

TRANSFORMATION OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES SCRUTINY WORKING GROUP

Date: 9 January 2015

Time: 2.00pm

Venue: **Chamber Meeting Room**

Members of the Panel:

Paxton Hood-Williams

Uta Clay

Yvonne Jardine

Hazel Morris

Ceinwen Thomas

Ann Cook

Chris Holley

Jeff Jones

Sue Jones

Gloria Tanner

Erika Kirchner

AGENDA

No.	Item
1.	Apologies and declarations of interest
2.	Work plan report to help the working group: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree broad lines of inquiry• Undertake a prioritisation exercise to identify specific areas of focus to scrutinise• Agree broad community engagement strategy• Consider whether co-option is necessary to support the working group

Item 2

Report of the Convenor

Transformation of Adult Social Services Working Group – 9th January 2015

Work Plan Report

Purpose	The purpose of this report is to help the working group: i) confirm broad lines of inquiry ii) identify specific areas of focus iii) agree broad strategy for community engagement and co-option
Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aims and purpose of the working group• List of ideas and priorities to be scrutinised identified by the panel at previous meetings• Co-option report• Future meeting dates
Councillors are being asked to	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agree broad lines of inquiry• Undertake a prioritisation exercise to identify specific areas of focus to scrutinise• Agree broad community engagement strategy• Agree if co-option is necessary to support the working group
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Bob Clay, Convenor
Lead Officer(s)	Dean Taylor, Director – Corporate Services
Report Author	Delyth Davies, Overview & Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01792 637491 E-mail: delyth.davies@swansea.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Transformation of Adult Social Services Working Group was set up to carry out in depth work on the transformation of adult social services in Swansea. It is responsible for developing and managing its work plan to ensure that it is as effective as possible. It is a standing item on each agenda to discuss and manage the work plan so that the panel can maintain an overview, monitor progress, and coordinate work as necessary.

- 1.2 The broad aims of the working group are to:
- provide an effective challenge, assurance and scrutiny engagement in the TASS process
 - engage members in this area
 - engage service users and frontline workers

2. What is the purpose of the Working Group?

- 2.1 To provide 'critical friend' challenge to the Executive (and other decision-makers) in respect of the Transformation of Adult Social Services by undertaking scrutiny activities to support and contribute to improvement in services.
- 2.2 At the same time the panel must ensure that the work plan:
- manageable, realistic and achievable given resources available to support activities
 - relevant to corporate priorities and is focused on significant areas
 - adding value and having maximum impact
 - coordinated and avoids duplication

3. Prioritisation exercise with Ed Hammond

- 3.1 The list below contains suggested subject areas that could be examined by the working group.
- Independent Review
 - Western Bay work
 - Strategic integration
 - Network hubs and health
 - Joint commissioning of services and pooling funding
 - Costs
 - Transport
 - Housing
 - Different service areas such as Learning disabilities, Mental health
 - Local area co-ordination and community development, drawing on the approach in Scotland and Australia
 - Safeguarding & risks
 - Signposting
- 3.2 At the working group meeting on 8th December the group was presented with a timeline for proposed changes within the TASS programme implementation phase (appendix 1). The working group may also wish to consider whether the proposed changes should form part of its work plan.

- 3.3 At the meeting on 17th December the working group also discussed the summary of proposals which arose from the independent review of older people's services (appendix 2). The group was particularly keen to focus on the short term actions and the group may wish to include some of these in its work plan.
- 3.4 Given the long list of subject areas the panel should consider prioritising these. To do this the panel could apply the following questions to each subject area to determine its importance and priority.
- Is the subject area of strategic importance?
 - Is the subject area an issue of concern?
 - Will the working group be duplicating work already being carried out?
 - What is the impact of the subject area?

4. Community engagement & co-option

- 4.1 The working group has agreed to undertake community engagement as part of its overall work plan. The working group will need to consider the type of engagement it would like to undertake and then it should identify the right groups and stakeholders to engage with.
- 4.2 The Scrutiny Programme Committee has developed a protocol for co-option to ensure a consistent approach that should be adopted across Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups (appendix 3). The protocol outlines the benefits of co-option and the thinking that should be undertaken to best inform any decisions about co-option. It is designed to give clarity to conveners and scrutiny councillors about what steps to take.
- 4.3 It essentially highlights the importance of having a clear rationale, taking advice and ensuring that there are no potential conflicts of interest. It is important to remember that there were different ways of engaging people in the work of scrutiny. The protocol emphasises that there should be a strong case for co-opting someone, who rather than giving evidence, would work alongside scrutiny members to carry out the scrutiny.










5. Future meetings

5.1 The dates and times for the working group meetings are set out in the table below. Additional meetings can be added as and when required.







