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**VALE OF GLAMORGAN AND CARDIFF**

**REGIONAL COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE**

 **Minutes 12th January 2016**

**“This document is available in Welsh / Mae’r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg”**

**Present:**

Cllr Susan Elsmore – CCC (Chair)

Mike Ingram – VGC

Jane Thomas- CCC

Phil Richardson – CHC Rep.

Pam Toms - VGC

Neil Sutcliffe – CCC

Mark Sheridan – CHC Rep.

Conrad Eydmann – C&V UHB

Donna Lemin – Welsh Government

Frances Beecher – Cymorth Rep (Vice Chair)

Vicky Harris CRC

Jeff Gooch – Gwalia

Kate Hollinshead - RDC

Mark Davies – PAG

Louise Bennet - PAG

**Apologies:**

Cllr Bronwen Brooks – VGC

Helen Jones – VGC

Ceri Meloy – Cymorth Rep.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda item** | **Action** |
| 1. **Welcome, introduction, apologies and declaration of interest**

SE the Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.Introductions were made around the table.Apologies were received.New Declaration of interest forms were requested for the new year. DL confirmed that any one who needs to sign a new declaration of interest should complete the one attached to the MoU. |  |
| 1. **Minutes of meeting, 3rd November 2015 and Matters Arising**

The minutes were approved unanimously.Matters arising:DL queried whether the RCC had written to the Minister re the MoU. KH confirmed that a letter had been drafted but that the MoU had arrived before the letter was sent.FB requested that the MoU could be brought forward on the agenda as she had to leave the meeting at 3pm. |  |
| 1. **RDC report to the RCC**

Paper circulated with agenda.KH has finished amending the data sharing protocol in line with what was requested by the legal department. The document is now back with the Vale of Glamorgan’s legal department and hopefully will be approved soon. The Supporting People MoU has been agreed by the Minister and distributed to RCC members. The Supporting People budget has been protected for 2015/2016.Review of Vale and Cardiff RCC questionnaire distributed to members. Most members have responded and KH has written a short report which she will distribute later in the meeting. The RCP has been amended to reflect the budget being protected and will be ready for consultation very shortly.A joint team meeting between the Vale and Cardiff Supporting People teams has been agreed for the 22nd January 2016.KH reminded the RCC about some dates for their diaries: * Welsh Government Events for People who use Supporting People Services, 14th January 2016, 2pm YMCA**,**Mendalgief Rd, Newport NP20 2HF, Gwent.

FB queried if this event was tomorrow or the 14th. Established that the event tomorrow is for Mid and West Wales, the 14th is in Gwent. * Management Charges Event, 18th January 2016, 12:30pm, The Pierhead Building, Cardiff Bay.
* Tackling Tomorrow: How can our Young People be given a more hopeful future? 11th February 2016, Angel Hotel, Cardiff

**Older persons services task and finish group**The next meeting will take place on 28th January 2016. The work has been continuing details are provided in the update under agenda item 9.**Outcomes task and finish group**The group met on the 4th November 2015. The work of the group has been completed and Phil Richardson has completed a report for the RCC which he will talk about later. **Service user involvement task and finish group** The group have not met since the November 2015 RCC. KH has met with CM and we have a new plan which KH will update the group on later. **Regional plan 2016/19 task and finish group**The group have not met since the November RCC. The work has been continuing and MS will update on this under section 7 of the agenda.**Meeting with Individuals*** Helen Jones, VOGC
* Philip Richardson, Cadwyn
* Tim Cousins, VOGC Legal Department
* Ceri Meloy, Dimensions

**Meetings attended and brief summaries*** ***Outcomes Task and Finish Group, 4th November 2015*:** See notes above
* ***Cwm Taf RCC 10th November:*** To gain an understanding of the ways other RCCs operate
* ***RCC meeting with Strategic Finance Group, 12th November 2015:*** See notes above.
* ***Wellbeing Assessment Workshop, 19th November 2015:*** Discussions around how other agencies are preparing for the introduction of the Future Generations Wellbeing Act.
* ***SPIN, 25th November 2015:*** The meeting was held jointly with Cymorth and CHC to discuss different models of support and gain different perspectives on the issues these models represent.
* ***Poverty Action Group, 27th November 2015:*** To make links with the Poverty Action Group Representatives working in the Vale of Glamorgan and discuss similarities/differences between their work and the work of the Supporting People Programme.
* ***Cymorth Induction, 30th November 2015:*** Cymorth held an induction morning to give new RCC representatives and new RDCs an insight into the work of the RCC
* ***Meeting with Llamau, 16th December 2015*:** To discuss new pilot models of support

