

**THE KENSINGTON & CHELSEA PARTNERSHIP
SHADOW STEERING GROUP – 22ND JANUARY 2002 MEETING**

ACCREDITATION OF THE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

REPORT BY THE ACTING DIRECTOR OF NOTTING HILL SOCIAL COUNCIL

1. SUMMARY

This report presents the self assessment and action plan of the Kensington & Chelsea Partnership for approval by the Steering Group.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Local Government Act 2000 requires the establishment of a Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in each local authority area. The Kensington & Chelsea Partnership was launched on 27 June 2001 at a meeting of the Shadow LSP Steering Group hosted by the Mayor of the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.
- 2.2 In local authority areas which are eligible for Neighbourhood Renewal Funds, the LSP must be accredited by the Government Office for the region. In the case of the Kensington & Chelsea Partnership, this means accreditation by the Government Office for London (GOL).
- 2.3 Accreditation documents have been drafted with input from relevant officers of Kensington & Chelsea Council by the Acting Director of Notting Hill Social Council in accordance with *Accreditation Guidance for Local Strategic Partnerships* issued by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit of the Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions in October 2001 and the *Framework for Accrediting Local Strategic Partnerships in London* issued by GOL in November 2001.

3. ACCREDITATION PROCESS

- 3.1 GOL requires a written self-assessment and action plan and drafts of these are attached, together with a revised Partnership structure diagram.
- 3.2 It is proposed that the Steering Group should consider the self assessment, action plan and revised Partnership structure diagram and approve these with any amendments at its meeting on 22 January.
- 3.3 GOL also requires face to face dialogue about the accreditation. A meeting has been arranged for 30 January for this to take place and it is proposed that the Partnership should be represented by the Chief Executive of Kensington & Chelsea, a representative of the health or police or faith partners subject to

availability, the Acting Director of Notting Hill Social Council and the RBKC Policy Officer working on the LSP. It is possible, however, that the presence of GOL representatives at the Steering Group meeting on 22 January will be sufficient and that there will be no need for a further meeting on accreditation.

- 3.4 In December, GOL asked three people to act as key stakeholders in the accreditation process, providing comments on three strengths and three weaknesses of the Partnership by 8 January 2002. GOL were proposing to feed this information back to the Partnership to enable use to be made of it in the self-assessment, but nothing was received in time to take account of it in the drafting. The key stakeholders are Margaret Phillips of the Learning and Skills Council, Jed Davis (who is a member of the Steering Group and will be able to comment at the meeting) and Susie Parsons (who has, in any case, drafted the self assessment).
- 3.5 Once GOL has accredited the Partnership by 28 February 2002, it is proposed that the Steering Group will no longer be a 'shadow' Steering Group.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 Drafting the self assessment has shown that the Partnership has made great progress in the few months since its launch but that there are numerous gaps and weaknesses which need to be worked on. The action plan provides a detailed statement of what needs to be done. In particular, it is important to be able to show clearly that the local community is at the heart of the Partnership and the relationships and lines of accountability between local people, the Steering Group and the Partnership Clusters. The revised Partnership structure diagram attempts to do this and is commended to the Steering Group, along with the self assessment and action plan.

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 The Steering Group is recommended to consider and approve the self assessment and action plan of the Kensington & Chelsea Partnership and the revised Partnership structure diagram.

FOR DECISION

Contact officer
Susie Parsons, Acting Director, Notting Hill Social Council
E-mail: susieparsons@228a.fsnet.co.uk
Telephone: 020 8969 9897

THE KENSINGTON & CHELSEA PARTNERSHIP

SELF-ASSESSMENT – JANUARY 2001

INTRODUCTION TO THE PARTNERSHIP

The Kensington & Chelsea Partnership was launched on 27 June 2001. The Partnership aims to bring together the local authority, health service, police, other statutory agencies, voluntary and community sectors, faith organisations, business and local residents to improve the quality of life in the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea. The Partnership is working towards a greener Borough which is safe to live in, with affordable housing for local people and key workers, where there are educational and employment opportunities, with good health and social care, pleasant public spaces, accessible sports, leisure and arts facilities and good public transport for all. The Partnership's objectives are:

- to consult upon, approve and implement a Community Strategy – a grand plan for the Borough for the next ten years;
- to consult upon, approve and implement a Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy – setting out how the most deprived areas in the Borough will be brought up to the standard of the rest;
- to coordinate and add value to the work of the many partnerships already operating successfully in the Borough;
- to value the rich diversity of people living and working in the Borough and to act in an inclusive way so that all sections of the community are able to take part in improving the quality of life in Kensington & Chelsea;
- to adopt a structure which is representative of the various stakeholders, with open and transparent decision-making and commitment to community consultation and involvement and which is reviewed from time to time to ensure that it is still fit for its purpose;
- to improve the overall delivery of public services; and
- to recognise the general obligation to make wise and best use of public monies and acknowledge the interests of those whose financial support pays for those services.

