



**VALE OF GLAMORGAN AND CARDIFF
REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE**
28th May 2013

Present:

Councillor Bronwen Brooks – VGC
Councillor L Thorne - CC
Pam Toms –VGC
Mike Friel – CCC
Helen Jones – CHC
Michelle Brewer – CCC

Nina Langrish - TPAS
Sheila Gaughan – WG
Chris Maggs (CrM) – SPNAB
Mark Sheridan – CHC
Ceri Meloy (CM) - CHC
Jenny Lewington – VGC (Minutes)

Apologies:

Mike Ingram – VGC
Simon Prothero - WG
Francis Beecher – Cymorth
Sian Harrop-Griffiths – Cardiff & Vale
University Health Board
Sian Griffiths – Public Health

Not in Attendance

Peter Greenhill – Probation

Agenda Item	Action
<p>1. Introductions and Apologies</p> <p>Councillor Bronwen Brooks (Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made for the benefit of new attendees. Apologies received were noted.</p>	
<p>2. Minutes of last meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were read and agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.</p>	
<p>3. Matters Arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing First and Innovation to be added to future agenda items. • The SPNAB feedback form was circulated to RCC members following the last meeting. No comments were received by the deadline and the form was submitted to Welsh Government. • PT and MB interviewed applicants for the SP Development Officer (SPDO) post. The post has been offered to and accepted by Sarah Capstick who is due to start on the 5th June. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further suggestions were received for joint working. • MF provided an explanation of the Housing First project. An evaluation of the project is currently being undertaken. • Jan Williams, from SPNAB, did not attend the RCC meeting – SG to chase. • Amended meeting dates were circulated. <p>ACTION - Membership of Cardiff CCs Task Force and Expert Group for the commissioning of LD services to be circulated.</p> <p>ACTION – Re-circulate the Health and Homelessness Standards.</p> <p>ACTION – Housing First Project evaluation to be circulated when available.</p> <p>ACTION – Follow up to see if Jan Williams does intend to attend an RCC in the future.</p>	<p>MB</p> <p>SG</p> <p>MF</p> <p>SG</p>
<p>4. Standard Agenda Items</p> <p>A. Conflict of Interest Forms - available</p> <p>B. Accreditation – no update.</p> <p>C. Financial Position against Budget 2012/13 Outturn Figures</p> <p>Local Authority Outturn / Spend Plan 2012/13 (Nov 2012 – March 2013) spread sheets for the Vale of Glamorgan and Cardiff were circulated.</p> <p>Vale of Glamorgan – PT provided an overview of the figures provided and explained that they may appear misleading. The overspend for the full year is just over £15,000, the difference between the 6 month and 12 month figures is due to the end of year reconciliation which includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backdated payments. • LAs financial contribution to protected tenants (those residing since pre 2003) in sheltered housing and learning disability projects. <p>Cardiff – MB explained that Cardiff’s position is similar to the Vales; the LA contribution at the end of the financial year was £112’000 to balance the account. There was an overall underspend in the first half of the year and greater take up of services in the second half of the year. The part year to full year difference is due to fluctuations in the number of service users receiving funding for community alarm and sheltered housing services.</p> <p>SG clarified that these spread sheets need to be sent to the Welsh Government.</p> <p>ACTION – Send the Local Authority Outturn / Spend Plan 2012/13 (Nov 2012 – March 2013) to the Welsh Government.</p> <p>D. Regional Needs Mapping – no update.</p> <p>E. Outcomes and Performance – no update.</p>	<p>PT & MB</p>

F. Proposals for Strategic Remodelling

MB presented Cardiff Councils **Complex Needs Project Paper** – the paper proposes a reconfiguration of the SAIL Project to provide an accommodation based service for people with alcohol issues.


MS declared an interest as Taff Housing Association have acquired the building for the project. MS left the room for the item.

Service description – six accommodation based units for people with alcohol issues. The service will be targeted at people who find it difficult to move on from hostel services due to their alcoholism and chaotic lifestyles. The service will provide care and support but will not require the service user to address their issues. The project will enable move on from hostels, freeing up hostel spaces. The proposed service will be local (not regional) and it is anticipated the service will be operational from April 2014.

MB explained that funding would be moved from criminal justice client group to people with alcohol issues. The funding is less than the 10% level which requires RCC approval. However it was explained that Cardiff was presenting the paper in order to be open and clear. RCC support was sought for the proposal.

