

CHANGING THE NARRATIVE

A new conversation between
the citizen and the State.

Report Authors: Paul Buddery, Matthew Parsfield & Atif Shafique
Report Editor: Anton Florek

Published by: The Staff College

ISBN: 978-1-5262-0419-6

© 2016 The Staff College

All rights reserved. No part of the document may be reproduced without permission from the Staff College.

To reuse this material, please contact the administrator at the Staff College via hello@thestaffcollege.uk

Contents

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	8
Section 1 Why is the relationship between citizen and state changing?	11
Section 2 How is the relationship between citizens and state changing?	17
Section 3 Learning to make change - national and international case studies	24
Section 4 New places for new relationships - opportunities and risks in localisation	48
Bibliography	52
Appendices	57





Acknowledgments

Charlotte Alldritt
Roger Bushell
Anthony Painter
Jack Robson
Dez Holmes
Rachael Wardell

Foreword

This report is timely. During the years where a great deal of new money came into children's services, we did not always maximise its potential to change outcomes. We are now approaching a decade's worth of austerity and leaders and practitioners have shown great dexterity, thought and resilience in trying to do more for less. It is not willingness or commitment that will prevent the continuing journey, it is the formation of innovative thoughts, ideas and approaches that 'change the game'.

We need some help, this paper brings together some emerging thinking and suggests that we now need to think within a different paradigm, or we risk losing ground - we cannot afford to do that, but more importantly our children and young people cannot afford that.

Changing the Narrative points us towards a new deal in the relationship between the individual and the state. How do we build on the resilience of individual, family and community structures and move away from patriarchal and dependent based services, to an approach that builds choice, possibility and personal responsibility and better outcomes for children?

We live in difficult times, where difference is often accentuated above common cause. The challenge of collaboration and partnership will define the coming years, our leaders, practitioners and indeed our children and young people themselves need to embrace these approaches, thank goodness we have some help!

Dave Hill - President
Association of Directors of Children's Services



Executive Summary

Background

The genesis for commissioning this report from the RSA lies in an increasing realisation at the Staff College that the combination of national government austerity measures and the increasing demand by UK citizens on the welfare state is creating a perfect storm for those responsible for the planning and delivery of public services. This combination of a shrinking state and rising demand has created a public sector context, that we at the Staff College term permanent white water, a concept introduced by Peter Vaill in 1989.¹ Our 2012 publication *“Systems Leadership: Exceptional leadership for exceptional times”*² introduced the term VUCA (Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity) as a vivid descriptor of the constant turbulence in public services in the UK over the past few years. Given the lengthy period of instability in the wake of the 2007 financial crisis, the slow recovery and the lasting need for policies of austerity to drive down the enormity of the current public sector debt – equivalent to 2 years average wage for every citizen of working age - it has now become clear that these forces are not merely a feature of exceptional circumstances, but the new norm within English public services.

Recalibrating government

“Over the course of this decade, UK Government spending is forecast to decline by a fifth as a proportion of GDP. Among advanced economies, the UK looks set to drop from the 16th biggest spender on its state to the 26th, requiring a profound adjustment in how the public sector operates. In other words, Government in the UK is recalibrating – and that recalibration aims to align lower public spending with a leaner public sector.” The State of the State, Deloitte LLP. (2015)

During 2014/15 our work on leadership development with the most senior members of the children’s services community led us to conclude that attempting to meet the pressures of austerity through the annual, across the board, percentage contraction of resources would no longer work. VUCA times called for a radically different approach to public sector provision which challenges the role and purpose of the local state and the still prevailing culture of New Public Management.

It became clear to us that rather than continuing with a public sector model driven by the combination of politicians and professionals determining what citizens need from the state, we needed to consider seriously new models of provision which placed the citizen at the core of planning and delivery.

1 Vaill, P. (1996)

2 Ghate, D. & Lewis, J. (2013) *Systems Leadership: Exceptional Leadership for Exceptional Times*. Virtual Staff College.

We believe that this shift will be a challenging one to the public sector in general and those in public sector leadership positions in particular, hence the commission to the RSA to undertake some desk research through which we hoped to find national and international examples of shifts in the system. In practice, the relationship between the RSA and the College developed into a partnership as those involved became increasingly immersed in the emerging findings and realised that both organisations hold a similar commitment to helping to change the relationship between citizen and state.

Our approach

This report begins by looking at the drivers of change, which are economic, technological, ideological, cultural and demographic. We point out that the fiscal drivers – cuts to public budgets – are the most immediate and powerful, so much so that they tend to mask other trends that should be at the forefront of policy and practice thinking. To highlight the importance of looking beyond budgets we contrast contemporary austerity with the relative abundance of the Every Child Matters era to suggest that the central state’s command and control strategies were hitting up against limits, even before the money began to disappear.

From looking at the factors driving social change we conclude that persisting with a form of the state, which over-estimates its executive power would be unwise. Instead, we suggest that approaches to policy and service design that follow participative, collaborative and asset-based principles have the potential to mobilise a wider range of assets typically beyond the immediate control of the state and, as such, are more likely to achieve positive outcomes for individual citizens and communities.

Our definition of an asset based approach which we adopt throughout this research draws on the work of the co-production movement which has at its core *“the provision of services through regular, long-term relationships between professionalized service providers (in any sector) and service users or other members of the community, where all parties make substantial resource contributions.”*³

Whereas asset based approaches to community development and in the field of health and wellbeing are fairly common, this is not the case for the wider public sector nor for services for children and young people. Hence our interest in a *“strengths-based approach, which recognises that all children, young people and their families have their own sets of skills, knowledge and experiences which they can bring to the table.”*⁴

We describe how this broad ‘family’ of service design and public policy approaches, sometimes referred to in the international literature as ‘New Public Governance’, can be understood as a spectrum – calling on a range of social actors to take different degrees of responsibility for achieving public service outcomes.^{5 6 7} These social actors include citizens and the state, but also in some cases business and the social sector (voluntary and community groups and social enterprises). At its heart it’s a social capital approach, which builds upon the more traditional construct of individual social capital moving to one that combines the individual with the collective, i.e. Citizen Capital.

3 Tony Bovaird (2007) Beyond engagement and participation: user and community co-production of public services Public Administration Review. September -October pp 846-860

4 Jody Aked and Lucie Stephens (2009) Backing the future a guide to co-producing children’s services. Nef. London

5 Ansell, C. and Gash, A. (2007) Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research*, 18. pp.543-571.

6 Torfing, J. and Triantafillou, P. (2013) What’s in a name? Grasping New Public Governance as a Political-Administrative System, *ECPR General Conference, 4-7 September 2013, Bordeaux*.

7 Robinson, M. (2015) *From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service: Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries*. Singapore: UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence. [online] Available at: <http://bit.ly/1LOoAtk>

The case studies of practice

The RSA and the Staff College believe, in the words of our title, that there is an urgent need to set about 'Changing the Narrative' for public services and public policy. We present a number of detailed case studies of a range of services and policy interventions, all of which rely on citizens more than traditional service delivery models, but which do so in diverse ways and degrees, to make the point that the future will be complex and uneven.

The case studies provide practical examples of some of the ways in which a model of new public value and practices might emerge. Instead of a single roadmap to a discrete destination they represent a series of pathways to, or building blocks for, New Public Governance. These building blocks will include strategies or interventions that leave significant power with the state and its services, as well as strategies that see the state's role largely as a platform to enable citizens, individually or collectively, to forge their own solutions. Our stories provide interesting and encouraging examples where those responsible for public services provision have chosen to adopt different and often novel ways of thinking about and addressing the challenges by inviting their citizens to contribute to the quest for new solutions.

This research suggests that there is no single new model of the citizen-state relationship. Instead, there are a variety of new forms of social engagement that can be promoted and developed depending on the unique combination of context, challenges, issues and assets in question. As the most powerful of our case studies illustrates, the shift from New Public Management to New Public Governance is not something that can happen through institutional fiat or a technocratic blueprint. It needs substantive, long-term conversations between citizens and those with particular responsibility for our local and national public services.

We conclude that approaches to New Public Governance need to be defined iteratively, in conjunction with citizens as, without this dialogue between citizen and the state, future innovations will continue to offer only a glimpse of change at the margins. In almost every area of social policy in the UK, from the National Health Service to prisons, we witness public service providers, professionals, politicians and citizens caught by the challenges and tensions of systemic transformation; change itself becomes the enemy. Courage and conviction is needed to find a route through, but - on the basis of the evidence presented in this report - it seems clear that, for the most part, change will be messy, emergent and contingent, rather than strategically scripted from above. We argue that supporters of New Public Governance will have to ride out that uncertainty and messiness, confident that, by blending participatory approaches, they will be able to create effective, efficient and impactful public value. One sign of success for pro-social policies like devolution and co-production will be the blurring of boundaries between state and civic action.

Just as the transformation of our national infrastructure in the 19th century required the spread of new institutions we need now the emergence of a new democratic and social infrastructure, which enables citizens to be the architects and builders of the future we want. As Deloitte LLP so eloquently put it *"Amid this challenging recalibration, a sector that is built around the citizen, makes the most of its talent, takes the fullest advantage of technology, engages partners to best effect and maximises its value for the taxpayer is worth pursuing."* The State of the State, Deloitte LLP. (2015)

Introduction

“Public services face unprecedented challenges. Rising demand, changing demographics and increasingly stretched finances mean that the choice for local authorities and public service providers is stark: change the way they work, or face the possibility of service retrenchment, increasing irrelevance and perpetual crisis management.”⁸

We believe that we have reached a critical moment for public services in the UK. Long-term social changes are combining with unprecedented disruption to service provision in the form of deep budget cuts, as well as rapid, but often piecemeal, devolution to local authorities in England. Significant change to the state and our relationship with it is inevitable as profound, long-term drivers of social, economic, technological, cultural, demographic and ideological change meet head to head with more immediate fiscal challenges. The relationship between citizen and state is changing both in response to new opportunities emerging from enterprise, creativity and technological advancement (e.g. wearable technologies supporting personal health) and to threats to the sustainability of its traditional operating models (e.g. affordability of hospital-based healthcare). As citizens’ expectations also change, the traditional role of the state – whether through direct public service provision, funding or indirect regulation and accountability – is neither sustainable nor, in many cases, desirable.

This research leads us to conclude that our current social settlement needs rethinking and should be different from the one we know today. Instead, we need to create space for blending different types of intervention across tiers of central and local governance with a deeper understanding that times of VUCA mean that traditional boundaries are eroding or ceasing to exist and adhering to a service-centric model of public service delivery is unlikely to be successful. We categorise these different types of intervention as a spectrum, ranging from traditional technocratic forms of government delivery, to more co-productive and participative models in which citizens take an active lead. In this way, the art of public administration and good governance frames public policy as a holistic problem, complete with the different experiences, aspirations and values of citizens, communities, public service professionals and providers, private sector firms and charitable organisations that make up our rich social and civic fabric. Rather than searching in vain for a new, definitive social contract, we advocate thinking about this as an on-going, complex design challenge in which people can be involved, shaping their multiple relationships with different aspects of the state in appropriately different ways.

The challenge for children’s service professionals is how they can play an active and forward-looking role in shaping and supporting these processes of structural and social change, so that the rights and welfare of children continue to be at the heart of our social settlement.

However, in this quest for change, we should remember that the direction of change is by no means fixed. Many of the co-productive approaches advocated in this report have been with us for many years, but making only incremental progress. Austerity may prompt some services to retrench defensively, using scarce professional resources to deliver core functions by relying on familiar performance management and cost control strategies. Local authorities in particular, which are experiencing among the most precipitous funding cuts in the public sector, may face difficult choices between investing time and money in innovative collaboration and capability building with communities and protecting delivery budgets for non-discretionary services.

8 Managing demand: building future public services. RSA. (2014)

Yet despite its privations – and in part because of the urgent need to re-invent itself as a result of them – we argue that it is actually the local state rather than the national state that is best positioned to re-negotiate its relationships with citizens, communities and businesses. Potentially at least, local government operates at a scale of accountability, with a degree of accessibility, and with a sensitivity to identity and diversity that it would be hard for the central state to match.

Reframing the question

Recent attempts by academics and thought leaders to re-frame the state have focused on the idea of the post-bureaucratic state, the social investment state, the relational state, the enabling state, and the Big Society (in contrast to an implicitly over-bearing big state). All of these formulations considered what the state should and should not do; but more particularly, they explored how it could engage differently with citizens over their lives, depending on their particular needs or abilities. The RSA's chief executive has termed this *“putting the public back into public services.”*⁹

Central government cannot simply devolve and expect these more collaborative, citizen-dependent forms of intervention to spread without check, nor should it. If it wishes to see them flourish it will need to reassess its approach to inspection, regulation and open data, alongside its approach to autonomy and marketisation within health services and schooling. If it wishes to maintain public trust, it needs to spell out more clearly where the buck stops in this new world of hybrid solutions and social partnerships. Accountability inevitably becomes a complex question when ranges of actors come together to find solutions that may be messy and provisional. But public accountability is a critical element of any democratic public service settlement, and it should not be diffused through informal governance, or erased by whole scale shift of responsibility to individuals or – more nebulously – communities. The question then becomes how to create more co-produced public sector provision whilst maintaining the accountability for the public resources upon which the provision relies?

The RSA and the Staff College (SC) have collaborated to produce this report, which taps into the latest learning from practice, academia and international thought leadership in this field. For the RSA, the project builds on practical and conceptual work on public service reform in the UK that has encompassed service delivery (whole person services for people in recovery from drug and alcohol abuse), community network mapping and capacity building (nationwide community-led wellbeing projects) and the exchange of innovative international ideas, including through its Fellowship. For the Staff College, the project complements learning from scenario workshops with local authorities and other public-sector leaders that, in a context of flat or shrinking budgets and of escalating demands, reinforces the need to go beyond traditional forms of service leadership and practice systems leadership. Less clear, however, is how best to transcend established provider-client behaviours to engage the citizens and communities that should be at the heart of that system as dynamic partners in change.

This report looks at the alternative approaches emerging over recent decades in the UK and abroad, and how, despite widespread consensus in the academic literature and amongst public policy professionals, they have failed to become mainstream. How, in short, the state has failed to adapt fully to the new expectations, challenges and assets of the citizens it seeks to serve. The report also looks ahead and asks, what type of relationship do we want or expect between citizen and state? Although in many respects a perennial question, it is one that has been asked with increasing frequency and urgency since the 1980s, when the confident rise of the Keynesian welfare state first started to falter.

9 Quality not Quantity. Guardian Society, March 21 (2001)

The RSA and the Staff College believe, in the words of our title, that there is an urgent need to set about 'Changing the Narrative' for public services and public policy. As the most powerful of our case studies illustrates, this is not something that can happen through institutional fiat or a technocratic blueprint. It needs substantive, long-term conversations between citizens and those with particular responsibility for our local and national public services.

By setting out the scale of the challenges, and identifying some of the seeds of change and the conditions in which they may thrive - including more localised decision making - we hope that this report will encourage that essential conversation. It is therefore aimed primarily at children's services leaders and professionals, social sector practitioners and innovators, and community activists who are involved in making public services more open, engaging and impactful.



Section 1:

Why is the relationship between citizen and state changing?

Historically, children's welfare and rights have been fundamentally important in shaping the UK's public service arrangements: the first two planks of what became the post-war Beveridge settlement were the Butler and Family Allowance Acts of 1944 and 1945; and for better and for worse, support for younger children and their carers was integral to the state's expansion around 'new social risks' during the 1990s and early 2000s.¹⁰

The period of post-war consensus in the UK between 1945 and 1979 offered a secure and predictable account of the relationship between citizen and state; at least for the majority. Since then, the most important development has been the cumulative loss of this predictability; while major new services or budget lines have been added to the remit of the state, with children and youth services and childcare being prime examples, no longer can we be certain that a strong state will stand alongside us through a life course that we can confidently plan or anticipate. The recent financial and economic crisis forced into sharp reflection not only the priorities of government and the services it will defend above all others, but the legitimacy of government expenditure and investment more broadly: health spending is protected while social care – arguably, in an ageing population, the flip side of the same coin – is tightly squeezed; transport investment is regarded as a means to increase economic productivity and growth, while state support for developing adult skills – arguably the key ingredient to boosting economic inclusion and competitiveness – is cut.

Whether the results are liberating or disorienting depends on one's perspectives and circumstances; and to some extent at least, reactions will be different between generations. A participant in a scenario-planning workshop for children's service leaders that formed part of this project reflected on the quickening pace of social change, which is referred to in some of the literature as 'social acceleration.'¹¹ As someone from the baby boomer generation she felt that her outlook – the way she looked at the future – was out of kilter with the times. While all generations have their struggles and change is a constant, she reflected that her generation's experience and expectation was largely one of economic and social advancement, leaving her discomfited by a VUCA¹² future – one dominated by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity.¹³ Younger people, she believed, might be stronger travellers and more resilient navigators of fiscal, technological, demographic, cultural and ideological change.

They will need to be. Expectations and obligations long familiar to the UK's citizens, policy makers and public service providers are being reassessed; and not only in the UK. The pressures that are redefining the relationship are being felt across

10 Olk, T. (2009) Children in the "Social Investment State". In: Centre for Globalisation and Governance, University of Hamburg, WELLCHI Network Conference 2, *Well-being of children and labour markets in Europe. Different kinds of risks resulting from various structures and changes in the labour markets Hamburg, Germany, March 31-April 1 2006. p.4.*

11 Hsu, E. L. and Elliot, A. (2014) 'Social Acceleration Theory and the Self'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 45(4). pp.397-418.

