

**Changing Lives
Service Development Group
28 November 2007**

Present:

Nigel Henderson (Chair)
David Cumming
Noni Cobban
Terry Findlay

Scottish Government

Catherine Rainey
Shane Rankin (for item 3)
Andrew Reid
Moira Hughes (Secretary)

Apologies

Apologies were received from Janet Birks, Mike Martin, Phil Robinson and Ronnie Hill.

Minutes of Meeting

1. The minutes of the last meeting held on 26 September were agreed.

Matters Arising

2. The revised version of the Shared Understanding paper had been circulated for discussion today. There is also the intention to publish the report of the work covered in the discussions with Oldham, North Lanarkshire and others. Nigel informed the meeting that he had attended the JIT conference earlier in November and reported that there had been discussion of both the personalisation and change agenda.

Concordat and Outcome Agreements

3. Shane Rankin introduced this item and spoke to the papers tabled. Shane explained that the Concordat Agreement and the Government's economic strategy were launched on 14 November. Both documents are structured around the Government's five strategic themes:

- Smarter
- Wealthier and Fairer
- Healthier
- Safer and Stronger
- Greener

4. The Concordat sets out a new relationship between the Scottish Government and local government. The National Performance Framework sets out the high level targets, national outcomes and indicators. Shane identified some of the components of the package:

- a commitment that the Scottish Government will not undertake structural reform of local government during the term of this Parliament;

- a move to a Single Outcome Agreement for every council, based on the agreed set of national outcomes (underpinned by agreed national indicators);
- Each local authority and community partnership to contribute to national outcomes;
- Each authority will be required to submit a single annual report and plans for the following year;
- Commitment that local government will be able to retain and re-use efficiency savings they make;
- Scottish Government to work with local government to develop an agreed response to the Crerar review.

5. Shane reported that CoSLA and the Scottish Government had established a Project Board to oversee and monitor the new partnership which held its first meeting on 27 November.

6. Nigel thanked Shane on behalf of the Group for his contribution. Nigel felt that the new relationship would provide real opportunity to do something different whilst acknowledging the challenges of the task. The points raised in discussion included:

- The implications of this for the work of this Group and other developments such as the national outcomes for community care and the work done by the joint future group. Shane replied that these outcomes will remain for the time being and that the LG Improvement Service, now within CoSLA, are looking at what local indicators should underpin the national agenda.
- As part of the package each of the 32 local authorities would aim to reach a single outcome agreement by April 2009 with some coming on stream earlier. But it was important that LAs focus on the delivery of outcomes – not indicators.
- Possibility of work being commissioned on the cost of delivering outcomes, some work to look at social work spend which is currently being done in England
- Developments on scrutiny (Crerar) were recognised as an important element of this new relationship and linked with the degree of confidence that LAs would actually deliver – and be able to demonstrate that they do – on the national outcomes agreed in the Concordat.

Implications for Future Activity

7. Catherine reported on the Chairs workshop which was held at the end of October. Chairs talked through the issues around their key areas in delivering the Changing Lives agenda, thinking through engagement and how this sits in the new world – as outlined by Shane earlier. Catherine highlighted key pieces of work that were already being taken forward by the Change Programmes. These included:

- Production of the Leadership & Management framework, how this sits with Practice Governance Framework;
- The Continuous Learning Framework
- Performance Improvement Framework – to reflect the PIM Model and developments on self-assessment/improvement;
- The role of the Chief Social Work Officer and consideration of issues around the reserved functions of social workers;
- The R&D strategy.

8. The work of the Service Development Group was seen in terms of raising awareness and raising discussion of the personalisation agenda. The Performance Improvement Group has a similar approach with the Research and Development Strategy underpinning the work of all the Groups.

9. In discussion Nigel spoke of the Chairs' frustration about not having a sense of how the Changing Lives agenda has reached people who use services. Chairs identified a challenge of the importance of getting top down and bottom up involvement, in particular user/carer involvement which does not seem to be fully engaged. It was agreed that there was an opportunity now to focus the work in Changing Lives to sit with the new world of outcome agreements and national indicators etc. and communicate the key 'products' that could be expected from the national programme over the next year. Catherine reiterated that we should be talking about the whole single agenda – not individual Change Programmes, making sure that we are feeding into/making the connections to other agendas, such as changing the balance of care, tackling health inequalities etc.

