

Notes of Meeting

ONE SWINDON BOARD AWAY DAY, TUESDAY 17 DECEMBER 2013 @ STEAM MUSEUM

Present : Gavin Jones (SBC), Cllr David Renard (Chair) (SBC), John Gilbert (SBC), Nigel Tucker (JCP), Liz Hickey (Wiltshire Probation Trust), James Griffin (SBC), Michelle Howard (SEQOL), Nicky Alberry (Influence), Heather Mitchell (SEQOL), Tony Ranzetta (CCG), Pat Geenty (Wiltshire Police), Cllr Brian Mattock (SBC), Cherry Jones (SBC), Alison Chamberlain (SBC), Angus Macpherson (PCC), David Wray (VAS), Cllr Jim Grant (SBC), John Popowicz (Wiltshire Fire & Rescue), Maria Moore (GWH), Patrick Weir (SBC), Janet Beattie (SBC), Stuart McKellar (SBC), Kirsty Cole (SBC) and Liz Holmes (Chair of CTB),

Apologies for absence : Liz Rijnenberg (Wiltshire Probation), Paul Aviss (Wilts Probation), Dr Peter Crouch (CCG), Nerissa Vaughan (GWH), Simon Routh-Jones (Wiltshire Fire & Rescue) and Cllr Stan Pajak (SBC).

Observers: Carmel Burton (SBC), Ian Jeary (Wiltshire Fire), Jill Annal (DWP), Iain Francis (CCG), Paul Saunders (Wiltshire Police), Russell Frith (Wiltshire Probation Trust), Sarah Hardwick (SBC), Jane Lord (CLG)

