What examples of co-production exist already?

Here are a few examples that we have started to collect so far – we have summarised them to make them easier to read:

Example 1 - User Voice charity www.uservoice.org

User Voice is a charity run by ex-criminal justice system services users - it was founded in 2009 by Mark Johnson, an ex-offender and former drug abuser. User Voice believes strongly that only offenders can change their behaviour. As a group of ex-service users they work to influence public bodies such as the courts, the police, and youth offending teams. They recruit new members from prisons for example. User Voice builds the structures that enable productive collaboration between service users and service providers. They try to change the perceptions of those in power. They provide User Voice Councils for example as a platform for service users to have a voice. They have been developed for use within prisons and in the community for probation, youth offending teams and other related services. Their democratic processes enable voices to be heard and focus on collective challenges and solutions. They work across the country in places such as Kent, Sussex and Manchester and have published many of their consultations and co-production processes online **http://www.uservoice.org/about-us/our-services/consultations/**

**Example 2 – Newham ESOL Exchange
www.astonmansfield.org.uk/newhamesolexchange**

Newham ESOL Exchange is a network of people from the voluntary and statutory sectors who have contact with ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) learners. Running since 2007 they meet every two months to share news and discuss issues important to ESOL provision. In the past year they have looked at:
- How the refugee and migrant system works in the UK
- Learning how to learn, focusing on non-literate learners
- Developing online resources for ESOL tutors and learners
- The refugee crisis – working together to provide supportive pathways

Network members have created tools to help improve ESOL learning pathways e.g. Genesis Housing wanted to run ESOL classes and were helped by the network members to develop classes which were relevant and well attended. Also during Refugee Week, network members gave advice to frontline reception staff about how to work with clients with poor English language skills. Co-production has

created opportunities for the group's members and has helped to break down barriers.

Example 3 – Connect Hackney www.connecthackney.org.uk

Connect Hackney is a project led by older people, for older people. The project which, is based at Hackney CVS and funded over the next 5 years by The Big Lottery Fund, provides projects and activities for local people over 50 to meet people, socialise and have fun. Hundreds of Hackney's older residents voted on which projects to fund with the first tranche of Big Lottery Fund money. Now many projects are up and running (more than £1m has now been commissioned), offering older people a chance to meet new people, socialise, have a chat and try out everything from "mindfulness" meditation and massage to hen-keeping or digital media training. Instead of deciding internally as an organisation how the money from the Big Lottery Fund should be spent, Hackney CVS set up lots of ways that local older people could vote for the projects they wanted to see developed. Hackney CVS has now created a Connect Hackney co-production statement.

Example 4 - Islington Personal Budgets Network Community Interest Company (IPBN) www.ipbn.co.uk

The IPBN was established to ensure that people who get services are treated as equals by the people who provide services and to help people understand and make the most of the services they receive. The IPBN began as a steering committee coming together to discuss difficulties with the services they were getting. Through peer support members supported each other with their issues. The group worked with the local council to help raise awareness of common difficulties. A Chair of the committee was elected and co-production began. At the June 2013 IPBN network meeting, Islington Council Adult Social Care introduced Making it Real. Making it Real is a framework about transforming adult social care. It sets out what people who use services expect to see and experience if support services are truly personalised. From the beginning Making it Real Islington was co-produced. The co-chairs, Sandy Marks, Chair of the IPBN and Simon Galczynski, Director of Adult Social Care in Islington worked together as equals. The six themes within the framework were explored and developed working with local organisations and Experts by Experience. Experts by Experience are people who have lived experience and use or have used health or social care services. The Making it Real Islington Programme ended in March 2016. The final evaluation of the programme is here https://www.islington.gov.uk/social%20care%20health/Making%20it%20Real

hackneyCVS

The IPBN became a Community Interest Company (CIC) to continue the legacy and learning of the Making it Real programme. Funded by Islington Council the IPBN CIC are developing a Centre for Inclusive Living (CIL) in the borough.

Example 5 - Empowering Parents in Kensington & Chelsea through the Parents Reference Group www.kcsc.org.uk

Back in 2014 the Council announced, following a survey that took place in the summer of 2014 with parents, that they were going to tender out the council's after school play service. This caused enormous upset with parents claiming that a survey which took place in the summer holiday when many families are away was unfair and not representative. The situation became worse as parents learnt that play workers from within the council could potentially lose their jobs as many of them were held in such high esteem by parents. The council approached Kensington and Chelsea Social Council (KCSC) to see if we could act as a bridge between the parents and the council by setting up and running a Parent Reference Group. The Parent Reference Group now helps local parents to influence of how services are commissioned locally, with some parents involved in evaluating which providers are chosen to deliver services.