

**KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA PARTNERSHIP****REVIEW OF PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES AND PARTNERSHIP WORKING****Report by the Partnership Support Officer****17<sup>th</sup> March 2004**

This paper outlines a framework to review both the Kensington and Chelsea Partnership strategies and Kensington and Chelsea Partnership joint working at the end of the financial year. The paper has three annexes. They are arranged thus:

- **Introductory paper**
- Appendix 1
- **Annex A**
- Appendix 2
- Appendix 3
- **Annex B**
- Appendix 4
- **Annex C**
- Appendix 5

The steering group are asked to discuss and agree the framework of the review and the way forward.

**FOR DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL****1. Introduction**

1.1 The first Community Strategy, "The Future of Our Community", was published in June 2002. Although it is a ten year plan, the first draft was written in January 2002 and most of the actions contained in it cover a two or three year span. The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS) "Renewing Our Neighbourhoods" was published in September 2002; it identified eleven key issues, or priorities, in Golborne and St Charles wards with targets and an action plan for each of the issues. Although the first tranche of Neighbourhood Renewal funding was from April 2001 to March 2004, the strategy contains actions through to 2005.

1.2 We are now planning to review and rewrite the Community Strategy, to be launched in summer 2005, preceded by a consultation programme this autumn. It is most likely that the NRS will be integrated within the revised Community Strategy. Both the Community Strategy sub-group and the Strategies Implementation Group (SIG) have expressed a wish to feedback to residents and stakeholders in the borough on what we have achieved so far before launching a new consultation programme. It is therefore timely to review delivery of both the strategies; this would feed into a written Progress Report to be distributed to libraries, the 'Friends of the Royal Borough', Residents Associations etc, in May or June this year.

1.3 The Community Safety team are undertaking the annual review of the Community Safety Strategy over the coming months. This can be linked into the Kensington and Chelsea Partnership's review of what it has achieved within its Safer Communities cluster. This in turn will feed into the preparation of a new Community Safety strategy.

1.4 The Social Council are involved in a parallel process in reviewing projects supported by Community Empowerment Funds – for details contact Similola Towry-Coker at the Kensington & Chelsea Social Council.

## **2. Government Office for London and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit**

2.1 The Government Office for London (GO-L) indicated in the Autumn of last year that LSPs need not go through the accreditation process to receive Neighbourhood Renewal funding this year. However in its place the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) has stipulated that LSPs should:

- Demonstrate that they have a rigorous and structured methodology for managing the delivery of Neighbourhood Renewal strategies;
- Carry out a reflective review on the success of Partnership working, also known as Partnership ‘health’;
- Develop an Improvement Plan for the next year, 2004/05. This should pull together the actions from the review of delivery and the partnership review, including a timetable for reviewing outstanding areas of NRS delivery, and set out the activities and support needed over the coming year to improve partnership working and the delivery of services. The Improvement Plan should be completed by 30<sup>th</sup> April and will form the basis of the annual review with GO-L (in late May or June).

In exceptional circumstances an LSP’s accredited status may be withdrawn, e.g. if the LSP fails to take action to put in place robust performance management arrangements.

2.2 The NRU has provided a model performance management framework (PMF) for the review of delivery and the review of partnership working. The option of using parts of the NRU model is discussed in more detail in Annexes A and B. There is no obligation to use the model but any PMF that we devise ourselves must meet ‘core requirements’. The NRU guide on core requirements is attached as Appendix 1.

2.3 Finally, the NRU has asked that all LSPs in receipt of NRF reach a formal agreement with their community networks on how they will work together. A ‘model protocol’ has been issued and officers from RBKC and the Social Council have been meeting to develop this agreement. A draft of the protocol is presented for comment in a separate paper.

## **3. The way forward**

Whilst the timing and methodology is driven to some extent by the Government Office for London and the NRU, it dovetails quite well with the Partnership’s own ambitions to review progress on the Community and Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies as part of the preparatory work on the new Community Strategy. Officers at RBKC have studied the core requirements and suggest that the approach outlined in Annexes A and B would be likely to meet the GO-L requirements and also be useful for the delivery of the Partnership’s own priorities.

