and understand the terms of participation within the evaluation.

Participant: _________________________________Date:________________

I agree to and understand the terms of participation within the evaluation.

Researcher: ________________________________Date:________________
EVALUATION OF LIMERICK COMMUNITY CO-ORDINATOR SCHEME

CONSENT FORM FOR YOUTH

You are invited to take part in this focus group so that we can find out from you how the Coordinators can help you enjoy living on your housing estate. It will take about one hour of your time. We are asking your opinion in order to find out what the youth need in your area.

The researcher will ask you some questions about living on your estate so that she can make a list of things the Coordinators can do to help you. She will also ask for your suggestions and ideas.

Sometimes, with the permission of the youth group, the researcher might tape the session but you will be asked beforehand if this is OK with you. When the researcher is writing up the feedback from the focus group she will not name, or identify in any way, any individual youth who had something to say. Sometimes, the researcher might like to quote somebody whom she felt made a very important point but in this case too, permission will be sought from the person and he/she will not be named.

If you are not sure you want to take part in the focus group, you can ask the researcher any questions you might have beforehand. If you feel you understand what the focus group is about and you would like to take part, please sign your name below. If you are under 18 years of age, please ask your parent or guardian to sign it as well.

Thank you for your help.

Youth’s Name: ____________________ Date: ______________
I agree to ______________________ taking part in the focus group.
Parent/Guardian Name______________________________

Thank you for your co-operation.
17th May, 2010.

Dear Tenant,

Re: Evaluation of Limerick Community Coordinator Pilot Scheme

The Limerick Community Coordinator Scheme is a three-year pilot community safety programme which has been operating on selected local authority housing estates in Limerick City since May 2007. It is managed by the Limerick Community Safety Partnership Board which comprises representatives of Limerick City Council, the Gardaí and the HSE. The Scheme is nearing the end of the pilot period now and the Board would like to find out if the Scheme was effective in having any impact on community safety on your estate.

You kindly participated in the first part of this evaluation which was carried out by me on the Scheme in 2008. Now, as the Scheme is nearing the end of the pilot period, I am carrying out a final evaluation to report on the overall impact of the Scheme on your estate. As a follow-up to the last questionnaire you completed for me, I am attaching a short questionnaire to get your current feedback.

As the idea behind the Scheme was to try new and different ways of tackling anti-social behaviour, your comments as a tenant would be most helpful to the Board. I have enclosed a stamped, addressed envelope for you to return the questionnaire to me, if possible, before Monday 24th May, 2010.

I would appreciate your co-operation. All information provided by you will be treated in confidence by me at the University of Limerick. If you have any questions or you would like help with completing the questionnaire, I can be contacted on my mobile phone at 087-6886703.

Yours sincerely,

_________________
Jacinta Cunneen
BA Public Admin, MA, MA Sociology
FG 178, Foundation Building
University of Limerick.
Appendix 6 Swot Analysis

A SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis was conducted with two key stakeholders on the Scheme to identify best practice and effective innovation. The feedback on their perceptions of the Scheme is presented below:

Strength of the Scheme

The Scheme is cost-effective

Taking future short-fall in funding into account, the Scheme is advantageous because it is:

- Tried, tested, modified
- Targeted
- A tailored and flexible service

The Scheme is innovative because:

- It was the first pilot community safety scheme in a local authority area
- It was the first multi-agency partnership approach
  - Reinforcing and supplementing An Garda Síochána and HSE activities
  - Providing opportunities, through selected activities, to enhance LCC staff engagement with tenants on the ground in the estates
- It established a data base, using an original log-book template, tracking trends on issues, and information on actions and activities to inform on-going strategic planning
- It was the first Scheme in LCC to be monitored and evaluated from the outset by an outside agency.

The Scheme is sustainable

- Operating successfully for 3 years
- Modified based on experience during this time

The Scheme facilitates efficient use of resources because it is a:

- Multi-agency partnership
- Buffer between community and staff of LCC, HSE and An Garda Síochána
- Filter agent for LCC, An Garda Síochána and HSE
- Conduit between functional areas of LCC

The Scheme, with its wide remit, is policy reactive e.g.

