

# Grenfell Support Scrutiny update: Q2 2025

Community Support programme

November 2025



If you would like a translated copy of this document please contact [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

আপনি যদি এই নথির একটি অনুবাদিত অনুলিপি চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk) এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

የተተረጎመውን የዚህ መረጃ ይዘት ከፈለጉ እባክዎ በ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة مترجمة من هذه المعلومات، فيرجى الاتصال بـ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk) أو

«اگر یک نسخه‌ی ترجمه شده از این اطلاعات را می‌خواهید، لطفاً با ایمیل [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk)

Se desejar uma versão traduzida desta informação, por favor entre em contato com [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

Haddii aad rabto nuqul dukumeenti ah oo la turjumay fadlan la xidhiidh [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

Si desea una versión traducida de esta información, póngase en contacto con [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk).

ኅይዲ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተረጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ [futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk) ርኽቡ።

# Purpose

This document is the second Independent Scrutiny Function update on scrutiny of the Community Support programme. It provides a assessment on delivery of the programme from July – September 2025.

Previous scrutiny reports can be accessed [here](#).

# Overview

## **What is the Independent Scrutiny Function?**

The Grenfell Support programme is being delivered by the Grenfell Partnerships Team (GPT) and overseen by an Independent Scrutiny Function (ISF). The job of the ISF is to help ensure the Grenfell Support is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and the immediate local community near Grenfell Tower. Further information about the ISF and its appointment can be found [here](#).

## **What is the purpose of this document?**

This document provides a summary of our scrutiny assessment on the delivery and monitoring of the Grenfell Community Support programme from July – September 2025.

## **What are the contents of this document?**

This document presents our scrutiny assessment according to our scrutiny framework (which you can see on slide 6). This quarter, we have drawn on insights from a review of the GPT's Q2 monitoring report, the Grenfell Community Support Programme First Year Review Survey, an Operational Steering Group (OSG) meeting attended on 9 September, a meeting with the Grenfell Community Advocacy Team (GCAT) on 3 October, and the ISF-hosted sensemaking event on 7 October.

# Contents

1. Scrutiny framework – slide 6
2. Summary scrutiny assessment – slides 7-14
3. Sharing your views and staying in touch – slides 15 & 16

Appendix: Detailed scrutiny assessment (slides 17-29)

# Scrutiny framework

To make our scrutiny assessment, we reviewed the GPT's monitoring data against the following questions:

<b>Delivery, reach and impact</b>	Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? Who is accessing the programme and who is it not reaching? Is the programme having an impact and being adapted as required to improve impact?
<b>Complaints</b>	Are there any trends or patterns in complaints? What learning/actions have been taken as a result?
<b>Expenditure</b>	Is expenditure for the programme as intended? Have significant changes in expenditure been recorded and justified?
<b>Reporting and transparency</b>	Is reporting/planned reporting providing people with clear, honest, and timely information about the programme and decisions?
<b>Restorative practice</b>	Are the GPT ensuring that the process of delivery and monitoring centres the perspectives and experiences of people accessing the programme? Is the delivery and monitoring of the programme informed by restorative practice?
<b>Monitoring</b>	Is the monitoring providing the necessary insight for the GPT to deliver and improve the programme?

# **Q2 2025 summary scrutiny assessment**

# Scrutiny assessment overview (1)

**Based on the evidence reviewed, the ISF is satisfied that the GPT is continuing to deliver the Community Programme effectively and in line with the agreed model. Delivery remains responsive, transparent and is increasingly data-driven.**

**Summary of overall progress** (you can find out more in the GPT update [here](#)):

- As of the end of September (Q2), the Grenfell Community Programme was showing good progress in increasing take-up across all strands, with strong delivery of wellbeing grants, leisure centre memberships and advocacy support.
- 463 new grant applications were received this quarter and 389 new payments have been processed since the last report, supported by targeted outreach.
- 227 new Kensington Leisure Centre memberships approved; all memberships extended to March 2026 and this has been communicated to residents.
- Collaboration with voluntary and health partners (e.g. Age UK Kensington & Chelsea, Nova, Citizens Advice Bureau) has strengthened referral pathways across all parts of the programme, widening access and ensuring residents are connected to the right support.
- The Q2 community survey achieved strong engagement (417 residents), offering new insights into satisfaction, reach and impact.
- The Grenfell Community Advocacy Team (GCAT) continues to operate in a relational way. Their approach has earned significant trust within the community, demonstrated by positive feedback and higher engagement levels.