Officer Contact:  
Helen Kay  
Partnership Support Officer  
Tel: 020 7361 3671  
Email: Helen.Kay@rbkc.gov.uk

## APPENDIX 1

### Core Requirements of a Performance Management Framework

Requirements on what information you should record and report on if your Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) uses its own Performance Management Framework (PMF):

- ♦ ***Your PMF will need to make sure that you gather accurate information captured in each of the following three sections: reviewing delivery, reviewing partnership working and improvement planning. The information must be presented in a clear and understandable way that can be read as individual sections or as a whole.***
- ♦ ***The information in each PMF should be available to the public. You will need to keep to the Data Protection Act and manage any local sensitivities.***
- ♦ ***The PMF should build on LSP Accreditation Guidance you followed and the work identified in the Accreditation Action Plans you produced in February 2002 and 2003.***
- ♦ ***All actions should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Resourced/ Realistic, & Timetabled) and have clear lead individuals/agencies. You should clearly schedule progress reporting.***

#### **SECTION 1 – REVIEWING DELIVERY**

This section will monitor and measure your progress in implementing the local neighbourhood renewal strategy or the LNRS section of the community strategy and examine your progress in meeting the targets and milestones you committed to in the strategy.

You should review your delivery at least once a year but your LSPs will probably want to receive reports or updates more regularly. This will make sure you can identify areas, targets or action needing urgent attention by the LSP Board or agencies and delivery-focused partnerships or themed sub-groups.

You can use the PMF to monitor any local strategies, targets or priorities but it **must** be used to drive delivery of neighbourhood renewal. Use of NRF to support delivery of targets and impact on mainstreaming needs to be recorded in the PMF.

This monitoring should include indicators to:

- ♦ **Measure progress on relevant floor targets.**
- ♦ **Measure progress on targets identified as a local priority.**
- ♦ **Challenge the plausibility of actions to deliver agreed targets.**

Plausibility means that the action you take to achieve the desired outcomes is likely to deliver them because there are clear logical links between actions and outcomes; what you are doing is the best possible approach based on knowledge and evidence of what works.

NB Particular attention and priority must be given to national and local targets covering the areas of crime, education, health, housing and employment and the 'liveability' agenda. The

latter is a cross-cutting theme which encompasses a cleaner, safer, green living environment.

## **SECTION 2 - REVIEWING PARTNERSHIP WORKING.**

This section will assess the contribution made by individual partners to the success of your LSP, review the effectiveness of your LSP and the added value it brings to the delivery of local services. It will build on the process of accreditation.

You must carry out a full review **at least once every three years**. However any areas of weakness you identify should be reviewed more frequently.

The review must set out how well you are performing to meet the following criteria:

- ♦ **Strategic**
  - **Inclusive** –to include a measure of how well the LSP is engaging with the community and voluntary sectors through the Community Empowerment Network and black and minority ethnic and other minority communities.
- ♦ **Action-Focused**
- ♦ **Performance Managed**
- ♦ **Efficient**
- ♦ **Learning and development**

## **SECTION 3- IMPROVEMENT PLANNING**

This section brings together the conclusions from sections 1 and 2 to set out the action and support needed over the coming year to build on and improve the delivery of services. You should monitor your action points to address identified weaknesses and **regularly** review your LSP improvement plans to inform revisions of local strategies and related action plans.

The improvement plan you produce should:

- ♦ Identify key actions needed to drive improvement within your LSP and in partner organisations.
- ♦ Identify key actions to meet agreed targets or amend targets where appropriate. You should include details of key outcomes and milestones.
- ♦ Identify the support needed to implement key actions across the LSP “family” and promote delivery drivers across the district as well as at sub-district and ward/neighbourhood levels.
- ♦ Provide enough resources and commitment from all LSP partner organisations to make sure that adjustments and improvements to key strategies and improvement plans are made accordingly.

## ANNEX A

### REVIEW OF DELIVERY OF THE COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL STRATEGIES

Steering group members are asked to note the background to this review and the minimum requirements from NRU, then to agree on a way forward given the usual constraints of time and resources.

FOR DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

#### 1. Government Office for London and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit

According to GO-L the primary purpose of this review is to monitor and measure the Partnership's progress in implementing the NRS with a view to driving delivery of neighbourhood renewal. The steering group are encouraged to extend the review to include the Community Strategy in order to contribute to the process of revising this strategy for 2005.

The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit have asked that this year:

"Particular attention and priority must be given to national and local targets covering the areas of crime, education, health, housing, employment and the 'liveability' agenda. The latter is a cross-cutting theme which encompasses a cleaner, safer, green living environment."

But also that:

"In order to develop robust plans it would be acceptable if an LSP wanted to *review* a minimum of **three** priority theme areas. A justification for focusing on the three areas would need to be provided and plans for taking forward outstanding theme areas outlined by the end of April 2004."