• The Scheme, as one of the first multi agency community safety interventions in the country, with three-years of operating experience, is in a prime position to inform the current policy document: *White Paper on Crime Prevention and Community Safety (Discussion launched in July 2009)*

*The Scheme reflects positively in the estates on LCC, An Garda Síochána and to an extent the HSE at local level*

• As a sole unit operating outside LCC for LCC
• Providing empirical evidence of positive perceptions of the three agencies because of the Scheme
• Improvement in trust in LCC staff

*The Scheme is a self-contained unit*

• Employs seven people
• With good level of education, computer literate
• On-going training received
• Team structure is inter-changeable
  - Good for covering staff absences
  - Good for re-focusing activities
• The Scheme, as an off-shoot of a statutory agency, is therefore in a position to maintain independence from other agencies and community groups.

*The Scheme is versatile*

- The Scheme as a ‘model’ of service delivery could be replicable for other interventions e.g. estate management, regeneration and CDPs.

*The Scheme has community development potential*

• Coordinator Role
  - Can prevent overlapping and duplication in community activities
  - Can act as an independent link for community groups and agencies
  - Can provide a fresh independent perspective to auditing of activities using feasibility studies conducted by Coordinators
  - Can provide a map of current services in the communities and identify gaps

- Facilitation Role
  - Encourages capacity-building in the communities

*Current perception of the Scheme*

The research clearly suggests a perception of the Scheme as being:

• Open and accountable
• Transparent (ethos, aims and objectives, log-book evidence)
• Visible (Uniforms)
• Having no affiliations
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• A neutral nexus between LCC functional areas
• Non-partisan
• Good for follow-up on queries with the necessary agents
• Creating linkages
• That the Coordinators are:
  - Trustworthy
  - Personable
  - Reducing the perception of level of crime
  - Reducing fear of crime
  - Friendly faces

**Current support for the Scheme**

• Reasonable support from most politicians
• Growing support from LCC staff, An Garda Síochána and HSE
• Growing support in communities
  - Community groups
  - Agencies
  - Tenants

**Weaknesses**

• Perception of poor ownership of the Scheme at Board level initially
• Perception of poor top-level ‘buy-in’ initially
• No long-term strategic plan for the partnership
• High staff turnover at operational and board level
• Poor transfer of knowledge regarding the Scheme at operational and board level
• Poor communication with community agencies
• A lack of financial commitment to the Scheme from participating agencies mainly due to budgetary deficits.

**Opportunities**

• Raise profile of LCC as ‘Centre for Learning’ in community safety intervention.
• ‘Twin’ with another local authority conducting a multi-agency partnership intervention (community safety or other local authority programme).
• Develop a structure for coordination of activities between LCC and Regeneration Agency.
• Incorporate the Scheme into LCC structure.
• Formally identify common strategic areas between LCC, An Garda Síochána and HSE agencies.
• The evaluation has provided a data-base of tenants for a longitudinal survey of community safety.
• The log-books have provided primary data from which indicators can be developed.
• Demand for the service - When the Coordinators left two particular areas – the tenants and community workers were looking for them to return.
Threats

- Mission statement, aims and objectives need to be reviewed
- No strategic plan for the Partnership
- Lack of planning for funding from all partners should the Scheme continue
- No agreed impact indicators
- Original lack of community development experience in the Coordinator team
- Perception of the Scheme as an LCC sole initiative
Appendix 7 Partnership Assessment

There were three agencies represented in the Partnership- Limerick City Council, as the lead-agency, An Garda Síochána and the Health Service Executive (HSE). Since it was established, there was a turnover in representation on the board. Fifteen people have represented the three organisations during the study period. There are eight current members on the board, six of whom represent Limerick City Council and there is one representative each for An Garda Síochána and the Health Service Executive (HSE). Because of the perceived imbalance in membership on the board, the researcher contacted all fifteen board members for the Partnership assessment. Previous board members were contacted in order to ascertain their views, hopes and aspirations for the Partnership when they were members at start up or during the earlier phases of the Partnership. This data was compared with current board members perceptions of, and aspirations for, the Partnership. It transpired that three board members had not been actively engaged in the Partnership, because during their term (in 2008) no board meetings were held. No response was received from the two past members who were nominated to represent the HSE and one past member who represented LCC declined to participate because of perceived lack of knowledge of the Partnership. The researcher conducted twelve semi-structured interviews of approximately one hour duration. Detailed notes were taken and typed. Seven LCC members (six present and one past); three representatives of An Garda Síochána (two past and one present) and two members from the HSE (one past and one present).

The Nuffield Assessment questionnaire was sent to the eight current members of the board and seven were returned. Several attempts were made, to no avail, to encourage the outstanding member to participate (one face to face request, two emails, six phone calls to administrative assistant and a personal note). This persistent effort was made because the declining member was a sole representative and therefore feedback from this person was significant to balance the data against the majority membership. Two of the four past members completed the questionnaire, one representing Limerick City Council and the other An Garda Síochána. Although feedback from past members together with feedback from the researcher’s interviews with them, was not quantitatively taken
into account in the survey data, it added to the depth of qualitative data on the history and original vision of the Partnership for comparative purposes.