Date	Pre-meeting (held in councillor meeting room)	Meeting time	Venue
29/1/15 – Public Engagement Session	N/A	TBC	TBC
2/2/15	1.30pm	2.00pm	Meeting room 3.4.1
2/3/15	1.30pm	2.00pm	Meeting room 3.4.1
30/3/15	1.30pm	2.00pm	Meeting room 3.4.1
27/4/15	1.30pm	2.00pm	Meeting room 3.4.1

Appendix 1

Timeline for proposed changes within TASS Programme - Implementation Phase (Two)

Proposed Change	Sustainable Swansea Workstream	Yr 1 2015/16	Yr 2 2016/17	Yr 3 2017/18
1. Implement Local Area Coordination within target communities	Prevention & Demand Management			
2. <u>Swansea Integration Plan</u> : Common Access Point to simplify access arrangements	Prevention & Demand Management			
3. <u>Support to Carers</u> Changes linked to Carers Measure/ Regional Strategy and Local Action plan	Prevention & Demand Management			
4. Volunteering & Befriending to address social isolation and increase daytime opportunities	Prevention & Demand Management			
5. Adult Family Group Conferencing - support families through crisis in caring relationship to prevent breakdown	Prevention & Demand Management			
6. Reduce number of Assessments and Reviews carried out by social workers	Prevention & Demand Management			
7. Divert referrals at front door (6 week follow up)	Prevention & Demand Management			
8. <u>Swansea Integration Plan</u> : Intermediate Care Tier - 1 year Funding agreed through regional business case- to deescalate social care needs	New Models of Service			
9. <u>Swansea Integration Plan</u> : Network Hubs	New Models of Service			
10. <u>Western Bay</u> – Dementia Care Services	New Models of Service	TBA	TBA	TBA

11. Development of pathways to help people remain in their own homes	New Models of Service			
12. Development of Reablement across YA	New Models of Service			
13. Capacity within Domiciliary Care by offering Direct Payments to help people employ Personal Assistants	New Models of Service			
14. Change focus of reviews to 'Promoting Independence' Reviews by using Telecare and OT	New Models of Service			
15. Reclaiming Social Work/ Signs of Safety to implement new ways of working with citizens	Efficiency			
16. Right sizing of existing care packages based on the pathways to independence (pti) methodology	Efficiency			
17. Remodelling Domiciliary Care	Efficiency			
18. Remodelling Swansea Vale to provide more skills/ employment based support	Efficiency			
19. Remodelling Ty Cilla to support complex respite needs	Efficiency			
20. Retendering Llansamlet Physical Dis. Service	Efficiency			
21. Audit & Review Direct Payments (linked to Item 13)	Efficiency			
22. Redesign Home Care / Day Care for those with Complex Needs	Efficiency			
23. Reduce the need for Long Term Support Timescale:	Efficiency			
24. Re-commission Dom. Care based on outcomes	Efficiency			
25. Review Procurement	Efficiency			
26. Review Charging / Income Generation	Efficiency			
27. Changes to Residential Service External LDS	Efficiency			

28. Changes to Residential Service (Ext.) Mental Health	Efficiency			
29. Independent Review of Care and Support to Older People – Timescale: OPS Review Report to Cabinet, awaiting decision/ response:	Stopping Services			

Appendix 2

Ongoing strategic projects (endorsed by review)

- Continue to develop Integration and evaluate
- Continue to develop Reablement services and evaluate
- Continue with TASS programme
- Continue with Western Bay programme
- Further develop robust consultation engagement

Short term actions (0-6 months)

- Develop a fully costed Prevention Strategy as part of SSF4F workstream and supported by the Prevention Fund.
- Establish accurate unit costs – supported by Corporate Finance
- Develop Direct Payments programme
- Commence work to explore developing Social Enterprise micro-sites
- Prioritise a review of income and charging as part of SSF4F
- Develop/Implement Assistive Technology strategy as part of Integration

Medium term actions (6-12 months)

- Review how we shape and influence the market re Dom Care
- Review Commissioning arrangements – Domiciliary Care
- Reduce unit costs – efficiencies/effectiveness
- Identify tipping point – quality of life
- Review quality monitoring – Domiciliary Care
- Review and report back on proposals to remodel day care

Longer term (residential care) (12-18 months)

- Review commissioning arrangements to include;
- Determining future demand (including choice, aspirations of OP)
- Financial modelling information
- Review how we shape the market re Residential care
- Confirm balance between in-house/external provision
- Review quality monitoring – Residential Care
- Review respite (residential) requirements
- Review accommodation with support avail

APPENDIX 3

Scrutiny Programme Committee - 9 June 2014

PROTOCOL FOR CO-OPTION

Purpose	This report seeks agreement on a protocol for co-option to ensure a consistent approach across Panels and Working Groups.
Content	Information from relevant guidance is presented to ensure understanding about the power to co-opt and benefits. This report focuses on non-statutory co-option.
Councillors are being asked to	agree the protocol to aid consideration of co-option to scrutiny
Lead Councillor(s)	Councillor Mike Day, Chair of Scrutiny Programme Committee.
Lead Officer & Report Author	Brij Madahar, Scrutiny Coordinator Tel: 01792 637257 E-mail: brij.madahar@swansea.gov.uk

