

Gibson, M., van Lier, F-A. and Carter, E. (2023). Tracing 25 years of “initiativitis” in central government attempts to join up local public services in England. *Policy & Politics*.

## Annex I - Coding Framework

### Central Levers

<b>Funding and fiscal powers</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	The use of money as a direct instrument to expand the funding directly available for specific cross-cutting issues or to allocate funding to support a specific (more collaborative) way of working - bolster local capacity (e.g. allocating funding on a pooled basis). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New money directly to local level from central government</li> <li>2. Financial acrobatics - pooling budgets locally (Better Care Fund)</li> </ol>
<b>Criteria for classification</b>	Is the initiative <b>not</b> classified as law and regulation? Is there a specific, defined pot of money assigned to the initiative? Is there a restructuring of existing funding at the central or local level?
<b>Example</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Life Chances Fund; New Deal for Communities</li> <li>2. Community budgets</li> </ol>
<b>Law and regulation</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	The use of legal means to create or change the roles, responsibilities and governance of key organisations and allow or sanction particular types of activity (e.g., new statutory duties on local government to work in partnership with the community to develop strategies and address local problems).
<b>Criteria for classification</b>	Is the initiative created by/drawn from an Act of Parliament? Is the initiative mandated by statute? (For example, Crime and Disorder Reduction partnerships are statutory bodies created by the Crime and Disorder Act) Is the initiative a regulatory body or framework?
<b>Example</b>	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships
<b>“Administration” (Non-legal and non-fiscal measures)</b>	
<b>Definition</b>	Beyond legislative and financial powers, central government has at its disposal a range of administrative tools with which to influence local practice. These include ‘hard’ measures through existing executive powers, such as creating new central government bodies and restructuring departmental responsibilities or instituting cross-cutting performance targets. They also include softer, persuasive tools: providing information, setting standards, and using communication, non-financial incentives or

	behavioural science techniques to influence the actions of organisations and change their behaviour.
<b>Criteria for classification</b>	Exclusionary – is the initiative neither classified as law and regulation, nor funding and fiscal powers?
<b>Example</b>	Local Strategic Partnerships

### *Allocation Process*

<b>Allocation process</b>	<b>Description</b>
Competitive	The initiative was allocated according to pre-determined criteria against which bids were scored, with the highest-scoring applications receiving support.
Needs-based	The initiative was allocated according to criteria reflecting the need of the area. This need might be based on demand in a particular policy field, such as homelessness or unemployment, or on a broader measure such as indices of multiple deprivation.
Negotiated	The initiative was optional, with the specific arrangement determined by negotiations between central government and relevant local actors.
Universal	The initiative applied to the whole of the country (England or the United Kingdom).
Missing/NA	The allocation process could not be determined OR an allocation process was not applicable (for example, a central government advisory unit is not “allocated” to particular places).

### *Governance model*

<b>Level of objective setting/account ability</b>	<b>Description</b>
Central	The objectives of the programme are clearly outlined, with little or no local flexibility and/or the project is primarily accountable to central actors
Local	The objectives of the programme are locally defined and/or the project is primarily accountable to local actors
<b>Level of delivery approach</b>	<b>Description</b>
Central	The service model/approach is clearly prescribed in policy documents, with no or little flexibility to adapt to local context.
Local	The service model/approach is not specified, offers a number of different options which may be selected from, or offers significant scope for local adaptation.

