Redesign Board Workshop 25.4.18: Action Note

Board Members present: Cllr Lobban (Chair), Cllr Reiss (Vice Chair), Cllr Caddick, Cllr I Cockburn, Cllr Christie, Cllr Fraser, Cllr Jarvie, Cllr Louden, Cllr MacKenzie, Cllr MacKinnon, Cllr C Smith, Cllr M Smith, Paul MacPherson, John Gibson

Apologies: Cllr Bremner, Cllr Davidson, Cllr Sinclair, Cllr Wilson, Steve Barron

Other Members present: Cllr Adam, Cllr Baxter, Cllr Finlayson, Cllr Gray, Cllr Henderson, Cllr Laird, Cllr MacDonald, Cllr Munro, Cllr Paterson

Staff present: Carron McDiarmid; Allan Maguire and Sandra Campbell (for item 3); Alison Clark and Ruth Cleland (item 5 facilitation) David Haas, Alasdair Bruce, Robbie Bain (for items 5 and 6); William Gilfillan (item 6).

1. **Action note from 13.3.18** – confirmed as accurate.

2. **Matters arising noted from the action note**:
   a. A proposal on a community review is under development with proposals to come to the May workshop.
   b. How reviews can help meet the Board savings target are being discussed with the Depute Chief Executive and Director of Finance with further information for the May workshop.
   c. The postponed discussion on the stock take against the Board's work plan will be programmed for the May workshop.

3. **Peer review of commissioned preventative services**
   The team leader, Allan Maguire presented the further work of the team using the slides circulated to Board Members. This reminded Members of the current issues around the 29 separate commissions and included an up-date on the CL&H Committee decision to agree the business case and 4 year plan to develop resources within Highland for looked after children presented by the Head of Service and instigated/stimulated by the review. 3 options had now emerged from the review:
   a. Tightening up arrangements around the current commissions (presented previously to a Board workshop);
   b. Develop an in-house hub to take relevant children's services together and have it more focused on delivery to reducing the number of looked after children and to get the best service and outcomes possible for looked after children, including educational outcomes. This would mean some structure change and a re-focus of activities.
   c. Transfer relevant children's services to an ALEO.

A slide on each option was presented.

The key points made on the latter two options were:

- The option of an in-house hub had emerged from the discussions with staff on the ALEO model, as this enabled reflection on how the in-house approach could improve, getting the benefits of an ALEO model without transferring it to an ALEO. It was seen by the team as less complex in the short-term and more convincing to staff.

- The discussions with staff had taken place through a workshop with lead officers for the commissions. A key issue had been the need to engage with education services and to ensure looked after children are integrated into education. Concerns had been expressed about the rate of school exclusions of looked after children, the pressure this put on parents and subsequently children coming into care. Some had questioned whether an ALEO might make this worse as those providing support would be even further removed from education providers; although some had seen this as a risk anyway if school governance is removed from local authorities. However although there was a representative from ASN services at the workshop, none of the leads for these commissioned services sit in education so this was recognised as a gap in the consultation.

- The ALEO model appeared to be more flexible, enabling speedier decision-making and action and with scope to attract funding from sources out with the reach of the Council. The team suggested finding out how the ALEO model works in practice would be helpful, with a Chief executive from an English ALEO providing that information to the Board.

The team also provided an up-date to the Board on recent engagement with some current suppliers organised by the Highland Third Sector Interface (HTSI). This had followed from a letter from the HTSI expressing concern about a lack of involvement. The key issues they raised were: should the sector be involved more, and directly rather than through the HTSI? In reviewing current commissions the Council should look at wider value than cost and consider social return on investment, the local impacts of 3rd sector provision and the additionality the sector brings. They also fed back that the current service level agreements restrict innovation. They asked how they could be more involved in redesign of this service.

Issues raised by Members following the presentation were responded to by Allan and the host Head of Service, Sandra Campbell. They focused on:

