

## Outputs from Partnership framework pilot workshop Kensington and Chelsea LSP 22nd February 2008

### Strengths and areas for improvement

Partners participating in the workshop completed a self assessment against the characteristics in the Audit Commission's draft partnership tree. The following were identified as strengths and areas for improvement:

Characteristic	Strength	Area for improvement
<b>ASPIRE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Determined effort to consult but need to manage expectations</li> <li>✓ Clear outcomes e.g. fire and safer communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We know what we need to achieve</li> <li>• Silos, (themes) but need to join up</li> <li>• Could be more citizen focussed</li> </ul>
<b>THINK</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Good use of information to inform decisions</li> <li>✓ Partners valued</li> <li>✓ Waste collection – adding value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to recognise we do not always have to do things together</li> <li>• Choice versus preferred option – used to being lead rather than choices</li> <li>• Escalation process?</li> </ul>
<b>LEAD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Options for skill sharing across the partnership (further development needed e.g. half day event)</li> <li>✓ New members – having a position paper or learn from experienced member</li> <li>✓ Establish what the core function and priorities are for the partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We critique rather than propose e.g. specific issues – partnership view needed on the LDF</li> <li>• A need to take more risks</li> </ul>
<b>COLLABORATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ LSP working together</li> <li>✓ All partners valued equally</li> <li>✓ Voluntary organisations engagement</li> <li>✓ Social council leading the community strategy</li> <li>✓ Maturity of the partnership and recognition of what everyone adds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link with LDF needed</li> </ul>

<b>ACCOUNT</b>	✓ Working well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressing risk management for the partnership</li> <li>Trust/equity/allocation of resources – what is the impact?</li> </ul>
<b>DELIVER</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ LAA – an opportunity for ‘joined up’ work e.g. worklessness (transformational)</li> <li>✓ LAA monitoring</li> <li>✓ Good delivery via LAA e.g. Fire prevention and safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who is accountable? Collective responsibility versus individualism</li> <li>What are the levers and sanctions?</li> <li>Do people know how to feed into the partnership process?</li> <li>Link between feed in from people and decisions made needs to be made clearer</li> </ul>

### Specific comments

Each characteristic was scored by each participant where 1 = weak/needs improvement, 2 = present in parts, 3 = strong. The following specific comments were made:

Characteristic	Specific comments
<b>ASPIRE</b>	Score 1 No specific comments
	Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong on all indicators here except ‘ seeking challenging outcomes’ – we are too risk averse</li> <li>LAA –fire safety outcome – PIs established to promote safety in the home</li> <li>Our knowledge of local priorities is good in our silos ( eg community strategy themes) we are much less good at connecting e.g. link between culture and community safety</li> <li>Clear understanding of what is needed but possibly affected by changing agenda of local government and partners</li> <li>Good at focussing on specific outcomes but could be more citizen focussed</li> <li>Well established stakeholder network but could be more comprehensive</li> <li>Has been determined effort to consult and build views into the community strategy and is ongoing in terms of new</li> </ul>

	strategies – need to be careful not to arouse false expectations
	Score 3 No specific comments
<b>THINK</b>	Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most proposals/papers to the partnership suggest a preferred option rather than a choice</li> </ul>
	Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good use of data to inform decision making</li> <li>Need deeper scrutiny of single agency versus multi agency delivery</li> <li>Use data, research and views to challenge service design</li> <li>Some progress e.g. new timetable for waste collection, parks strategy consultation</li> </ul>
	Score 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good use of data and research to support service redesign</li> <li>Bi-annual review of LSP offers opportunity to consistently review purpose and what value can be added</li> <li>Confidence in partnership which allows all partners to be valued</li> <li>Working in tandem with social services to achieve targets for both parties</li> </ul>
<b>LEAD</b>	Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We critique more than we propose (as partnership – individuals often have suggestions)</li> </ul>
	Score 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong on leadership but weaker on being transformational (need to take more risks to be transformational)</li> <li>Challenge status quo and empower citizens</li> <li>Beginning in current round of consultations – needs very careful handling so that empowerment is practical</li> <li>Partners could be in a different place in forward thinking strategies</li> </ul>
	Score 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Intervention Programme – creates improvement in demonstrating responsibilities of each partner</li> </ul>
	Score 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-producers - yet to see but hopefully will do so</li> </ul>

<b>COLLABORATE</b>	<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Some good examples of successful collaboration across sectors</li> <li>o Collaboration needs to be underpinned more by joining up resources and expertise ⇒ joint delivery</li> <li>o The way meetings of the whole LSP work is a 3 but we should be better at bringing new members on board</li> </ul>
	<p>Score 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Partnership with voluntary sector – provide funding and assist in their expansion</li> <li>o Many success stories e.g. Children's Trust</li> <li>o Strengthened VOF network has led to better equipped VOF representatives</li> <li>o All partners valued equally</li> </ul>
<b>ACCOUNT</b>	<p>Score 1</p> <p>No specific comments</p>
	<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Systems of accountability (e.g. forums feeding into forums) are in place but I don't always believe that they are used effectively and I'm not convinced that users and communities know about the partnership (in general) although they do benefit from its outcomes. I'm not aware of any mechanisms for direct feedback etc from citizens, however effective routes of accountability through the partnerships would facilitate this indirectly</li> <li>o Trust among partners but possibly could be unbalanced by resource differentials</li> <li>o Engage, involve and inform – made progress with last community strategy better still with this one</li> <li>o Youth intervention programme/ YOT / Connexions – develop outcomes further</li> <li>o How many people know about the partnership as opposed to individual members – if we are not visible how accountable are we?</li> <li>o Robust accountability systems in place though only just starting to address risk management seriously</li> </ul>
	<p>Score 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Speedy and clear communications e.g. LA's website</li> <li>o Sharply focussed on getting priorities right ⇒ informs resource allocation and vfm</li> </ul>
	<p>Score 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Strong leadership and ownership in parts of the delivery chain but difficult for partnership to feel collectively</li> </ul>

<b>DELIVER</b>	<p>responsible for delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Partnership with voluntary organisations – clarity of delivery needs development</li> <li>o Getting delivery chains right – yet to see but hopefully will do so</li> </ul>
	<p>Score 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Good potential to join up the delivery chain</li> <li>o Need to ‘work up’ delivery chain enablers at operational sub-group level</li> <li>o I’m not convinced that the LSP always focuses on delivery. Although it has the capacity, I think there are weak links in the chains of delivery</li> </ul>
	<p>Score 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Memorandum of understanding establishes key responsibilities for data sharing</li> <li>o Very good LAA setting process and community strategy</li> <li>o LAA monitoring</li> <li>o Aligning fire service targets to the LAA and LA Community targets</li> </ul>