**Letter to Board Members**

9th August, 2010.

Dear

Re: Evaluation of Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the above evaluation by completing the attached Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool. As your involvement was primarily at the front end of the Project, I’ve included below some information to help you recall the purpose of the research.

In May 2007 the Limerick Community Safety Partnership Board launched a pilot community safety initiative - the Limerick City Community Coordinator Scheme. When it was introduced, I was commissioned to monitor and evaluate its delivery. Based on this research, and in parallel with it, I commenced doctoral research at the University of Limerick.

There are two strands to the research. Firstly it provides on-going feedback to the Partnership regarding the operational management of the Scheme and secondly the research is being used as a case study for my doctoral thesis which explores multi-agency partnership working for the delivery of community services in local government. An interim report on the Scheme was produced in November 2008.

The Scheme is now nearing the end of the pilot phase and I’m currently writing up the final report on this community safety initiative. In addition to reporting on the operational structures and processes for the delivery of the Scheme, I would like to explore the partnership process in more depth. This study is extremely worthwhile as it would substantially inform both the partnership report and my thesis.

In order to assess the Partnership, I am enclosing a copy of the Nuffield Partnership Assessment Tool which I would ask you to complete. This is a tool used extensively in the UK for conducting ‘health checks’ on strategic partnerships in local governance. I am aware that some people have been
members of the Board from the outset, others are new members and some are past members and therefore they will have spent differing amounts of time on the Board. Nevertheless, I would ask you to be frank and honest in your responses based on your experience of board membership. Information provided will be treated in confidence and no names will be attributed to feedback comments.

It is anticipated that the assessment will highlight successes and perhaps some difficulties in the development of partnerships for the delivery of community services in local governance. In this instance, the research relates to community safety. The partnership assessment will enhance and inform my doctoral study by providing information that will help to develop a model of best practice in multi-agency partnership working in local governance.

The assessment takes about 30-45 minutes to complete. All the questions are fully explained but if you have any further queries I’m available to answer them for you. My contact details are provided below. As committed above, all information provided will be confidential and no names will be attributed to comments made.

I would appreciate it if you returned the assessment to me in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

__________________

Jacinta Cunneen
BA Public Admin, MA, MA (Sociology)
FG 178, Foundation Building
University of Limerick.
Tel: 061-233206
Mob: 087-6886703
Email: jacinta.cunneen@ul.ie
Interview Schedule for Board Members

Four broad areas of investigation
1. Background to the Partnership
2. Rationale for the Partnership
3. Current view of the Partnership
4. Future Plans for the Partnership

Background to the Partnership
- Why was the notion of a community safety partnership mooted in the first place? (the driver?)
- Representatives from the Partnership visited Stockport, why the Stockport model?
- How was the Partnership established? (Ltd. Company yet staff of Limerick City Council involved)
- Why a partnership rather than any other structure?
- How were partner agencies selected?
- Why is Limerick City Council the lead-agency?
- Was a structure put in place? Accountability? e.g. chair, secretary, coordination, meetings, records?
- How does the Partnership fit into current LCC, HSE and Garda structures and wider community safety structure?

Rationale for the Partnership
- What were the underlying policy drivers? (voluntary, coerced or mandatory partnership?)
- What did the Partnership set out to achieve? Was there a clear vision, clearly defined aims and objectives? Are they realistic?
- Was there a plan, short, medium, long-term?

Current view on the Partnership
- Few board meetings –extent of leadership? Commitment to Partnership?
- Partners clear about the reason for their involvement and their responsibilities?
- No evidence that the Coordinator Scheme fits into an overall strategic safety plan for Limerick City?
- Locating the Coordinator Scheme
  - Delegation of responsibility but no decision-making powers?
  - No clear rationale for the Scheme?
- Board-member and staff turnover? –transfer of information issues

Future of Partnership
- Partners must be clear about the notion of partnership (rationale and their role)
- Overall partnership strategic plan for community safety in Limerick City (and County?)
- Coordination of community safety interventions
- Operational plan for the Coordinator Scheme
- Stability of Future Funding and Resource issues
- Knowledge management
Appendix 8 Dissemination of Research Findings

Presentations:
RESPOND! Housing Conference November 2010
MOPAN/NIRSA Conference, Maynooth 2009
Centre for Housing Research, Annual Conference 2008