- Legal advice confirms that ALEO provision is not prohibited in the discharge of the Council's legal responsibilities for looked after children. The Council would specify how the duty would be discharged. An ALEO could still commission services.
- The ALEO model could have the advantage if set up as a charity to attract other income with potential for a subsidiary as a trading arm. Running costs and a SCIO model would need to be considered too.
- The team had reached out to NHSH but as yet engagement had been limited to information that NHSH is reviewing their commissions for children and had extended current contracts for a year to provide time for the review.
- The timing to involve looked after children and their parents in the review team's work was a difficult issue as children currently looked after have relationships with current providers.
- It had taken the team 3 months to understand what and who was being paid for all 29 commissions. A focus solely on the commissions themselves (option 1) could make savings (e.g. through tendering and re-tendering) but it would be a difficult process although it could be re-visited if the other options are ruled out.
- On costs associated with an in-house hub, it was confirmed the £20m budget currently fragmented would be brought together. Around half is spent on looked after children. Over-spending in the service tended to come from using expensive out of authority placements (and with poor outcomes for the children affected) at around £220k per child per annum and for 35 children. The economic and social arguments exist for bringing children back from out of the authority, especially with the example of the Killen project which had saved £60k per annum for each of two children supported this way and with considerable leaps in their educational development within 1 year.
- On staffing in the in-house hub, the Social Workers involved currently sit in family teams and it's not proposed this would change. The in-house hub would include the aspects presented on slides 4, 5 and 6 so to include residential units, Northern Lights and Aberlour projects, in-house residential and fostering provision, staff and management included in those and all the commissioned services. It would not include social workers in family teams, staff in education or in early years' provision.
- Stimulating more fostering and for teenage children needs to be encouraged. The Lean review had helped but we would need to generate savings in order to pay foster carers more.

In conclusion, Members agreed:
- On option 2 – in-house hub, Members could see potential benefits on simplifying the structure, the relative speed of implementation, the scope to develop the service through dedicated staff and with more Trade Union support. They would

like to see more detail on the structure. They have interest too in seeing how the education service would be involved and how engagement with families might be approached. This information is to come back to a future workshop.

- On option 3 – the ALEO model, some Members could see the advantage, drawing on the benefits of HLH in terms of culture, getting things done, positivity and innovation. Members are keen to hear from a Chief Executive of an ALEO on their experience and achievements, even by using VC or Skype at a future workshop.

4. **Building trades review**

Cllr Cockburn and Cllr Caddick provided verbal feedback from the review team. They feel the review is likely to need additional time. It may be that 80% of the review remit can be delivered initially with 20% progressed later. Some issues exist around tension across different teams and the case for change among the host Heads of Service, with a sense that some change had been tried before but did not work. Other issues flagged up by the evidence gathered are: there is no housing voids hit team, a localised area approach is lacking and all trades are paid at the same rate leading to difficulty in attracting some trades people. The review of the framework agreement through procurement is being delayed until the peer review concludes. The Team Leader's approach was valued by the Members involved. Engagement with Trade Unions in the review was good.

5. **Communications plan 2nd workshop** – Having spent time in a workshop in December, Members worked in groups to identify what redesign means and why we are redesigning for: staff and trade Unions; elected members; the private sector and the third sector. Following a presentation re-capping on that and including feedback from the public, Members were able to consider what redesign means and why we are redesigning for our communities. The feedback is attached at Appendix 1.

6. **Car parking review**

David Haas, team leader for the peer review presented the slides circulated earlier to Board Members on the redesign proposals. A full discussion with contributions from 18 Board and non-Board members followed. Two further Members unable to attend had sent comments in by e-mail. The Chair read the email from Cllr Wilson. The discussion reflected diversity of opinion and it was acknowledged that the budget decision in February had been taken separately to the peer review which was still underway.

The team was asked to reflect on the points below.
- Stakeholders should include local businesses.

- Clarity is needed on the timeline – for policy and proposals being implemented.
- Clarity on the % that can be kept locally – 50/50 suggested but this needs further deliberation.
- Surplus generated to stay locally should be available to use on local priorities and not be confined to community services activities.
- Local committees given opportunity to consider how to bring in Member views from each Ward on car parking proposals – especially where committees cover large geographies
- Draw out how Lochaber Area Committee has used its powers locally to vary rates and time periods for car parking - £300k to £600k was being raised in Fort William now.
- Consider lobbying approach to Govt. and its agencies on scope for levying tax on larger commercial car parks and for that to be retained locally.
- Whether the Highland Rover ticket could be available for local residents too.
- Helping residents with parking where charges are to be introduced e.g. residents living above town centre shops.
- How to respond to staff concerns about paying for parking – Fort William staff had raised this issue with Trade Unions. Some commented that free parking can be seen as a perk.

In conclusion, the current inequity with charging in only some areas was acknowledged. Some Members highlighted that those charging are subsidising costs incurred for car parking elsewhere and the status quo was not acceptable. Some Members present are opposed to introducing car parking charges in their Wards mainly because they feel there would be adverse local impacts. It was acknowledged that the policy proposed enables local context to be considered, local decisions to be made and for public engagement. This would include understanding impacts, re-investing surpluses generated locally (with surplus to be defined) and bearing deficits locally.

The Chair asked that the review team prepare their recommendations for a report to a formal Redesign Board to be arranged for the following week. If possible the recommendations from the Board could be presented to the Council in May.