With increasing amounts of monitoring data being generated and use of the ISF's new scrutiny reporting template, the availability and presentation of insights to inform decision making and scrutiny has strengthened. The ISF welcomes the ongoing development of a case audit process for GCAT to help embed learning and support continuous improvement for the programme and wider council services.

# Scrutiny assessment overview (2)

## Strengths:

- The GPT continues to operate transparently, with timely updates and open communication about programme developments.
- Monitoring and evaluation systems have developed, now including satisfaction and impact measures through the survey.
- Complaints are handled promptly and have informed improvements to programme design and communication.
- The team's restorative approach, centred on accessibility, honest and face-to-face support (particularly through the advocacy support service) is valued by residents.
- The GPT is demonstrating learning and adaptability, refining delivery methods based on community feedback and partnership insight.

## Key risks/issues:

- While the GPT's engagement with the OSG remains consistent and constructive, a continued focus on wider community engagement is needed to ensure a breadth of representation as plans for Year 2 develop. The ISF would also like to see more clarity and transparency about the purpose of the OSG (i.e., to hear community feedback and/or perform monitoring and scrutiny and/or inform/make decisions).
- Long-term sustainability of some offers (e.g. KLC memberships) remains uncertain. However, GPT has begun early conversations, informed by survey insights and recent OSG discussions, about potential options for allocating additional funding. Clear communication with residents about future options will be essential as these discussions progress.
- There has been no expenditure on the community activities budget, as plans have not yet been agreed with residents. GPT is seeking further clarity through the review and ongoing discussions with the OSG to ensure this budget is shaped by, and accountable to, the community.

# Scrutiny assessment overview (3)

- A small number of residents with more complex, multi-service needs experience slower progress and less clarity about next steps. Improving coordination and communication across wider council teams would strengthen consistency and trust, an area that the ISF could support with as part of wider council influencing.
- The GPT's planned shift to using Power BI dashboards to share data is positive, but accessibility remains untested. Resident feedback will be important to ensure the platform supports transparency effectively.
- Current data provides good insight into those accessing the programme, but there is limited understanding of those not. The ISF would like the GPT to provide clearer demographic and geographic analysis to identify under-represented groups using insights from survey data and recent targeted outreach to housing associations and sheltered housing. It would be helpful for this to include reflective insights from the GPT on why certain groups may be engaging less.

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (1)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Delivery, reach and impact</b>	<p>Implementation and delivery remain on track and consistent with agreed plans. The GPT has shown strong responsiveness to feedback, with clear evidence of adaptation and learning. Application rates increased by 23% this quarter following targeted outreach via housing associations, postal letters, and workshops. The extension of leisure memberships until March 2026 was communicated clearly to residents, reinforcing transparency.</p> <p>The Q2 survey (417 responses) provided richer insight into resident satisfaction and outcomes, with most respondents describing helpful and responsive staff interactions. Survey feedback shows the main issues raised were delays in accessing leisure memberships, communication around wellbeing grant payments, and general awareness of the programme. Only a small number of respondents commented on GCAT, and these were mostly positive.</p> <p>There has been no expenditure on the community activities budget, as plans have not yet been agreed with residents. The ISF recognises this as a constructive delay, reflecting the GPT's commitment to co-design and to ensuring activities are shaped by resident input.</p>
<b>Complaints</b>	<p>Complaints remain low, with 11 Stage 1 complaints logged since programme launch (0.44% of applications). All were resolved on time and none escalated to Stage 2. Complaints primarily related to communication or clarity around support boundaries. Importantly, feedback from complaints was used to shape the community survey, showing that the GPT is learning from residents' experiences.</p>

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (2)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Expenditure</b>	<p>Expenditure is broadly in line with delivery plans for Year 1, with underspends emerging in wellbeing grants, community activities, and communications and engagement where delivery is still developing. Small reallocations (e.g., to support KLC memberships) have been made transparently and in line with resident feedback.</p> <p>The ISF would like clearer reporting of unspent variance as separate budget lines, particularly where funds are re-allocated to other programme areas. The ISF would also like future updates on decisions about the use of interest accrued in reserves, and continued community involvement in how underspend and Year 2 priorities are shaped, to ensure financial decisions reflect community feedback, and this is communicated to them.</p>
<b>Reporting and transparency</b>	<p>The GPT continues to demonstrate a transparent approach, sharing regular updates via newsletters and email to explain decisions and programme progress. The September and October communications provided a clear rationale for extending leisure memberships. The GPT acknowledges accessibility limitations in its Linktree reporting platform and is developing an improved Power BI dashboard that will consolidate data and be published on the RBKC website.</p>