1. Guidance on Co-option

- 1.1 Scrutiny has the power to co-opt non-voting members for either a topic or a term up to the next Annual Meeting of Council. There is no formal mechanism for co-option and relevant legislation / guidance focuses on co-option as a way of involving those who are not councillors in the scrutiny process (*that does not preclude the co-option of other councillors as non voting members but there is no automatic right for members to be co-opted onto a scrutiny committee / body or their request to be placed on an agenda*).
- 1.2 Co-option in the main is about scrutiny reaching out for expert knowledge or skills from others to support elected members in their deliberations and adding value to their work. It would effectively mean having someone work alongside Panel / Working Group members at all stages, e.g. planning of meetings, evidence gathering, drawing up conclusions and recommendations.
- 1.3 Any scrutiny body interested in co-option should consider:
- the range of expertise, skills and knowledge needed to effectively deliver its work
 - the range of expertise, skills and knowledge the existing members are already able to bring
 - where there are gaps in the required expertise, skills and/or knowledge that a co-opted member could fill

- whether the need for the expertise, skills and knowledge is time-limited
- 1.4 According to Statutory Guidance from the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011 ‘in all instances where co-option is being considered, care should be taken to ensure that co-option is in fact the best way for some individuals or groups of interest to be involved in the work of scrutiny committees’ (p. 36). Co-option is not the only means for scrutiny to engage others. Other arrangements include the calling of expert and other witnesses, and consultation through a range of means designed to reach members of the public, and receiving evidence or hearing from interested parties.
- 1.5 Ultimately it is for the scrutiny body to come to a view about co-option but the advice would be that this is done with a clear rationale about what the committee is looking for in a co-optee and consideration given as to whether other people ought to be asked / included, who may meet any criteria set out.
- 1.6 When considering co-option it would be good practice to:
- determine the number of co-optees to be sought
 - identify the range of experience, skills, knowledge and expertise sought and seek nominations from organisations and individuals who demonstrate they have these
 - guard against seeking nominations from organisations or individuals with a single issue perspective or personal agenda
 - be inclusive and fair
- 1.7 Co-opted members would not count towards a quorum of a meeting nor be eligible to serve as Chairman or Vice Chairman. Co-optees would also be required to declare any interest / conflict of interest / predetermination.

2. Protocol

- 2.1 It is proposed that Scrutiny Panels and Working Groups adopt the following approach when considering co-option:
- a) at the outset of any inquiry / task consider whether co-option is necessary and the rationale behind it – identifying the gaps in the required expertise, skills and/or knowledge that a co-opted member could fill;
 - b) consider whether co-option is the best way to involve others, as opposed to inviting relevant persons to appear as a witness;
 - c) consider who would be the most appropriate person(s) to act as co-optee, e.g. seek nominations from organisations and individuals who can demonstrate they have the required experience, skills, knowledge and expertise

- d) once suggested co-optee(s) are identified consult with relevant officers to ensure there is no conflict of interest;
- e) invitation to be sent to proposed co-optee to join the Panel / Working Group, outlining duration of co-option;
- f) report to the Scrutiny Programme Committee to ensure awareness of the agreement to co-opt.

2.2 In the case of a member of the public requesting co-option onto a specific Panel / Working Group the following process should be followed:

- a) further information be sought as to the experience / skill / knowledge / expertise that they can add to the scrutiny process;
- b) refer the request to the relevant convener for consideration;
- c) consider whether co-option is the best way to involve the individual, as opposed to inviting them to give evidence as a witness;
- d) if co-option is agreed consult with relevant officers to ensure there is no conflict of interest;
- e) invitation to be sent to proposed co-optee to join the Panel / Working Group, outlining duration of co-option;
- f) report to the Scrutiny Programme Committee to ensure awareness of the agreement to co-opt.

2.3 Where a member of the public has a general interest in being a co-optee the scrutiny team will:

- a) obtain further information about what they can add to the scrutiny process;
- b) invite them to observe relevant Panel / Working Group meetings to develop an understanding of scrutiny and way of working;
- c) raise awareness of their interest in scrutiny with conveners, allowing for the discussion about the appropriateness of co-option to develop naturally.

2.4 Subject to committee discussion this report will be shared with scrutiny conveners to ensure clarity about the process that should be followed for co-option.

3. Legal Implications

3.1 The report sets out the Constitutional requirements. In assessing any particular person as a co-optee it is vital, as the report makes clear, to consider any potential conflicts of interest.

4. Financial Implications

4.1 There may be a financial cost to co-option, for example in the payment of expenses, which will have to be met from the existing scrutiny budget.

Date: 29 May 2014

Legal Officer: Nigel Havard
Finance Officer: Carl Billingsley

Background Papers:

Council Constitution

Statutory Guidance from the Local Government Measure 2011 (Welsh Government June 2012)