7. **Council report for 10th May** – an up-date report would be provided and depending on the Board meeting the following week it may contain the Board's car parking recommendations to Council.

   Post workshop note: the Board meeting held on 1st May finalised the recommendations for stage 1 of the review but further work was requested before the Board could finalise its recommendations to Council. The minute from the Board meeting will be prepared for the Council meeting for noting.

8. **AOB –** None.

Why we are redesigning and what redesign means for our communities – feedback from the workshop groups and the key themes

Why Redesign?

Theme	Feedback
We have less resources and we are making the most of them.	Limited resources and need to save money (need to provide clear easy to understand financial info). Need to prioritise what we do due to reduced money. The Council needs to make best use of what resources it has. We couldn't afford the model we had. That some things may not continue. That the demand for services has changed – growth in demand in certain areas, why there is the need within that community/community of interest, the need to target support.
Continual search for efficiency **Improving services by changing how we run them**	To reduce waste. To simplify processes – make it easier to use/access services. Faster, more efficient, improved experience. Use resources in the most efficient way. To adapt to changing technology. Technology is changing and that leads to us changing how we can deliver our services Improving the service. To better understand Council business processes. Need to keep finding more efficiencies. Better value to public purse – not just about savings. Improving the service.
Being open to different views and to local solutions.	Because we are Listening and being Responsive. To query what we do and the level to do it at. That redesign is not about one size fits all. The public is less bothered about who does what as long as it gets done.
Changing for the better	No option. The need for change. The fact we are doing this is important - being proactive. To provide more ownership. To keep positive.
Redesign works	We've already some redesign and been successful (provide good case studies and examples).
Changing what the Council can do and what communities can do…better	That some things may not continue Manage realistic expectations. To re-set expectations of can do. Reduce dependency. That the organisation won't necessarily be able to continue to do everything it always has.

What will change? What will redesign mean for communities?

Theme	Feedback
Innovation **Good business practice** **Efficiency**	Council will be more innovative/risk averse. More innovation Better understanding of business. Business opportunities, funding streams, HOIL and Business Gateway. New ways of doing things can be better (e.g. Rangers – donation approach is bringing more income than charging approach). Commercial -need to be clear about the reason for adopting a commercial approach, being more business-like, resourceful, if we raise more we can provide more. Better use of technology. Easier to access/use services. Simpler processes – efficient (LEAN Reviews). Working more efficiently. Less silo working. Perpetual improvement. Transparent evaluation. Fewer unintended consequences
Redesign is happening and we are seeing the improvement.	The Council has already changed for the better. Tell the positive stories e.g. smallest management structure. We have a story of success given budget situation.
The involvement of people and communities matters for redesign	We will find different ways of engaging groups of people – a new approach. Local solutions. Involving people more. Communities will be involved and communities ideas and views are important in shaping redesign. Need to promote the opportunities to do things jointly with communities which will offer opportunities to do more. Supporting communities to participate and be involved in delivering what and where the Council can't. Important to take a pro-active approach to involving and engaging communities. Communities doing more – this should be seen as positive – may lead to more local jobs, Different expectations. Closer partnership working. Better communication. Transparent evaluation. Improved public engagement and confidence. Fewer unintended consequences.
Joining up	Closer partnership working. Less silo working. Transparent evaluation.
Shifting expectations	We will have less money in the future. Different expectations. Say what we will do. Say what we will no longer do or can't do. Be open about our constraints e.g. when we have press releases about road repairs we set that in the context of the length of our road network. Give the positive first about the scale and context of our service delivery. Some things might change in a noticeable way.

On the approach to how we communicate

- PLAIN ENGLISH IS IMPORTANT
- To keep positive
    - Tell the positive stories e.g. smallest management structure.
    - Get the positive stories heard in a concise and focused way and agree what the key messages are.
    - Be open about our constraints e.g. when we have press releases about road repairs we set that in the context of the length of our road network. Give the positive first about the scale and context of our service delivery.
- Strategic messages about purpose and aims of redesign
- Use a technique such as releasing one Council message a day.
- Managing expectations will be critical and supporting communities to understand the need for change
- On timing and variation
    - Communication is needed at different points in the Redesign process with different messages for different times in the redesign process – message needs to be clear
    - Following a service redesign process, the message needs to include:
        - How things will be delivered
        - Who will be delivering services in the future
        - Timings for change – pace of change
    - Being transparent with the public but this needs to be balanced against appropriate timing for engaging and sharing
    - Local dimension – different messages for different areas
- Focus on dispelling myths
- Need case studies and examples
- Remember staff are members of the public too