12 Welbourn, D. (2015) Leadership in a Contested Space: A review of literature and research. *Virtual Staff College*

13 Lawson, A. (2014) 'Chapter 2: A Speeding Up of the Rate of Social Change? Power, Technology, Resistance, Globalisation and the Good Society'. In Archer M.S. (ed.) *Late Modernity: Trajectories towards Morphogenic Society. Bern: Springer International Publishing.*

advanced economies, whether they have followed social democratic (Nordic), Christian Democratic (Continental) or liberal welfare (Anglo-Saxon) models.¹⁴ It is important to recognise the complexity of the drivers.

Changing the narrative

It would be artificial to pretend that national austerity is anything other than the single most powerful factor, and that these have brought to a head critiques, trends and aspirations that have been building over decades. The first step for politicians and public service leaders wanting to embark upon a changed narrative with their citizens – a new set of expectations and obligations – is for them to be straightforward about the parameters in which they are operating. Double speak, even when trying to make the legitimate point that spending less does not necessarily involve reducing standards, can only breed cynicism. This is not always easy to avoid. In a recent review of a major social care project The Local Government Association (LGA) includes a determinedly upbeat section on ‘Developing a new contract with citizens and communities’.

“The approach is not about cutting services in response to financial pressures, but about proactively helping and encouraging people to live healthier lifestyles, thus reducing or delaying the need for formal social care services. To deliver this new model of care, there needs to be a fundamental shift in the expectations of individuals, communities and service providers if the most is to be made of diminishing resources while securing public wellbeing.”¹⁵

However, the project was the LGA Adult Social Care Efficiency Programme – a programme set up expressly to reduce costs.

Public servants are accustomed to periodic rises and falls in public spending. What we are experiencing now is quantitatively and qualitatively different. In the words of social scientist Peter Taylor-Gooby, the reforms begun under the coalition and continuing under the current government represent.

“...the most far-reaching and precipitate attempt to achieve fundamental restructuring in an established welfare state in a larger Western economy in recent years.... The objective is to set the UK on a trajectory of permanently lower spending, lower debt and market-led growth.”¹⁶

The UK government has committed to reducing expenditure as a proportion of GDP to around 36%, – well below its historic trend line of around 40%. Some areas of resource departmental expenditure such as health and the 2015-2016 schools budget are being nominally protected, but cuts elsewhere have been and will continue to be dramatic. Local authority grants have been reduced by 40% since 2010, and will fall by another £6.1bn over the next five years. In a recent survey of local authority chief executives, 69% believe that in the next three years some authorities will fail to deliver essential services required by their residents, and 85% believe that some will fall into serious financial crisis.¹⁷ Deficits in health trusts¹⁸

14 Esping-Anderson, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Oxford: Policy Press. Cited in Diamond, P. and Lodge, G. (2013) *European Welfare States after the Crisis: Changing public attitudes*. Policy network paper. London: Policy Network. [online] Available at: www.policy-network.net.

15 Local Government Association (2014) *Adult Social Care Efficiency Programme: Final Report*. London: LGA.

16 Taylor-Gooby, T. (2012) Root and Branch Restructuring to Achieve Major Cuts: The Social Policy Programme of the 2010 UK Coalition Governments. *Social Policy & Administration*, 46(1). pp.61–82.

17 PwC (2015) *Delivering the Decentralisation Dividend*. London: PwC. [online] Available at: <http://www.pwc.co.uk/industries/government-public-sector/local-government/insights/local-state-were-in/delivering-the-decentralisation-dividend.html>

18 National Audit Office (2015) *Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General:*

and colleges¹⁹ and financial warnings from social care providers²⁰ underline the real risk of major institutional failure and subsequent damage not only to the particular services in question, but to citizens' trust in public services more generally.

Cuts on this scale will inevitably have an impact on people's experience of the state, and their expectations of it. However, to date attitudes appear to be ambivalent. In a recent poll, a majority of people agreed with the proposition that in recent years, government and public services have tried to do too much, and people should take more responsibility.²¹ Most people felt that the cuts have not affected them and their families significantly, and in fact most believe that services in general have been improving. However, these findings do not capture geographic, social or demographic variations,²² and overall numbers reporting deterioration are much greater in relation to social care for the elderly and health services. Crucially, people are pessimistic about the future of the NHS – financially and symbolically our keystone public service²³ and, interestingly, this specific concern became a significant feature of the “leave” campaign leading up to the EU Referendum in June 2016 with promises of significant increases in state funding for the NHS coming from the net saving of the UK contribution to the EU.

Many public service professionals and policy analysts believe that the state is underfunding its statutory and policy commitments. The RSA's chief executive, Matthew Taylor, has expressed concern that we are perilously close to: “the acceptable floor below which public services do not have adequate funding to carry out government policy”. Many of the children's service leaders we interviewed are also alarmed.

“The government has sought to roll back the state... [But] for children's services state responsibilities haven't really reduced so you have a rising level of demand but we are supposed to meet it with less money. Efficiency measures have allowed us to meet that demand for now, but what happens next with even more cuts is more problematic.

The changes since 2010, both in terms of money and ideological direction, have been significant – the pre-2010 period now seems quite a long time ago, because the last five years have been so dominant... the focus has very much been on a reduction in the size of the state as we know it.”²⁴

Sustainability and financial performance of acute hospital trusts. London: NAO Communications. [online] Available at: <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Sustainability-and-financial-performance-acute-hospital-trusts.pdf>

¹⁹ House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts (2016) *Overseeing financial sustainability in the further education sector: Thirteenth Report of Session 2015-16.* [online] Available at: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmselect/cmpubacc/414/414.pdf>

²⁰ ADDAS (2015) *Budget Survey 2015: Report.* London: Association of Directors of Adult Services. [online] Available at: http://www.adass.org.uk/uploadedFiles/adass_content/policy_networks/resources/Key_documents/ADASS%20Budget%20Survey%202015%20Report%20FINAL.pdf

²¹ Duffy, B. (2015) What the public think of public services and volunteering. Nesta UK Slideshare (Slide 7). [online] Available at: http://www.slideshare.net/NESTA_UK/bobby-duffy

²² Joseph Roundtree Foundation (2015) *The cost of the cuts: The impact on local government and poorer communities.* York: Joseph Roundtree Foundation. [online] Available at: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/cost-cuts-impact-local-government-and-poorer-communities>

²³ Duffy, B. (2015) Coming to terms with austerity? October 2015. London: Ipsos Mori. Available at: <https://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/3644/Coming-to-terms-with-austerity.aspx>

²⁴ All indented blocks of italic text are quotations from project interviews. For details on participants, see Methodology.

Managing demand

Critics of austerity describe the spending reductions as ideologically self-imposed, and are wary of responses that appear to collude in a discourse of unaffordable social protection.²⁵ Nevertheless, the UK fiscal outlook for the foreseeable future is highly demanding, whichever political party is in charge. Even if the next government loosens the small state straitjacket and reverts to a more familiar level of expenditure, hard choices will be difficult to avoid. The economist Stephen Toft makes the long-term point:

*“The increased pressure on the public purse will mean that, if spending is to be kept at 40 percent of GDP, some of the things we currently take for granted will have to go. In other words, even without trying to shrink the state, further cuts to welfare and services are inevitable. The task for this decade is to design a state that can handle the next one.”*²⁶

What are those increased pressures? Some are subject to decisions that we make as a society, but many are beyond our control or have already been made. We are becoming a different type of society in ways that affect our choices, expectations and interactions. But the change that promises to have the most direct impact on our welfare model is that, like most Western societies, we are an aging population. The number of people in England aged 65 and over will rise by over 50% between 2010 and 2030, and the number aged over 85 will more than double. This will bring increased demands for health and social care support, and is doing so already. Between 2008 and 2018 the number of people with three or more long-term conditions is set to rise by over 50%.²⁷ Although longer lives are by no means the only drivers of health care costs – given good health management, aging may impact more on when care is needed, not if or for how long – they are an important factor underlying projections that expect the UK to spend nearly a fifth of its wealth on health and social care by mid-century, putting enormous pressure on other areas of social spending.²⁸ Compounding this, an aging population will increase the difficulty of achieving the rate of economic growth needed to accommodate these demands unless there is a long-term shift in the age pattern of those in work, which rebalances the proportion of the population that is not.

Less predictable than changes to economic productivity and morbidity are the possible changes to culture and political economy as the population ages. By 2020, when we become a society in which there are more over 65s than under 5s, we will be entering historically uncharted waters. Conflicts over inter-generational fairness may become sharper, especially if economic stagnation persists. In the words of the government’s social mobility and child poverty czar, the *“idea that the succeeding generation would do better than the previous generation is”* – or has been – *“part of the glue that binds”*.²⁹ Ironically, tensions are mounting even as traditional boundaries between life stages become less clear-cut and transitions are extending

25 Hall, S. et al (eds.) (2013) *After Neoliberalism? The Kilburn Manifesto*. London: Soundings; see also: Virtual Staff College (2014) *Disrupting the prevailing discourse: a ‘fresh effort of thought’*. Nottingham: Virtual Staff College. [online] Available at: <http://www.virtualstaffcollege.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Disrupting-the-discourse-web-version-pdf>

26 Toft (14 July 2011) This is the dawning of an age of austerity [Wordpress]. Available at: <https://flipchartfairytale.wordpress.com/2011/07/14/this-is-the-dawning-of-the-age-of-austerity>

27 House of Lords (2013) *Ready for Ageing? Select Committee on Public Service and Demographic Change. Report of Session 2012-13*. London: The Stationary Office. [online] Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/public-services-committee/report-ready-for-ageing/is-government-ready-for-ageing/>

28 Appleby, J. (2013) *Spending on health and social care over the next 50 years: why think long-term?* London: King’s Fund.

29 Malik, S. and Barr, C. (2016) UK faces permanent generational divide. *The Guardian*. [online] 16 March. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/11/uk-faces-permanent-generational-divide-social-mobility-tsar-warns>

for economic and cultural and reasons. For example, the number of 20 to 34 year-olds still living in their parents' home, increased by almost 20% between 1997 and 2011.³⁰ Whereas commentators such as Danny Dorling³¹ may question the social and societal reasons for this phenomenon, the fact remains that it's happening and denotes a shift from the patterns of social behaviour of previous generations.

While the nature of these cross-generational tensions continues to emerge, there is already evidence from authors such as Griffiths et al and Inglehart²⁵ to suggest that some of the social attitudes associated with support for strong welfare based public services have been declining over time and across generations. In particular, our sense of solidarity with the poor has become weaker, and our trust in the state's ability to target support to the most deserving has also diminished. As the place of custom and tradition in daily life has faded there has been a rise in what the social scientist Ulrich Beck has termed 'individualisation', in which individual agency is highly prized.³² In 1973, 56% of the UK population could be classified using Values Modes segmentation tool as Settlers – driven by needs for security, belonging, and care about family, home and tradition. By 2012, this had fallen to 30%. In contrast, the proportion classified as Pioneers, driven by a need for knowledge, beauty and self-fulfilment and are activists in the areas they care about such as the environment, justice and equality has nearly doubled – from 19% in 1973 to 38% in 2012. While significant shared ground between generations remains in terms of public spending priorities, younger generations are less committed to traditional institutions like the NHS and less supportive of out of work benefits.³³

Individualisation does not necessarily imply atomisation or purely self-seeking behaviours; we are learning to collaborate in new ways. Longer working lives, changing technologies, and markets that rely on flexible production and differentiated and rapidly changing patterns of consumption all point towards multi-generational workplaces in which roles and seniority are less closely tied to age and experience than today. The rise of self-employment, the gig economy³⁴ and, potentially, the sharing economy³⁵ may also create forms of connectivity that are much less hierarchical and predictable than the rigid patterns of association and control associated with Fordist manufacturing and the traditional professions.

Outside of our working lives we are likely to connect with each other in more diverse ways. The emergence of hyper-connectivity through ubiquitous online technologies will change our experience of how information can be accessed and acted upon. It may accelerate the growth of what Yochai Benkler has termed the “*networked information economy*”, and particularly its potential to extend collaboration and co-

30 Foresight (2013) *Future Identities. Changing identities in the UK: the next 10 years. Final Project Report. London: The Government Office for Science. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/273966/13-523-future-identities-changing-identities-report.pdf*

31 Dorling, D. If you are young in Britain today you are being taken for a ride. *New Statesman*. 7 November (2013)

32 Inglehart, R. (2012) 33 years of cultural change: what's next? Montreal: Secretariat of International Political Science Association. [online] Available at: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>. See also, Griffiths, S. et al (2009) *Assertive Citizens: New Relationships in the Public Services*. London: Social Market Foundation.

33 NatCen (2015) *British Social Attitude Survey*. London: NatCen Social Research. [online] Available at: http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/media/38977/bsa32_welfare.pdf; see also: Demos (2013) *Generation Strains*, [blog] 9 September. Available at: <http://www.demos.co.uk/project/generation-strains/> and Hansard Society (2015) *Audit of Political Engagement 12: The 2015 Report*. London: Hansard Society. [online] Available at: <http://www.auditofpoliticalengagement.org/media/reports/Audit-of-Political-Engagement-12-2015.pdf>

34 An environment in which temporary positions are common and organizations contract with independent workers for short-term engagements.

35 Balaram, B. (2016) *Fair share - reclaiming power in the sharing economy*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/fair-share-reclaiming-power-in-the-sharing-economy/>. See also Dellot, B. (2015) *Boosting the living standards of the self-employed*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/boosting-the-living-standards-of-the-self-employed/>

operation beyond proprietary market mechanisms – and public service structures – enabling people to collaborate in new ways to “peer produce” services that make sense to them.³⁶ Online and offline identities will converge. Our physical networks of family, friends and neighbours will increasingly be amplified by electronic networks and social media portals through which we will connect with ideas, innovation, communities and causes well beyond our localities or our immediate experience. Ethnic and social fragmentation, amplified by personalised information flows dubbed the “filter bubble”³⁷ by Eli Pariser, are likely to go side by side with hyper-diversity and radical solidaristic³⁸ movements.

Less hierarchical workplaces and an economy that is less centralised and more distributed will not by themselves lead to a society in which opportunity is spread more equally however. Divisions by income and class have been widening for decades, reduced social mobility is eroding social justice and if automation continues to shrink the labour market, even more individuals and families will find themselves consigned to no employment or low-skilled, poorly paid, insecure employment.³⁹

These societal shifts will challenge the traditional New Public Management orthodoxy of the public sector, which remains essentially a professionally determined model of provision and practice. The public sector will need to be nimble and adaptive in its response to these changes if it is to sustain its primary purpose of improving the social outcomes for the most vulnerable and marginalised in society a point well made by the RSA:

*“If public service bodies, including local authorities, don’t actively respond to this new reality, they risk finding their ability to act in future severely constrained. They have already done a great deal to adjust to new circumstances over recent years, making significant savings and efficiencies, mainly through supply side reforms. But the limits of such reforms are being reached. We need a new approach.”*⁴⁰

36 Benker, Y. (2006) *The Wealth of Networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

37 Pariser, E. (2012). *The Filter Bubble: What the internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Books. London.

38 Meulen, R.T et al (2001) *Solidarity in Health and Social Care in Europe*. Springer Science Media.

39 Social Mobility & Child Poverty Commission (2015) *State of the Nation 2015: Social Mobility and Child Poverty in Great Britain*. London: Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/485928/State_of_the_nation_2015_foreword_and_summary.pdf

40 Beyond Nudge to Demand Management. RSA. (2013)

Section 2:

How is the relationship between citizens and state changing?

The demographic, technological and cultural changes unsettling our model of the citizen-state relationship have been emerging over decades. Many of these changes originate from the explicit policy decisions or structures of the state, value shifts and the decline in deference; the ageing population; and transformative changes in information and communications technology. E-commerce, social media, cybercrime and online services, such as internet banking and increasingly health consultations, will continue to affect the landscape in which our citizen-state relationship plays out.

Other changes are more 'elective' – the product of a changing view of the efficacy of the state and new state strategies and narratives. The shift in the dominant narrative over the health and role of public finances changed quickly following the UK financial crisis in 2008 and in the run up to the 2010 general election. After years of maintaining a large public sector net debt and deficit, the coalition government was elected on a fiscal mandate committed to financial sustainability through austerity. The programme of public sector cuts and reprioritisation of government expenditure and activity (emphasising growth and productivity) has been profound as the state, particularly the local state, shrinks. This shrinkage, when combined with the dynamics and aftermath of the Scottish referendum in 2014, the shift towards greater localism and city-regional governance within England and the outcome of the EU referendum in June 2016, means that the UK now finds itself questioning its design, capacity, autonomy and efficacy as a nation state. As a consequence, the relationship between citizen and 'state' is increasingly unsettled, not least because the locus of 'state' itself is in such a period of flux.

Over the longer term, the question becomes whether and how the state will continue to shift away from the traditional New Public Management (NPM)⁴¹ model towards New Public Governance (NPG), blending a range of more subtle and sustainable approaches for citizen and state to engage. The transition from NPM to NPG has already begun. Notable examples in the UK include England's Every Child Matters programme, which is described as a case study below. This and the other case studies in this report, which are drawn from the UK and abroad offer a number of potential pathways to New Public Governance. They also highlight the challenges and tensions.

Stepping back and looking beyond the UK, the strategies and positions taken during recent years show a changing conception of how a modern state can function. Bryson et al. (2014)⁴² have summarised the evolution from post-war Public Administration, to post-oil-crisis New Public Management to the emerging era of New Public Governance:

41 Gruening, G. (2001) Origin and basis of New Public Management. *International Public Management Journal* 4 (2001) pp 1-15.

