

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ACTION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SCRAIP)

Committee: Joint Mid-Kent Improvement Partnership Overview and Scrutiny Group

Meeting Date: 12th January 2015

Minute N^o: 109

Topic: Mid Kent Improvement Partnership Governance and Communication

Recommendation ⁱ	Cabinet Member ⁱⁱ	Response ⁱⁱⁱ	Timetable ^{iv}	Lead Officer ^v
It was recommended that: a) Opportunities for pre-scrutiny should be provided within existing governance arrangements at each authority prior to any new shared service proposals being considered at a tri-Cabinet meeting (i.e. after MKIP Board approval, if not before);	Leader	<p>The principle of pre-decision consideration of significant decisions is fully supported.</p> <p>Pre-decision scrutiny of Cabinet decisions is currently achieved through Overview and Scrutiny Committees. From May 2015 the Committee governance system will be in place; pre-decision "scrutiny" can be achieved in a variety of ways within this system. It will be for the Policy and Resources Committee to ensure that this is undertaken.</p>	Continuing	Chief Executive

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

b) That Joint Overview & Scrutiny task and finish groups should be convened by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee(s) of the individual authorities, as necessary, to jointly review any major issues that arise in regard to shared service delivery and also any new options, such as the possibility of contracting to deliver a shared service for an authority outside the partnership;	Leader	<p>The principle of joint review of the performance of or alternative models for shared services is supported.</p> <p>The convening of task and finish groups by Overview and Scrutiny is a matter for Overview and Scrutiny and not for Cabinet.</p> <p>From May 2015 the Committee governance system will be in place. It will be for the Policy and Resources Committee to decide whether or not to convene/participate in any joint task and finish group; this could be achieved by nominating Members of the Committee or other members of the Council to participate</p>	Continuing	Chief Executive
c) That the MKIP Board will notify the Overview and Scrutiny functions of each authority when there are potential items of interest that a joint task and finish group could review on their	Leader	<p>In our current governance arrangements it is for Overview and Scrutiny to consider the potential items that it wishes to review and it is not for Cabinet to presume what they might be.</p> <p>It is essential that the business</p>	Continuing	Chief Executive

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

behalf		<p>of the MKIP board is transparent and accessible so that any Member can see what is under consideration.</p> <p>The Maidstone representatives on the MKIP Board are the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive. From May 2015 the Leader will also chair the Policy and Resources Committee and will be in a position to ensure that the Committee is briefed enabling potential items of interest to be identified for review or pre-decision scrutiny.</p>		
d) That the creation of the Mid Kent Services Director post should be favourably considered in light of the value already placed on this role by members of the Shared Services Boards and others, as it provides a single point of contact for the MKIP Board and Mid Kent Service Managers;	Leader	<p>The terms of reference of the Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group covered governance arrangements, communication and the objectives of the MKS Director and how these would be measured. This recommendation falls outside the remit of the Group.</p> <p>The Cabinet while noting the view of O&S believes that it is essential that the position of MKS Director, which is currently a trial arrangement, is properly evaluated before any decision about the future of the role is</p>		Chief Executive

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

		made. This should take place in accordance with the timetable agreed by the MKIP Board and be conducted on an evidential basis including the assessment and conclusions from the independent review group which is chaired by Zena Cooke (MBC Director of Regeneration and Communities) as well as giving consideration the resources available to fund the post and the consequences for the senior management structure of the partner authorities.		
e) That the role of the MKIP Programme Manager should be re-examined and aligned with the reporting arrangements arising from the appointment of a Mid Kent Services Director (if the post is confirmed);	Leader	<p>This recommendation is related to management issues and not issues of governance or communications and therefore lies outside the remit of the task and finish group.</p> <p>The remit of the MKIP Programme Manager is clear and was established at the outset of the partnership specifically to support the MKIP partnership particularly the MKIP Board, MKIP Chief Executives and previously the MKIP Management Board and now provides support to the Shared Service Boards</p>		Chief Executive

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

		<p>If MKIP is to continue to develop positively then this support is essential and is not affected by confirmation of the MKS Director role.</p>		
<p>f) That early consideration should be given to transferring the management of the Planning Support and Environmental Health shared services under the Mid Kent Services umbrella as soon as possible</p>	<p>Leader</p>	<p>This recommendation is related to management issues and not issues of governance or communications and therefore lies outside the remit of the task and finish group</p> <p>The Planning Support service is "hosted" (inasmuch as the Shared Service manager is employed) by Maidstone and Environmental Health by Tunbridge Wells. Therefore the line management of these services are a matter for each of the host authority.</p> <p>It has been the practice of MKIP partners to work collaboratively and establish consensus in terms of management arrangements. We would expect to have constructive and meaningful discussions about any changes in current arrangements.</p> <p>It would be prudent to review the current arrangements in the</p>		<p>Chief Executive</p>