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| 1 | Welcome and purpose : Cllr David Renard welcomed everyone to the session and outlined the objectives of the day. | |
| 2 | <p>Public Sector Transformation – our shared strategy and resource allocation principles</p> <p>James Griffin reminded members of the shared strategy and objectives around public service transformation and asked that consideration be given to adopting guiding principles for the allocation of resources. He referred to the suggested principles as outlined in the agenda pack and invited discussion</p> <p>The following discussion points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required changes and savings cannot be achieved without partners working closely together. Openness and transparency amongst partners allows for a better service to be provided to residents, and collective principles are essential to ensure that services are not duplicated and transformation is achieved effectively. • It was noted that a big partner on the growing economy agenda is Wiltshire Council (WC) and it was queried how that relationship fits in here. Discussions have been held with WC regarding transformation, and the LEP provides for a more common understanding between the two Councils. Both Councils have differing agendas currently but areas of partnership working through service delivery could be identified in the future through the LEP. • It was noted that there are areas of potential alignment between the two councils, for example on children's services, local authorities have an obligation to look at all opportunities due to the serious financial difficulties they are facing. • It was noted that the proposed merger of Wilts Fire Service with Dorset will add another level of complexity but that the principles of partnership working remain the same. • There was a query around recurring benefit from the proposal that partners collectively invest at least £2 from their budgets for every £1 invested from the One Swindon Transformation Fund. It was confirmed that there will be but that this principle would need to be made clearer with regards to leverage. • Concern was raised about the baseline and the ability to achieve returns being curtailed if partnership working is not as effective as expected. It was noted that the great record of partner working in Swindon was instrumental in receiving the funding originally and that all partners share the aim of making public money go further. | |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that delivery agents will need a change of culture and expectation to drive forward savings. Definition will also be required on how benefits are divided as the current proposed principles relate to commissioning agents only, and differentiation between deliverers and commissioners provided. It was proposed that there is a missing overarching principle, covering the sentiment of supporting Swindon and its residents and helping to benefit them. <p>It was agreed that the suggested principles contained within the agenda pack would be reviewed with the above comments in mind and re-presented for formal approval by the Board at its meeting on 28 January 2014. ACTION JG</p> | ACTION JG |
| 3 | <p>Outline Business Cases – Information gathering</p> <p>Carmel Burton highlighted to members that there are 12 business cases for consideration, all tying in with the four priorities already identified by the Board. The business cases are user focussed and include integrated working and cross cutting enablers such as data and information sharing, workforce development and developing community capacity.</p> <p>The following discussion points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness raising will need to be a high priority so that communities and voluntary groups are keyed in to the overall agenda and are able to work consistently together. It was suggested that commonality with regards to consistently approaching change across organisations will assist the process. It was noted that enablers are critical for the success of these business cases and it will be a challenge to get the right infrastructure in place. It was noted that there is an opportunity here to revisit the Compact. It was queried where the concept of poverty is addressed, further than just getting people back in to employment. Synergies across the broader pieces of work being undertaken need to be investigated. It was agreed that more time and emphasis should be placed on the enablers as although the benefits of them cannot be demonstrated, without them the projects cannot deliver. | |
| 4 | <p>Individual Business Cases</p> <p>Nominated sponsors spoke briefly regarding their individual business cases and updated the Board on any developments. The discussion points raised following each update is as follows:</p> <p><i>Community Navigators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that this project is being renamed to the 'Link Worker Scheme'. It was queried where the link workers would come from as they will require a certain level of knowledge to begin with. They have been recruited from nursing and community backgrounds and will share their respective knowledge at joint training sessions. It was noted that success will be measured by assessing and evaluating individual's responses to the project. <p><i>Well-being Co-ordinators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was queried what work a co-ordinator would undertake to affect behaviour changes and change lifestyle choices. It was noted that the co-ordinators would need to provide quick responses to people and encourage them to make the right choices. | |
| | <p><i>SAIL Project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was felt that this project may increase demand initially. There would be a need to have a community based approach and infrastructure in place for when people get referred. | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p><i>Troubled Families</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested that the name of the project should be changed. • It was suggested that opportunities for getting people back to work should be explored as well as other links and a Programme Board. <p><i>Reducing Domestic Abuse: IDVA's & Perpetrators Projects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that there had been delays but that commissioning the project will be considered by the PCC during January 2014. • It was suggested that opportunities for working with schools and academies could be looked at, the PCC already has funding set aside for schools for year groups 9 – 11. <p><i>Alcohol Support and Advice Project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the cost of dealing with alcohol abuse is around £66m. <p><i>Ready for Work Academy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the issue of gaps in skills was being presented to the LEP and that we should use their data and links. • It was queried how many people would be affected by this project and confirmed that up to 100 would be involved to start with, with growth predicted thereafter. • It was queried if 6 months was a critical time point at which it could be said that a person will remain in long term employment if they reach this point. It was confirmed that data does show this, and that sustainability is required so that people do not end up back on the job market. • It was noted that there is a surplus of industrial skills in the town but that future employment opportunities could be in the health and social care industry and this project will target that. <p><i>Town Centre Team</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the location for this team should be visible and accessible, and that team members should be easily identifiable. <p><i>Local supply chain and procurement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that there is a big emphasis on public sector spend and queried if more effort could be directed towards the private sector. Private business will be approached though to test their appetite. • It was queried if the value of cost versus the value of using local could be articulated. <p><i>Integrated Front Line Workforce</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that this is a big project with a significant change for frontline staff. <p><i>Repeat Offenders (5 Wards Project)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that offenders would only get training through this project if they don't fit in elsewhere with other services. <p><i>Social Impact Bonds</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has agreed to underwrite this and have commissioned a feasibility study. ACTION TR • It was queried how joint investment decisions would be protected. There is a need to diversify sources of funding to secure longevity. • The Community foundation has people to fund something like this and the expertise already exists. | <p>ACTION TR</p> |