PARTNERSHIP STRUCTURE

The structure of the Partnership is shown in the attached coloured diagram.

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

LSP – Local Strategic Partnership
GOL – Government Office for London
VOF – Voluntary Organisations Forum (the Community Network)
CS – Community Strategy
NRS – Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
PCT – Primary Care Trust
UDP – Unitary Development Plan
SRB – Single Regeneration Budget
CEF – Community Empowerment Fund

ASSESSMENT

The Partnership's assessment of its strengths and weaknesses against the Government's 43 sub-criteria (grouped into six main criteria - that Partnerships are strategic, inclusive, action-focused, performance managed, efficient and promote learning and development) is set out below. It should be read in conjunction with the Partnership's Action Plan for remedying identified weaknesses. Numbers in brackets refer to the list of supporting documents in Appendix One to this assessment.

EFFECTIVE, REPRESENTATIVE AND CAPABLE OF PLAYING A STRATEGIC ROLE

1. Ability of LSP members to make strategic decisions and influence decision-making and delivery within their organization or community.

Strengths:

- Representation on LSP Steering Group at senior level from local authority, health service, police and voluntary sector.
- Agreement reached on 6 December 2001 to include three representatives elected by VOF and two representatives of tenants and residents (3).

Weaknesses:

- Faith representation currently limited to the Christian religion
- No business representative at present.
- No representation from tenants and residents groups yet.
- Limited links to registered social landlords and regional agencies, such as the Learning and Skills Council, Employment Service, London Development Agency.
- The Steering Group is still a 'shadow' Steering Group, pending accreditation of the LSP by GOL.
- There is a lack of clarity and understanding about what the LSP is (ie that it is wider than the Steering Group) and the relationship between the Steering Group, the Working Group and the Partnership Clusters.

2. Ability of the LSP to build consensus and resolve conflict.

Strengths:

- Good record of partnership working between sectors and agencies (13)
- The Steering Group has shown it can resolve conflict eg over voluntary sector representation (3).

Weaknesses:

- Unresolved conflict within the Council over political representation.

3. How decisions are reached and how partner organizations are held accountable

Strengths:

- Early decisions on how to develop the LSP, CS and NRS were made on a consensual basis (1,2,3)
- Partners will be asked to sign up to the CS and align their own plans to it.
- Limited bureaucracy.

Weaknesses:

- No formal standing orders or terms of reference for the Steering Group or Partnership Clusters.
- No formal allocation of responsibilities to Steering Group members.
- LSP role and structure not widely understood – perception that the Steering Group is the LSP.

4. Whether the LSP practices equal opportunity for all

Strengths:

- Steering Group members have formal equal opportunities policies in place.

- There was a good gender balance and many people from different ethnic groups and some people with disabilities at the two Borough Conferences in October 2001 (4, 5).
- Community workshops took place with black and ethnic minority groups (8).

Weaknesses:

- None of the current Steering Group members are from black or ethnic minority backgrounds.
- All the statutory sector members of the Steering Group are men.
- No information available whether any one on the Steering Group has a disability.

5. Leadership style

Strengths:

- Joint planning of consultation process between local authority, Social Councils and PCG.
- Consultation to date undertaken jointly by local authority and the Social Councils.
- Leadership is being shared across the LSP (e.g. the aims and objectives of the LSP were drafted by the Social Councils).
- The Social Councils are leading on the accreditation process.

Weaknesses:

- Misunderstanding of the Council's role – LSP seen as Council-dominated.
- Changes in health service structures are making their participation more difficult.
- Health and police less engaged than the Council and the Social Councils.
- Most of the administrative burden of servicing the LSP falls on the Council.

ACTIVELY INVOLVES ALL THE KEY PLAYERS, INCLUDING THE PUBLIC, PRIVATE, COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SECTORS

6. The Partnership manages involvement creatively to ensure views, reflecting the diversity of local organizations and residents, are fed into the Partnership while maintaining its ability to make decisions and focus on results.

Strengths:

- Many local organizations and residents were involved in the wide consultation process so far on the CS and NRS (4,5,7,8).
- LSP structure includes a Steering Group which is able to make strategic decisions.

Weaknesses:

- Local consultation fatigue.
- Government guidance on CS and NRS is very focused on process, rather than results.
- There is a lack of clarity and understanding about what the LSP is (ie that it is wider than the Steering Group) and the relationship between the Steering Group, the Working Group and the Partnership Clusters.

7. The openness and transparency of decision-making and other processes of the LSP.

Strengths:

- LSP has distributed its newsletter widely (11).
- LSP website is being developed, meanwhile information on LSP is available on the local authority and Chelsea Social Council websites.

Weaknesses:

- The work of the LSP is not yet widely known.
- The Steering Group does not yet have any terms of reference.
- There is limited knowledge and understanding of the various Partnership Clusters which constitute the full LSP and their relationship to the Steering Group.