Questions

- i. HJ – Is this a reconfiguration or decommissioning one service to re-commission another? MB – The SAIL Project assists some of the same clients. MF – It is a new project to tackle an existing problem.
- ii. BB – Is the project long or short term? MB – Move on is not a requirement. The service users won't be required to tackle their alcohol issues. MF – it is not anticipated that many will move on from the service.
- iii. BB – If there is limited move on, how will others be assisted? MF – This is a solution for six people and there is a growing market for this type of accommodation. These service users would fail in mainstream accommodation. Six units won't meet all need, but it's a start and only one solution to the wider problem.
- iv. CM – The proposal states that six month introductory tenancies will be used. Will this be changed if it anticipated to be a long term service? MF – six months is the standard worked to and it also provides some comfort to the landlord.
- v. HJ – Which provider is contracted to provide the SAIL Project? MF – the Council is the provider. For the new service the care and support contracts will be tendered. Expressions of interest will be sought from providers and the process will be supported by the HUB (City Centre group).
- vi. SG – Is information on the funding for care available? MF – It will be made available as part of the tender process.
- vii. SG- Is there the option to provide floating support instead of attaching the support to the accommodation? MF – Maybe in the future. The existing Shoreline Project operates on a floating support basis. However this project is

<p>addressing the needs of people who are more likely to settle only with on-going support.</p> <p>viii. NL asked whether service users had been consulted as part of the development of the project proposal. MB – Yes detailed service user consultation was carried out in 2009/10, including interviews with service users in hostels who had failed to move on looking at their barriers and difficulties.</p> <p>The group discussed whether the proposal needs RCC or approval or support only; CrM suggested it is good practice to bring the proposal to the RCC to share information. However the group should be clear whether support or approval is sought. BB clarified that the proposal is outside of the remit of the RCC and as such asked what was sought from the RCC? MB reiterated that Cardiff was keen to be upfront about the proposal and was seeking support from the RCC. SG suggested this was acceptable as long as the project was included in the Local Commissioning Plan and the Plan should be re-submitted to the RCC with this change to funding included.</p> <p>SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL - BB asked if the RCC members were happy to support the proposal. All members agreed they were supportive of the project.</p> <p>MS returned to the room and provided a completed Conflict of Interest Form</p>  <p>G. Commissioning and Procurement</p> <p>Vale of Glamorgan Contract Update – PT explained that the interim contracts given to the previously SPPG funded service providers who transferred to the LA in November 2012, were originally due to begin ending in October 2013. These contracts will now be extended for 12 months; the service providers have all agreed to the extension. Contracts will now begin to expire from October 2014.</p> <p>H. Service User Involvement</p> <p>TPAS Project (Nina Langrish) - The TPAS update on Service User Involvement (May 2013) and the guidance for developing a Service User Involvement Frameworks were circulated.</p> <p>NL explained that the work has moved on since the project update was written. A brief background to the TPAS work was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPAS organised a number of service user events for the Welsh Government to inform the SP Guidance and involvement of service users at the RCCs. • The event presented Swansea City Councils 'Join In' project, which offers high level involvement, such as peer reviews of services. NL suggested that 	<p>MB</p>
---	-----------

<p>the service users that attended the event liked the Swansea model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Following these event, TPAS developed a project plan to ensure service user involvement at the RCC level, which included the development of regional service user groups.• NL explained that the Welsh Government want ‘focus’ and that it is a requirement for RCCs to develop a service user involvement framework.• TPAS will support the development of service user involvement in whatever way the RCC want. <p>There are six RCC regions across Wales, so the time TPAS can dedicate to each region is limited. They are keen to work with RCCs who <u>want</u> support. There are opportunities for the Vale and Cardiff to improve, as the Welsh Government want to see both local and regional approaches.</p> <p>SG highlighted that the Welsh Government require a Service User Involvement Framework to be developed. This does not include the requirement for a service user on the RCC, but service user views should be represented. SG explained that service users have suggested that would like the RCC ‘to go to them’; therefore the RCC does not necessarily need to identify a service user to attend.</p> <p>LT asked what the RCC wanted service user views on? CrM suggested that service users should have the <u>option</u> to contribute to the development of the service they receive, but also to the development of the SP programme locally, regionally and across Wales.</p> <p>NL provided an update on the work across Wales to-date; SP Regional Coordinators (RDCs) have been working together to develop guidance on developing the Service User Involvement Framework, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How to involve service users in service planning.• Opportunities for service users to be involved at all levels.• What is currently being done? Could it be done better?• How to evidence the influence of service users. <p>PT explained that from a Vale perspective, the SP Team already have a service user involvement framework; it was commissioned by the local authority and developed by Tamsin Stirling. Considerable service user consultation was undertaken and the results suggested that service users did not want formal involvement in the programme. Service users wanted Supporting People to go to them. The framework includes a number of ways for the SP Team, to engage with services users, including; by interviewing a minimum of 20% of service users during service reviews, publishing an annual newsletter, attending house meetings, events and other informal opportunities.</p> <p>BB expressed concerns that putting service user involvement on too formal a footing would deter some service users from being involved and may only end up representing the strongest voices. BB suggested the Vales less formal approach may reach more service users. PT also highlighted that service user involvement is conducted routinely by SP Teams, for example Cardiff’s service user involvement in the development of the project proposal discussed and it is also the intention to</p>	
--	--