# Scrutiny assessment against framework: summary (3)

Below we summarise our scrutiny assessment against our framework:

<b>Restorative practice</b>	<p>Restorative principles remain embedded in the programme's delivery. The team's approach (with an emphasis on openness, face-to-face contact, and responsiveness) continues to be well received by residents. The ISF commends the GPT's consistency in maintaining trust and accountability by being transparent and communicating honestly, even when outcomes are uncertain. Following some challenging OSG meetings, the ISF welcomes the GPT's decision to use external facilitation to create a more balanced space and help clarify the group's purpose.</p> <p>The GPT's plans to strengthen wider engagement and influence across the Council will also help extend restorative approaches beyond the programme's immediate remit.</p>
<b>Monitoring</b>	<p>Monitoring has strengthened this quarter, supported by the introduction of new satisfaction and impact data from the resident survey. The GPT is analysing reach and outcomes by demographic group and location to identify differences in experience. A case-audit process for GCAT is being developed to ensure learning from individual cases informs wider improvement. The ISF views the GPT's monitoring as robust and supportive of continuous learning.</p>

# Scrutiny assessment: further information required in the future

## Information we want to see immediately from the GPT (i.e., before the next round of scrutiny)

An update on the proposed changes to the programme for Year 2, including how the GPT has reached these decisions and how resident feedback has informed them. The ISF would like to be sent all communications shared with the community so we can review ongoing decision making and reporting related to changes to the programme for Year 2.

## Information we want to see in the next round of scrutiny

- Evidence of the GPT sharing expenditure updates with the community, as part of communicating proposed changes to the programme for Year 2.
- Update on launch and community feedback regarding the new Power BI dashboard.
- The number of complaints received each quarter remains low, which is positive. While this means identifying clear patterns is not always possible, the ISF would like the GPT to continue recording complaints and feedback consistently so that any recurring themes over time can be noticed. A short narrative showing what has been learned and how issues were addressed would support transparency and continuous improvement.
- How the GPT is gathering insights to support wider system influencing, showing how emerging findings from the programme inform other areas (e.g., the Council, Health systems and Government policy). This will help the ISF and the GPT co-develop a more formal approach to wider influencing ambitions in 2026.

**Sharing your views and staying in touch**

# Sharing your views and staying in touch

The monitoring and scrutiny arrangements aim to help ensure the Grenfell Support programme is delivered transparently and effectively in the interests of bereaved and survivors and community members.

The ISF's monitoring and scrutiny updates will be shared with you via the GPT every quarter, but your voice is also crucial. To share your views on the programme's delivery and get involved in its scrutiny, you can:

- Provide direct feedback to the GPT by contacting [FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk](mailto:FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk).
- Provide direct feedback to the ISF by emailing [isf@involve.org.uk](mailto:isf@involve.org.uk) or calling 020 3745 4334.
- Participate in the collective scrutiny & reflection sessions. These are a dedicated sessions with the GPT to help understand programme delivery so far, and identify changes needed to the programme (and beyond). There will be two community sensemaking & reflection sessions a year on the Community Support programme, facilitated by the ISF. The ISF will be in touch prior to this with details about how to take part.

You can be involved as much or as little as you would like, and your involvement can vary at different points in the programme depending on your interest and capacity. There is **no** obligation to get involved in these scrutiny processes and your choice to participate or not will not affect your ability to access support.

# Appendix: Q2 2025 Detailed scrutiny assessment

If you'd like more detail than provided in the above summary, please see the following slides for a more detailed assessment against each part of the scrutiny framework

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: delivery

## **Is the programme being delivered in line with agreed plans? What have been key areas of success and challenge?**

The GPT report demonstrates that the Community Support programme continues to be delivered in line with agreed plans and shows evidence of progress. Since the last quarter, 463 new wellbeing grant applications have been received, 389 payments processed and 227 new leisure centre memberships approved. All memberships have been extended until March 2026. This was communicated to residents through newsletters and follow-up emails in September and October.