8. Whether all partners actively seek and support engagement of hard to reach groups and those who may traditionally have been excluded from partnership working.

Strengths:

- Extensive consultation so far on the CS and NRS included community workshops with hard to reach and excluded groups and bringing them into the October 2001 Borough Conferences (4,5,8).
- The Development Plan to March 2003 agreed between the Social Councils/VOF and GOL includes strengthening VOF as the Community Network for K&C by targeting more such groups (9) and there are specific proposals in the January to March 2002 work plan (15)
- The Council has an extensive annual consultation programme.
- The health service funds a BME Health Forum.
- The police have consultation arrangements in place with community organisations.

Weaknesses:

- Local consultation fatigue.
- Lack of information about representation of hard to reach and excluded groups in Partnership Clusters.

9. What barriers to involvement have been identified and what solutions have been agreed (including flexibility in the working practices of the LSP).**Strengths:**

- Barriers have been identified as set out below and solutions agreed as set out in the Action Plan.

Weaknesses:

- Local consultation fatigue.
- None of the current Steering Group members are from black or ethnic minority backgrounds.
- Lack of inter-faith network.
- Lack of any real interest from current business networks.
- Tenants and residents groups not yet represented on the Steering Group.
- Limited links to registered social landlords, Learning and Skills Council, Employment Service, London Development Agency.

10. The participation of all partners from the earliest opportunity, to help determine the structure, processes and priorities of the LSP.**Strengths:**

- Steering Group was formed at the earliest opportunity to take the process forward.
- The Borough Conference on 19 October 2001 considered structure and principles underpinning processes.

Weaknesses:

- The Council and the Social Councils are more influential than other partners in determining processes.

11. Seeks and supports the input and membership of voluntary and community organizations, smaller community groups and local residents, especially from hard to reach groups.**Strengths:**

- Five places for voluntary/community sector and two for tenants and residents on the Steering Group.
- Wide representation at the Borough Conferences in October.

Weaknesses:

- Lack of information about representation on Partnership Clusters.

12. Seeks input and uses expertise from business of all sizes and community enterprises, each of whom have very different concerns and contributions to make.

Strengths:

- Two consultation meetings were held with the Chamber of Commerce in the autumn of 2001 and a meeting is scheduled for January 2002 with the Portobello Business Forum.

Weaknesses:

- Little active interest so far from business networks.

13. Involves representatives from key public sector agencies who have the authority to ensure delivery of agreed action through their organizations.**Strengths:**

- Representation on LSP Steering Group at senior level from Council, health service and police.

Weaknesses:

- Limited links to Learning and Skills Council, Employment Service, London Development Agency.

14. There is early, ongoing and varied involvement of residents and all the sectors outlined above in identifying priorities, finding ways to tackle deprivation and renew communities, taking decisions and delivery.**Strengths:**

- Wide involvement in consultation process on CS and NRS so far, with further consultation planned for February 2002.
- Wide involvement of residents representatives in key strategies eg UDP, SRBs, Earls Court WP.

Weaknesses:

- Tenants and residents groups not yet represented on Steering Group.

15. The LSP works with a range of people who reflect the make up of the local population and who can help to build support for local strategies and help to implement them.**Strengths:**

- There was a good gender balance and many people from different ethnic groups and some people with disabilities at the two Borough conferences in October 2001 (4, 5)
- Community workshops took place within both geographical communities and communities of interest (8).

Weaknesses:

- Support for local strategies among the local population has not yet been measured.

16. The LSP is developing protocols with local communities to involve people in the design and delivery of programmes that affect them.**Strengths:**

- There is a history of community action in the Borough and local people are strongly involved in the design and delivery of SRB programmes.

Weaknesses:

- No formal protocols.
- Little coordination across organisations and sectors.

17. Whether local people are able to hear about and feed into the LSP's work.**Strengths:**

- LSP has distributed its newsletter widely.
- LSP website is being developed, meanwhile information on LSP is available on local authority and Chelsea Social Council websites.

Weaknesses:

- Work of LSP not yet widely known.

18. Levels of participation of the community and voluntary sectors in the LSP, in the context of the *Compact on relations between Government and the Voluntary and Community Sector in England*.

Strengths:

- The Social Councils have taken a leading role in the LSP.
- A meeting was held on 22 August 2001 to kick start participation in the LSP by the community and voluntary sectors.
- The community and voluntary sectors have been heavily involved in consultation to date (4,5,7,8).

Weaknesses:

- Lack of representation of black and ethnic minority community groups at Steering Group level.

19. Evidence of continuing and effective Local Compact development, explicitly linked to the LSP.

Strengths:

- The local *Compact* was launched in October 2001(10).
- Work is starting on the Funding sub-Compact and the Consultation sub-Compact.

Weaknesses:

- No explicit link between the Compact and the LSP Steering Group.

