

Notes from John Fletcher who will not be at the Governors meeting on Feb 19th.

The governance group

I see governance as on going although the size of the task should diminish with time. For this reason it would seem sensible to keep the governance group going. But there does appear to be a gap in the management structure of the LINK. If the Governance group is outside of the LINK who is managing the LINK? Clearly at the moment this job is being done very largely by the Host. Is this what we want? In my opinion, although the Host has a very important role to play in this area, it was never meant to be the manager.

When the Priorities panel has been selected and is running what will its role be in relation to management? This Panel will be making very important decisions on the work of the LINK and will be in a powerful position to dictate policy. Is this what we want?

I do not see the enlargement of the Governance group as a solution to these problems. It might be sensible to enlarge the group if its functions change but not as they are.

As the governance group is outside of the LINK (as is the Host) is it true to say that the Group cannot get involved in the business of the LINK other than Governance? Does this rule apply to the group as a whole or to it as individuals? Could individuals within the Governance Group become involved in the work of the LINK?

These issues need to be clarified. I would choose to increase the remit of the Governance group to make it is more of a Management group and then it could be sensible to recruit a few more members so that there are always a sufficient number at a meeting to make decisions (a quorum number to be decided). Such a group should then be able to devise policy and approve work/tasks which could be ratified at public meetings, quarterly or annual.

Authorised Visitors

I hope the Group will have a final draft document for the meeting which will combine the comments of Roger with my original paper. I am assuming that Brenda will put these together. One point the group should debate is how many authorised visitors our LINK should have? The number I have chosen is about the same as I heard other LINKs talk about at the London meeting. But I have some doubts about this number as it seems to me that the need might be very variable. But because of CRB checks it will not be able to be. I learned that CRB checks are free to LINK (some said they cost £7 each) so perhaps we should not hesitate in applying for many more in order to cover all eventualities. For instance, I think that the entire governance group and all the other panels should have such a check.

One point I did not raise in the Authorised Panel paper. Authorised visitors will need to be identifiable i.e. wear a label. Has anyone thought of designing one for the Kent LINK?

Projects

In general I agree with Evan's paper. He covers all the issues very thoroughly. But I have a fear that the complexity of application will be a disincentive for some. Also I think that such paper work should perhaps be used for work of a certain size only. This size limit would need to be defined but it would be difficult to justify a lot of preparation input into a one day project. I would hate LINK to become overly bureaucratic. If there are a size limit what do we do with the smaller work items? I suggest we have another name for these and call them tasks or something similar. A very simple guide would then need to be drawn up to cover these.

John Fletcher
Lead on Communications and PR
Kent LINK Governors