42 Bryson, J.M., Crosby, Barbara C. and Bloomberg, L. (2014) *Public Value Governance: Moving Beyond Traditional Public Administration and the New Public Management*. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4) pp.445-456.

Table 1 – Comparisons between the key features of ‘traditional public administration,’ ‘new public management’ and ‘new public governance’

DIMENSION	Traditional Public Administration	New Public Management	Emerging Approach to New Public Governance
Broad environmental and intellectual context			
Material and ideological conditions	Industrialisation, urbanisation, rise of modern corporation, specialisation, faith in science, belief in progress, concern over major market failures, experience with the Great Depression and World War II, high trust in government.	Concern with government failures, distrust of big government, belief in the efficacy and efficiency of markets and rationality, and devolution.	Concern with market government, not for profit and CMC failures; concern with so-called wicked problems; deepening inequality; hollowed or thinned state; networked and collaborative governance; advanced information and communication technologies.
Primary theoretical and epistemological foundations	Political theory, scientific management, naïve social science, pragmatism.	Economic theory, sophisticated positivist social science.	Democratic theory, public and social sector management theory; diverse approaches to knowing and behaviour.
Prevailing view of rationality and model of human behaviour	Synoptic rationality, “administrative man”.	Technical and economic rationality, “economic man”, self-interested decision makers.	Formal rationality, multiple tests of rationality (political, administrative, economic, legal, ethical), belief in public spiritedness beyond narrow self-interest, “reasonable person” open to influence through dialogue and deliberation.
The public sphere or realm			
Definition of the common good, public value, the public interest	Determined by elected officials or technical experts.	Determined by elected officials or by aggregating individual preferences supported by evidence of consumer choice.	What is public is seen as going far beyond government, although government has a special role as a guarantor of public values; common good determined by inclusive dialogue and deliberation informed by evidence and democratic values.
Role of politics	Elect leaders who determine policy objectives.	Elect leaders who determine policy objectives; empowered managers; administrative politics around the use of specific tools.	Public work, “including determining policy objectives via dialogue and deliberation”; democracy as “a way of life”.
Role of citizenship	Voter, client, constituent.	Customer.	Citizens seen as problem-solvers and co-creators actively engaged in creating what is valued by, and is good for, the public.

DIMENSION	Traditional Public Administration	New Public Management	Emerging Approach to New Public Governance
Government and Public Administration			
Role of government agencies/ services	Rowing – seen as designing and implementing policies and programmes in response to politically defined objectives.	Steering – seen as determining objectives and catalysing service delivery through tool choice and reliance if possible on markets, businesses and social sector organisations.	Government acts as convener, catalyst, collaborator; sometimes steering, sometimes rowing, sometimes partnering, sometimes staying out of the way.
Key objectives	Politically provided goals; implementation managed by public servants; monitoring done through the oversight of bureaucratic and elected officials.	Politically provided goals; managers manage inputs and outputs in a way that ensures economy and responsiveness to consumers.	Create public value in such a way that what the public most cares about is addressed effectively and what is good for the public is put in place.
Key values	Efficiency.	Efficiency and effectiveness.	Efficiency, effectiveness, and democratic values.
Mechanisms for achieving policy objectives	Administer programmes through centralised, hierarchically organised public agencies or self-regulating professions.	Create mechanisms and incentive structures to achieve policy objectives especially through use of markets and quasi-markets.	Selection from a menu of alternative delivery mechanisms based on pragmatic criteria; this often means helping build cross-sector collaborations and engaging citizens to achieve agreed objectives.
Role of public manager	Ensures that rules and appropriate procedures are followed; responsive to elected officials, constituents, and clients; limited discretion allowed for administrative officials.	Helps define and meet agreed upon performance objectives; responsive to elected officials and customers; wide discretion allowed.	Plays an active role in helping create and guide networks of deliberation and delivery and helps maintain and enhance the overall effectiveness, accountability, and capacity of the system; responsive to elected officials, citizens, and an array of other stakeholders; discretion is needed but is constrained by law and democratic values.
Approach to accountability	Hierarchical, in which administrators are accountable to democratically elected officials.	Market driven, in which aggregated self-interests result in outcomes desired by broad groups of citizens seen as customers.	Multifaceted, as public servants must attend to law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizens' interests.

Based on: Bryson et al. (2014). A landscape version of this table is also available in the Appendices.

From management to governance

The journey towards New Public Governance, and the active role it expects of citizens, is far from complete. Many of its values and methodologies have been known and championed for years, and though they have made important inroads, they have yet to penetrate deeply into mainstream practice. In the next section we present several case studies where the values and methodologies of New Public Governance have been trialled. We set out the nature of the policy innovation ('What it is'), the insight we can glean from ('What it tells us') and the impact it had on finding a path away from traditional, top-down approaches to more participatory and networked governance, offering improved quality, and better or earlier access to support.

However, in most cases, services or interventions that have been designed with social collaboration at their heart have been at the margins of traditional services. If someone time travelled from 1966, when Traditional Public Administration reigned, to 2016, when the flag of New Public Governance was flying, the cast of public servants they would meet on arrival, and their roles and institutional identities would be largely familiar. Polling by Ipsos MORI for the Collaborate Institute in 2014 suggested that only 14% of citizens surveyed felt that they had an influence on the services they receive.⁴³

Ethically and intellectually those interviewed in this report recognise the rightness of 'working with' rather than 'delivering to' individuals, families and communities. Indeed, this philosophy chimes with the long-held values of many public service professionals. (Older children's service professionals may remember that the Barclay Committee Report on the roles of the social worker (1982) flagged the importance of supporting communities to be strong, neighbourly and resourceful, and working in equal partnership with the voluntary sector.⁴⁴) There was support for the idea that families and communities should be seen as assets and problem solvers, not – in the words of one of our interviewees – an 'expense item'; and some sympathy for the view that institutional and cultural defaults had sometimes encouraged an over-reliance on the state:

"Our community and voluntary sector were heavily dependent on council and public services, and there was quite a patriarchal relationship between public services and communities."

But there was real anxiety that progress towards NPG's facilitative state would stall or go into reverse.

"Since 2010, broadly there has been an attempt by the government to accelerate and heat up the New Public Management agenda. You can see this in the speeding up of privatisation, the use of outcomes-based commissioning or payment-by-results, and in the NHS reforms."

In this respect, austerity is a double-edged sword. It undoubtedly sharpens some incentives for working collaboratively alongside citizens and capitalising on them as assets. However, research suggests that local authority disinvestment in preventative and public good services, in order to prioritise statutory services for those at most risk, has already begun.⁴⁵ These are the margins in which many of the most citizen-

43 Collaborate (2014,) *'The Collaborative Citizen.'* Report 2014 [online] Available at: <http://collaboratei.com/wp-content/uploads/The-Collaborative-Citizen-Report-2nd-Edition4.pdf>

44 Rhodes, B. and Broad, R. (2011) *Revisiting Barclay. The Centre for Welfare Reform.* [online] Available at: <http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/authors/bob-rhodes/revisiting-barclay.html>

45 Action for Children, National Children's Bureau and The Children's Society (2016) *Losing in the long run.* [online] Available at: https://www.actionforchildren.org.uk/media/5826/losing_in_the_long_run.pdf

centred interventions have been developed. In the words of one of our roundtable participants, prevention is inherently participative: *“You can’t do prevention from the top, you need to do it with people.”* Our interviewees had mixed views on how or whether this asset-building space could be protected:

“Local authorities can now only really be responsible for meeting the most acute need... Historically there were growing opportunities for the public sector to think about preventative work, but now that is being restricted.”

“If you followed a deficit model and said the easiest thing to do is to pull early intervention and prevention because we can’t take cash out of child protection and social care... this will only increase demand over the longer time.”

There is a real possibility of residualisation rather than reinvention, a scenario in which public services stay firmly in the control of risk-conscious professionals, and are designed and delivered as a safety net to meet basic social functions and only the most acute social needs.

A system in transition

The transition from NPM to NPG has already begun; a notable example in the UK was England’s Every Child Matters programme which we consider to be the most ambitious and complex effort to date by the UK post-war state to transform outcomes for children and young people. It was also an attempt to refocus the state, and establish new forms of interaction and accountability between state, citizen and community. Its achievements were significant in terms of service access and quality.

ECM was launched in 2003 as a response to Lord Laming’s inquiry into the death of Victoria Climbié. From the outset its remit went wider than reforming acute services and child protection. It set out to secure wholesale reform children’s services, becoming the organising framework for all policy affecting children and young people. Success would be measured against five outcomes: children and young people would be healthy, stay safe, enjoy and achieve, make a positive contribution and achieve economic wellbeing. To achieve these outcomes, and to meet the overarching aim of a country skilled and flexible enough to thrive in a changing global economy, the state would have to grow. A social investment state⁴⁶ prepared to build citizens’ capabilities, rather than simply provide protection from market failure, had to extend the borders in which it exercised authority and responsibility: it reduced the age range through new Early Years entitlements, and raised the age range into later adolescence, through raising the participation age in training and education from 16 to 18.

ECM required grand policy making across Whitehall, driven by a powerful, re-purposed department of state (the Department for Children, Schools and Families), guided by a Plan for Children up to 2020, supported by a new minister for Children, and delivered through Public Service Agreements with local government and National Indicators across health and home affairs. Although conceived as outcome focused, it became as heavily dependent on process targets as other areas of government policy, and reporting and accountability was persistently centralising. Governance and guidance emphasised partnership with parents and the centrality of children and young people’s views, while ultimately privileging the view from Westminster – an irony captured by a front line family worker: *“Sure Start is a very target driven process, but parents are told that it is their wishes that are paramount. Often they cannot reconcile these two concepts.”*

⁴⁶ Devaney, J. (2009) Child abuse as a complex and wicked problem: Reflecting on policy developments in the United Kingdom in working with children and families with multiple problem. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(6) pp.635–641.

Local partnerships – Children’s Trusts with a statutory core brought together diverse providers and stakeholders to deliver integrated services within the ECM framework, often embedded in communities, highly accessible and responsive. This ensured a greater role for the voluntary and community sector than ever before. Their participation was encouraged as an integral part of government’s commitment to civic renewal – strengthening self-organised mutual support and social action.⁴⁷ But partnership with the state involved compromise – a willingness to be part of a competitive outsourcing market and a willingness to accommodate ways of working which were unfamiliar to the statutory sector. Critics worried about whether charities and community groups were being empowered or enlisted.⁴⁸

Improving outcomes for children and young people, and professionalising those involved with supporting them went hand in hand. Workforce remodelling introduced new professional standards, new professional bodies, and new professional and para-professional roles. Personal advisers from a newly established Connexions service took on responsibility for information, advice and guidance of young people. A new graduate-level qualification was introduced in early-years education (the Early Years Professional or EYP) and other qualifications were encouraged. Serious child protection concerns led to the state seeking greater control and responsibility than ever before over who could work or volunteer with children. Until modified by the coalition government, plans were on course that would have required up to 9.3 million people to register with, and be monitored by, a vetting and barring scheme condemned by its critics for shifting too much away from the employer and towards the state.⁴⁹

Another dimension of ECM ambition that was ultimately scaled back was the plan to construct an online directory accessible to frontline professionals such as teachers and social workers which would contain basic information on all children born and resident in England. Though the idea that it would include flags of concern was dropped early on, ContactPoint, as the system was called, was designed to encourage and enable cross-professional working: it would show whether there was a lead professional, and whether an assessment under the Common Assessment Framework had taken place. It was never entirely clear whether it would contain too little or too much – too little specific information to improve protection for the small section of the population of children who are at risk of abuse and neglect (Victoria Climbié was foreign-born); or too much about the many children who need additional early additional support in order to thrive, but whose needs might be better viewed and addressed at a universal service level. In either case, ContactPoint was conceived as a tool for professionals, and not a means by which to enable children, young people and families to take a more active role in designing or requesting support.⁵⁰ Rather, citizens were being invited to enter an online, data-rich future as subjects of state power and knowledge. Critics of the ‘Big Brother’ state were vociferous in their opposition. On coming into power the coalition government cancelled the programme taking the view that ContactPoint was ultimately more likely to generate bureaucratic disengagement than timely intervention.

47 Jochum et al (2005) *Civil renewal and active citizenship: a guide to the debate*. London: NCVO.

48 Macmillian, R. (2010) *The third sector delivering public services: an evidence review*. Birmingham: The Third Sector Research Centre. [online] Available at: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tsrc/documents/tsrc/working-papers/working-paper-20.pdf>

49 Department for Education, Department of Health, Home Office (2011) *Vetting & Barring Scheme Remodelling Review –Report and Recommendations*. London: Stationary Office. [online] Available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97748/ybs-report.pdf

50 Department for Children, Schools and Families (2006) *Duty to provide information, advice and assistance*. London: The Stationary Office.

In trying to sum up the strengths and limitations of ECM's view of the state, one document more than any other tells the story. In 2008, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) published the first national Play Strategy. Here was a far-sighted state, prepared to set goals and standards, challenge social and economic trends that seemed to compromise children's rights, act on children's priorities, and invest early in the lives of its citizens. Here too was a centralising state that was happy to prescribe, measure, judge and reward local government and local communities down to a fine level of detail, for their own good. England's Play Strategy did not survive the change of government as a live commitment. Cath Prisk, Play England's director in 2012, recognised, ruefully, that the scene of action had changed:

*"For the English government it is a locally important issue. Localism rules... Responsibility for policy implementation has now turned from the state to being the responsibility of communities and their representatives. This might have been an almost wholly welcomed evolution, if it hadn't been for the austerity measures, and the concurrent end of both the government investment and the Big Lottery investments in play."*⁵¹

ECM was broadly in line with the Labour government's overall approach to state shaping and citizenship. It promoted choice and voice in an attempt to satisfy citizens' rising expectations and improve service quality, as well as championing participation and collaboration as rights and valued social practices. Yet for all these laudable aims, and despite its participative ethos – the Children's Plan claimed 'partnership with parents' as 'a unifying theme'⁵²– we consider that ECM may now represent the high water mark of a citizen-state model based on widening state powers and responsibilities, command and control, professionalisation and big financial transfers.

This makes Every Child Matters an interesting case of the new struggling to emerge from the old – the cultures, norms and institutions of which are often an overwhelming legacy. In practice, the ways in which public services were designed and held accountable meant that these practices rarely penetrated so deeply as to overturn institutional behaviour or the behaviour and expectations of citizens. In almost every area of social policy in the UK, from the National Health Service to prisons, we witness public service providers, professionals, politicians and citizens caught in no man's land – the environment of devising and implementing new policy becoming the enemy of change. Courage and conviction are needed to find a route through, but starting at the participatory end of our New Public Governance spectrum is, we believe, the best hope leaders have of creating a sustainable, legitimate shift in the relationship between citizen and state.

51 Prisk, C. (2012) Current landscape for play in England, In *4 Nations Play Policy Symposium: Playing the Long Game. Millennium Stadium, Cardiff, 28 November, 2012.* [online] Available at: <http://www.playwales.org.uk/login/uploaded/documents/Play%20Policy/4%20nations%20play%20policy%20symposium%20report.pdf>

52 Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007) *The Children's Plan: Building brighter futures.* The Stationary Office: London. p.13.

Section 3:

Learning to make change – national and international case studies

Our research suggests that many public servants want to move to a new relationship between citizen and state. They recognise that we need a different balance of responsibilities between the state and its citizens – in their communities or businesses – in order to tackle the following entrenched problems:

- Wicked problems with multiple causes interacting in unpredictable ways and which therefore require the alignment of a broad set of actors.⁵³
- Highly individual problems, including those that are related to life and living circumstances that may require relational support.⁵⁴
- Highly political problems that require important ethical or material trade-offs, and therefore require deliberation and the mobilisation of consent, such as participatory budgeting (see, for example, Paris⁵⁵ and Madrid.⁵⁶)

If it was hard to make that change during a time of relative financial plenty, how will it be possible to achieve this in the chill of austerity? Many local leaders have been bold in placing the question of the citizen-state relationship squarely before their residents, setting out the need for a new deal or a ‘new social contract’. It was one of the key recommendations of the 2012 Commission on the Future of Local Government, for example. This new ‘social contract’ provides a persuasive trope for behaviour change and demand management. It can even set the stage for genuinely collective and deliberative decision making – as we illustrate in some of the case studies that follow in this section – although it has so far proved a difficult metaphor to translate into practice.

In a more complex, networked context in which social value is expected to arise from numerous stakeholders, we believe it will be necessary to pay more attention to the diverse parties involved in this dynamic matrix of relationships, what forms these relationships might most productively take, and how new conversations between new actors might be initiated.

The challenges facing society today are too complex to be solved by state institutions alone – or, for that matter by any single institution. It is important therefore to enlist the talents and creativity of all sections of society and harness their collective potential, be they public services, third sector organisations, businesses, individual citizens and their families and social networks, and communities of place and interest. One task for local government is to alter its default stance of being a provider or commissioner of services delivered to citizens, and think instead about the various ways it might take responsibility for providing platforms for these various stakeholders to collaborate and work towards outcomes that are valued by citizens.

53 Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. (1973) ‘Dilemmas in a general theory of planning’. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2). pp.155–169.