20. Work to establish baselines and aspirations for effective and meaningful community involvement in the LSP and how these are brought together into a plan for involving the community

Strengths:

- History of community action in the Borough.
- Consultation so far has included both geographical communities and communities of interest.

Weaknesses:

- No specific written plan for community involvement in the LSP.

21. How the LSP supports and works closely with the evolving Community Network and how a framework is being developed for integrating the network and the Community Empowerment Fund with the work of the LSP.

Strengths:

- The Development Plan for the LSP/Community Empowerment Fund work (9) is an integral part of the work of the LSP.
- VOF is electing three representatives to the LSP Steering Group (6).
- The CEF is being used to strengthen VOF.
- The CEF paid for some of the consultation which took place on the LSP in the autumn of 2001.

Weaknesses:

- No mechanism for reporting progress against the Development Plan to the LSP Steering Group.

22. The LSP works within race relations legislation and whether those public authority partners identified by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 use their influence to encourage partnership activity to promote racial equality.

Strengths:

- Statutory sector members of the Steering Group are required to ensure that their own practice and that of the Partnership conforms to the public sector duty to promote racial equality imposed by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000.

Weaknesses:

- No performance measurement system for racial equality in place for the LSP.

23. The LSP demonstrates clear mechanisms for ongoing consultation and including black and minority ethnic communities in planning, decision-making on funding and any other functions.

Strengths:

- The consultation to date has included community workshops with many black and ethnic minority community groups (8) including one run by the BME Health Forum.
- Black and ethnic minority community organisations were involved in the two Borough Conferences (4,5).

Weaknesses:

- The Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum was not in a position to become very much involved in the consultation to date, although the Forum did provide a brief slot at one meeting to discuss the LSP.

24. Membership (in its widest sense) and activities reflect the diversity of the area that the LSP covers.

Strengths:

- Diverse attendance at the Borough Conferences in October 2001.

Weaknesses:

- None of the current Steering Group members are from black or ethnic minority backgrounds.
- Lack of information about representation on Partnership Clusters.

25. Business representatives have been chosen appropriately and are able to link to other business networks.

Strengths:

- Two consultation meetings were held with the Chamber of Commerce in the autumn of 2001 and a meeting is scheduled for January 2002 with the Portobello Business Forum.

Weaknesses:

- Little active interest so far from business networks.

26. Business representatives are empowered to play a role in the LSP in its widest sense.

Strengths:

- There are some business representatives on local partnerships such as Golborne United.

Weaknesses:

- Little active interest so far from business in representation on the Steering Group.

27. Business representatives represent the diversity of private sector activity in the area.

Strengths:

- The LSP is attempting to reach out to different parts of the private sector.

Weaknesses:

- Little active interest so far from business in representation on the Steering Group.

HAS ESTABLISHED GENUINE COMMON PRIORITIES AND TARGETS AND AGREED ACTIONS AND MILESTONES LEADING TO DEMONSTRABLE IMPROVEMENTS AGAINST MEASURABLE BASELINES

28. Whether measurable baselines have been established.

Strengths:

- Part of CS and NRS preparation is establishment of baseline data at a neighbourhood level.

Weaknesses:

- 2001 Census information is not yet available.
- Ward boundary changes make comparison with previous years difficult.

29. The extent to which decisions are taken on the basis of evidence.

Strengths:

- The LSP Steering Group receives evidence in reports such as the NRF Statement of Use.

Weaknesses:

- As the LSP is so new, too few decisions have yet been taken to be able to see a track record of evidence-based decisions.

30. Identification of and efforts to deal with any conflicts between partners' priorities.

Strengths:

- Conflict between Council and voluntary sector priorities over membership of Steering Group was dealt with successfully (3).

Weaknesses:

- No other conflicts have yet arisen.

31. Contents of the Community Strategy and the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

Strengths:

- Currently being drafted.

Weaknesses:

- Currently being drafted.

32. The extent and nature of joint working between LSP partners.

Strengths:

- Extensive experience of joint working through partnerships (13).

Weaknesses:

- Lack of belief that this will make a difference - doubts about the need for a new Partnership in addition.

33. Evidence of improvements in service delivery, in particular against the deprivation related public service agreements identified in the Spending Review 2000.

Strengths:

- The CS and NRS will be cross-referenced with public service agreement floor targets, where applicable.

Weaknesses:

- Public service agreement not due until late 2002.

MEMBERS (ORGANISATIONS) HAVE ALIGNED THEIR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES, CRITERIA AND PROCESS TO THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE LSP

34. Appropriate incorporation of elements of the aims and objectives of the LSP into the corporate aims and/or business plans of the strategic partners.

Strengths:

- Strategic partners will sign up to the CS and NRS.

Weaknesses:

- The timescale means that decisions by strategic partners on their corporate/business plans may not be able to wait until the CS and NRS are finalised.

35. Progress towards sharing the information, targets and monitoring processes necessary to implement agreed strategy.

Strengths:

- Extensive experience of joint working through existing partnerships (13).