Key areas of success include targeted outreach through housing associations, personalised letters and in-person engagement, which led to a 23% increase in applications. The GCAT continues to work collaboratively with council teams, maintaining transparency, and earning significant community trust through consistent follow-up and responsiveness.

The development of new community activities has taken longer than planned due to the breadth of consultation and differing community views on priorities. The ISF recognises this as a constructive delay, reflecting the GPT's commitment to co-design and to ensuring activities are shaped by resident input.

Challenges include sustaining the delivery capacity of the GPT as demand grows, and maintaining clarity about the role and purpose of the OSG within wider engagement and decision making structures. The GPT is taking steps to broaden participation and improve transparency as Year 2 plans are finalised.

## **Have challenges been addressed? How?**

The GPT has adapted by using varied outreach methods, such as housing association channels, personalised mailouts and door-knocking, to reach residents less likely to engage digitally. Collaboration with voluntary and health partners (Age UK Kensington & Chelsea, Nova, Citizens Advice Bureau) has improved referral pathways.

The team has also co-designed the residents survey and workshops with the OSG, embedding feedback loops into future programme adjustments.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: delivery

**Are there any factors from beyond the programme's remit that are impacting delivery (positively or negatively)? If so, what are they? How are these being recorded? Is anything being done to address these?**

During the ISF sensemaking event, discussions about the legacy of the Grenfell Support Programme highlighted residents' hopes that learning from the programme will influence wider council services. Community members emphasised the importance of carrying forward key principles (trust, transparency, visible presence, active listening and a more personalised, caring approach), into other areas of council work and wider public services.

Broader council processes and local estate works, including at Lancaster West and Silchester, continue to affect residents' wellbeing and contribute to increased demand for advocacy and emotional support.

The GCAT maintains a steady presence at Baseline Studios and works closely with housing teams to help mitigate these effects and ensure residents feel heard and supported.

## **Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for delivery:**

- GPT should continue developing ways to capture front-line staff reflections (e.g., from GCAT and outreach workers) on what is and isn't working in delivery, to complement quantitative data.
- Ensure monitoring distinguishes between short-term activity data (e.g., applications processed) and long-term outcome data (e.g., sustained engagement or wellbeing improvements).
- Develop a simple process for triangulating monitoring insights across outreach, complaints, and referrals to identify delivery bottlenecks early.
- Build in regular learning reviews with the OSG and partners to reflect on monitoring findings and adjust delivery approaches in real time.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: reach

## **What percentage of eligible people have accessed the programme?**

While the GPT collects detailed participation data, a precise measure of eligible residents has not yet been confirmed. Participation continues to increase, with application volumes and membership numbers showing an upward trend, with engagement improving following targeted outreach and enhanced communications. Further demographic analysis of participation data is planned for Q3 to understand reach by group and area.

## **Are there specific groups of people the programme isn't reaching? What work is being done to understand this?**

The GPT has already begun work (following the Q1 recommendation) to understand the profile of residents who have not applied, with a particular focus on council and housing association properties. Targeted outreach through personalised letters, housing association channels, and in-person engagement has led to a notable increase in applications from housing association residents since Q1. The ISF welcomes this progress and recommends that the GPT now expand this analysis to include demographic variables such as age, gender and proximity to Grenfell Tower, where this can be done in a sensitive and appropriate way, to ensure insight does not compromise confidentiality or community trust.

## **What (if any) measures are being taken to improve reach? Why were these measures chosen? What has been the impact of these measures on reach?**

Measures include targeted mailouts, outreach such as door-knocking via housing associations and sheltered housing, and partnerships with voluntary sector organisations. These approaches were chosen to improve awareness and access among under-represented residents and those with limited digital engagement. Early indications show increased application rates and broader community participation.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: reach

## Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for reach:

- The GPT has identified the need to analyse which residents are not yet accessing the programme, starting with council housing residents, to understand any barriers or patterns.
- Analysis planned for future monitoring will explore reach by demographic group (age, gender, and household type) and, where appropriate, by proximity to Grenfell Tower, ensuring this is done in a sensitive and appropriate way.
- The ISF's sensemaking event highlighted some ongoing confusion about who the programme is for and how it is funded, which may affect engagement. The ISF recommends the GPT communicate more clearly that the programme is open to all eligible community members — with separate support available for bereaved and survivors — and that it is funded through the Global Settlement Agreement, not core council budgets.
- Providing clear, accessible information on eligibility, funding, and how to register for the programme will help build understanding and trust. Feedback from the sensemaking session highlighted that some residents feel they should not access support because others may be “more deserving”; the GPT should continue to make explicit that the programme is for everyone who is eligible.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: impact

## **What difference is the support making? What benefits has it enabled?**

Evidence from the First Year Review Survey (417 responses) and case studies indicates that the programme continues to make a meaningful difference to residents' wellbeing and daily life. Many residents reported that access to wellbeing grants and free leisure memberships has supported physical and emotional health, reduced isolation and encourage participation in community activities.