54 Leadbeater, C. and Cottom H. (no date) *The User Generated State: Public Services 2.0*. London: RSA 2020 Public Services. [online] Available at: <http://charlesleadbeater.net/wpcontent/uploads/2007/03/PSRG3.pdf>

55 Mairie de Paris (2015) *5115 ideas submitted for the 2015 Paris participatory budget*. Paris, 5 March. [online] Available at: http://next.paris.fr/english/english/5115-ideas-submitted-for-the-2015-paris-participatory-budget/rub_8118_actu_154341_port_19237

56 See Decide Madrid (2016) *The city you love will become the city you want*. [online] Available at: <https://decide.madrid.es/?locale=en>

Public service leaders need:

“...a much greater appreciation for the role of citizens and communities so that they don't just assume the solution to everything is the public sector professional but much more about empowering people to do things themselves, and building their capacity to do so.”⁵⁷

The issue of obesity illustrates the importance of addressing issues of agency and responsibility in all dimensions and not assuming that either state service solutions, or stand-alone citizen solutions will suffice. If trends continue, 11.9% of NHS costs will go to meeting health problems associated with overweight and obesity by 2025.⁵⁸ However, few would argue that reducing the rates of obesity or dealing with its impact is solely the responsibility of the National Health Service. Given other potential contributory factors such as poverty, ready access to exercise places, sedentary job contexts etc., a wide range of actors have different contributions to make and potentially positive or negative roles to play. For example, supermarkets might be encouraged to change the positioning and placement of certain unhealthy foods, schools could increase their role in educating children to eat healthily and take exercise and food manufacturers could take steps to reduce the amounts of sugar and fat in their products over and above the relatively tokenistic efforts so far. At a more local level, sports clubs could do more to help people to stay fit, individuals and families could take greater responsibility for their health and business initiatives like Weight Watchers could help people to lose weight or develop exercise apps, and groups of citizens might campaign more openly against fast food shops opening in their areas, or turn disused land into community vegetable gardens.⁵⁹

Irrespective of the size or relative financial health of the state, it is important to recognise its limits. For most people, most of the time, the most important relationships in their lives are with each other, not with the state, however defined. Danny Kruger, a former adviser to David Cameron and the founder of the West London Children's Zone, has said that a focus on only the citizen and state omits the important third virtue of the republican motto, 'liberté, égalité, fraternité'. Modern political discourse, he says, concerns itself primarily with either 'liberty' (the rights of citizens as individuals) or 'equality' (the role of the state in promoting equitable and just outcomes) – and neglects proper consideration of communities who foster the fellowship and fraternity of mutual support and social life.⁶⁰

This view is challenging and doesn't represent the zeitgeist for Mathew Taylors's solidaristic citizen⁶¹ behaviour. We must consider the role of the social sector in any new social settlement in promoting and nurturing a more collective sense of social responsibility. The voluntary, community and social sector incorporates the broad subset of institutional public life that is not part of the formal state apparatus. Consisting of charities, volunteers, religious and community institutions and increasingly social enterprises – businesses with a social purpose – the social sector does not encompass the whole of what is meant by 'community', but it does have a role in organising communities and occupies a potentially key position between communities and the state. This is likely to become increasingly the case in England, as devolution arrangements simultaneously renew the emphasis on locally focused social interventions and reposition the local state to a potentially more remote,

57 RSA interview with prominent public policy expert and thought leader in public service reform.

58 Foresight (2007) *Tackling Obesities: Future Choices – Project Report 2nd Edition*. London: Government Office of Science. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287937/07-1184x-tackling-obesities-future-choices-report.pdf

59 Ibid.

60 See Kruger, D. (2007) *On Fraternity*. London: Civitas. [online] Available at: <http://www.civitas.org.uk/content/files/Attached-On-FraternityFeb07.pdf>

61 Taylor.M. (2016) Humility of the intellect: ambition of the will. Mathew Taylor's Blog May 12th.

regional level,⁶² and the role of local authorities increasingly shifts towards being a commissioner rather than a direct provider of services. If the ‘Big Society’ is “not the same thing as the state”⁶³ and if we are to broaden our public discourse from a technocratic balancing of liberty and equality with an ethical ideal of fraternity, solutions will be required that work within deeper changes to culture and the lived context of communities as opposed to concentrating on service-centric public service reform. The social sector is likely to play a key role in such a configuration, with its ability to understand and cultivate relationships with and between people, often in ways that the state sector is less able to do as exemplified so well in the case study on the West London Children’s Zone.

“It’s wrong to see social support simply as services delivered to the individual, by the state. This characterisation completely cuts out the important relationship an individual has with the community (or communities) of which he is part of. Children are not the children of the state; they are the community’s children; they are part of communities and neighbourhoods... We’ve lost that sense of community.”⁶⁴

New conversations

With this enlarged cast of actors engaged on a larger stage in which citizens, businesses, social networks and social sector organisations are expected and enabled to play a larger role in producing public welfare outcomes, a new relationship cannot be merely assumed. Rather, new conversations will need to be pursued to realise the value of what is often termed citizen and community capital.

Whatever the agreed goal of such a reframing, the conversation will need to go beyond top-down appeals from government for citizens to be more civically responsible. Twenty first century conversations that lead successfully to a new relationship will look less like the ‘Keep Britain Tidy’ campaign in the 1980s in which the Prime Minister publicly demanded that people change their behaviour “*as a matter of civic and national pride*”, and more like a set of diverse and often messy solutions. As they seek a range of approaches appropriate to different circumstances, public services and government officers will need to reassess their position in the relationship and their own behaviour. Sometimes this will involve supporting people to be more capable of meeting their own needs as individuals and communities; sometimes it will involve an explicit re-articulation of the ‘social contract’ of rights and responsibilities, and at other times it will involve public services getting out of the way altogether and genuinely trusting people to take control.


International research points to a range of strategies that have been employed to reframe the relationship between citizen and state in respect of public welfare outcomes. Figure 1 sets out this spectrum of approaches, starting with the notion of a service that designs and delivers interventions to citizens as recipients (the state frames the problem and provides the solution). It then moves to the state as a paternalistic designer, drawing on its expert knowledge and responsibility for the public good to ‘nudge’ citizens into unwittingly beneficial choices (the state frames the problem and manoeuvres citizens into solving it), and progresses to what we term ‘person to person social justice’, in which groups and individuals collaborate directly to identify outcomes that matter to them, and marshal the diverse resources that will help to achieve them. At this point in the continuum the state is peripheral, and citizen activists or entrepreneurs take the lead on how public services provision is determined and delivered.

62 See Buddery, P. (2016) *People Shaped Localism*. London: RSA, for a commentary on the paradox of devolution deals bringing together towns into centralised ‘regions’ and therefore making some functions of local governance less ‘local’ than in previous scenarios.

63 Cameron, D. (2005) Conservative Party Leadership Victory Speech. [online] Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4504722.stm

64 RSA interview with Chief Executive of a social sector organisation focused on improving children’s outcomes.

Figure 1: Pathways to New Public Governance – a new Citizen-State relationship



Working through the model

A. Service delivery: state provides, citizens as recipients

The delivery of basic administrative functions, such as issuing passports, collecting income, property and sales taxes, or the collating of statistical data and information is central to an effective, efficient state. In this aspect of the state as service deliverer, the main issue is one of competence; citizens expect government to provide the basic backbone infrastructure of state affairs. In addition, there are services where the level of technical expertise is such as to necessitate all but those skilled service professionals accepting their role as passive recipients of professional care and knowledge.

Acute health care is an obvious example, where clinicians would be expected to operate in a manner that respects the rights and wishes of patients, but to exercise their professional clinical judgement first and foremost. Emergency treatment and complex non-elective surgery are likely to fall into this category. As noted in an RSA blog: *“I don’t want to co-produce my own heart surgery”*.⁶⁵ i.e. the merit of technocratic wisdom should not be overlooked. Rather it should be seen as part of a range of types of interventions, each of which have value when applied appropriately within a holistic public-policy design model.

65 Marcus, G. (2014) I don’t want to co-produce my own heart surgery! RSA Blogs [blog] June. Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/rsa-blogs/2014/06/i-dont-want-to-co-produce-my-own-heart-surgery>

B. Nudge: state knows best – behaviour change

‘Nudge theory’ as developed and popularised by the American authors Richard Thaler and Cass R. Sunstein, is the application of behavioural science to subtly influence citizens to change their behaviour. They describe a nudge as:

*“A nudge[...] is any aspect of the choice architecture that alters people’s behavior in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives. To count as a mere nudge, the intervention must be easy and cheap to avoid. Nudges are not mandates. Putting fruit at eye level counts as a nudge. Banning junk food does not.”*⁶⁶

The UK Cabinet Office established the Behavioural Insights Team (or ‘Nudge Unit’) under the 2010 coalition administration to apply nudge principles in government. The techniques are generally most readily applicable in ‘oiling the wheels’ of simple, transactional public services by encouraging citizens to act responsibly and predictably. For example, encouraging people to pay fees and taxes on time by informing people that the majority of their fellow citizens submit their payments ahead of deadlines. The Nudge Unit has more recently been made independent of government, and now operates out of the charity Nesta under the academic David Halpern.

C. Call on citizens: state stimulates philanthropy and altruism

As state funding becomes ever more stretched by austerity, an ageing population and changing expectations, it may be possible to bridge some of the gap in provision by encouraging greater giving, including from business and high-value individuals - in short, a new philanthropy.

Large parts of our civic infrastructure, from hospitals to libraries, and from schools to parks, were built from acts of individual philanthropy or collective charitable effort. Some of the champions of 19th century industry were also champions of social improvement, investing in the welfare of their workforce on a grand scale. If pure disinterest was less common then than what today would be termed a ‘shared value’ outlook,⁶⁷ the breadth and depth of the social contract it implied between wealthy citizens and disadvantaged citizens – not only between citizens and the state – was nonetheless powerful in shaping our towns and cities albeit with many flaws and contradictions.

Such philanthropy is far from being confined to Victorian Britain. In Europe and globally, individual philanthropy is growing in value.⁶⁸ In Hong Kong, for example, Project WeCan has seen major corporations, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and wealthy private individuals pledge their time and money to strengthen public schools. Philanthropic participants in the programme are encouraged to feel a moral responsibility towards the city’s children, and each ‘adopt a school’ and provide it with much-needed funding as well as institutional links, mentoring opportunities and careers programmes. To date, one hundred million Hong Kong dollars have been given to the 10 lowest performing schools and in the academic year 2015/16, the number of supported schools has increased to 50 with consequent

66 Thaler, R. and Sunstein, C. (2008). *Nudge*. Penguin Books.

67 Kippin, H. et al (2012) *Business, Society and Public Services: a social productivity framework*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/business-society-and-public-services/>

68 Forbes Insight (2015) *2015 BNP Paribas Individual Philanthropy Index*. London: BNP Paribas Wealth Management. [online] Available at: <https://wealthmanagement.bnpparibas/content/dam/bnpparibas/pdfs/BNP%20Paribas%20Forbes%20Philanthropy%20Index%202015%20-%207%204%202015.pdf>

additional funding and support provided by a *“total of 27 corporations, three universities, three Consulates, two other organizations, and a number of business associations, professionals and retirees joining to assist 42,000 students.”*⁶⁹

The sums donated by individual or corporate philanthropists are often striking. However, the motivations of those involved – a sense of duty, an altruistic wish to help others – are little different from those that energise the countless men and women whose everyday acts of generosity knit together our communities through the community groups they support, the voluntary organisations to which they contribute and the social businesses they set up. The question of how the state should act to strengthen and encourage, rather than overload or stifle these individual and collective acts of generosity, has vexed and divided politicians since the Keynesian Welfare State’s inception – famously, one of its chief architects in Britain was anxious that the balance was wrong.⁷⁰ The Big Society was only the most recent attempt by government to shift the balance so that people would be more likely to act on their sense of responsibility. In practice, the shift did not go much further than exhortation and an open invitation to be part of public service markets. In reality, the ways that our public services elicit and support the acts of altruism for community benefit have changed very little since Victorian times and this is now a significant challenge to those in the most senior leadership positions in public services as they will have to find a way to overcome the traditional culture of the state providing and learn to encourage and accommodate new philanthropy.

CASE STUDY 1:

West London Zone – the collective impact of the social sector

West London Zone (WLZ) is an interesting example of an attempt to organise community resources in a defined place, blending them effectively with statutory services, and enabling philanthropic individuals, trusts and corporations to invest in effective, coordinated support, instead of ad hoc interventions. Led by Danny Kruger, David Cameron’s former adviser, WLZ uses a ‘collective impact’ approach to planning and accountability and has some ‘devolved authority’ from the relevant local authorities and schools to commission services for children on their behalf. However, just as important as a distribution of what might be termed this ‘hard power’, which usually rests exclusively with the statutory sector – the collective impact approach enables organisations to organise around shared aims, and track progress through shared metrics. For WLZ the ‘soft power’ of being a social sector organisation, embedded in and trusted by the community has proved critically important as a backbone.

What it is: West London Zone is a new collective impact initiative that brings together public and social sector organisations to improve children and young people’s outcomes in the White City area on London. It leverages philanthropic, charitable, and public funding, and works through the community’s existing organisations and groups to build community capability and spread support for constructive social norms.

69 Citation needed here

70 Cottam, H. (2008) *Beveridge 4.0*. London: *Participle*. [online] Available at: <http://www.hilarycottam.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/Beveridge-4.pdf>

What it tells us: The social sector is uniquely placed to develop strong relationships with citizens and communities, and to strengthen the ties between citizens and the communities in which they live. Harnessing social sector capacity through collective impact, social investment and public support and partnership has the potential to transform the outcomes of children and families over the long term.

Key outcomes: The initiative, which begins piloting services in the academic year 2016/17, has a 10-year plan. Its aim is to provide comprehensive, ‘cradle to adulthood’ support to the children and young people it works with at different life stages. Through its focus on early support and prevention, it is designed to create financial savings for statutory services by reducing acute need, and therefore service demand, over the long term. It envisages a future public services model, which is based on a more ambitious and rationally designed blend of both public and private resources.

West London Zone is modelled on the collective impact approach originating in the United States and draws inspiration from the Harlem Children’s Zone, a well-known organisation in Central Harlem, New York, that provides a pipeline of ‘cradle to college’ support to children (and their families) experiencing or at risk of generational poverty. It is widely credited as having a significant impact on the outcomes of the communities with which it works. Collective impact seeks to tackle complex challenges through a systematic approach to partnership in which the organisations involved align their work through five conditions for collaboration: a common agenda; shared measurement; mutually reinforcing activities; continuous communication; and backbone support for managing and coordinating the initiative.⁷¹


WLZ acts as a ‘backbone organisation’ for a ‘collective’ of voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) organisations working in the White City area of West London, providing them with support in the form of data analysis, financing and co-ordination. They are joined by a range of partners within the community to help develop a shared vision, participate in the network, and build local social capital. Importantly, the ‘zone’ across which the project operates – White City – is not a single administrative district or catchment area, but draws its identity from the citizens and communities who live and work there.

WLZ’s shared goal is to provide tailored support from the social sector to children most in need, in order to help them ‘flourish’ and achieve the outcomes that will enable them to be safe, happy and healthy adults. This ‘cradle to adulthood’ support is provided from birth through to 25 years, with a range of outcomes tailored to different periods of their life. The outcomes are co-designed and rooted in the practical experience of the delivery organisations and the needs and assets of local people.

Statutory sector institutions such as children’s centres, schools and job centres that provide the core services for local children and young people act as ‘anchor’ organisations from which it is possible to identify children with additional needs. A link worker within the anchor organisation engages with children and young people and their families and works with them to broker appropriate packages of support from the diverse resources and organisations within the collective. This is a strengths based intervention in which the link worker ensures that where appropriate, families and trusted adults are fully involved in shaping and delivering this bespoke support. The link worker has an ongoing role in encouraging the children and young people to engage on a sustained basis and not lose sight of their goals in life. Fig 2 below provides a summary of the link worker role.

⁷¹ Kania, J. and Kramer, M. (2013) Embracing Emergence: How Collective Impact Addresses Complexity. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 21 January. [online] Available at: www.ssir.org

Figure 2. The role of link workers in West London Zone



Source: westlondonzone.org

Year one funding is philanthropic: the long-term goal is to make WLZ sustainable through a social finance model that combines private capital (including social investors) with public funding. A Collective Impact Bond is being developed in partnership with a range of investors, commissioners and delivery organisations that cut across multiple policy and service areas (for example health, education, welfare and criminal justice). The Collective Impact Bond aims to overcome the limitations of some social impact bonds, which in the UK have tended to rely on linear models of change, achieved through a narrow range of inputs. Ensuring that interventions are evidence-based is paramount and WLZ plays a key role in analysing a full range of data and tracking how well the various services achieve their specific outcomes and support the children and young people to progress along the WLZ ‘whole child’ outcomes scale.

Collective impact, community and place

One of the central strengths of the WLZ model is that it helps to coordinate a normally fragmented delivery landscape and enables a range of organisations that are more used to working in silos to pool and align their goals, activities and resources to achieve a common good. WLZ brings them together in order to tackle complex challenges and achieve a sustainable and collective impact across a place and tailors support to the needs and assets of children, young people and their families. By addressing the problem of fragmentation and short-termism in service delivery, it also simplifies and enriches the relationship between citizens and communities and the professionals that support them through the course of their lives. The collective impact principles also underscore the value of the state working in new ways with communities and institutions in a place, and embracing social sector leadership as a key lever for encouraging civic action and behaviour change.

WLZ has a strong empirical focus on shared measurement and outcome evaluation. It is also underpinned philosophically by a vision of society that brings to the fore the sometimes forgotten third ‘fraternity’ that sits between individual citizens and the state: association, social organisation and relationships. Modern debates and analyses tend to be polarised, focusing on individual liberty (citizens) or wider

legality (the state). In contrast, the WLZ model identifies community⁷² as having the greatest potential for lasting change and a flourishing society. This recognises that the main agency affecting the lives of children is the society in which they live, not any one single public institution. Achieving culture change within communities and influencing the way that families, communities and social institutions work and support each other can be key to achieving the widest impact. WLZ therefore focuses on working intensively and building strong relationships with families, their social support networks and the wider community, and ensuring that the way in which services are delivered and the ways that the social sector and the state work together to improve outcomes are informed by the community.