Weaknesses:

- Lack of information about performance monitoring systems.

36. Consideration of accountability for achieving results within the Partnership.

Strengths:

- Early decisions on how to develop the LSP, CS and NRS were made on a consensual basis (1,2,3)
- Partners will be asked to sign up to the CS and NRS and align their own plans to them.
- Limited bureaucracy.

Weaknesses:

- No formal standing orders or terms of reference for the Steering Group or Partnership Clusters.
- No formal allocation of responsibilities to Steering Group members.
- LSP role and structure not widely understood – perception that the Steering Group is the LSP.

IT REDUCES, NOT ADDS TO, THE BUREAUCRATIC BURDEN

37. Any proposal from the LSP should be signed up to by all partners.

Strengths:

- Partners will be asked to sign up to the CS and NRS and align their own plans to them.

Weaknesses:

- None so far identified.

38. Clarity of links between partnerships and plans, lines of responsibility and accountability.

Strengths:

- List of current partnerships exists (13).
- Revised Partnership diagram shows the links and lines of responsibility and accountability.
- Website is under development where links can be displayed.

Weaknesses:

- Steering Group has not yet seen/adopted revised Partnership diagram.

39. Simplicity of access to funding for local organisations.

Strengths:

- Social Councils are funded to provide funding advice to local organisations.

Weaknesses:

- Funders have different monitoring requirements.

40. Efforts to reduce form filling and duplication of effort.

Strengths:

- The development of the CS and NRS has not overburdened the strategic partners with form filling.
- The NRF is being administered with the minimum bureaucracy compatible with accountability and transparent decision making.

Weaknesses:

- Government reporting requirements eg for SRB imply a great deal of form filling.

41. How partners coordinate consultation activity.

Strengths:

- Recognition of the need to coordinate consultation activity so as to maximise effectiveness and minimise consultation fatigue.

Weaknesses:

- No protocols in place yet.

IT BUILDS ON BEST PRACTICE FROM SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS BY DRAWING ON EXPERIENCES OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL STRUCTURES AND NATIONAL AGENCIES

42. The LSP is building on experience, spreading best practice and learning from others.

Strengths:

- Year of experience of successful urban regeneration in Kensington & Chelsea.

Weaknesses:

- Experience has not been written up.
- Limited links with other boroughs.

43. The LSP brings together its plans for improving skills and knowledge into a plan for 'local action on learning' as part of its Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

Strengths:

- NRS currently being drafted with strong knowledge and skills emphasis.

Weaknesses:

- NRS not yet in place.

APPENDIX ONE

KENSINGTON & CHELSEA LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

SELF ASSESSMENT – JANUARY 2002

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

(NB These documents are not attached but will be sent to GOL)

1. Minutes of Steering Group launch 27 June 2001
2. Minutes of Steering Group meeting 25 September 2001
3. Minutes of Steering Group meeting 6 December 2001
4. Invitation list 8 October 2001 Conference
5. Invitation list 19 October 2001 Conference
6. Invitation to nominate voluntary sector representatives for the Steering Group
7. OPM report on consultation
8. List of community workshops autumn 2001
9. Development Plan to March 2003
10. Kensington & Chelsea Compact
11. LSP Newsletter
12. Public feedback
13. List of current partnerships
14. Progress report to GOL October to December 2001
15. January to March 2002 work plan

THE KENSINGTON & CHELSEA PARTNERSHIP

ACTION PLAN – JANUARY 2002

INTRODUCTION TO THE ACTION PLAN

This action plan sets out the way forward for the Kensington & Chelsea Partnership over the coming year.

To date, the Partnership Steering Group has

- launched itself on 27 June 2001 as a shadow Steering Group consisting of senior representatives of the local authority, police, health service, faith communities and voluntary sector;
- run some 20 community workshops, a range of consultation meetings with local residents and business and two Borough Conferences to involve local people and organisations in its work;
- commissioned a mapping exercise of some 50 major budget holders across the Partnership to establish where resources are being used in the Borough;
- commissioned a draft Community Strategy and Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy for local consultation in February 2002;
- conducted a self assessment.

The Partnership has measured itself against the 42 sub-criteria set out in the Government Neighbourhood Renewal Unit publication *Accreditation Guidance for Local Strategic Partnerships*. These are grouped into six main criteria - that Partnerships are strategic, inclusive, action-focused, performance managed, efficient and promote learning and development. The Government Office for London, which is responsible for accrediting the Partnership, has indicated that more emphasis should be placed on the first three criteria in the first year. Objectives and action points are included in the action plan for each of the Government's 43 sub-criteria. Some of the 43 criteria are repetitious. Where this is the case, the proposed action is also repeated. This action plan for remedying identified weaknesses should be read in conjunction with the Partnership's self assessment.

