**Redesign Board Workshop 13.3.18**

**CR 1 and Cr 2 Council HQ**

**2-4pm**

**Draft action note**

1. **Board Members present:** Cllr Lobban (Chair), Cllr Reiss (Vice Chair), Cllr Bremner, Cllr Caddick, Cllr Christie, Cllr Davidson, Cllr Fraser, Cllr Jarvie, Cllr Louden, Cllr MacKenzie, Cllr MacKinnon, Cllr C Smith, Paul MacPherson

**Apologies:** Cllr I Cockburn,Cllr Sinclair, Cllr M Smith, Cllr Wilson, John Gibson

**Other Members present:**  Cllr Gray, Cllr Adam, Cllr Paterson

**Staff present:**  Steve Barron; Carron McDiarmid; Louise McGunnigle, Murray Bain and Bernadette Cairns (Lean showcase); David Haas, Alasdair Bruce, Robbie Bain and William Gilfillan (car parking review); Evelyn Johnston and Matt Bailey (facilitation); Steve Walsh

1. **Action note from 13th February 2018 –** Agreed as accurate
2. **Actions arising from the Council Meeting 8th March 2018**

* Work is underway to develop other types of reviews, including those requiring a focus on savings given the savings target agreed for the Redesign Board, with proposals to come back to the Board.
* The amended motion on public transport options agreed at Council which refers to action by the Redesign Board will be programmed. Timescales are not yet clear on the legislation proposed.
* Board members involved in the three peer reviews concluded so far will have been invited to attend a focus group to share their experience and help to continuously improve the review framework.

1. **Lean showcase of ASG allocation model for Additional Support Needs** – Louise McGunnigle and Murray Bain from the review team presented the findings from the Lean review. They highlighted that over 10% of the Council’s staff are involved in the ASN allocation process. It had taken several attempts to map the current process and to understand all the steps involved including reporting pupil needs, accuracy checks, liaison with teachers and double handling of data. In total 49 significant steps were identified. Data quality on pupil needs was an issue and this is currently resolved through mediation with local schools individually. Other issues included: a lack of standardisation; little discussion across schools within an ASGs (apart from in one ASG where a pilot was underway); relatively high levels of stress among ASN staff linked to delays and uncertainties around which pupils they were to support; and lack of awareness and records of staff skills and training. The team had mapped out the steps for the various staff teams involved and showed that if data, as a critical enabler of the process, was provided in the right way and on time and with Head Teachers recognising the importance of getting this right, then this would lead to a real improvement in the process. The ASG pilot had demonstrated benefits of the approach where Head Techers across the ASG share information and plan resources together based on the needs across the schools. This shifted the process from being about competitive bidding for resources to local ownership and shared responsibility for the total resource. Those involved had found it positive. Other pockets of good practice had been identified.

Improvements already in place from the Lean review included improved data security through use of a SharePoint site and a training register for workforce planning. If all improvements are taken forward 49 steps could reduce in a future state to 18. The timescale for allocation would reduce from 16 weeks to a maximum of 12, Business Support involvement would no longer be needed and there would be scope to re-focus ASN management.

The team identified what still needs to happen as: compliance in using SEEMIS across the school estate for the C&L Executive Team to take this forward and the roll out of the ASG model with 8 further ASGs to use the process this year.

Bernadette Cairns as Head of Service was able to respond to Member queries which focused on: in what way and why data were unreliable; whether requests inflated or under-estimated pupil need; how changes in need in year are dealt with; whether ASG geography worked as well for Inverness and whether having an urban and rural approach might be better; prioritising resources to higher levels of need; how Pupil Support Assistants (PSAs) are re-assigned to pupils; and provision for staff development and training.

1. **Reviews:**
   1. Cllr Caddick provided a verbal up-date on progress with the building trades review. Engagement was underway with Heads of Service, staff and Trade Unions and workshop was planned for that week. There is sense there are real possibilities for savings, efficiencies and improvements in staff satisfaction. Cllr Fraser declared an interest in this item.
   2. Cllr Jarvie provided a verbal up-date on progress with **the review into commissioned preventative services for children** and that work was in progress on exploring the ALEO model as a potential option. A further workshop was planned for April. The scope for in-sourcing some residential placements, linked to the capital programme had been considered. Members agreed that the focus of the review must be improved outcomes for children. Cllr Davidson sought involvement in this review. The team is scheduled to attend the next Board workshop with further information, including on the ALEO model.
   3. David Haas, team leader, made a presentation with suggestions for **refocusing the review of car parking** following budget decisions made on car parking charges at Council in February 2018. David shared data on the areas where car parking costs were incurred and where car parking charges are applied. This showed where there was a mismatch between income and expenditure and it highlighted where further information on financial data was needed. He confirmed that the scope for the car parking review to support localism still existed, with surplus income generated ring-fenced to the locality and made available to invest locally and as agreed by the local committee. Being open about how charges are reinvested would improve transparency on charging to the public. Experience in 2018/19 would test the modelling on projected income and on impact. He highlighted areas where there was growing demand for car parking e.g. Skye and for other opportunities to support tourism. He confirmed that some research had shown that where charges had been introduced at the right level, footfall had increased to towns as car parking spaces were re-used as people realised the value of them.

Member comments included: the interest the Commercial Board has in camper van parking provision; the scope for drilling into the income and expenditure associated with individual sites; collecting payments in remote areas; andhe proportion of funding that might be retained locally.

Those concerned about new car parking charges queried whether: Ward Discretionary Grant could be used to offset car parking income and the potential displacement of car parking to supermarkets where no charge is levied. They felt in Caithness that the poor condition of car parks made it difficult for some to justify the new charges being applied to them. Others wanted to know what form the planned consultation would take and expressed their opposition to introducing charges; noting the Council decision had been made.

Others were concerned about current inequity and felt it was not fair to charge in some places and not others. The review in progress offered scope to improve localism and enable charging to be defensible and beneficial to the public. Political leadership was needed.

The Director present confirmed that the scope for community wards enforcing charges was limited because they provide services to tenants (HRA funded) but that the new enforcement plan includes recruiting 4 new officers. He confirmed the consultation plan was being devised and he offered to speak to local Members.

1. **Stock take against work plan** – a short report providing a stock take of achievements and progress since the Board’s remit and work plan was circulated along with a forward look of proposed actions for the next 3 months. As there was insufficient time for the facilitated discussion planned, this item was deferred.
2. **Communications plan – what redesign means for Highland citizens and communities.** Analysis was circulated of the feedback from the Citizens’ Panel on involving communities. However as there was insufficient time for the planned facilitated discussion on what redesign means for Highland citizens and communities, this item was deferred to the next meeting.
3. **AOB** – the new date for the next workshop on 25th April was confirmed and Members agreed to extend the time so the workshop would run from 2-5pm.