|---|-------------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 5 | <p>Outline Business Cases – decision making-: The Board re-visited each Business Case with a view to making a decision on which of them will be approved to move to the next stage and which would receive funding at this stage. Any further discussion points and the decisions are outlined below:</p> <p><i>SAIL Project</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was felt that the question of how the administration of this would be dealt with had not been answered. It was noted that they could use an organisation like Age Concern as per the example in Devon. • Commissioning work will be around partners doing their own referral work and working it out using existing community groups, and designing their own end product. Referrals will not always be made to Adult Social Care. • It was noted that the two year funding proposed would be for the design phase of bringing in the voluntary sector to design, specify and identify issues which then get passed on to the right place. • This is a single point of access design project. • Need the right support in place to where people can be navigated to – need to link to advice and guidance and have those connections. <p>Agreed: funding of £16k for two years of the programme and that the project should progress to the next stage of design and commissioning. The Board asked the sponsor to link with the Information and Advice Hub Project.</p> <p><i>Well-being Co-ordinators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board queried if there would still be a need for a programme manager after a year. It was confirmed that by then the project will be embedded into existing and new contracts and would be a different way of working and would be self-sustaining. CCG noted that it only has to achieve two less admissions to hospital in a year and it has paid for itself. The CCG could be in a position to fund this in future years. <p>Agreed: The Board agreed the funding of £45k for a programme manager for one year. After the first year the new way of working will be embedded – new processes will be written into contracts and staff will have been trained in the new roles so there will be no need for on-going funding.</p> <p><i>Town Centre Team</i></p> <p>The Board noted that no funding is required at this stage and agreed for this Business Case to progress to the next stage, with the identification of premises and starting systems design work on the concept.</p> <p><i>Ready for Work Academy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work of the LEP needs to be investigated to see if they can answer the bulk of questions rather than further research being undertaken. • There is a need to identify skills gaps for entry level jobs. <p>Agreed: To fund the c£7k needed to commission the research around skills gaps and employer needs.</p> | |
| | <p><i>Repeat Offenders (5 Wards Project)</i></p> <p>Agreed: The Board agreed to fund £2.5k for the installation of WIFI into five hubs. The Board also agreed to the potential funding of £20k to be used on qualifications and training if no alternative funding could be sourced.</p> <p><i>Alcohol Support and Advice Project</i></p> <p>Agreed: The Board agreed to fund £23,200 one off funding for training, mentoring and management costs. If the project is successful, possible future funding could</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| | <p>come from GWH or CCG.</p> <p><i>Reducing Domestic Abuse: IDVA Project</i> Agreed: The Board agreed in principle to fund 50% of this project. The PCC will consider part or full funding of the project in January from the Commissioning Fund. Project lead will await decision from the PCC in January. Decision held back until PCC decision is made</p> <p><i>Reducing Domestic Abuse: Perpetrators Project</i> The Board noted that there was no funding required, and agreed for it to proceed to the commissioning and implementation stage.</p> <p><i>Troubled Families</i> The Board noted that no funding is required and agreed to progress this project to the next stage, which is progressing negotiations with partners around lead officers / case workers to work with families and establishing a road map for success.</p> <p><i>Community Navigators / Link Workers</i> The Board noted that no funding is required and agreed to progress to the pilot stage. The Board requested clear and measurable milestones and indicators to be included in the business case.</p> <p><i>Local supply chain and procurement</i> Deferred: The Board agreed in principle to fund £52k subject to an acceptable business case and evidence base being presented to the next Board meeting in January.</p> <p><i>Integrated Front Line Workforce</i> The Board noted that no funding is required at this stage and agreed for the pilot to proceed to the next stage which will include systems design work, and agreeing the areas of work with a focus on anti-social behaviour.</p> <p><i>Social Impact Bonds</i> Agreed: The Board agreed to fund £19k in principle with £7k being available from the BHP underspend. The Board requested a business case be presented at the next Board meeting in January together with more information on other brokers and other sources of funding to be investigated and reported back in January.</p> | Action JG |
| 6 | <p>Enabling Transformation through shared data and analysis The Board received a presentation from Sarah Hardwick on the work done on so far in identifying common customer cohorts in the hope of achieving a shared understanding across the board on groups of customers in common, including their nature, scale and costs.</p> <p>She highlighted some issues that had arisen, such as confidentiality issues and the differences amongst partners in recording and data systems. Not all agencies also attribute costs to customers in a direct sense.</p> <p>There is recognition of the limitations on the data as it stands – the resources need expanding and the scope narrowing, and there is some missing information.</p> | |
| | <p>The following discussion points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that a further level of detail is required on the data and queried if it was possible to drill down to individual names. It was confirmed that it is possible to drill down to street level and household level but not to individual | |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <p>names level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that there are no distinct common customer cohorts but that there is a lot of overlapping. It was agreed that the next step is to drill down to household level and to include other partners like AWP. ACTION JG <p>The Board then discussed the Data Protection Act, which will now be known as the Data Sharing Act, and the new possibilities for agencies to share information easily. Along with the new Act, there will be an Action Plan. The more detailed, robust plan will include a high level statement of intent and will be presented at the next Board meeting in January for sign off. ACTION JP</p> | <p>ACTION JG</p> <p>ACTION JP</p> |
| 7 | <p>Towards a One Swindon Transformation Hub</p> <p>The Board received a presentation from Gavin Jones regarding the opportunities for partners to pool transformation funding to achieve more savings. The proposal is for partners to resource a team to build capacity and deliver some of the most critical changes in respective organisations.</p> <p>During discussion the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that following their recent restructure the CCG were in a position to support this and endorsed the approach to systems thinking. It was noted that in some instances it is frontline staff that drive change. It was noted that some sovereignty may have to be relinquished by partners involved but that they would gain by having influence over other partners. It was noted that engagement with the third sector would need to take place early on to get them involved. It was noted that strong leadership will be required to run the project and that existing transformation capacity at Swindon Borough Council can be dropped in. One organisation would have to host the Hub but the One Swindon governance would apply. It was noted that underspends could be used for this project and that it would be a good investment for the future. It was noted that funds were required to pump prime the project separate to the change programme, but that change programme work could be added in the future to start achieving savings. <p>It was agreed that a proposition for partners to take back to their respective organisations would be brought to the January Board meeting and will contain firm proposals and outcomes. Finance Directors will also meet in January to look at investment opportunities. ACTION JG</p> | <p>ACTION JG</p> |

Date and Time of Next Meeting:

Tuesday 28th February 2014, Committee Room 6, Civic Offices, Swindon