#### 2. The Progress Trackers

2.1 Steering group members may recall that last year cluster co-ordinators collected information on the progress of targets in the strategies by means of a 'progress tracker' for each cluster. Cluster champions and cluster co-ordinator(s) then met to review progress on delivery of the strategies and identify achievements, issues, opportunities and priorities for their clusters. This exercise fed into the NRF allocation process for years four and five.

A broadly similar exercise is proposed for this year with some changes to data collection and the role of the Steering Group, in order to improve the usefulness of the exercise and to satisfy some of the requirements from GO-L. Since the eleven priorities for the NRS are still current and the new priorities for NRF years 4 and 5 are already agreed, the focus of the exercise this year would be to review the effectiveness of delivery and update the action plan for the NRS in particular.

Bearing in mind the Partnership's wish to report back on the progress on all aspects of the Community Strategy to local residents and stakeholders early in the summer, it is proposed that all themes or clusters are included in the review, rather than a selection of them.

***The steering group is asked to agree the scope of the review as outlined above.***

### 3. Proposed Timetable

The proposed timetable for the review of the delivery of the strategies would be:

#### Stage 1 – 18<sup>th</sup> March to 16<sup>th</sup> April 2004

Cluster Co-ordinators provide factual evidence of progress on delivery of the strategies, including performance indicators where available, and record this in the Progress Trackers. All NRF projects will be highlighted. A sample page from the newly-formatted Tracker is attached in the Appendix 2.

Co-ordinators would make a judgement on whether a target outcome or action has been achieved, partially achieved, etc and allocate a score between five and one accordingly. If the co-ordinators feel unable to make these judgments then they should be discussed with the champions in stage 2 – see below.

The Strategies Implementation Group have been consulted on stage 1 and their comments already taken on board.

#### Stage 2 – Week ending 23<sup>rd</sup> April

Co-ordinators to meet with their cluster champions. It is suggested that **both** of the champions and **both** the co-ordinators are involved in the second stage of this process in order to reach a consensus on progress, reflect on what has worked or not worked and start to develop an Improvement Plan. Also NRU has emphasised the need to share learning throughout the process. The method proposed here satisfies the core requirements but is nevertheless likely to be spread over two fairly long meetings.

GO-L have also suggested an 'independent challenge' or peer group review at this stage in order to avoid the person responsible for an outcome being the same person assessing progress on that outcome. The proposal presented here is a compromise solution as, in most cases, one of the cluster champions for each cluster is a non-specialist.

More specifically Champions would be asked to work with co-ordinators to:

- a) Confirm the co-ordinator's assessment of the level of progress in meeting the desired outcomes for the NRS. Scoring on a scale from five (achieved) to one (not achieved).
- b) Assess whether the actions have been effective in meeting the desired outcomes for the NRS, i.e. were the actions appropriate or 'plausible' for each particular objective.
- c) To discuss with co-ordinators WHY some outcomes or issues have not been met or addressed in the NRS (barriers, policy changes, inappropriate actions, etc) and the possible solutions to the problems.
- d) Identify key actions to meet outstanding targets and the support needed to implement them, focussing on the NRS.
- e) Identify which projects or actions may have:
  - 1) Human interest potential to use as case studies for the Annual Report
  - 2) Made a positive contribution to the Equalities agenda
  - 3) Could potentially make a greater contribution to the Equalities agenda
  - 4) Could potentially make a greater contribution to the sustainability/green agenda
  - 5) Could potentially be 'mainstreamed'?

f) Conclusions would be recorded on a summary sheet with four categories: Achievements, Barriers, Solutions, and Action for Improvement -see Appendix 3.

Note that parts a) to d) above are based on NRU core requirements for assessing performance on Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies. Part e) is optional and part f) is based on the general guidance from NRU, to help move towards the development of the Improvement Action Plan. We are not obliged to go through this process for the Community Strategy but it would be useful for the current process of revision.

This stage to be completed and recorded by 23<sup>rd</sup> April in order to draft an Improvement Action Plan by 30<sup>th</sup> April.

***The steering group is asked to carefully consider the requirements for stage 2 of the strategies review and to agree on realistic level of input given the general constraints on time.***

#### Stage 3 - Steering group meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> May

Cluster Champions to report on Achievements as last year and share any disappointments where issues, outcomes or actions were not addressed/ met/achieved. Also to report any learning, conclusions, recommendations gleaned from the process and the key actions they wish to pursue.