D. Contract with citizens: state confirms something for something

The role of the social contract in defining and legitimatising the relationship between citizen and the state is an idea that came to the fore during the Enlightenment⁷³. Works by political philosophers such as Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau were integral to the development of the structures and tenets of emerging western democracies between the mid-17th and 18th centuries, but their legacy continues in the notion of modern rights-based societies. On what basis does the state have authority to legislate over its citizens, raise taxes or redistribute income? What constitutes a just settlement between citizens and state?

Relative to the post-war Beveridgean welfare state of the middle of the last century, central government is retreating in its every-day commitment to citizens in many key aspects of delivery of state functions. Indeed, the current UK government has a clear policy objective to reduce the size of the state to less than 40% of GDP as a defined policy target. Similarly, central government has been active in its support for new institutions, such as combined authorities and Metro Mayors, to give sufficient scale to localised interventions on infrastructure, skills, health and social care. While lines remain blurred, particularly where central government continues to be prime funder and regulator (e.g. education), there are signs that a new social contract is emerging with initiatives such as Our Manchester⁷⁴, Birmingham City Council's Citizen Engagement initiative⁷⁵ and the Wigan Deal.

72 Kruger, D. (2007b) *On Fraternity: Politics Beyond Liberty and Equality*. Wiltshire: The Cromwell Press.

73 The period of Enlightenment culminated in the political upheaval of the French Revolution in which traditional hierarchical, political and social values were destroyed to be replaced by a political and social order informed by the ideas of freedom and equity for all

74 http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500313/the_manchester_strategy/7173/our_manchester_a_progressive_and_equitable_city

75 http://podnosh.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/birmingham_citizen_engagement_final_report_dib.pdf

CASE STUDY 2:

Wigan Citizen Deal

Wigan local authority and its Citizen Deal is an example of how alternative or additional social contracts are being formed at different tiers of government as the 'state' becomes increasingly diffuse. The local Council in Wigan, Greater Manchester identified a disconnect between what the Council was able to provide and what its citizens expected, leading to a one-way relationship with citizens and communities that was both patriarchal and unsustainable.

The 'Wigan Deal' was introduced as "an informal agreement between the council and everyone who lives or works there to work together to create a better borough".⁷⁶ This 'Deal' set out what the Council is for, what it can do, and what it hopes to achieve in the future. It also made number of requests to residents, outlining its own capabilities and limitations, and asked them to contribute with ideas and commitments. The Council recognised that it had sometimes got in the way of citizens that wanted to contribute in this way and the 'Deal' was a formal way of encouraging active participation and of ceding some of the power and responsibility to the people that used and paid for the services.

What it is: A new, clear articulation of the expectations on citizens in return for a series of pledges together designed to save money and improve quality of life in the local area.

What it tells us: The relationship between citizens and the state can take multiple forms, including at different tiers of government –local, national, and, increasingly perhaps, at city-regional level (in Wigan's case, within Greater Manchester). This relationship can be codified, albeit informally, in order to create a conscious shift in the expectations and behaviours of citizens and council officers.

Key outcomes: Reported increased 'pro-social' behaviour amongst citizens and communities, as well as significant efficiency savings for the council (£100m).

The 'Deal' also consists of a number of highly publicised pledges – the Council pledged to freeze the Council Tax and build services around individuals. It also sets out the Council's expectations of citizens, e.g. to recycle waste, volunteer if they can and make more use of online services. Separate deals were drawn up in particular policy areas, such as health and social care and children and families, with deals tailored to the needs of the business community. Publicising the reciprocal arrangement between taxpayers and service providers and encouraging people to sign up to the deal – literally, on widely circulated printed copies of the deal, has achieved impressive results in terms of encouraging pro-social behaviour from citizens,⁷⁷ while saving £100m in council finances.

This shift in thinking has not only dramatically increased satisfaction with the Council, it has also galvanised the local public sector workforce. They too have become more creative, working closely with businesses and communities in ways that they had not done previously. There is growing evidence that Wigan citizens feel more connected to their local public services and have a greater sense of responsibility for conserving increasingly limited council resources.

⁷⁶ Wigan Council, *About The Deal*, available at: <https://www.wigan.gov.uk/Council/The-Deal/The-Deal.aspx>

⁷⁷ Wigan Council, *The Deal in Action*, available at: <https://www.wigan.gov.uk/Council/The-Deal/The-Deal-in-Action/index.aspx>

E. Strike a deal with citizens: state and citizens agree new vision

Sometimes merely articulating expectations and obligations does not go far enough. Certainly, some of our local authority interviewees felt that a new agreement with citizens was needed to re-balance responsibilities away from services and towards citizens – largely because of affordability, but also because ‘dependency’ on the state was felt to be negative and self-perpetuating.

They suggested that the terms of the citizen/state ‘contract’ may need to be changed and expectations on all sides re-calibrated. In some cases that may involve agreeing that the state will do less and that citizens will do more, either for themselves or with others, or pay more at point of service access. For example, a local authority and its service users, having consulted on the future of the re-enablement service, may agree that the service will be retained, but that charges will be introduced after the first four weeks or a Council might agree to keep a library building open on the condition that volunteers take responsibility for staffing and running it.

It is also possible to reframe the social contract so that it is more demanding on both sides and leads to more ambitious services that draw on a wider set of resources that may involve higher taxation to pay for the change. Our next case study example is from the United States, where attitudes to taxation, public services, citizenship and philanthropy are quite different from the UK. While average public spending per student in primary and secondary education is actually higher than in the UK, there are significant variations between individual states⁷⁸ and Cincinnati in Ohio, the setting for our case study has been, and remains, one of the country’s lowest spending states.⁷⁹

CASE STUDY 3:

Cincinnati Public Schools’ Community Learning Centers

In the mid-1990s, the Ohio Supreme Court found that the condition of Cincinnati’s Public Schools was so poor as to be infringing children’s right to an adequate public education. Parents were rapidly abandoning the state system – with only 19 percent of voters having school age children, and with only about half of those children being sent to public schools. Enrolment was down from 90,000 students in the 1970s to a projected 28,000 by 2010. An attempt to fund renewal of the estate through a local tax rise was rejected by voters in 1999 and local politicians and public servants became convinced that a new deal was needed in relation to schools and their role within communities.

Following the rejection in 1999 the School Board realised that it had to revise its thinking and formulate a new public value proposition⁸⁰ which would attract the support of a wide range of tax paying citizens including those who had opted to educate their children in the private school sector. In effect, the question that local leaders took into their communities was not what kind of school they wanted, but

78 OECD (2014) *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. [online] Available at: <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2014-eag-2014-en>

79 U.S. Census Bureau (2015) *Public Education Finances: 2013*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. [online] Available at: <http://www2.census.gov/govs/school/13f33pub.pdf>

80 Moore, M. H. (1997) *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, Harvard University Press London

what kind of communities they wanted to live in.⁸¹ The new proposition was that schools would become community centres of learning:

“The Board of Education believes that each school should also be a community learning center in which a variety of partners shall offer academic programs, enrichment activities, and support to students, families, and community members before and after school as well as during the evenings and on weekends throughout the calendar year. Each school’s Community Learning Center shall hereinafter be referred to as CLC. The Board envisions each CLC as the neighborhood’s center of activity.

The Board further believes that in order to serve more fully the needs of students and to support the improvement of their academic and intellectual development, each District public school must engage its community if these worthy purposes are to be realized.”⁸²

A new vote in 2003 approved the creation of Community Learning Centers, which are governed by members of the community and resourced through a combination of Federal, State, School Board, project grants and community partners funding arrangements.

What it is: Cincinnati’s public schools had been in long-term decline and an earlier proposal to fund improvements through a predicated tax increase was turned down by voters. However, in 2003, voters approved a revised proposal that would use revenue from increased taxation to fund new schools designed as facilities for the whole community. Community Learning Centers (CLCs) have been established, each of which hosts a range of services for children and adults. Resource co-ordinators in the schools draw in non-statutory funding and other resources on an ongoing basis.

What it tells us: Schools can be powerful civic rallying points, even when they are in difficulty. In the US context, the community school movement provided a pedagogy and a vision of community partnership and capacity building that galvanised this energy and maintained progress over several years during a complex transformation programme. This is in contrast to high profile failures in programmes or investment strategies that were not based upon a shared vision of community and pedagogy— notably that by Mark Zuckerberg, founder of social media giant, Facebook.⁸³

Key outcomes: High school graduation rose from 51 percent in 2000 to 81.9 percent in 2010. Community Learning Centers now host health, mental health, and early childhood education services, many of which are provided through district wide partnership networks, all of which are closely tailored to the specific needs of the local community (for example, an international welcome centre at the Roberts CLC is provided in partnership with the Guatemalan and Mexican consulates and attracts more than 800 families).

Each school has an allocated Community Resource Co-ordinator who operates within clear guidelines laid down by the Cincinnati School District. Commercial promotion by sponsor organisations within the CLC is prohibited. Co-ordination between CLC districts allows for high-value, long-term partnerships with large corporates or social foundations to be negotiated. For the most part, however, co-ordinators operate independently and to date have proved capable of leveraging in substantial

81 The Centre for Popular Democracy (2016) *Community Schools: Transforming Struggling Schools into Thriving Schools*. [online] Available at: http://populardemocracy.org/sites/default/files/Community-Schools-Layout_e.pdf

82 Cincinnati City School District Bylaws and Policies. [online] Available at: <https://community.cps-k12.org>.

83 Jackson, A. (2015) Mark Zuckerberg’s \$100 million donation to Newark public schools failed miserably — here’s where it went wrong. *Business Insider*, 25 September. [online] Available at: <http://www.techinsider.io/mark-zuckerbergs-failed-100-million-donation-to-newark-public-schools-2015-9>

financial and non-financial resources. This has been most straightforward for CLCs in either particularly affluent or particularly deprived circumstances. Schools in the middle have found it more difficult to attract support.

Increased student enrolment is the most direct evidence of increased confidence by the community in their Community Learning Centers. Participation in governance is through each CLC's Local School Decision Making Committee. Composed of a mix of residents, parents, teachers and students, the committee's role and powers are very similar to those of a Board of Governors in a maintained school in England. The system is reported to be running effectively, although recruitment and continuity are constant challenges.

Students are reported to have benefited from the new variety of support services brought together in the CLC, particularly those who had previously been struggling. In 2011-12 more than twice as many CLC students received or participated in programmes as in the previous year. CLC students who received services improved their academic performance most following their engagement in programmes, despite often having higher rates of absence or behavioural referrals than their peers.

Participants stress how the transition from schools to CLCs involved and continues to involve a deep commitment to collaboration and dialogue – bespoke, attentive, evolutionary. In the words of one of the programme's staff members: *"It's the art, not the science, of Community Learning Centers"*. The rewards of being prepared to engage and deal with communities however, greatly outweigh the challenges:

"No school can do everything single handed in the 20th century. Collectively we're all responsible. It's not about either the city or the community; it's about both."

The citizens of Cincinnati recently renewed their support for the CLC initiative and the consequent higher rate of local taxation to pay for it.

F. Build capacity and networks: citizens supported to give and receive help

In some instances, citizens and communities may not be ready to step in and take responsibility for meeting public welfare outcomes that were previously seen as the responsibility of the state. Capacity building and ongoing support is often necessary, helping people to find out what their options are and how they might participate in meeting their needs and aspirations and those of others in the community. Increasingly, public services attempt to offer support in ways that build on assets, and focus less on implied deficits either in communities, families or individuals.^{84, 85} Asset building⁸⁶ can support people to make better use of the sources of support around them, or it can support people to themselves be more active and informed sources of support to their families or communities.

In our next case study example we look in some detail at both types of initiative. Local Area Co-ordination is an internationally evidenced way of supporting vulnerable individuals and their families to access networks of informal and community support in the places where they live alongside as professional and statutory services. Altogether Better⁸⁷ is a programme that has developed volunteer 'Health Champions' within and beyond clinical settings. Its work has revealed some of the cultural barriers that can make it difficult for professionals and citizens to learn from each other.

84 Craig, G. (2007) Community capacity-building: Something old, something new...? *Critical Social Policy*, 27(3). pp.335-359.

85 Knapp, M., Bauer, A., Perkins, M. and Snell, T. (2013) Building community capital in social care: is there an economic case? *Community Development Journal*, 48(3). pp.313-331.

86 <http://locality.org.uk/our-work/assets/what-are-community-assets/>

87 <http://www.altogetherbetter.org.uk>

CASE STUDY 4:

Local Area Coordination

Originating in Australia in the late 1980s as a means of supporting people with disabilities to take an active part in their communities, Local Area Coordination is designed to form bridges between state, community and citizen resources. Local Area Coordination is promoted in England and Wales by the social enterprise Inclusive Neighbourhoods, who have partnered with other agencies and individuals to develop the model. Initially trialled in Middlesbrough in 2010, Local Area Coordination has since been adopted in a number of localities around England and Wales, including in Derby, Cumbria, Swansea and Thurrock. It works by employing a Local Area Coordinator to support people in a small local area to lead a self-defined good life, and remaining flexible and open to a diverse range of actions that might contribute to that outcome as opposed to the traditional service delivery model. By investing time in building relationships with local people, Local Area Coordinators help individuals to solve problems, to be as resilient and connected to others as possible, and to prevent more significant problems or crises before they occur. The model is designed to move beyond 'prevention' by building community capacity and contributing to a more responsive culture within public services.

What it is: A full time Local Area Coordinator is embedded within a small geographic community to support 50-65 individuals considered to be vulnerable due to their age, mental health or disability, and their families to exercise and enjoy their role as a citizen. Organised and led by public bodies but located in the community, the Local Area Coordinator is an approachable and accessible single point of contact, helping people to solve problems, to be as resilient and connected to others as possible, and to prevent more significant problems or crises before they occur.

What it tells us: The model represents the emergence of a new concept of public service 'delivery', concentrating on improving lives by empowering people to draw on their personal and community resources. Access to traditional public services provided by the local state provides a back up when required. The challenge now is one of scale – to understand how far increased prevention and greater overall citizen wellbeing can help to reduce demand for, or costs associated with, public services? What does learning from this highly relational approach to individual and community capacity building suggest for the development of New Public Governance approaches to public policy design?

Key Outcomes: In Derby, an evaluation by the University of Derby published by the Centre for Welfare Reform, calculated savings and diverted costs of £800,000 in the first 10 months, a period in which the programme was estimated to be operating at only 40% capacity as it set up and established itself in the area. These savings were attributed to a range of factors including reduced visits to GPs, avoidance of housing evictions, the identification of low cost or no-cost solutions to problems through family or community relationships, reduced isolation and prevention of out of home service placements. Evaluations from other areas report similar benefits.

Local Area Coordination represents a reversal in the focus of support for vulnerable people, concentrating on improving lives rather than delivering services, and positioning the Local Area Coordination of individual and community resources as the first and preferred approach and drawing upon traditional public services only if and when required. The approaches are eclectic and dependent on context,

but the sequence of questions asked by the Local Area Coordinator stays broadly consistent:

- What can each person do for themselves using their gifts, skills and experiences?
- How can friends, family and community help?
- What is the role of services and money?

The order of this sequence is important; rather than individuals engaging with bureaucratic services as a first point of contact, the Local Area Coordinator supports the individual to get the most out of their personal assets and community circumstances before considering the involvement of formal services. The process is one of addition as opposed to traditional assessment; instead of assessing whether or not an individual meets the criteria for immediate state support, the Local Area Coordinator provides, as an alternative, advice and support to help answer questions such as:

- How can an appreciation of a person's assets add to their lives?
- How then can the person's relationships and community networks add further benefit?
- (If necessary) How might services or financial support further contribute to beneficial outcomes for the individual?

Seven applied principles are common to the Local Area Coordination model in Australia and Britain:

1. **Citizenship** – with all its responsibilities and opportunities.
2. **Relationships** – the importance of personal networks and families.
3. **Information** – which can support decision making.
4. **Gifts** – all that individuals and families can bring.
5. **Expertise** – the knowledge held by people and their families.
6. **Leadership** – the right to plan, choose and control your own life and support.
7. **Services** – as a back up to natural support.

In practice, this takes various forms, and might include accompanying an isolated parent to a morning coffee club at a Sure Start Centre, advising them of opportunities to volunteer their skills to reduce their own isolation, or supporting somebody to fill out benefits forms or create a CV to send to prospective employers.

Overall, the Local Area Coordination model appears to be a small, local but effective means of providing additional support to particularly vulnerable people, helping them to navigate bureaucracies and build their own and their networks' capacities, thus reducing avoidable public expenditure and achieving more productive and humane outcomes for the individuals involved.

CASE STUDY 5:

Community Health Champions – a new blueprint for health and wellbeing

Between 2008 and 2012 Altogether Better, funded by the Big Lottery Fund, recruited, trained and supported more than 18,000 ‘Community Health Champions’ to help improve the wellbeing of people in their communities. Over the course of the programme the champions developed their confidence and skills and supported over 105,000 people, many of whom are reported to have begun to take more responsibility for their own health and wellbeing. This was followed in 2011 with the two-year ‘The Right to Conversation at the Right Time project,’ which helped to improve the quality of the conversations and relationships between clinicians and patients.