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

LSP – Local Strategic Partnership
GOL – Government Office for London
VOF – Voluntary Organisations Forum (the Community Network)
CS – Community Strategy
NRS – Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
PCT – Primary Care Trust
UDP – Unitary Development Plan
SRB – Single Regeneration Budget
CEF – Community Empowerment Fund

EFFECTIVE, REPRESENTATIVE AND CAPABLE OF PLAYING A STRATEGIC ROLE

1. Ability of LSP members to make strategic decisions and influence decision-making and delivery within their organization or community.

Objective: to bring in key decision-makers who are not already involved.

Action:

- Social Councils to encourage people from ethnic minorities to stand for election as voluntary sector representatives on the Steering Group.
- Faith representative to establish a multi-faith forum to provide representation.
- RBKC Chief Executive to undertake further consultation with local business on involvement of this sector.
- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager/ Acting Director of Notting Hill Social Council to design an electoral process for tenants and residents groups.
- Officer Working Group to seek involvement of RSLs, Learning and Skills Council, Employment Service, London Development Agency in appropriate Partnership Clusters.

2. Ability of the LSP to build consensus and resolve conflict

Objective: to resolve conflict over political representation within the Council.

Action:

- Leader of the Council and Cabinet to resolve this with the Minority Party.

3. How decisions are reached and how partner organizations are held accountable

Objective: to improve the transparency of decision making.

Action:

- Steering Group to approve the revised LSP structure diagram on 22 January 2002.
- Officer Working Group to draft terms of reference for the Steering Group and for itself for 22 March 2002.
- Each formal Partnership within the Partnership Clusters to report to the Steering Group on its terms of reference by June 2002.

4. Whether the LSP practices equal opportunity for all

Objective: to ensure that there is appropriate gender, racial and disability balance on the Steering Group.

Action:

- Council, PCT and police to consider gender balance when reappointing representatives.
- Social Councils to encourage people from ethnic minorities to stand for election as voluntary sector representatives on the Steering Group.
- Steering Group to conduct an audit to establish if any of its members have a disability.

5. Leadership style

Objective: to ensure that all members of the Partnership make a contribution and lead where they have expertise.

Action:

- PCT and police to consider and advise what contribution they can make to drafting policy papers and servicing the Steering Group
- As new members join the Steering Group, they will be asked to make a similar contribution.

ACTIVELY INVOLVES ALL THE KEY PLAYERS, INCLUDING THE PUBLIC, PRIVATE, COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SECTORS

6. The Partnership manages involvement creatively to ensure views, reflecting the diversity of local organizations and residents, are fed into the Partnership while maintaining its ability to make decisions and focus on results.

Objective: to move forward from focus on process to focus on results, while continuing to feed in local views.

Action:

- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager/ Social Councils Community Partnership Officer to feedback to people who took part in consultation the action which has resulted from their ideas.
- Officers drafting CS and NRS to include outcome measures.
- Steering Group to ensure that results are publicised annually.

7. The openness and transparency of decision-making and other processes of the LSP.

Objective: to improve the transparency of decision making.

Action:

- Officer Working Group to commission a publicity plan for the LSP from one of those partners (local authority, health, police) which have public relations departments.
- Officer Working Group to draft terms of reference for the Steering Group and for itself for 22 March 2002.
- Each formal Partnership within Partnership Clusters to report to the Steering Group on its terms of reference by June 2002.
- Steering Group meetings to be advertised on the LSP website as being open to the public.

8. Whether all partners actively seek and support engagement of hard to reach groups and those who may traditionally have been excluded from partnership working.

Objective: to ensure that the Partnership Clusters include such groups.

Action:

- Each formal Partnership within the Partnership Clusters to report to the LSP Steering Group by June 2002 on arrangements for including hard to reach and excluded groups in its work.

9. What barriers to involvement have been identified and what solutions have been agreed (including flexibility in the working practices of the LSP).

Objective: to ensure that all relevant interests are involved in the Steering Group and Partnership Clusters.

Action:

- Social Councils to encourage people from ethnic minorities to stand for election as voluntary sector representatives on the Steering Group.
- Faith representative to establish a multi-faith forum to provide representation.
- RBKC Chief Executive to undertake further consultation with local business on involvement of this sector.
- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager/ Acting Director of Notting Hill Social Council to design an electoral process for tenants and residents groups.
- Officer Working Group to seek involvement of RSLs, Learning and Skills Council, Employment Service, London Development Agency in appropriate partnership clusters.

10. The participation of all partners from the earliest opportunity, to help determine the structure, processes and priorities of the LSP.

Objective: to ensure that all partners take part in determining how the LSP develops.

Action: Officer Working Group to consider secretariat arrangements further and report to Steering Group on 22 March 2002.

11. Seeks and supports the input and membership of voluntary and community organizations, smaller community groups and local residents, especially from hard to reach groups.

Objective: to ensure that there is appropriate representation on Partnership Clusters as well as the Steering Group.