Officers to present a draft Annual Report and the draft Improvement Action Plan. The latter to be amended in the light of the learning and recommendations emerging from the first half of the meeting.

This stage can be refined by the Agenda Planning sub-group.

#### Stage 4 - Community Strategy sub-group meeting in late May 2004

The sub-group to consider how the Annual Report could be used to launch the consultation on the next Community Strategy. Also how the review as a whole might inform a change in the organisation of clusters or themes and the delivery mechanisms associated with them.

***It is proposed that***

- a) the steering group endorse the process for reviewing delivery of the strategies as outlined above, and***
- b) commit the time as Cluster Champions, and the necessary resources from within their own organisation, to make a success of the review***

## Appendix 2

### Renewing Our Neighbourhoods: Action Plan - Part 1 Golborne and St Charles Neighbourhood ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT

Issue	Outcome Means of Evaluation	Action Required by 2005 See Part 3 for NRF - related targets	Partners & Contacts Lead partner in bold	Progress as at: 31st March 2003	Progress as at: 31st March 2004 Achievements ( Indicators), Barriers, Solutions, New targets and actions	Scores on Outcome and Action	Score on Appropriate ness of Action?
<b>1. Relatively low satisfaction with streetscape and street cleansing, particularly streets with markets and Ladbroke Grove</b>	1.1 By March 2004 to have increased local satisfaction rates with street cleaning to the Borough average  <i>Residents' panel</i>  See <b>LPSA</b> target 7i); Improve quality of public space particularly re litter in north of borough	<b>NRF funding:</b> Establish street closure protocols to facilitate regular street cleaning. By Sept 2003 to have protocol in place By March 2004 to have increased local satisfaction rates with street cleaning to the borough average	<b>RBKC Environmental Services - Mark Raisbeck (now Vera Gajic?)</b>	Consultants undertaking research.	NRF Project Manager to complete ?	NRF Project Manager to complete ?	
		<b>NRF funding:</b> <i>Environmental improvements</i> By June 2003 to have improved the visual appearance of bridge with enhanced lighting, developed in partnership with local community and agencies	<b>The Westway Project - Miles Watson</b> RBKC Environmental Services, RBKC Planning and Conservation Railtrack	Consultation with residents and agencies undertaken in December 2002. Work has not begun on the bridge as there are issues to be resolved surrounding the structural integrity of the bridge, and maintenance issues if cladding is used.	NRF Project Manager to complete ?	NRF Project Manager to complete ?	
		Develop a streetscape proposal for Golborne Road and/or Ladbroke Grove.	<b>RBKC Environmental Services - Mark Raisbeck (now Vera Gajic?)</b>				



## Appendix 3 - Delivery of the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy - Environment and Transport

Attendance at review meeting:

Date of Review

Special Achievements

Barriers

Possible Solutions

Action for Improvement

## ANNEX B

### REVIEW OF THE HEALTH OF THE PARTNERSHIP

Steering group members are asked to note the background to this review and the minimum requirements from NRU, then to agree on a way forward given the usual constraints of time and resources.

FOR DISCUSSION AND ACTION

#### 1. Introduction

This part of the review will assess the contribution made by individual partners to the success of the Partnership and review its effectiveness and the added value it brings to the delivery of local services. It will build on the process of accreditation and will use the same six core criteria:

- Strategic
- Inclusive
- Action Focused
- Performance Managed
- Efficient
- Learning and Development

#### 2. Review of the Accreditation Action Plan

In January 2003 an Accreditation Action Plan was approved by the Steering Group which set out a range of actions to address its perceived development needs at that time. These were mainly 'process based' and assessed how well the partnership was performing against the six core criteria. A mid-year progress report was brought to the Steering Group in September 2003. A final review of this Action Plan is now required with a view to:

- Noting which target actions have been achieved.
- Agreeing a timetable and way forward for targets that have not yet been achieved.

This exercise would satisfy the minimum requirements from GO-L and NRU for reviewing the health of our Partnership this year.

***The steering group are asked to review the Accreditation Action Plan in part 2 of the meeting.***

#### 2. Government Office for London and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit

Guidance from NRU states that each of the six categories in the Accreditation Action Plan should be reviewed thoroughly at least once every three years. So, for example, two categories could be reviewed in detail each year. It is recommended that any areas of weakness should be reviewed more frequently. Steering group members may wish to choose one or more of the six categories for detailed review this year. NRU have issued a

set of prompts in a tabular format to help bring rigour to this process. Appendix 4 gives an example of how this exercise might be recorded for the first category, 'Strategic Working'. It is accompanied by a detailed set of indicators to help us decide which score to give each sub-category (not shown). If the steering group wish to carry out a more thorough review using this model, or to devise a review methodology of their own, then it is recommended that a half day be set aside for this purpose. Ideally this should take place by the 23<sup>rd</sup> April in order to feed into the Improvement Action Plan by 30<sup>th</sup> April.