In 2013 Altogether Better, supported by £2.7m additional funding from the Big Lottery Fund, developed the ‘Working Together to Create Healthier People and Communities’ programme. This initiative involved working with local partners in seven localities across three English regions. The aim was to develop a systematic approach to help champions, communities and health services to engage with each other in order to improve the health and wellbeing of members of the community. This would become the basis for a new collaborative model of Community-centred General Practice where the practice helps develop the capacity of local people to take care of their own needs. The approach was developed for three types of local projects, including:

- Practice Health Champions. Health champions worked with 30 GP practices.
- A specialist hospital-based service for people with chronic fatigue syndrome.
- Citywide initiatives, focusing on children and young people, and on early years.

What it is: An evidence-based programme that supports local people to become ‘community health champions’ – volunteers that work in partnership with local services (particularly General Practitioner practices) to support patients by promoting health and wellbeing within their communities.

What it tells us: A new, strengths-based relationship between citizen and state can unlock the capacity of citizens to actively contribute to improving outcomes (their own and their communities’) and working in partnership with services to achieve more at a time when there’s less money and growing demand.


Key outcomes: Patients reported increased confidence and wellbeing and a richer social life, while the large majority of service staff recommend the programme and want to continue. GP practices identified a wide range of health champion-led activity that led to improvements in patients’ wellbeing and resilience and a better understanding of how to use services.

As part of the programme, over 1,100 practice health champions worked together with staff from GP practices (supported by a local team and Altogether Better) to develop an initial offer outlining the support that champions could provide to patients and local people. Much of this focused on social activities that promoted health and wellbeing, for example support groups, craft clubs and ‘flu fairs’.

216 activities were identified, spanning five different categories:

- Practice support (approximately 35% of activities) - helping to make the practice better for people, including helping patients use the services and provide information.
- Providing peer support groups (approximately 25% of activities) - connecting people in the community with similar circumstances or conditions.
- Connecting and learning - exercise and outdoors (approximately 20% of activities) - developing social groups based around exercise or other outdoor activities.
- Connecting and learning - crafts and healthy food (approximately 15% of activities) - developing social groups there were based around creative activities such as knitting, cooking and eating.
- Connecting people with activities in the community (approximately 5% of activities) - signposting people to activities within the wider community.

Figure 3. The Altogether Process for Community Health Champions ⁸⁸



Source: Altogether Better (2015). A landscape version of this diagram is also available in the Appendices.

An evaluation of the programme showed it had a significant impact on the knowledge, wellbeing and social engagement of both champions and participants, as well as a range of benefits for the practices. This included:

- 87 percent of champions and 94 percent of participants reporting new knowledge and awareness related to health and wellbeing.
- 86 percent of champions and 94 percent of participants reporting increased levels of confidence and wellbeing after involvement.

⁸⁸ This case study is based on an interview with Alyson McGregor, Director of Altogether Better, and findings from Altogether Better (2015) 'Working Together to Create Healthier people and Communities: Bringing citizens and services together in new conversations. The evaluation report of the Wellbeing 2 Programme'.

- 98 percent of champions and 99 percent of participants reporting increased involvement in social activities, membership of social groups or social networks.
- 95 percent of practice staff would recommend the programme, and 95 percent of staff wished the programmes to continue. There was a greater recognition by staff of the value and resourcefulness of citizens.

Evidence from some GP practices has shown other benefits including improved morale for practice staff, the development of patient groups as an additional resource to the practice and healthcare system, the potential for a new, sustainable business model, better consultations between patients and clinicians and a range of additional support for delivering care plans. Over the long term, such approaches have the potential to transform the way services are delivered by enabling citizens and communities to take a greater role in their own wellbeing, and significantly reduce demand.

Robin Lane Medical Centre is an example of a new blueprint for services. It not only provides GP services, but also has a wellbeing centre as well as 19 groups run by over 50 volunteer champions, every week. The medical centre was able to increase its patient list by 4,500 people without an increase in demand for primary or secondary consultations; highlighting the benefits that services that truly develop the social capital of communities can provide.

“It feels like we’re a GP practice within a larger organisation, there’s the general practice primary care bit which is wrapped around with a much bigger range of things going on.”

A central learning point from the Community Health Champions programmes is that enabling citizens genuinely to shape service systems that tend habitually to be hierarchical, rigid and highly formalised is deeply challenging. Some professionals struggled with the basic concept of health champions and there were practices that imposed strict rules on citizen involvement (including one practice that documented both the role that champions would play and the sanctions that would apply should they overstep the boundaries). This alienated champions and undermined the reciprocity that is fundamental to such approaches. The top-down nature of the NHS also caused delays and created barriers – for example there were lengthy approval processes for printing promotional materials while, in some cases, champions were not permitted to have identification badges bearing their name or photograph.

The project evaluation highlighted the need to bridge two worldviews if the relationship between citizen and state is to be re-fashioned. Champions had often to balance the informal, ‘lifeworld’ of citizens (for example, informal relationships, multiple and fluid identities, and improvisation) with the ‘service’ worldview of formal systems and institutions (for example, roles, qualifications and titles; processes and structured interaction; aversion to risk, hierarchy and authority). Developing approaches that bridge these worldviews is key to designing services that are genuinely rooted in communities and shaped through a reciprocal relationship between citizen and state. This requires new types of culture, language and behavioural norms to emerge: it is not sufficient to establish an initiative as an add-on to the existing system and simply expect local people to become engaged.

CASE STUDY 6:

Zeist's Austerity Dialogues

In 2010, faced with the necessity of making €6.2m of savings to discretionary municipal services, the newly elected coalition administration in the Dutch town of Zeist deferred to the expertise of the town's residents in deciding where to make the necessary cuts. Instead of presenting a programme of cuts to citizens either as a done-deal or as a proposal for consultation, the administration invited citizens to make their own proposals for where the savings should be made. Over a three-month period, committees of 'citizen experts' put forward 229 cost-saving proposals, 217 of which were approved in a local authority White Paper securing some €7.6m in savings – exceeding the original target with more public consent than might otherwise have been achieved through a more traditional officer-led budget review. Reversing the direction of decision-making meant that citizens had more ownership over the decisions that had not been imposed upon them, with some services being reshaped or redesigned with more citizen input rather than simply vanishing altogether.

Similar to the UK, the Netherlands has a centralised fiscal regime and the incoming coalition governing Zeist was faced with steep retrenchment mandated by the Dutch central government. There had been a period of 'bad relations' between local politicians and civic society,⁹⁰ culminating in citizens occupying City Hall in protest over a housing policy dispute. New approaches were needed. In its governing programme, the coalition had committed itself to involving the expertise and efforts of citizens in finding solutions to problems that were *"too difficult to be solved by governments alone"*.⁹¹ This bold commitment was tested early on when the initial proposal was to consult on a range of 'scenarios' drawn up by local government officers. Local aldermen – representatives of the governing parties but not elected councillors – intervened, arguing that:

"Our organisational values state that we are not the ones who know best, that we want to listen to society, facilitate dialogue, connect and take risks. [...] In order to do that as an organisation and as public officers, three key values are essential: strength, trust, and proximity."

Aldermen expressed the concern that top-down proposals for austerity measures would fail to find support in communities. A new process was developed, closer to the principle that officers were *"not the ones who know best"*, with citizen engagement the guiding principle. The 'Austerity Dialogues' were launched, with citizens instead coming up with proposals for politicians to consider.

What it is: citizen councils were entrusted to develop proposals designed to help Zeist, a town of 60,000 people within the city-region of Utrecht, make significant cashable savings. These proposals were put forward to local government for consideration and, where approved, implementation.

What it tells us: Actively involving citizens in identifying solutions and decision making can be engaging – the Zeist initiative attracted 200 volunteers to serve on a citizen councils. It can also be highly productive, enabling difficult decisions to be taken where there was previously deadlock or lack of political will. Participative democracy enhances legitimacy in decision making, as well as (perhaps when used sparingly) improving the relationship between citizens, communities and government.

90 RSA interview with Austerity Dialogues project officer, August 2015.

91 Coalition programme 'Uitwerking Dichterbij' 2010:12 Available at: <http://www.govint.org/good-practice/case-studies/the-austerity-dialogue-in-zeist/objectives/>

Key Outcomes: Over a three-month period, committees of ‘citizen experts’ put forward 229 cost-saving proposals. Of these, 217 were adopted by the local authority, securing €7.6m in savings – exceeding the original target and attracting greater public consent than might otherwise have been the case with more traditional approaches.

Some 200 citizens volunteered in response to an open call online and in the local press, to take part in the Dialogues. They were divided into eight committees based on their expertise and interests (for example, Sports and Leisure or Health and Welfare). The citizen experts discussed local issues without the intervention of politicians and made cost-saving proposals based on their expertise and collective judgement. The dialogues were facilitated by non-political public officers, with the role of politicians being to introduce the Dialogues framework and overall objectives at the outset (i.e. the €6.4m cuts) and to approve or reject the proposals once these had been put forward by the citizen experts.

1. The following co-design principles were established to guide the relationship between state officers, politicians and citizens:
2. Citizens have the expertise, creativity and strength to find solutions to the current challenges.
3. The owner of a problem is also the owner of the solution.
4. Bring together all key stakeholders – do not exclude anyone.
5. First try to understand, then to be understood.⁹²

Figure 5. Zeist Austerity Dialogue Citizen Expert Committees



Source: Schepers, A. and Overmans, T. (2015)

The process lasted approximately three months and involved six dialogue meetings for each of the eight committees. 80% of the original citizen participants remained engaged for the full duration of the programme. A large majority of Citizen Expert Committee proposals were adopted, with around 200 being included in a local government white paper. 12 proposals were rejected either because their fiscal contribution was unclear or they were deemed inconsistent with the aims of the Austerity Dialogue (for example, a proposal not to cut social benefits),

92 Schepers, A. and Overmans, T. (2015) The austerity dialogue in Zeist: How the Municipality of Zeist harnesses the ideas of ‘citizen-experts’, *Governance International*. [online] Available at: <http://www.govint.org/good-practice/case-studies/the-austerity-dialogue-in-zeist/change-management/>

Proposals ranged from transactional changes (such as increasing the cost of using the municipal swimming pool and reducing collections of green waste from a weekly to a fortnightly service), to more participatory alternatives to existing services, such as citizens voluntarily establishing a cooperative to provide transport and other assistance to elderly people in one suburb, replacing an expensive and little-used public bus service.

The programme was not without difficulties: young people were particularly under-represented on the committees (a point to bear in mind if adopting this approach), and many of the expert citizens are reported to have been concerned that the process was too quick, limiting the opportunity to develop ideas fully, and causing some tension when politicians came under pressure in the latter stages and found it difficult to maintain their open and sincere attitude toward the process. Some citizen experts are reported to have become disillusioned by the translation of their ideas into the language of policy white papers - evidently the distance between citizen and state was not bridged entirely.

However, in addition to the achievement of a balanced budget, several other positive outcomes were noted by the convenors of the project. The Citizen Expert process is regarded by political leaders as *"a good example demonstrating the value of society in solving local problems"*⁹³ and has been reconvened for other local decisions, including a committee in summer 2015 that proposed new options for the use of the town's historic castle, with a school coming forward to run the site. This approach has since been replicated in other European towns, including Woudenberg in the Netherlands and Eisenkappel-Vellach in Austria.

H. Delegate budgets to users: citizens control personal budgets

Collective decision making, whether through Austerity Dialogues or other deliberative mechanisms can help to prioritise and problem solve, and can strengthen trust between communities and authorities as well as within and across communities themselves. However, the number of people directly involved is inevitably small in comparison to the total population affected by the decisions. There are more direct ways in which citizens assume more control over their lives by moving from a system where the state decides how to spend public funds in the form of service provision to one where service users are enabled to decide for themselves how those resources should be used. This principle has already been established in some areas of public service provision, and technology is opening up new possibilities.

People with disabilities have been the pathfinders. From being the group of citizens whose relationship with the state was perhaps most obviously paternalistic, people with disabilities have gone furthest in showing that a different kind of relationship is possible in which citizens have real choice and control. While disability rights campaigners may believe that more change is needed the distance travelled practically and conceptually from the beginning of the modern Keynesian Welfare State to the situation in the UK today is immense.

The National Assistance Act of 1948 required UK local government to provide accommodation to those, including people with disabilities, who were assumed to be incapable of working - an example of a progressive state giving protection to the vulnerable. In discharging its duty to protect, however, the state paid little attention to citizens' rights to autonomy and dignity. People were placed in heavily medicalised and bureaucratic institutions incapable of meeting the personal and social aspirations of their residents. Inspired by the radical politics of the 1960s, a small group of disabled people within these institutions developed a different vision.

93 Ibid.

Taking inspiration from campaigners in California who were establishing new centres run by and for disabled people, they argued that the main thing stopping them living full lives was not their disability but the very top down, medical perspective that treated them like incapacitated patients rather than independent citizens.

Closing large and expensive residential institutions was part of the answer; to be truly independent though, disabled people needed control of the money that funded the help they required to get around and look after their homes and themselves. The 1948 Act specifically made it illegal to hand state funds directly to disabled people themselves. Initially, campaigners persuaded authorities to direct money to third parties operating on behalf of disabled people. Then came the real breakthrough, when in 1996 the 1948 Act was repealed, and for the first time funds could be legally handed over to disabled people themselves to purchase support on their own behalf.

Personal budgets now extend beyond social care into the NHS in situations where adults or children require continuing health care. Over two decades of research shows how for most groups of users, personal budgets have improved people's lives in terms of independence, dignity and family and paid relationships; and people who make long term use of social care have repeatedly demonstrated that they are often better than highly trained professionals at making effective use of public resources.⁹⁴ There is no evidence to suggest that it has undermined the provision of social care on the basis of need.

Change could go much further, but critics of delegated budgets worry about fraud, marketisation, inequity, de-professionalisation and workforce fragmentation. Certainly, extending the principle into adult skills through Individual Learning Accounts (ILAs) was a failure due to a variety of factors including fraud. However, the ILA initiative shouldn't cast too long a shadow. The programme was driven through at speed, against official advice and without sufficient time being allowed to develop even a basic level of security.⁹⁵ Its problems could have been overcome or managed by better systems trialling, digital identification, proper provider accreditation (albeit with standards not set so high as to discourage new providers), digital currencies, and robust fraud prevention.

Such safeguards may not be sufficient to convince those who are concerned by the degree to which markets have already become part of public service delivery since the advent of New Public Management.⁹⁶ Yet as things stand today, most of the market choices in our hybrid public service system lie with the state – with commissioners not citizens – arguably the worst of both worlds. By shifting more power directly to citizens it may be possible to improve people's experience of support, and with it their commitment to public provision – albeit provision that might look very different. More importantly, the expansion of citizen budget holding could spark the growth of a supply-side far more diverse than we have seen so far, which citizens could access as individuals or as groups with shared interests. Critically, it would be supported by and would encourage the web-enabled, mission-driven social sector described below in our final pathway.

94 Fox, A. (2014) *People Powered NHS: A Power to Create Discussion Paper*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/people-powered-nhs/>

95 King, A. and Crewe, I. (2013) *The Blunders of our Governments*. UK: One World Publications.

96 Sandel, M. (2012) What Isn't for Sale? *The Atlantic*, April. [online] Available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/04/what-isnt-for-sale/308902/#.T3N-Wpk1fzE.twitter>

I. Person to person social justice: state as platform, citizens as designers

There are profound shifts underway in the nature of social and political power. Hierarchical, technocratic methods of achieving social outcomes are weakening, and new forms of collective power are emerging, and citizens and communities work to achieve favourable outcomes in ways that are independent of public services. The RSA calls such phenomena “*person to person social justice*”⁹⁷ and Anthony Painter, Director of Policy and Strategy explains:

*“Increasingly we see the emergence of a smart state that works with the people rather than for or on their behalf. Smart Government fulfils its statutory duties of course (e.g. around child protection and universal education to 18), it provides a series of public goods such as a taxpayer financed NHS or social security but seeks to incubate and accelerate innovative responses to complex challenges beyond that. In other words, it is different from the traditional social democratic state in that it acts as a partner in social change instead of commissioner and provider. It relates rather than dictates.”*⁹⁸

Examples of this approach include the Granby Four Streets campaign in Toxteth, Liverpool, where residents of a neglected and often vandalised area of town took the initiative to start decorating and beautifying empty houses. They made the area feel more pleasant, safer and somewhere that people would want to live. Some years later, the originators of this work have become the first non-artists to win the Turner Prize, a contemporary art award given by the Tate Gallery, as well as having improved the wellbeing and quality of life for residents.

In Brixton, London, local people came up with their own alternative plans for the Brixton Market redevelopment and, facilitated by the Council, the ‘Friends of Brixton Market’, developers and a social enterprise Space Makers Agency were able to work together. Six years later and Brixton Village, with its amazing food and atmosphere, is a thriving hub of great food, great times and community regeneration.

In West Norwood, Croydon, the local Borough Council collaborated with the social innovation group Open Works to turn a vacant shop into a platform for social action. Council staff and resources were based in the highly visible shop, giving advice, support and sharing back-office functions with citizens who wanted to start new projects and groups in the local area, such as community gardening projects and peer-support groups. These initiatives were designed and delivered by citizens, with the state providing the administrative and logistical support needed to give people the confidence and capacity to change their own communities.

