ITEM 7b

Camden Local Strategic Partnership	
Meeting	5 December 2008
Report Title	**Note of joint LSP and Social Cohesion Forum meeting, 27 October**
Report by	Olivia Mensah, Senior Policy Officer, Customers, Strategy and Performance Department Tel: 020 7974 6409 email: olivia.mensah@camden.gov.uk
Purpose	This is a report of the joint meeting of the LSP and the Social Cohesion Forum held on 27 October 2008.
Recommendations	The LSP is asked to note the report.

1 Introduction

1.1 The latest Social Cohesion Forum was held on 27 October 2008. At the meeting the following items were on the agenda:

- Social Capital Survey
- Delivering national indictors NI 1 and NI 6
- Developing Local Indicator H

2 Social Capital Survey

2.1 Ipsos Mori presented on the findings from this years Social Capital Survey. The survey considered a cross section of social capital issues: trust, participation, volunteering, self efficacy, quality of life and social networks.

2.2 The key findings presented were as follows:

- Camden residents are generally positive about their neighbourhood with 87% saying they are satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live, compared to 78% nationally
- People in Camden are more trusting of each other than in previous years
- 85% of residents are satisfied with their own quality of life, which is similar to the latest national figure for the UK
- Almost three quarters of people mix with people from different ethnic backgrounds to them at least once a week

2.3 The young persons' booster showed that young people are less trusting, but tend to be more positive than adults about their neighbourhood and are much more likely than adults to socialise with people from different ethnic groups and financial backgrounds.

2.4 It was found that opinions on extremism had a marked effect on social cohesion levels. Social renters and DEs, and older longer term

residents, expressed greatest concerns about extremism. Questions were raised by SCF concerning whether there was an agreed definition of extremism that participants were able to use when responding to this question. Ipsos Mori confirmed that extremism had not been explained by interviewers and was left to the individuals' perception.

2.5 Social class was reported as having an effect on social capital, with DEs being less trusting, happy with their neighbourhood and quality of life and less likely to be active in their communities and feel they can influence decisions.

2.6 Barriers to taking part in local decision making were also identified as a challenge that needed to be addressed.

2.7 SCF members raised questions around whether there was any significant change to the borough demographics over the past three years, was it reasonable to consider a neighbourhood that consisted of a 15-20 minute walk and suggested that in the future the SCS should ask about who people feel threatened by instead of extremism.

3 Delivering Local indictors NI 1 and NI 6 and developing LI H

3.1 Cllr Moffitt informed the meeting that the LSP felt SCF should be the lead body for the following targets:

- NI 1 - % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area
- NI 6 - Participation in regular volunteering
- Local indicator H - Social cohesion

3.2 The SCF will be accountable to the LSP for these three indicators agreeing delivery plans and monitoring and reporting progress to the LSP on an exceptions basis addressing any underperformance. SCF members are not individually or collectively responsible for performance, which is an important distinction. It has a support role to play to the lead partner in meeting the targets under these indicators. It was felt there was a need for more formal meetings and a possibility of increasing the frequency of meetings.

3.3 As the strategic body leading on social cohesion, the SCF also has a role in challenging partners where necessary, and addressing risks and obstacles to implementation. The baseline, targets and actions are to be agreed at the next meeting.