Action:

- Each formal Partnership within Partnership Clusters to report to the LSP Steering Group by June 2002 on its membership, including voluntary and community organizations, smaller community groups and local residents, especially from hard to reach groups.

12. Seeks input and uses expertise from business of all sizes and community enterprises, each of whom have very different concerns and contributions to make.

Objective: to involve local business in the LSP.

Action:

- Meeting with the Portobello Business Forum scheduled for January 2002.
- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager to set up an email-based business panel
- Officer Working Group to ensure that the cross-Council Business Contact Officer Group is broadened to a cross-agency Group.

13. Involves representatives from key public sector agencies who have the authority to ensure delivery of agreed action through their organizations.

Objective: to engage key public sector agencies.

Action:

- Officer Working Group to seek involvement of Learning and Skills Council, Employment Service, London Development Agency in appropriate Partnership Clusters.

14. There is early, ongoing and varied involvement of residents and all the sectors outlined above in identifying priorities, finding ways to tackle deprivation and renew communities, taking decisions and delivery.

Objective: to involve tenants and residents groups in the Steering Group.

Action:

- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager/ Acting Director of Notting Hill Social Council to design an electoral process for tenants and residents groups.

15. The LSP works with a range of people who reflect the make up of the local population and who can help to build support for local strategies and help to implement them.

Objective: to assess support among local people for the draft CS and NRS.

Action:

- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager/ Social Councils Community Partnership Officer to organise consultation on the draft CS and NRS in February 2002.

16. The LSP is developing protocols with local communities to involve people in the design and delivery of programmes that affect them.

Objective: to formalise best practice

Action:

- RBKC Head of Economic Development to write up the experience of urban regeneration in Kensington & Chelsea.

17. Whether local people are able to hear about and feed into the LSP's work.

Objective: to improve the transparency of decision making.

Action:

- Officer Working Group to commission a publicity plan for the LSP from one of those partners (local authority, health, police) which have public relations departments.

18. Levels of participation of the community and voluntary sectors in the LSP, in the context of the *Compact on relations between Government and the Voluntary and Community Sector in England*.

Objective: to facilitate representation from black and ethnic minority community groups at Steering Group level.

Action:

- Social Councils to encourage people from ethnic minorities to stand for election as voluntary sector representatives on the Steering Group.

19. Evidence of continuing and effective local Compact development, explicitly linked to the LSP.

Objective: to link the local Compact with the LSP.

Action:

- LSP Steering Group to consider the Compact on 22 January.
- Working Groups on Funding and Consultation Sub-Compacts to report to the LSP Steering Group on progress in due course.

20. Work to establish baselines and aspirations for effective and meaningful community involvement in the LSP and how these are brought together into a plan for involving the community

Objective: to develop a plan for community involvement in the LSP.

Action:

- Steering Group to consider further by April 2002, in the light of evidence of community involvement in the CS and NRS consultation.

21. How the LSP supports and works closely with the evolving Community Network and how a framework is being developed for integrating the network and the Community Empowerment Fund with the work of the LSP.

Objective: to develop a mechanism for reporting progress against the LSP/CEF Development Plan to the LSP Steering Group.

Action:

- LSP Steering Group on 22 January 2002 to consider progress report to GOL as at December 2001.
- Social Councils Community Empowerment Officer to make regular progress reports to Steering Group as well as to the Social Councils and VOF.

22. The LSP works within race relations legislation and whether those public authority partners identified by the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 use their influence to encourage partnership activity to promote racial equality.

Objective: to develop performance management measures for racial equality.

Action:

- Officer Working Group to commission a racial equality audit of LSP work to date to establish baseline and set performance management measures.

23. The LSP demonstrates clear mechanisms for ongoing consultation and including black and minority ethnic communities in planning, decision-making on funding and any other functions.

Objective: to involve the Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum in future consultation.

Action: Social Councils to seek involvement of MRFCF.

24. Membership (in its widest sense) and activities reflect the diversity of the area that the LSP covers.

Objective: to facilitate representation from black and ethnic minority community groups at Steering Group and Partnership Cluster levels.

Action:

- Social Councils to encourage people from ethnic minorities to stand for election as voluntary sector representatives on the Steering Group.
- Each formal Partnership in Partnership Clusters to report to the LSP Steering Group by June 2002 on membership, including from black and ethnic minority communities.

25. Business representatives have been chosen appropriately and are able to link to other business networks.

Objective: to involve local business representatives in the LSP.

Action:

- Meeting scheduled for January 2002 with the Portobello Business Centre, following on from two meetings already held with the Chamber of Commerce.

26. Business representatives are empowered to play a role in the LSP in its widest sense.

Objective: to make the LSP accessible to local business.

Action:

- RBKC Research and Consultation Manager to set up email-based business panel.
- Officer Working Group to ensure that the cross-Council Business Contact Officer Group is broadened to a cross-agency Group.

27. Business representatives represent the diversity of private sector activity in the area.

Objective: to reflect the diversity of the business sector.