involve service user groups in future tendering in the Vale. Service user involvement is seen as 'automatic' as a commissioner.

FB (apologies given) was unable to attend the RCC and so had sent feedback on the TPAS project to PT by email in readiness for the meeting. FB is unhappy with the TPAS project plan as it stands, as it does not provide effective methods to enable service user views to be represented at the RCC. Work needs to continue to build on service providers practices and tap into their existing groups and forum. This would also provide visibility in terms of which client groups and service had not been consulted.

CM agreed that there is lots of good work already being undertaken by service providers and that they have a wealth of knowledge on how to engage with their client group. It is important to enable service users to develop the confidence to get involved; another cumbersome structure is not needed.

MF asked how service users are involved at SPNAB level. CrM explained that the SPNAB would rely on the RCC to provide service user views. An event had also been organised where service users had the opportunity to speak to the Minister directly. NL highlighted that this was a good example of service user involvement.

NL suggested that the pyramid model of involvement, used in terms of tenant engagement, is a useful model for Supporting People to consider and that the RCC should not rule out asking service users if they want a regional group. This may identify service users at the end of support who may see the opportunity to get involved as a way to improve their skills and employability. NL asked the RCC to be ambitious and consider all the options. NL sees her role to challenge the RCC and promote an ambitious approach. NL used the example of the service user event organised by TPAS, which no service users from Cardiff or the Vale attended. PT highlighted that all service providers and users in the Vale had received the invite to this event but none of them chose to attend.

MF summarised that yes service providers have existing methods of involving service users, but the RCC probably need to build on this and fill any gaps.

Service User Involvement Mapping Exercise – MB presented the results of the service user involvement survey completed by service providers in Cardiff and the Vale:

- The return rate was very good, with only four providers not responding.
- The results show that service user involvement is done using a variety of methods, including, but not limited to; one-to-one discussions, forums, groups, social events, suggestion boxes, play sessions and newsletters.
- Themes that emerged from consultation were provided and commonalities identified.
- The barriers to service user involvement were suggested, including; length of support, service user ability, motivation, age, chaotic lifestyles and language and literacy issues.
- In conclusion it was felt that service user views are influencing the delivery of services and providers are looking to further develop their service user

<p>involvement in the future.</p> <p>The Welsh Government has provided a new survey for service providers about service user involvement. Clarity was sought as to whether the Vale and Cardiff need to re-survey providers, having already done this once? HJ highlighted that re-surveying service providers was ‘over-consultation’ and some providers may take the view that they hadn’t been listened to the first time, so why complete the survey a second time.</p> <p>SG explained that the Welsh Government want a benchmark of where service user involvement is currently in order to compare in later years as practices develops. It is important that the information collected is able to <u>evidence</u> what difference service user involvement has made. However, if the work has already been done the exercise does not need to be repeated.</p> <p>NL reiterated the importance of providing evidence of the influence service users have and what difference their views have made. Service user involvement was previously a SPRG aim, but it is no longer a requirement. The outcomes measure service user progress, but not their influence; therefore the framework must provide a more robust focus. NL said she was happy to be involved and it was time for TPAS to talk to and help Cardiff and the Vale.</p> <p>Following the discussions of the TPAS project and the Welsh Government survey it was suggested that the RCC set up a working group looking at service user involvement. The group will look at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing service user involvement and how it can be built upon. • How to measure effectiveness. • How to communicate difficult topics, e.g. funding cuts, service closures, changes to service provision. • How to develop the framework in collaboration. <p>Membership – PT highlighted that it needs to be led by RCC members. MF suggested the Cymorth and CHC representatives lead this working group. It was agreed this working group will be established when the RDC is in post.</p> <p>ACTION – Establish a service user involvement working group.</p> <p>I. Re-tendering – No updates.</p>	<p>Sarah Capstick RDC</p>
<p>5. Engagement with the Private Rented Sector (PRS)</p> <p>MB presented the PRS Discussion Paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2011 Census shows the PRS now represents 22% of households in Cardiff and 15% in the Vale. Both of which are above the national average. • The PRS now outweighs the social rented sectors in both local authority areas. <p>The paper was presented in response to discussions about a PRS representative being a member of the RCC. PRS representation was considered as landlords are</p>	