The Grenfell Community Advocacy Team (GCAT) has provided vital, person-centred support, helping residents navigate complex situations, access financial help, and connect to wider services such as Age UK K&C, CAB, and the FACES employment team.

The increase in outreach and partnership working has enabled better coordination of support and more consistent referrals, ensuring residents with emerging needs are reached sooner.

## **Is there any difference in impact across the different programme strands or by demographic group? Why might this be?**

It remains too early to assess differences in impact conclusively, but emerging evidence suggests variation in impact between programme strands (e.g., wellbeing grants, advocacy support, leisure memberships). Variation between strands is expected at this early stage, as different offers deliver benefits on different timelines. This is not a concern for the ISF; the priority is that the GPT continues to monitor these differences to ensure impacts remain consistent and equitable as the programme develops.

Residents who are more digitally connected or already engaged with housing associations appear to access and benefit from offers more readily, while those with limited digital access or language barriers benefit most from face-to-face outreach.

The GPT plans to conduct further demographic analysis in future quarters to compare satisfaction and impact by age, gender, disability, and proximity to Grenfell Tower. The ISF notes this analysis will be essential for identifying any disparities and ensuring the programme remains equitable and inclusive.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: impact

## Areas of improvement on the monitoring plans for impact:

- Finalise and implement detailed demographic analysis of survey data to identify variations in satisfaction and outcomes.
- Integrate qualitative resident stories and staff reflections into impact reporting to capture change beyond quantitative indicators.
- Over the longer term, align impact monitoring with wider council and partner insights (e.g., health, employment, community participation) to contextualise results.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: complaints

**How many complaints have been received? What proportion of these have been resolved (and in what timeframe)? What proportion of them have been escalated?**

Three Stage 1 complaints have been received this quarter, representing 0.44% of total applications. All were resolved within required timeframes and none were escalated to Stage 2.

**Are the complaint themes or patterns emerging?**

Themes include frustration about waiting times and unclear communication in complex cases. While a few survey respondents reflected on advocacy outcomes, no complaints have been received about GCAT. The comments shared tended to relate to the complexity of individual cases or the limits of what can be resolved through advocacy alone, rather than concerns about GCAT's practice. Complaints data has been used constructively to shape the resident survey, demonstrating learning is being actively applied.

**How have these been addressed and what lessons have been learned?**

The GPT has used complaint trends to refine communications, clarify expectations and improve referral processes. The ISF notes good responsiveness and encourages GPT to continue analysing complaint types to identify any systemic issues requiring wider council action.

**Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for complaints:**

Continue reviewing complaint data to identify themes and recurring issues.

Explore whether residents who present multiple issues are being effectively supported and if coordination across council teams can be improved.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: expenditure

*The Grenfell Support Programme is subject to usual council expenditure and budget monitoring and oversight, and an annual external audit. The role of the ISF is to decide whether, overall, expenditure for the programme is as intended, and whether significant changes in expenditure have been recorded and justified.*

## **Is expenditure and predicted spend for the programme as intended?**

Expenditure across the Grenfell Community Support programme is broadly in line with expectations for 2025/2026 Q1&2, with underspends emerging where activity has only just begun (e.g., community activities and communications/engagement). The ISF notes that this is the first year of delivery and spending patterns reflect the timing of programme launch, the pace of community engagement, and the appropriate decision to slow down delivery where co-design is still underway.

## **What variances are there?**

- Wellbeing grants: A significant underspend is forecast for Year 1, even assuming a total of 3,000 registrations. This is due to lower-than-expected uptake earlier in the year. This funding will remain ring fenced for future wellbeing grants and discussed further with the community.
- KLC Memberships: A small overspend is predicted but is expected to be fully mitigated through reallocation from the unspent communications budget, an approach supported by residents via the survey.
- Community Activities: No expenditure to date, as Year 1 plans are still being co-developed with residents and the OSG. Forecasts remain unknown and depend on the pace of community-led design.
- Comms and Engagement: No expenditure to date because costs have been met through the administration budget. This creates a positive variance that can be reinvested into other programme areas.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: expenditure

Although there has been no expenditure on community activities or comms/engagement budgets, the GPT has gathered community feedback through the Year 1 Review Survey and begun discussions with the OSG. There is scope for the OSG to play a key role in informing the design of community activities for Year 2.

