

KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA PARTNERSHIP

STEERING GROUP

Wednesday September 17

KCP REVIEW

This paper invites Steering Group members to participate in the bi-annual review of the partnership and agree the process to be undertaken.

For discussion and decision

1. Introduction

1.1 In 2006, the KCP undertook a review of the partnership's structure and role. A small number of Steering Group members volunteered their time to attend three externally facilitated sessions, and discuss the role and structure of the partnership. Following this some, some changes were recommended to the partnership including adjustments to the membership of the Steering Group, adopting the theme group structure for the wider KCP network and undertaking a review of the partnership every two years. The KCP agreed these proposals and the Terms of Reference for the partnership was amended accordingly.

2. Purpose of the bi-annual review

During the last review, the KCP agreed that a regular structural review underpins strong and healthy partnerships and that a bi-annual review would therefore be good practice for the partnership to follow. The KCP also agreed that a bi-annual review should be an evolving process which builds on arrangements already in place where these are working well.

The role of the KCP has become increasingly high profile as Government has placed the LAA and Community Strategy at the heart of driving forward improvement in local public service delivery. This has been strengthened by the new statutory element to the LAA and Community Strategy, binding partners together to take collective responsibility to ensure the successful development and delivery of both.

The new Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) will ask how well all organisations in the local area determine local priorities and then deliver services to meet these priorities. This will call into account all the organisations represented in the KCP, and the LAA and Community Strategy

will be used as the starting point for assessing progress and understanding how well the partnership works.

A review of the KCP should therefore serve the purpose of addressing both the structural and operational composition of the partnership, highlighting weaknesses and recognising strengths.

3. Proposed structure of the review:

3.1 Based on the intended purpose of the review, sessions could therefore focus on the following:

Structure

- Membership – is the membership of the Steering Group right, do other organisations need to be invited?
- Theme group structure – is this adequate, do people understand how it works, does it need strengthening?

Operational

- Role – is this clear to KCP members, wider organisations and the public? How has this evolved over time and how well is the KCP performing?
- Governance and Accountability – is this clear to KCP members and to anyone outside the partnership? Have new responsibilities evolved over time and are these captured in the Terms of Reference?
- Risk – does the partnership consider risks to carrying out core business and if so, how are these addressed?
- Challenges and opportunities – does the partnership consider and/or undertake innovative practices or solutions to problems? Are these communicated to partners and the public?

3.2 Steering Group members will recall the Risk Exercise that the KCP undertook earlier this year, facilitated by a risk expert from Zurich insurance. The exercise was structured around some common risk management methodology which consisted of considering the following themes:

- Roles and responsibilities
- Objectives
- Legal
- Resources
- Strategic
- Legislative/regulatory
- Business case
- Communication and relationships
- Governance
- Political
- Skills
- Change Management
- Stakeholders

The sessions focussed on the degree to which some of these areas could provide real risks to the KCP undertaking agreed responsibilities. Some potential scenarios were then developed and scored using traffic lights, suggesting areas which the partnership should focus for improvement. These include:

- Recognition of the KCP, local and regionally
- Ensuring a consistent approach to KCP theme group structure
- Ensuring the LAA and Community Strategy links with other plans and strategies
- Performance of the KCP within new CAA framework
- Achieving LAA targets
- Formal induction process to the KCP
- Individual partners engagement with KCP

The first risk was rated high, with the remainder being rated moderate. A full summary of the feedback from Zurich is attached at Annex A.

3.3 The Audit Commission (AC) approached the KCP in January to pilot a new Partnership Framework Model. Some volunteers from the Steering Group attended a workshop with AC officers and reviewed key component elements of partnerships. These included considering how the partnership aspires, thinks, leads, collaborates, accounts and delivers. Some of the issues to address which were raised include:

- proposals put to the partnership could suggest choice rather preferred options;
- the partnership actively propose more than critique;
- the partnership could become more joint collaborators than co-producers; and
- there is strong leadership and ownership throughout the partnership but as a whole, the partnership could feel more collectively responsible.

The workshop was an opportunity to trail the partnership framework but was not a formal assessment of how the partnership operates. A full summary of feedback from the session is attached at Annex B.

3.4 Both the Risk Exercise and the AC Workshop highlight some areas which the partnership could focus on during the review underneath the headings outlined in paragraph 3.1.

3.5 *Do Steering Group members agree with the suggested focus of the review as outlined above? Can it be improved?*

4. Proposed timetable and next steps

4.1 The KCP review undertaken during 2005 used the composition of the then Community Strategy sub group, asking members if they were happy to work on the review and inviting any other members of the Steering Group to join if they could volunteer the time. This year, the Community Strategy sub group are still working on the new Community Strategy and will soon be

focussing on the new Community Strategy Monitoring Plan, set to be the full new LAA.

Since this already represents a significant time contribution does the partnership wish to form a separate group to undertake the review this year?

4.2 The last review was made up of three sessions up to two hours maximum in length for each session. Since this review will build on the last one and both the Risk Exercise and the AC Workshop have provided some context for issues to consider during the review, officers propose a likely time commitment of two sessions up to two hours in length. Further sessions could be arranged if necessary. The previous review sessions were externally facilitated.

Would KCP member prefer the review sessions to be externally facilitated or do they wish RBKC officers to facilitate instead?

4.3 Whilst there is no deadline within which to complete the review, the new Community Strategy and full new LAA seem appropriate catalysts for ensuring that the partnership is in good health. Officers are therefore suggesting that the review sessions be undertaken in November, subject to diary commitments.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Steering Group members are asked to discuss the contents of the report and agree:

- the proposed structure of the review;
- that volunteers should be invited from the full KCP Steering Group; and
- the facilitation of the sessions.

FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

Contact Officer:
Rachel Smith
KCP Manager
RachelA.Smith@rbkc.gov.uk
020 7361 3671