Alternatively, the steering group may wish to combine a review of the Partnership 'health' with the development of an Improvement Action Plan (details in Annex C). If so an AwayDay is recommended, preferably before 23<sup>rd</sup> April.

***The steering group are asked to decide whether they wish to review the health of the Partnership more thoroughly and if so by what means.***

## Appendix 4

## Reviewing Partnership Working

## Strategic Criteria

<b>2.1.3</b> <b>Leadership</b>	Strategic leadership is provided by the LSP to make sure that it's own strategies are reflected in partners' business strategies and are cascaded down to team and individual work objectives		<b>Score</b>
	What Evidence do we have to demonstrate this standard?	What key progress have we made?	
<b>2.1.4</b> <b>Structure &amp; accountability</b>	The Partnership organises itself in a systematic, clear and accountable way. The LSP board is effective with members having the authority to speak for their organisation and there is genuine community involvement through the CEN		<b>Score</b>
	What Evidence do we have to demonstrate this standard?	What key progress have we made?	
<b>Total Score</b>			

## ANNEX C

### IMPROVEMENT ACTION PLAN

The following text is taken from NRU guidance on creating an Improvement Action Plan. The Kensington and Chelsea Partnership is not obliged to use the tables shown in the relevant Appendix but they may prove useful. The steering group may wish to delay a decision on the format of an Improvement Plan until after the reviews have taken place.

FOR INFORMATION

“This section is the most important part of your performance management process. Your Improvement Plan will form the basis of your annual review with Government Offices. You will need to show you and your partners have agreed priorities and clearly show how you will make sure your Improvement Plan is delivered. A table to record the Improvement Plan is below. (See *Appendix 5*).

This process of continuous improvement does not necessarily mean doing more of the same. It involves learning from what is and isn't working using this information to revise targets and objectives and identifying the support people need to deliver revised targets.

In drawing up your Improvement Plan you will need to bear in mind that those involved in delivery will often need support to develop the necessary skills and knowledge. Your plan will need to reflect:

- who will be involved
- the actions they will be required to undertake
- the support they will need
- how this support might be provided.

Support can cover traditional learning activities such as training courses, but should also cover activities such as, information sharing across partner organisations, accessing advice from experts, using relevant research, changing working practices, introducing job swaps and secondments.

#### **Actions to be taken to improve Delivery and Partnership Working**

Part 1 of the Improvement Plan brings together your findings from your discussions used to complete the tables in Section 1 – Reviewing Delivery. The actions for improvement are based on the strategic themes (*clusters*). A completed Improvement Plan, using these themes, provides a high level work plan for you and your partners together with related groups or lead organisations.

Part 2 of the Improvement Plan brings together your findings from discussions used to complete the tables in Section 2 – The Review of the Partnership. For each of the 6 core criteria, the action you have agreed to bring about improvement should be recorded. These tables will help you to record key contact details, along with target dates to reach milestones or to complete actions and identify the support you will need.

You will need to consider how your Improvement Plan will complement the LNRS, Community Strategy, Local Action on Learning Plans (*Skills and Knowledge*) and the business plans of your partner organisations, so that it demonstrates how everyone is working on delivering the same goals.

## Appendix 5

## Improvement Plan for Delivery (sample)

<b>1.0 Crime</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	
▪ Date to be completed	
▪ Key Contact	
▪ Support needed	
▪ How support will be provided.	
<b>2.0 Education</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	
▪ Date to be completed	
▪ Key Contact	
▪ Support needed	
▪ How support will be provided	
<b>3.0 Employment</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	
▪ Date to be completed	
▪ Key Contact	
▪ Support needed	
▪ How support will be provided	

## Improvement Plan for Partnership (sample)

<b>1.0 Strategic</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	
▪ Date to be completed	
▪ Key Contact	
▪ Support needed	
▪ How support will be provided	
<b>2.0 Inclusive</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	
▪ Date to be completed	
▪ Key Contact	
▪ Support needed	
▪ How support to be provided	
<b>3.0 Action Focused</b>	
▪ Action for Improvement	
▪ Date to be completed	
▪ Key Contact	
▪ Support needed	
▪ How support will be provided	