The ISF welcomes the clarity of the financial report, particularly in relation to ringfencing and the tracking of underspend across programme areas. However, it would be helpful for future reports to show unspent variance as a separate budget line, especially where funding is re-allocated between programme areas following community consultation.

## **Have any decisions been made to reallocate budget?**

- Decisions to reallocate funding have been justified, transparent, and grounded in resident feedback. For example, residents explicitly supported using unspent communications budget to bolster the KLC membership offer if required.
- There has been no use of the underspend in wellbeing grants or community activities for other purposes; these remain ringfenced to their original purpose and will carry forward into Year 2.
- Conversations about the use of interest accruing in reserves have not yet begun with residents. The ISF expects to be updated as this develops and emphasises the need for a transparent communication and feedback loops with the community on this.

From this point on, the ISF would like to receive budget and expenditure reporting each quarter (updates can be brief with comments by exception where little has changed). We will review whether this frequency of reporting is still required as the programme continues and becomes more stable. We recommend that the GPT updates the community on budgets and expenditure at least twice per year as part of wider programme reporting.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: reporting & transparency

**What reporting and wider communications have been shared in the last quarter? What was shared (e.g. programme updates, invitations to engage in the programme, updates on decisions/opportunity to be involved in decisions)? How frequently?**

The GPT has shared regular updates with residents through newsletters, direct emails and meetings. Communications in September and October clearly explained the rationale behind membership extensions and next steps in programme design.

The GPT has acknowledged previous accessibility limitations with its Linktree platform and is developing a new Power BI dashboard to publish monitoring data on the RBKC website. Plans include integrating data from multiple systems (complaints, satisfaction, impact) and defining all measures clearly.

**Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for reporting & transparency:**

- Test accessibility and usability of the Power BI dashboard with residents.
- Include updates in future reporting cycles on resident feedback and adjustments made.
- Share updates on budget and expenditure reporting with residents at least twice a year (see previous page).

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: restorative practice

## **How is the process of implementation and delivery (including reporting and complaints) centering the perspectives and experiences of people eligible to access the programme?**

The GPT continues to demonstrate a restorative approach through active listening, responsiveness and transparent communication. The team remains embedded in the community, delivering support via drop-ins, phone calls and home visits. Residents value the personal, face-to-face approach and openness when things go wrong.

## **How has restorative practice informed the delivery (including reporting and complaints) and monitoring approach?**

Restorative practice continues to underpin the OSG facilitation, survey co-design and community workshops. The use of an external practitioner helps the GPT engage as participants and maintain trust and inclusion in discussions. The ISF welcomes the GPT's decision to use independent facilitation following some of the challenging OSG meetings, and encourages ongoing clarity and transparency about the group's purpose and decision-making role to ensure the space remains restorative.

It is also positive that the GPT staff took part in the ISF-run sensemaking session as participants, openly reflecting on their experiences and learning from residents — modelling the same openness and accountability that the programme promotes.

## **Areas of improvement on monitoring plans for restorative practice:**

- The ISF would like the GPT to provide greater clarity and transparency about the purpose and role of the OSG and to show how the group's input influences programme design. The GPT should also ensure that non-members can contribute and that the opportunity to participate in the OSG is continually advertised, allowing new residents to join at any time.
- Expanding restorative approaches to Year 2 engagement means applying these same principles — openness, shared learning, and mutual accountability — to wider participation activities beyond the OSG. This could include ensuring co-design workshops, consultations, and communications all create space for listening, reflection, and repair where trust has been strained.

# Q2 2025 scrutiny: monitoring

## **Is the monitoring information and process giving the necessary insight to deliver and improve the programme?**

Monitoring now provides a comprehensive view of programme reach, satisfaction and outcomes. The Year 1 survey data has significantly enhanced understanding of impact and resident experience.

## **What areas require more focus/improvement?**

Deeper analysis of satisfaction and impact data by demographic groups and location once the dataset is large enough. Clearer presentation of what is meant by “other support” categories and measures on the dashboards. Continued work to make dashboards accessible and integrate data sources.