<p>increasingly being asked to house tenants with support needs and some landlords are reluctant to do this. The situation is likely to become more difficult with the introduction of Universal Credit and removal of direct HB payment.</p> <p>The issues relevant to RCC membership include; how the PRS should be represented? Could or would a representative attend? Are SP issues relevant to them?</p> <p>LT has attended a number of PRS events and has heard first-hand the concerns about Universal Credit. It is important to get the PRS on-board and local authorities are going to have to rely more on the PRS to meet housing need. However landlords are reluctant to attend forums and groups, as they are time consuming. HJ also highlighted that many landlords may not be interested in the work of the RCC and may only attend when there are relevant agenda items.</p> <p>MS suggested that if a PRS representative was identified maybe the agenda could be circulated in advance and they could choose whether to attend or not. CM supported this idea and suggested it was better to invite them and they not attend than not involve the sector. This was a view generally supported by members of the group.</p> <p>ACTION – Raise RCC membership at local PRS forums and groups to canvass interest in a representative from the PRS being co-opted onto the RCC membership.</p>	<p>MB & PT</p>
<p>6. Joint Working Suggestions from Members</p> <p>One suggestion was provided by FB – to look regionally at income maximisation and access to work initiatives.</p> <p>MS suggested that the group continue to look for joint working opportunities, but that new services were not the priority this year.</p>	
<p>7. Welsh Government Update</p> <p>SG provided the update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WG has written to all LAs to indicate that the funding position is not looking good and there is a continuing downward pressure on budgets. LAs should start to look at solutions for possible further funding cuts. • The specification for the revised redistribution formula is being developed and has been discussed at SPNAB. The Minister is keen for a formula to be developed which addresses need and is clear/transparent. The new Ministers views will be sought at the next SPNAB on 6th June. LAs will be informed of progress as soon as possible. LT highlighted that the Welsh Government will also need to be mindful of the effect this will have on planning and commissioning and allow time for LAs to plan effectively and involve service users in the process. • The Renting Homes White Paper was launched by the Minister last week. RCC members were urged to read the paper and feedback as there are 	

<p>implications for Supporting People services and providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting of RCC chairs was held; the Welsh Government was pleased that all regions were represented and felt the meeting was positive and beneficial. The differences between the regions and RCCs were acknowledged. • A presentation was given by Dr Clive Grace on the options for the future governance of RCCs; three options were presented. • Further meetings are to be held, in S. Wales the event will be on 25th June in Swansea. <p>ACTION: Circulate date, time, and location of the governance consultation event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A questionnaire has been developed to gather information on older person's services which will be sent to RCCs when ready. WG are seeking funding to support a report on the move from support based on tenure rather than need. The report will not provide direction, but examples of good practice. PT asked whether it was worth the RCC looking at OP services prior to the report being written. SG said yes as its important the RCC is aware of the issue and starts to think about a strategy for moving forward. • The next SP newsletter has been written and circulated. SG requested that this is circulated widely, to all relevant networks, organisations etc. • SP Bulletin 8 is available on the website. <p>ACTION – Circulate the link to the bulletin.</p> <p>ACTION – Circulate the bulletin and newsletter to all networks and groups.</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>SC</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>8. Agenda Items for July</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postpose the older person's accommodation agenda item to a later date. • Add Housing First and Innovation to the agenda. • Add HB/ Benefit Updates to the agenda; discussion – where we are, what work is being undertaken. • CrM suggested Information Sharing Protocols and Risk Management (as discussed at other RCCs). <p>ACTION – RDC to make contact with other RDCs and regions to look at standing agenda items and emerging themes.</p>	<p>Sarah Capstick RDC</p>
<p>9. AOB</p>	

<p>PT has received an email from CHC regarding a deputy representative as no-one put themselves forward during the election process. Richard Vaughan who works for Cadwyn Housing Association has volunteered.</p> <p>DECISION – the RCC members were asked if they are happy for RV to become the CHC deputy representative. Members all agreed this was acceptable.</p> <p>ACTION – RV to be added to the membership.</p> <p>BB thanks members for their attendance at the RCC.</p>	<p>PT / Sarah Capstick RDC</p>
<p>Next Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3pm – Tuesday 2nd July 2013 Room F26, Block A, the Alps Depot, Wenvoe</p>	