This approach does not assume that change makes itself. Instead, the state knows when to stand back and allow civil society to flourish on its own, and when to galvanise existing energies, build capacity and mobilise change through a range of institutions, central and local. Central to this must be a set of clear guiding principles that inform how the state operates as a platform for social justice, but beyond this:

*“You’ll notice there’s not a traditional ten-point policy plan here. That’s the old power approach. Pull the levers and the change will happen. But it often doesn’t... It will need to be a bit more like an investment fund including providing seed capital and capacity-builder – looking to support the best while identifying realistic ways of plugging gaps.”*⁹⁹

97 Painter, A. (2015) *Person to person social justice – where new and old power combine*. RSA Blogs [blog] 23 July. Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/rsa-blogs/2015/07/persontopersonpower/>

98 Ibid.

99 Ibid.

Section 4:

New places for new relationships – opportunities and risks in localisation

Over the preceding sections we have considered new ways in which relationships between citizen and state are being framed and who the participants in these relationships are. These systems do not assume a traditional service delivery model, or necessarily rely on binary assumptions based on the traditional role of state and citizen in a provider-consumer setting but, instead, rely on sets of relationships and interactions that take place in a particular place or locality.

Assumptions behind preventative and pre-service interventions, which become increasingly attractive as public services become ever more financially stretched, point often (but not exclusively) towards the type of soft interventions that draw on a variety of place assets. These assets include the formal and informal, statutory and voluntary, material assets such as buildings and institutions where people associate with one another or receive the support services they need, and much less tangible things like community networks, social relationships, integrated and flexible services, or a civic pride in the local place. It is impossible to conceive of all of these things being activated centrally. Instead, a mixed ecology of these assets and actors needs the opportunity to thrive – and this is most likely to happen around the construct of a local place.

Cohering around a particular place, all of the people, families, services and institutions have contribution to make in achieving improved outcomes. Shared outcomes will come from a shared vision of what a good life in a good place can be. As one of our interviewees, a prominent public policy expert, put it: *“Place-based approaches are enabling the development of a more coherent and place-based, locally determined and agreed set of outcomes or goals, and a reconfiguration of public services and community action in order to achieve these goals.”*

As we have seen, a set of relationships and practices is emerging that is beginning to free public services from the confusing patchwork of administrative structures that form the managerial, centralising state. These new relationships and practices can potentially align services more closely with the needs and resources of local places, thus deepening the relationships between institutions and citizens. Children’s services cannot meet the challenges they face in isolation, and it is increasingly clear that approaches that drive integration across public services and see problems and solutions through the lens of a ‘whole system’ are likely to bear most fruit. At a policy level, there is now a common recognition that the complex social problems we face have not been met by either a centralised state nor through the private outsourcing of consumer delivery models, and the regime of performance management, regulation and inspections that underpinned them.



“Austerity has thrust devolution and integration more into public services – because less resources has meant that you can’t continue with the status quo, and that arguments that have been going on for years, such as the need to integrate services like health and social care and devolve powers to empower localities to solve local problems, are now substantively informing shifts in policy and practice. Austerity has meant that we really do need to re-design services to achieve better outcomes – it means that we need to mainstream integration, fundamentally rethink professional roles and boundaries, and skills and capabilities. This is linked to a recognition that the old paradigm of public services wasn’t able to deal with the complex issues that have been festering away for a long time.”¹⁰⁰

Initiatives such as community budgets, City Deals and the Greater Manchester Devolution deal signal a recognition that the most effective way to relieve long-term pressures on public services and achieve sustainable outcomes will be through devolving power and integrating services around people and place, encouraging a shift in public service management from exercising control to supporting community action and open governance. Looking at the ‘whole system’ and adopting a systems leadership¹⁰¹ approach has also enabled public services to understand how community-based approaches can reduce demand by supporting certain groups of people that do not meet service thresholds for intervention but nevertheless exert demands on the system—for example working age males that present with low-level mental health issues, and experience debt, crime and welfare sanctions. However, such integration of services within areas cannot merely be assumed to bring with it greater advantages at the level of lived experience. The scale and focus of these new approaches will be key.

The RSA City Growth Commission explored how latent economic potential could be untapped by devolving certain administrative and economic functions of government to a regional level, based primarily within metropolitan areas around major cities, with equivalents in large rural counties. This approach has informed government policy, most notably with its aspirations for a ‘Northern Powerhouse’ and the new sets of powers handed over to Greater Manchester and other city-regions in a series of devolution deals.

Our work at a local and community level, particularly through our Connected Communities, Heritage and People Shaped Localism strands of work¹⁰² considers how places can utilise local assets and capacity from diverse sources. We urge policy makers – central and local – to consider that these devolution deals might be more participatory in their design and implementation, rather than relying solely on the mechanism of elected Metro Mayors. There is a significant opportunity to help recast the relationship between citizen and state by reshaping what a citizen does for their places, or what the state’s role is in helping to create the conditions for a place to thrive.

100 RSA interview with prominent public policy expert and thought leader in public services.

101 Ghate, D. & Lewis, J. (2013) Systems Leadership: Exceptional Leadership for Exceptional Times. Virtual Staff College.

102 For Connected Communities, see Parsfield, M. (2016) Community Capital: The value of connected communities. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/community-capital-the-value-of-connected-communities/>; for Heritage see The Heritage Index. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/action-and-research/rsa-projects/public-services-and-communities-folder/heritage-and-place/>; for People Shaped Localism see Buddery, P. (2016) *People Shaped Localism*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/people-shaped-localism/>

Conclusion

This report has highlighted several examples of how, in the UK and abroad, innovations in central and local government policymaking are allowing the early signs of a new relationship between citizen and state to emerge. At the heart of many of these new innovations is a more participatory, co-productive means of the state engaging with citizens to help identify and solve problems, creating a sense of shared endeavour in meeting the challenges of our times; the transition from New Public Management to New Public Governance has already begun. This is not to say that the merit of technocratic wisdom has been overlooked when it is appropriate. Nor does the state turn its back on the delivery of basic infrastructure of effective, efficient governance. However, it is clear that – as the state becomes more complex and diffuse, with new tiers of government in creation (e.g. city-regions) or under challenge (e.g. small local authorities) – a range of more subtle, sophisticated forms of engagement with citizens will need to emerge as central to a new relationship between citizen and state.

Despite attempts to mainstream some of the ideas of co-production and asset-based models within the public policy discourse, it has not, for most people, reshaped their experience or conception of citizenship and the state. Why? One key reason is that a centralising state cannot deliver or permit NPG. It cannot accommodate the relationship building and creative autonomy on which it relies. Devolution in England could be game changing, but only part of the puzzle. As the UK's central government is reducing the size of the state, it is for local government, institutions and organisations to re-fashion how the state functions for and with citizens and communities.

The case studies in this report, such as England's Every Child Matters, Local Coordinators or Zeist's Austerity Dialogues, suggest just some of the ways we might move to a model of new public values and practices. Instead of a single roadmap to a discrete destination they present a series of pathways to, or building blocks for, New Public Governance. These building blocks will include strategies or interventions that leave significant power with the state and its services, as well as strategies that see the state's role largely as a platform to enable citizens, individually or collectively, to forge solutions. Which building blocks local areas chose to use, at what speed, and in what order, will depend on their local vision, resources and priorities. As for the central state, it is unclear how far it will be willing to step back in terms of policy, regulation and inspection or indeed how far it should. National polling consistently reveals the public's attachment to consistent public service standards and if these are chimeras rather than rights, this needs to be publicly debated and politically owned.

Approaches to New Public Governance need to be defined iteratively, in conjunction with citizens. As Matthew Taylor, chief executive of the RSA, warned in his inaugural annual lecture (2007):

“Despite the ubiquity of a cluster of ideas which can be connected to the notion of pro-social strategy it is hard to define exactly what the boundaries of the idea are: is it simply a set of good practices around user engagement and participative decision making or is it a more profound recasting of the citizen-state relationship? If it is the latter what does this mean for the basic tenets of how we think about and practice politics and policymaking? In calling for a pro-social strategy I argue that we need to explore and combine a range of different insights and practices to accomplish a fundamental shift in the way we view ourselves and our society.”

Without this dialogue between citizen and the state, future innovations will continue to offer only a glimpse of change at the margins. In almost every area of social policy, from the National Health Service to prisons, we witness public service providers, professionals, politicians and citizens caught by the challenges and tensions of systemic transformation; change itself becomes the enemy. Courage and conviction is needed to find a route through, but – on the basis of the evidence here – it seems clear that, for the most part, change will be messy, emergent and contingent, rather than strategically scripted from above. To many schooled in New Public Management theory and practice, it might be tempting to manage the uncertainty of protracted austerity, devolution or the challenges of social change through traditional top-down means. Profound change will instead require agility and creativity by public service leaders and their partners. Adherents to New Public Governance will have to ride out that uncertainty and messiness, confident that, by blending participatory approaches, they will be able to create effective, efficient and impactful public value. One sign of success for pro-social policies like devolution and co-production will be the blurring of boundaries between state and civic action.

Just as the transformation of our national infrastructure in the 19th century required the spread of new institutions – from joint stock companies to local authorities. Similarly, the emergence of the universal welfare state in the 20th century required the institutional capacity of the modern nation state. Now we need the emergence of a new democratic and social infrastructure, which enables citizens to be the architects and builders of the future we want.



Bibliography

- Action for Children, National Children's Bureau and The Children's Society (2016) *Losing in the long run*. [online] Available at: https://www.actionforchildren.org.uk/media/5826/losing_in_the_long_run.pdf
- ADDAS (2015) *Budget Survey 2015*. London: Association of Directors of Adult Services. [online] Available at: http://www.adass.org.uk/uploadedFiles/adass_content/policy_networks/resources/Key_documents/ADASS%20Budget%20Survey%202015%20Report%20FINAL.pdf
- Ansell, C. and Gash, A. (2007) Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research*, 18. pp.543-571.
- Appleby, J. (2013) *Spending on health and social care over the next 50 years: why think long-term?* London: King's Fund.
- Aspden, J. and Birch, D. (2005) *New localism - citizen engagement, neighbourhoods and public services: evidence from local government*. London: Local and Regional Government Research Unit, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Bailey, N. et al (2015) Symposium Introduction: Local Responses to 'Austerity'. *Local Government Studies*, 41(4). pp.571-581.
- Bakker, J. et al (2012) Citizens' Initiatives: How Local Governments Fill their Facilitative Role. *Local Government Studies*, 38(4). pp.395-414.
- Balaram, B. (2016) Fair Share: *Reclaiming power in the sharing economy*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/fair-share-reclaiming-power-in-the-sharing-economy/>.
- Baumann, C. (2014) Citizen Participation in Child Welfare: Challenges and Benefits. *Public Administration Review*, 74(5). pp. 585-586.
- Benker, Y. (2006) *The Wealth of Networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bifulco, L. (2013) Citizen participation, agency and voice. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 16(2). pp.174-187.
- Blakeley, G. (2010) Governing Ourselves: Citizen Participation and Governance in Barcelona and Manchester. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(1). pp.130-145.
- Boyle, D. and Harris, M. (2009) *The challenge of co-production*. London: Nesta, with the Innovation Lab
- Broad, R. (2015) *Local Area Coordination: From Service Users to Citizens*. The Centre for Welfare Reform. p. 40. [online] Available at: <http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/uploads/attachment/340/local-area-coordination.pdf>
- Bryan, V. et al (2010) Key features of effective citizen-state child welfare partnerships: Findings from a national study of citizen review panels. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(4). pp.595-603.
- Bryson, J.M., Crosby, Barbara C. and Bloomberg, L. (2014) Public Value Governance: Moving Beyond Traditional Public Administration and the New Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4). pp.445-456.
- Buddery, P. (2016) *People Shaped Localism*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/people-shaped-localism/>
- Cameron, D. (2005) 'Conservative Party Leadership Victory Speech', transcript, *BBC News*, 6 December [online] Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4504722.stm
- Christie, C. (2011) *Commission on the future delivery of public service*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Coalition programme (2010) *Uitwerking Dichterbij*. [online] Available at: <http://www.govint.org/good-practice/case-studies/the-austerity-dialogue-in-zeist/objectives/>
- Coleman, S. and Firmstone, J. (2014) Contested meanings of public engagement: exploring discourse and practice within a British city council. *Media Culture & Society*, 36(6). pp.826-844.
- Collaborate (2014) *The Collaborative Citizen*. [online] Available at: <http://collaboratei.com/wp-content/uploads/The-Collaborative-Citizen-Report-2nd-Edition4.pdf>
- Commission on 2020 Public Services (2010) *From social security to social productivity: a vision for 2020 public services*. London: 2020 Public Services Trust at the RSA.
- Cook, G. and Muir, R. (2012) *The relational state: how recognizing the importance of human relationships could revolutionise the role of the state*. London: IPPR.

- Cottam, H. (2010) *Beveridge 4.0*. London: Participle. [online] Available at: <http://www.hilarycottam.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/Beveridge-4.pdf>
- Cottam H. (2011) *Relational welfare*. London: Participle.
- Craig, G. (2007) Community capacity-building: Something old, something new... ? *Critical Social Policy*, 27(3). pp.335-359.
- Creasy, S. ed. (2007) *Participation nation: reconnecting citizens to the public realm*. London: Involve.
- Dates, M., Mallender, J., Pritchard, C. and Rtveladze, K. (2015) *Community Engagement – approaches to improve health and reduce health inequalities: Review of Social Return on Investment (SROI) evaluations*. Optimity Advisors for the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. [online] Available at: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/NG44/documents/health-economic-analysis-4>
- Dellot, B. (2015) *Boosting the living standards of the self-employed*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/boosting-the-living-standards-of-the-self-employed/>
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007) *The Children's Plan: Building brighter futures*. London: The Stationery Office. p.13.
- Devaney, J. (2009) Child abuse as a complex and wicked problem: Reflecting on policy developments in the United Kingdom in working with children and families with multiple problem. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(6). pp.635–641.
- Diamond, P. ed. (2007) *Public matters: the renewal of the public realm*. London: Politicos.
- Duffy, B. (2015) *Coming to terms with austerity?* London: Ipsos Mori. [online] Available at: <https://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/3644/Coming-to-terms-with-austerity.aspx>
- Duffy, B. (2013) Generation Strains, *Demos* [blog] 9 September. Available at: <http://www.demos.co.uk/project/generation-strains/>
- Duffy, B. (2015) *What the public think of public services and volunteering*. Nesta UK, Slideshare (Slide 7). [online] Available at: http://www.slideshare.net/NESTA_UK/bobby-duffy
- Duffy, B., Vince, J. and Page, L. (2008) *Searching for the impact of empowerment*. London: Ipsos Mori Social Research Institute
- Elling, R. et al (2014) What Should We Do? Public Attitudes about How Local Government Officials Should Confront Fiscal Stress. *Local Government Studies*, 40(3). pp.380-402.
- Ellison, N. and Hardey, M. (2014) Social Media and Local Government: Citizenship, Consumption and Democracy. *Local Government Studies*, 40(1). pp.21-40.
- Esping-Anderson, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Oxford: Policy Press. Cited in Diamond, P. and Lodge, G. (2013) *European Welfare States after the Crisis: Changing public attitudes*. Policy network paper. London: Policy Network.
- Evans, M., Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (2013) Understanding localism INTRODUCTION. *Policy Studies*, 34(4). pp.401-407.
- Firmstone, J. and Coleman, S. (2015) Public engagement in local government: the voice and influence of citizens in online communicative spaces. *Information Communication & Society*, 18(6). pp.680-695.
- Foresight Future Identities (2013) *Final Project Report*. London: The Government Office for Science. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/273966/13-523-future-identities-changing-identities-report.pdf
- Fox, A. (2014) *People Powered NHS: A Power to Create Discussion Paper*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/people-powered-nhs/>
- Fung, A. (2015) Putting the public back into governance: the challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4). pp.513-522.
- Fung, A. and Wright, E.O. (2001) Deepening democracy: innovations in empowered participatory governance. *Politics and Society*, 29(1). pp.5-41.
- Geurtz, C. and Van de Wijdeven, T. (2010) Making Citizen Participation Work: The Challenging Search for New Forms of Local Democracy in The Netherlands. *Local Government Studies*, 36(4). pp.531-549.
- Griffiths, S. et al (2009) *Assertive Citizens: New Relationships in the Public Services*. London: Social Market Foundation.
- Griggs, S. and Roberts, M. (2012) From Neighbourhood Governance to Neighbourhood Management: A 'Roll-Out' Neo-Liberal Design for Devolved Governance in the United Kingdom? *Local Government Studies*, 38(2). pp.183-210.