Publications

### Appendix 9 Linked Agencies

#### Northside 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After School Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynanty Girls’ School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynanty Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynanty Retirement Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynanty Walking Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care &amp; Repair Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardaí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Office Watergate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORAS Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise &amp; Community (RAPID ACTION PLAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Depart. LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyes Open Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Resource Centre, Ballynanty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda Station Henry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go For Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Department L.C.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parent Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Street Garda Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

386
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Star Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side Intercultural Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside Learning Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent &amp; Toddler Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Beauty School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID Environment Sub Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration – Info link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE (Witness Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS Tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Completion Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (After School Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens’ Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lelia’s School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Adult Education Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Munchin’s Action Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Sub Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Southside 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Retirement Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALJEFF – Strengthening Families (Multi Agency Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Gais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Local Committee – CDP Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUB SPARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Copping On” Programme – Youth Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs Strategy Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Department LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FÁS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Garda Síochána – Mary Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Garda Síochána – Roxboro – Community Guard S/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Department LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE – Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE – Public Health Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMP After School Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEC – Multi Cultural Coffee Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City Council – Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick City Sports Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Leader Newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick Youth Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Radio Live 95 FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-West Region Drugs Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Department LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press 22 Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen of Peace School – Parents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID Co-Ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathbane Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflex Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill Community Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southill House &amp; Garden Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Mary’s Youth &amp; Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Vincent de Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Hall Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 10 Log-Book Data 2009**

**Northside**

1. **Increasing Community Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Administration</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB Anti Social Behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Assault on Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Community Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE Community Event</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Co-Or Abuse Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Co-Or Abuse Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Dangerous Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUG Drug Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL 1 Follow Up</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Gas Leak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN Hypodermic Needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Homeless Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV Home Visit</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Information Giving</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMP JUMP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH Others(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC Lost Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF Foot Patrol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Van Patrol</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTQ Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Suspicious Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Suspected Child Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Suspected Drug Dealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Suspected Spousal Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Theft From Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Improving Physical Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Northside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Abandoned House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Abandoned Vehicle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Broken Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Blocked Drains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Broken Pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dangerous Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL</td>
<td>Defective Street Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Fallen Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fire (B=Bonfire)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6(B)</td>
<td>1(B)</td>
<td>1(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL</td>
<td>Follow Up (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM</td>
<td>Green Area Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td>Home Visit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pest Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ</td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Stray Animals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Street Drinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Abandoned Trolley</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Water Leak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Raising Community Spirit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ</td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Personal Attention</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenants Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td>Walking Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Creating Awareness of Community Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL</td>
<td>Follow Up (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td>Home Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILK</td>
<td>Interagency Linking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Leaflet Drop</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ</td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southside

1. **Increasing Community Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Administration</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB Anti-social Behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Assault on Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Community Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE Community Event</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Co-Or Abuse Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Co-Or Abuse Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Dangerous Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL Follow Up 1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN Hypodermic Needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP Homeless Person</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV Home Visit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Information Giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMP Jump</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC Lost Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Personal Attention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF Foot Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Van Patrol</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ Private Tenancy Query</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS RAS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC Suspicious Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA Suspected Child Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDD Suspected Drug Dealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA Suspected Spousal Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td>Travelling Community Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Theft From Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Improving Physical Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Abandoned Trolley 3 1 1</td>
<td>3 5 5 18</td>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Query 4 2 6</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Water Leak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Raising Community Spirit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow Up (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenants Query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Creating Awareness of Community Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southside 2009</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow Up (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interagency Linking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaflet Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Tenancy Query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travelling Community Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenancy Query</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 11 Log Book Incidences/Activities including Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reducing Fear of Crime</th>
<th>Improving Environment</th>
<th>Raising Community Spirit</th>
<th>Developing Awareness of Community Safety through Education and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Anti-Social behaviour</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Shops/Advertising Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Assault on Person</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Abandoned House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Coordinator Abuse Physical</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Abandoned Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Coordinator Abuse Verbal</td>
<td>BINS</td>
<td>Bins Overflowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS</td>
<td>Damage to Bus Shelter</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Broken Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPB</td>
<td>Damage to Phone Box</td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Blocked Drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSF</td>
<td>Damage to Street Furniture</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Broken Pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Dangerous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Theft from Person</td>
<td>DSL</td>
<td>Defective Street Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ</td>
<td>Tenancy Queries</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Fallen Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Theft from vehicle</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Fly Posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Green Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Van Patrol</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLK</td>
<td>Walkabout</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Illegal Dumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pest Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>Rubbish for Collection</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Road Obstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Stray Animals</td>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Trolleys abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Water Leak</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Pest Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>