Proposals for the Workplan

10. Catherine explained that Andrew had re-visited the earlier paper discussed at the last meeting to propose options for taking work forward and it had been circulated round SG colleagues. This had led to colleagues in health and equalities unit in particular, showing an interest in ensuring we join up the strands of work around the personalisation agenda and being supportive – particularly in respect of the Shared Understanding paper which they felt covered the principles and issues to be considered whether in a social care or health environment

11. Andrew introduced the paper and the meeting discussed the options proposed:

Option 1: go with the All Inclusive programme and the appendices attached to the paper show the way forward for this option which would tackle all 8 system elements within a number of LAs.

Option 2: Fit in with what is happening elsewhere and pool material, identify issues not being tackled elsewhere and undertake that on a targeted basis.

Option 3: mainly draw from all sources around, both nationally and internationally plus information gathered by SWIA.

12. A full discussion followed which raised a number of issues:

- Inclusive living is about a holistic system, looking at inclusive lives
- Discussion of the average cost for the project over 320 project days and whether we could support this.
- The All Inclusive option, looking at a specific area within a local authority was still a possibility.
- Look at joined up work with NHS Integrated Pathways for Dementia (– an All Inclusive project for dementia)
- Not sure how much is out there in terms of the personalisation agenda
- Issues around the reduction in number of providers
- Debate around procurement and commissioning issues

- Need to recognise the pressure to continually deliver services and to balance this with seeing the longer-term picture
- Opportunities exist to respond to the new Scottish Government outcomes and the need to truly enhance the role of social work and social care in this agenda
- possibility of our linking with the early implementers working with the JIT who are looking at implementation of outcomes for community care
- Follow up with North Lanarkshire re work around older people work. To date no response re North Lanarkshire taking up the offer of some support from this Group.
- Issues about transitions. If all inclusive programme was in place this issue shouldn't arise
- People don't always learn from each other
- On Commissioning it was recognised that this group had no locus to lead for the whole of SG but that Andrew was well plugged in through his JIT work, providing an opportunity to inform and challenge.

Action: It was agreed that:

- Catherine should continue to link with other parts of SG to strengthen linkages and reinforce the personsliation approach which should feature in developments;
- Catherine should follow up on the early implementers work being done with the JIT to see how we can best influence / link with
- invite discussion on how to best progress this engaging with specific groups e.g. CCPS ADSW Standing Committees (Children and Community Care), Association of CHPs with a joint meeting around March. Send round an outline programme to gauge interest in a day's meeting (say from 10.00 a.m. until 2.00p.m./3.00p.m poss in March.)
- materials already available should be identified under the 8 elements.

Revised Shared Understanding

13. The Shared Understanding paper had been posted on the socialworkscotland website, circulated to the National Social Work Services Forum, to the Chairs Group, User/Carer Forum and to the Practitioner Forums and across the Scottish Government. Positive comments had been received from other areas of Scottish Government and in light of these and the comments from the National Social Work Services Forum the paper had been revised. Nigel informed the meeting the CCPS quarterly meeting would take place next week and there may be feedback on the paper from that.

Action: Formally send out to interested parties and draw alignment with the concordat agreement. Format the paper and look at the presentation. Issue to interested parties and put on socialworkscotland website. Launch revised paper in the New Year.

Commissioning for Personalisation

14. Andrew spoke to the paper on Commissioning and Procurement for Personalisation. It was agreed at the last meeting that it would be useful to have a high level paper that pulls together all the various pieces of information. The group discussed the diagram at Appendix 1 of the paper which looks at the key stages for establishing a commissioning strategy. There was further discussion in relation to setting standards for each of the steps in the process and Terry agreed to circulate a model currently being used in Glasgow (I would presume?)?.

15. The issue of budgets was raised, including barriers to personalisation such as managing across service areas/organisations and the possible involvement of CIPFA. There were developments where areas were trying to identify spend by individual, rather than by service type. All thought it would be useful to share different models that might be available and good examples of where a personalised approach was happening – while recognising this could happen in spite of, not because of organisational systems/approaches..

Action: Terry to circulate model paper on standards. Andrew would revise this paper in the light of the discussion.

Any Other Business

The next meeting takes place on 25 February, 1.00 p.m.-4.00 p.m. in Conference Room 4, Victoria Quay, Leith, Edinburgh. Dates for the remainder of the year will be set thereafter

January 2008