-
- Hall, S. et al. eds. (2013) *After Neoliberalism? The Kilburn Manifesto*. London: Soundings.
- Halpern, D. (2010) *The hidden wealth of nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hansard Society (2015) *Audit of Political Engagement 12: The 2015 Report*. London: Hansard Society. [online] Available at: <http://www.auditofpoliticalengagement.org/media/reports/Audit-of-Political-Engagement-12-2015.pdf>
- Forbes Insight (2015) 2015 *BNP Paribas Individual Philanthropy Index*. London: BNP Paribas Wealth Management. [online] Available at: <https://wealthmanagement.bnpparibas/content/dam/bnpparibas/pdfs/BNP%20Paribas%20Forbes%20Philanthropy%20Index%202015%20-%207%204%202015.pdf>
- Foresight (2007) *Tackling Obesities: Future Choices – Project Report 2nd Edition*. London: Government Office of Science. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287937/07-1184x-tackling-obesities-future-choices-report.pdf
- Hastings, A. et al (2015) Coping with the Cuts? The Management of the Worst Financial Settlement in Living Memory. *Local Government Studies*, 41(4). pp.601-621.
- Home Office (2011) *Vetting & Barring Scheme Remodelling Review –Report and Recommendations*. London: The Stationary Office. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97748/vbs-report.pdf
- House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts (2016) *Overseeing financial sustainability in the further education sector: Thirteenth Report of Session 2015-16*.
- House of Lords (2013) *Ready for Ageing?*, Select Committee on Public Service and Demographic Change. London: The Stationary Office. [online] Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/public-services-committee/report-ready-for-ageing/is-government-ready-for-ageing/>
- Hsu E. L. and Elliot, A. (2014) Social Acceleration Theory and the Self. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 45(4). pp.397-418.
- Inglehart, R. (2012) *33 years of cultural change: what's next?* Montreal: Secretariat of International Political Science Association. [online] Available at: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>
- Institute for Public Policy Research and PricewaterhouseCoopers (2010) *Capable communities: Public sector reform, the next chapter*. London: IPPR.
- Institute for Public Policy Research and PricewaterhouseCoopers (2009) *Towards a smarter state*. London: IPPR.
- Jackson, A. (2015). *Mark Zuckerberg's \$100 million donation to Newark public schools failed miserably – here's where it went wrong*. Tech Insider, Business Insider. [online] Available at: <http://www.techinsider.io/mark-zuckerbergs-failed-100-million-donation-to-newark-public-schools-2015-9>
- Jochum et al (2005) *Civil renewal and active citizenship: a guide to the debate*. London: NCVO.
- John, P. (2014). The Great Survivor: The Persistence and Resilience of English Local Government. *Local Government Studies*, 40(5). pp.687-704.
- Joseph Roundtree Foundation (2015) *The cost of the cuts: The impact on local government and poorer communities*. York: Joseph Roundtree Foundation. [online] Available at: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/cost-cuts-impact-local-government-and-poorer-communities>
- Kania, J. and Kramer, M. (2013) Emergence: How Collective Impact Addresses Complexity. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. [online] Available at: www.ssiir.org
- King, A. and Crewe, I. (2013) *The Blunders of our Governments*. UK: One World Publications.
- Kippin, H. et al (2012) *Business, Society and Public Services: a social productivity framework*. London: RSA [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/business-society-and-public-services/>
- Knapp, M. et al (2013) Building community capital in social care: is there an economic case? *Community Development Journal*, 48(2). pp.313-331.
- Kruger, D. (2007) *On Fraternity*. London: Civitas.
- Lambeth Early Action Partnership (2016) *About Parent Champions*. [online] Available at: <http://www.leaplambeth.org.uk/parent-champions/about-parent-champions/>
- Lawson, A. (2014) *A Speeding Up of the Rate of Social Change? Power, Technology, Resistance, Globalisation and the Good Society*. In Archer M.S. (ed.) *Late Modernity: Trajectories towards Morphogenic Society*. Bern: Springer International Publishing.
- Lawton, A. and Macaulay, M. (2014). Localism in Practice: Investigating Citizen Participation and Good Governance in Local Government Standards of Conduct. *Public Administration Review*, 74(1). pp.75-83.

- Leadbeater, C. and Cottam H. (2007) *The User Generated State: Public Services 2.0*. London: 2020 Public Services at the RSA. [online] Available at: <http://charlesleadbeater.net/wp-content/uploads/2007/03/PSRG3.pdf>
- Leggett, W. (2014) The politics of behaviour change: nudge, neoliberalism and the state. *Policy and Politics*, 42(1). pp.3-19.
- Local Government Association (2014) *Adult Social Care Efficiency Programme: Final Report*. London: LGA.
- Macmillan, R. (2010) *The third sector delivering public services: an evidence review*. Birmingham: The Third Sector Research Centre. [online] Available at: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tsrc/documents/tsrc/working-papers/working-paper-20.pdf>
- Malik, S. and Barr, C. (2016) UK faces permanent generational divide. *The Guardian*, 11 March. [online] Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/11/uk-faces-permanent-generational-divide-social-mobility-tsar-warns>
- Marcus, G. (2014) I don't want to co-produce my own heart surgery! *RSA Blogs* [blog] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/rsa-blogs/2014/06/i-dont-want-to-co-produce-my-own-heart-surgery>
- Moon, S. J. (2015) Commentary: Citizen Empowerment: New Hope for Democratic Local Governance. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4). pp.584-584.
- Mowbray, M. (2011) What became of *The Local State*? Neo-liberalism, community development and local government. *Community Development Journal*, 46(suppl 1). pp.i132-i153.
- NatCen (2015) *British Social Attitude Survey*. London: NatCen Social Research. [online] Available at: http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/media/38977/bsa32_welfare.pdf
- National Audit Office (2015) *Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General: Sustainability and financial performance of acute hospital trusts*. London: NAO Communications.
- Needham, C. (2010) Debate: Personalized public services: a new state/citizen contract? *Public Money & Management*, 30(3). pp.136-138.
- Neshkova, M. I. (2014) Does Agency Autonomy Foster Public Participation? *Public Administration Review*, 74(1). pp.64-74.
- Ney, S. and Verweij, M. (2014) Exploring the Contributions of Cultural Theory for Improving Public Deliberation about Complex Policy Problems. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(4). pp.620-643.
- OECD (2014) *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. [online] Available at: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2014_eag-2014-en
- Oliver, A. (2013) From Nudging to Budging: Using Behavioural Economics to Inform Public Sector Policy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 42(4). pp.685-700.
- Painter, A. (2015) Person-to-person social justice - where new and old power combine. *RSA Blogs* [blog] 23 July, Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/rsa-blogs/2015/07/persontopersonpower/>
- Painter, C. (2011) State, markets and society-Big Society joins the fray. *Public Money & Management*, 31(1). pp.71-74.
- Parker, S. and Gallagher, N. (2007) *The collaborative state: how working together can transform public services*. London: Demos.
- Parrado, S. et al (2013) Correlates of Co-production: Evidence From a Five-Nation Survey of Citizens. *International Public Management Journal*, 16(1). pp.85-112.
- Parsfield, M. (2016) *Community Capital: The value of connected communities*. London: RSA. [online] Available at: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/community-capital-the-value-of-connected-communities/>
- Pestoff, V. (2006) Citizens and co-production of welfare services - Childcare in Eight European countries. *Public Management Review*, 8(4). pp.503-519.
- Pestoff, V. (2014) Collective Action and the Sustainability of Co-Production. *Public Management Review*, 16(3). pp.383-401.
- PwC (2015) *Delivering the Decentralisation Dividend*. London: PwC.
- Olk, T. (2009) Children in the "Social Investment State". In: WELLCHI Network Conference 2, *Well-being of children and labour markets in Europe. Different kinds of risk resulting from various structures and changes in the labour markets*. Centre for Globalisation and Governance, University of Hamburg, 31 March - 1 April. p.4
- Reeder, N. (2014) New development: UK government ambitions for a preventative agenda-fact or 'Futurewash'? *Public Money & Management*, 34(1). pp.71-74.
- Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2). pp.155-169.

- Roberge, I. (2014) New development: Canada's cutback management. *Public Money & Management*, 34(2). pp.131-134.
- Robinson, M., (2015) *From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service: Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries*. Singapore: UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence.
- Sandel, M. (2012). What Isn't for Sale? *The Atlantic*, April. [online] Available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/04/what-isnt-for-sale/308902/#.T3N-Wpk1fzE.twitter>
- Sarrami-Foroushani, P. et al (2014) Key concepts in consumer and community engagement: a scoping meta-review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 14(1), e.
- Schepers, A. and Overmans, T. (2015) *The austerity dialogue in Zeist: How the Municipality of Zeist harnesses the ideas of 'citizen-experts'*, Governance International. [online] Available at: <http://www.govint.org/good-practice/case-studies/the-austerity-dialogue-in-zeist/change-management/>
- Scourfield, P. (2007) Social care and the modern citizen: Client, consumer, service user, manager and entrepreneur. *British Journal of Social Work*, 37(1). pp.107-122.
- Social Mobility and Child Poverty Commission (2015) *State of the Nation 2015. Social Mobility and Child*. London: Poverty Commission. [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/485928/State_of_the_nation_2015__foreword_and_summary.pdf
- Stoker, G. (2011) Was Local Governance Such A Good Idea? A Global Comparative Perspective. *Public Administration*, 89(1). pp. 15-31.
- Sullivan, E. M. et al (2011) You are taking who?! To a national conference on social policy? A place for youth in the social policy life of their communities. *Community Development Journal*, 46(4). pp.511-525.
- Talo, C., Mannarini, T. and Rochira, A. (2014) Sense of Community and Community Participation: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Social Indicators Research*, 117(1). pp.1-28.
- Taylor-Gooby, T. (2012) Root and Branch Restructuring to Achieve Major Cuts: The Social Policy Programme of the 2010 UK Coalition Governments. *Social Policy & Administration*, 46(1). pp.61-82.
- Thaler, R. and Sunstein, C. (2008). *Nudge*. Penguin Books.
- The Centre for Popular Democracy, Frankl, E. eds. Dunn, K., Kingston Roche, M., Serrette, K., Stahly-Butts, M. and Razza, C. (2016) *Community Schools: Transforming Struggling Schools into Thriving Schools*. The Center for Popular Democracy, Coalition for Community Schools and Southern Education Foundation. [online] Available at: http://populardemocracy.org/sites/default/files/Community-Schools-Layout_e.pdf
- Toft (2011) *This is the dawning of an age of austerity*. [online] Available at: <https://flipchartfairytails.wordpress.com/2011/07/14/this-is-the-dawning-of-the-age-of-austerity>
- Torring, J. and Triantafillou, P. (2013) What's in a name? Grasping New Public Governance as a Political-Administrative System.. *7th ECPR General Conference*. Sciences Po Bordeaux, 4-7 September.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2015). *Public Education Finances: 2013*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. [online] Available at: <http://www2.census.gov/govs/school/13f33pub.pdf>
- Wallace, J. (2013) *The rise of the enabling state*. Dunfermline: Carnegie.
- Warner, M. E. (2010). The Future of Local Government: Twenty-First-Century Challenges. *Public Administration Review*, 70 (Issue Supplement s1). pp.s145-s147.
- Watson, D. et al (2014). The role of 'embeddedness' in the delivery of integrated children's services. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 47(3). pp.370-377.
- Wilding, N. (2011) *Exploring community resilience in times of rapid change*. Dunfermline: Carnegie.
- Wilson, L. (2010) Subversive Citizens: Power, Agency and Resistance in Public Services. *Local Government Studies*, 36(6). pp.869-871.
- Wright, A. (2014) *Disrupting the prevailing discourse: a 'fresh effort of thought'*. Nottingham: The Virtual Staff College. [online] Available at: <http://www.virtualstaffcollege.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Disrupting-the-discourse-web-version-.pdf>
- Won-soon, P. (2014) In Seoul, the Citizens Are the Mayor. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4). pp.442-443.
- Woolum, J. (2011) Citizen Involvement in Performance Measurement and Reporting a Comparative Case Study from Local Government. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 35(1). pp.79-102.
- Yang, K. F. (2005) Public administrators' trust in citizens: A missing link in citizen involvement efforts. *Public Administration Review*, 65(3). pp.273-285.

Appendices

Methodology

This was a mixed methods research project designed to combine recent research and thought leadership with learning from practice in the public sector, and also in the voluntary, community and social (VCS) sector.

A rapid literature review was conducted of English language academic and grey literature over the last decade using combinations of the following search terms: active citizenship, behaviour change, social contract, demand management, relational value, citizen empowerment, community development, community capacity building, asset-based approaches, co-production, co-design, co-creation, citizen participation.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 25 people, drawn from children's services (mainly directors of service), the voluntary, community and social (VCS) sector, other public sector, academia, think tanks, the private sector and technology companies. We then conducted a thematic analysis of the transcripts. Emerging findings were explored at a workshop and two roundtable events. Participants were drawn from the statutory and VCS sectors.

The project was overseen by a research advisory group that included children's service leaders, as well as researchers and a personal health data expert.

Research Advisory Group

- **Alan Wood**, Director of Children's Services, London Borough of Hackney
- **Clem Henricson**, Fellow and Chair of the RSA's South East Region, and Honorary Senior Fellow at the University of East Anglia
- **Dez Holmes**, Director, Research in Practice
- **Mark Carriline**, Executive Director of Children's Services, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
- **Nigel Richardson**, Director of Children's Services, Leeds City Council
- **Dr Paul Hodgkin**, Founder, Patient Opinion and RSA Fellow
- **Rose Collinson**, VSC Associate (Durban)

Table 1 – Comparisons between the key features of 'traditional public administration', 'new public management' and 'new public governance'


DIMENSION	Traditional Public Administration	New Public Management	Emerging Approach to New Public Governance
Broad environmental and intellectual context			
Material and ideological conditions	Industrialisation, urbanisation, rise of modern corporation, specialisation, faith in science, belief in progress, concern over major market failures, experience with the Great Depression and World War II, high trust in government.	Concern with government failures, distrust of big government, belief in the efficacy and efficiency of markets and rationality, and devolution.	Concern with market government, not for profit and CMC failures; concern with so-called wicked problems; deepening inequality; hollowed or thinned state; networked and collaborative governance; advanced information and communication technologies.
Primary theoretical and epistemological foundations	Political theory, scientific management, naive social science, pragmatism.	Economic theory, sophisticated positivist social science.	Democratic theory, public and social sector management theory, diverse approaches to knowing and behaviour.
Prevailing view of rationality and model of human behaviour	Synoptic rationality, "administrative man".	Technical and economic rationality, "economic man", self-interested decision makers.	Formal rationality, multiple tests of rationality (political, administrative, economic, legal, ethical), belief in public spiritedness beyond narrow self-interest, "reasonable person" open to influence through dialogue and deliberation.
The public sphere or realm			
Definition of the common good, public value, the public interest	Determined by elected officials or technical experts.	Determined by elected officials or by aggregating individual preferences supported by evidence of consumer choice.	What is public is seen as going far beyond government, although government has a special role as a guarantor of public values; common good determined by inclusive dialogue and deliberation informed by evidence and democratic values.
Role of politics	Elected leaders who determine policy objectives.	Elected leaders who determine policy objectives; empowered managers; administrative politics around the use of specific tools.	Public work, "including determining policy objectives via dialogue and deliberation"; democracy as "a way of life".
Role of citizenship	Voter, client, constituent.	Customer.	Citizens seen as problem-solvers and co-creators actively engaged in creating what is valued by, and is good for, the public.
Government and Public Administration			
Role of government agencies/services	Rowing – seen as designing and implementing policies and programmes in response to politically defined objectives.	Steering – seen as determining objectives and catalysing service delivery through tool choice and reliance if possible on markets, businesses and social sector organisations.	Government acts as convener, catalyst, collaborator; sometimes steering, sometimes rowing, sometimes partnering, sometimes staying out of the way.
Key objectives	Politically provided goals; implementation managed by public servants; monitoring done through the oversight of bureaucratic and elected officials.	Politically provided goals; managers manage inputs and outputs in a way that ensures economy and responsiveness to consumers.	Create public value in such a way that what the public most cares about is addressed effectively and what is good for the public is put in place.
Key values	Efficiency.	Efficiency and effectiveness.	Efficiency, effectiveness, and democratic values.
Mechanisms for achieving policy objectives	Administer programmes through centralised, hierarchically organised public agencies or self-regulating professions.	Create mechanisms and incentive structures to achieve policy objectives especially through use of markets and quasi-markets.	Selection from a menu of alternative delivery mechanisms based on pragmatic criteria; this often means helping build cross-sector collaborations and engaging citizens to achieve agreed objectives.
Role of public manager	Ensures that rules and appropriate procedures are followed; responsive to elected officials, constituents, and clients; limited discretion allowed for administrative officials.	Helps define and meet agreed upon performance objectives; responsive to elected officials and customers; wide discretion allowed.	Plays an active role in helping create and guide networks of deliberation and delivery and helps maintain and enhance the overall effectiveness, accountability, and capacity of the system; responsive to elected officials, citizens, and an array of other stakeholders; discretion is needed but is constrained by law and democratic values.
Approach to accountability	Hierarchical, in which administrators are accountable to democratically elected officials.	Market driven, in which aggregated self-interests result in outcomes desired by broad groups of citizens seen as customers.	Multifaceted, as public servants must attend to law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizens' interests.

Table 1 a – From Public Administration via New Public Management to New Public Governance (Shortened version for presentations).

	Public Administration	New Public Management	New Public Governance
Common Good or Public Value	Determined by elected officials or technical experts	Determined by elected officials or aggregated individual preferences	Determined by inclusive dialogue & deliberation. Informed by evidence and democratic values
Key Objectives	Politically provided goals. Managers. Implementation by public servants	Politically provided goals. Managers ensure economy and responsiveness to consumers	Create public value to address what the public cares most about
Role of Politics	Elected leaders determine policy objectives	Elected leaders determine policy objectives. Empowered managers	Public work – policy objectives via dialogue and deliberation democracy
Role of Citizens	Voter, client, constituent	Customer	Problem-solvers and co-creators
Role of Government	Rowing – designing/planning policies & programmes to deliver political objectives	Steering – determining objectives and catalysing service delivery	Convenor, catalyst, collaborator – steering, rowing, partnering, keeping out of the way
Role of Public Manager	Ensures that rules & procedures are followed – limited discretion	Helps define and meet agreed performance objectives – wide discretion	Active role in helping to create and guide networks & delivery – responsive to an array of other stakeholders, constrained by law & democratic values

Based on Bryson et al (2014)

Figure 3. The Altogether Process for Community Health Champions



Source: Altogether Better (2015)



ISBN: 978-1-5262-0419-6

© 2016 The Staff College

Sir Colin Campbell Building,
Triumph Road,
Nottingham, NG7 2TU

www.thestaffcollege.uk