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

		light of any future decision concerning the MKS Director role (which could continue as a trial, become a permanent arrangement or discontinue). Changing reporting lines while this outcome remains uncertain would be premature.		
g) That a toolkit is created to assist managers in their role as internal clients of shared services	Cabinet Member for Corporate Services	<p>This recommendation is related to management issues and not issues of governance or communications and therefore lies outside the remit of the task and finish group</p> <p>Nevertheless we recognise the need to further improve the clienting arrangements for shared services. The Director of Environment and Shared Services has taken the lead on this from a Maidstone perspective and will continue to work with CLT and SLT colleagues to achieve this.</p>		Director of Environment and Shared Services
h) That (where appropriate) shared services create a service catalogue for their service that will help internal clients to better understand the extent of the service they provide	Cabinet Member for Corporate Services	Cabinet is clear that clients for shared services have responsibility for defining the services required in terms of scope and standards at a cost that is affordable. The process for establishing the service to be provided is clear and reflected in a service level		Director for Environment and Shared Services

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

		<p>agreement and the shared services' service plans.</p> <p>There is a number of ways in which internal clients can improve their understanding of services provided by MKS. Current examples include regular surgeries eg between Planning and Legal Services. A directory of services may also assist</p>		
i) That a joint communications plan is developed to improve staff and member awareness and understanding of MKIP (shared service development) and MKS (shared service delivery)	Cabinet Member for Corporate Services	Cabinet support this recommendation	Continuing	Head of Policy and Communications
j) That the MKIP Board has responsibility for the effective implementation of an agreed communications plan and ensures its delivery is resourced appropriately	Cabinet Member for Corporate Services	Cabinet agrees that there is a need to significantly improve communication with respect to the MKIP partnership – both internally and externally and that the MKIP Board should contribute at a strategic level eg agreeing the objectives for a communications plan while the MKIP Chief Executives actively monitor the impact of the plan	Continuing	Head of Policy and Communications

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

		and day to day implementation is undertaken by the MKIP Programme manager working closely with the communications teams in all three authorities		
k) That communication should be improved between the newly created Shared Service Boards and the MKIP Board to ensure the latter is fully aware of any major service issues and any suggested options for change	Leader	Clear reporting arrangements between Shared Service Boards and the MKIP Board are in place. Although these arrangements are relatively recent they have quickly become embedded and are working well.	Continuing	Chief Executive with the Director of Environment and Shared Services
l) That client representatives on the Shared Service Boards should ensure the outcomes of their meetings, including any related direction coming from the MKIP Board, are effectively cascaded to relevant staff within each authority	Leader	Cabinet supports this recommendation. At Maidstone BC there is a regular briefing meeting led by the Director of Environment and Shared Services with SLT colleagues which enables two way communication	Continuing	Director of Environment and Shared Services
m) That future MKIP	Leader	Cabinet agrees that MKIP	Continuing	Chief Executive

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

Board meetings should be held and papers published in accordance with the appropriate local authority access to information regulations		papers should be openly available and through a process which reflects the spirit of the access to information legislation.		
n) That given the change in governance arrangements at Maidstone BC from May 2015, consequential amendments be made to reflect that the Overview and Scrutiny function will be absorbed within the Policy and Resources and three other service committees	Leader	The new Maidstone BC constitution is currently being drafted. Please also see responses (a) and (b) above	April 2015	Chief Executive

Notes on the completion of SCRAIP

ⁱ Report recommendations are listed as found in the report.

ⁱⁱ Insert in this box the Cabinet Member whose portfolio the recommendation falls within.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box either the acceptance or rejection of the recommendation.

If the recommendation is rejected an explanation for its rejection should be provided. The 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes can be left blank

APPENDIX (ix) - DRAFT RESPONSES

If the recommendation is accepted an explanation of the action to be taken to implement the recommendation should be recorded in this box. Please also complete the 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes.

^{iv} The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box when the action in indicated in the previous box will be implemented.

^v The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box the Officer responsible for the implementation of the action highlighted in the 'response' box.