Action:

- To seek to involve: businesses the partners have major contracts with; the 50 largest businesses in the Borough; members of the Chamber of Commerce; members of the Portobello Business Forum.

HAS ESTABLISHED GENUINE COMMON PRIORITIES AND TARGETS AND AGREED ACTIONS AND MILESTONES LEADING TO DEMONSTRABLE IMPROVEMENTS AGAINST MEASURABLE BASELINES

28. Whether measurable baselines have been established.

Objective: to include baseline data in the CS and NRS.

Action:

- Officers preparing drafts to include baseline data.

29. The extent to which decisions are taken on the basis of evidence.

Objective: to ensure that decisions are evidence-based.

Action:

- Steering Group to be clear that its decisions are based on sound evidence and to include this in its terms of reference.

30. Identification of and efforts to deal with any conflicts between partners' priorities.

Objective: to ensure that any conflicts are resolved.

Action:

- Steering Group members to point out and discuss any conflicts and to include this in its terms of reference.

31. Contents of the Community Strategy and the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

Objective: to ensure that the CS and NRS both conform to Government guidelines and are locally useful and supported.

- **Action:** RBKC Research and Consultation Manager/ Social Councils Community Partnership Officer to organise consultation on the draft CS and NRS in February 2002.

32. The extent and nature of joint working between LSP partners.

Objective: to build on the extensive local experience of successful joint working.

Action:

- Each formal Partnership within Partnership Clusters to report to LSP Steering Group on its progress by June 2002.

33. Evidence of improvements in service delivery, in particular against the deprivation related public service agreements identified in the Spending Review 2000.

Objective: to align the CS and NRS with the PSA.

Action:

- Officers drafting CS and NRS to cross-reference with PSA floor targets.

MEMBERS (ORGANISATIONS) HAVE ALIGNED THEIR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES, CRITERIA AND PROCESS TO THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE LSP

34. Appropriate incorporation of elements of the aims and objectives of the LSP into the corporate aims and/or business plans of the strategic partners.

Objective: to ensure that corporate/business plans of the strategic partners take account of the LSP.

Action: Council, police, PCT and Social Councils to report to the Steering Group on 22 March 2002 on how they have built the LSP aims and objectives into their planning for 2002/3.

35. Progress towards sharing the information, targets and monitoring processes necessary to implement agreed strategy.

Objective: to obtain information on performance monitoring systems.

Action: Officer Working Group to consider how to obtain meaningful information.

36. Consideration of accountability for achieving results within the Partnership.

Objective: to improve the transparency of decision making.

Action:

- Steering Group to approve the revised LSP structure diagram on 22 January 2002.
- Officer Working Group to draft terms of reference for the Steering Group and for itself for 22 March 2002.
- Each formal Partnership within the Partnership Clusters to report to the Steering Group on its terms of reference by June 2002.

IT REDUCES, NOT ADDS TO, THE BUREAUCRATIC BURDEN

37. Any proposal from an LSP should be signed up to by all partners.

Objective: to ensure that all partners sign up to the CS and NRS.

Action: Steering Group to approve final CS and NRS on 22 March 2002. Council, PCT, police, Social Councils, VOF, Faith Forum representatives to report back to next Steering Group meeting after 22 March on endorsement by their organisations.

38. Clarity of links between partnerships and plans, lines of responsibility and accountability.

Objective: to make explicit the links between current partnerships and the LSP.

Action:

- LSP Steering Group to approve revised Partnership Diagram on 22 January 2002.
- Officer Working Group to continue developing the LSP Website.

39. Simplicity of access to funding for local organizations.

Objective: to simplify monitoring requirements of funders.

Action:

- Funding Sub-Compact Group to consider and report back to LSP Steering Group by September 2002.

40. Efforts to reduce form filling and duplication of effort.

Objective: to ensure that only forms which are essential have to be filled in.

Action:

- GOL representatives to be asked to clarify on 22 January what Government is doing to reduce form-filling.
- Officer Working Group to ensure that only essential forms are issued by the LSP.

41. How partners coordinate consultation activity.

Objective: To design a framework and timetable for consultation in Kensington & Chelsea.

Action: Officer Working Group to consider and report back to the Steering Group.

IT BUILDS ON BEST PRACTICE FROM SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS BY DRAWING ON EXPERIENCES OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL STRUCTURES AND NATIONAL AGENCIES

42. The LSP is building on experience, spreading best practice and learning from others.

Objective: to disseminate best practice experience.

Action:

- This will feature as an objective in the draft NRS and the Skills and Knowledge element of the NRF.
- An LSP-wide Regeneration Exchange will meet quarterly from February 2002.

43. The LSP brings together its plans for improving skills and knowledge into a plan for 'local action on learning' as part of its Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy.

Objective: to include a plan for 'local action learning' in the NRS.

Action: Officers drafting the NRS to include a 'plan for local action learning'.