Some RCC members said that they had not been able to open the links on the RDC report.CE suggested that this may be due to different versions of word being used.KH confirmed that she will have a look at this before the next update is distributed.**Action: KH to check that links on RDC report will open in different versions of word.** | KH |
| **15. MoU** (discussed earlier due to some RCC members having to leave early)DL confirmed that MoU is for voting members but deputies should also sign.FB explained that she is disappointed that the final version of the MoU is a more watered down version of the original. FB feels that it is not strong enough but thinks it is essential the RCC signs it asap. FB is happy to sign.MS stated that he would prefer something more permanent.JG agreed with FB and MS.PR agrees with the other providers that it could be stronger but accepts that it is better than nothing.PT has no issues and thinks the RCC should sign asap.MI is happy with it.DL understands frustrations but thinks the RCC needs to sign.CE believes it is fit for purpose and has no particular issues but pointed out that there is some ambiguity on page 5 as the RCC can give as much advice around procurement as it likes but ultimately the LAs hold the money and the LAs are the ones with a vested interest as they are the ones accountable and therefore any strategy around procurement/collaboration is down to the LAs which means that this document has no teeth.PT agreed that it comes down to the LAs individual financial regulations. JT agreed that the RCC is there to advise but that local commissioning arrangements are already set out by LAs. JT has no issues signing the document. NS pointed out that the MoU is a condensed version of the guidance.SE feels that the MoU gives some clarity of individual’s roles and corporate roles. SE suggested we take a week or so to have a look at the MoU and queried whether the RCC can sign electronically.DL and KH agreed that members can sign electronically. SE asked voting members to sign within two weeks.FB agreed. FB pointed out that it is not just LAs who have a vested interest in procurement as it can hamper front line services and the RCC can help with this. SE reminded the RCC that the RCC needs to live up to its title and work collaboratively. SE advised the RCC members must listen and agree but must also make decisions. CE agreed that the important thing is that the RCC can see that any issues have been considered by the RCC.  |  |
| 1. **Welsh Government Update**

Paper circulated with the agenda.DL explained that the document started off as 1 to 2 pages but has now turned into a much larger document with a massive amount of information in it. This has been very time consuming as it has involved chasing lots of people around the office. DL suggested cutting the document down so that it is leaner and sharper. DL explained that she would not go through the whole document as it is so large but would pick out some of the salient points. DL advised that substantial work has gone on across Wales about getting the SP word out to as many people as possible. DL advised that the Minister is committed to driving the SP agenda forward and the RCC also needs to drive this forward. FB advised that she found the WG report very useful and that it is nice to have all the information together. MD said that he would be happy to circulate any information to the PAGs too.CE explained that there is a new Substance Misuse Delivery Plan which he will circulate to the group. He advised that there is a substantial work programme to come out of this piece of work..**Action: CE to circulate new Substance Misuse Delivery Plan to RCC.** | CE |
| 1. **Vale LA update**

Paper circulated with agenda.PT gave the update as HJ had sent her apologies. PT advised that following the success of the providers to gain a place on the provider Framework Agreement we are now in a position to retender services whose contracts are coming to an end. These services are: Domestic abuse refuge provision, mental health supported housing, young people’s services and families static projects. This will be done in the form of a mini tender exercise with the top providers on the framework agreement eligible to bid. The new preferred provider list is therefore in place and the Vale will be tendering the services mentioned in March 2016.The Supporting People Local Planning Group, which consists of representatives from Housing, Social Services, Probation, the Cardiff and Vale University Health Board and the Vale Housing and Homelessness Forum, met in December and agreed the local priorities for housing related support services funded by Supporting People. As the planned cuts didn’t materialise the team is looking at any cost saving we make to pilot new services in high demand areas. Proposed new models of support delivery have been examined by the group and several pilots are now underway with existing providers in the areas of domestic abuse, mental health and young people services.The Local commissioning plan has been updated following the announcement of the static budget for next year. Priorities have been identified from the data analysis undertaken by the team.Joint Working. The SP Lead continues to meet with the Poverty action group which includes Families First, Communities First and Flying Start teams who have been looking at coordinating the outcomes programmes across all funding streams and looking at closer working links. We have also invited the Chair of this group to attend the RCC as a representative from the Vale services. |  |
| 1. **Cardiff LA update**

Paper circulated with agenda.NS advised the outcomes for November 2015 were submitted on time.Quarterly returns were received from all providers. Cardiff are looking to realign funding. They have agreed to stop one project because of voids and lack of demand.NS advised that working groups have been set up. DL asked whether there had been any discussion re joint commissioning. JT advised that there is a joint review of DV services by PCCO.PT agreed that this was a joint review of the Vale and Cardiff.MI advised that the Vale are waiting for outcomes of Future Lives Research and that joint commissioning would be helpful.SE advised that the RCC needs to be starting a dialogue about joint commissioning.PT advised that the Vale and Cardiff are already at looking at joint commissioning with DV services. PT explained that the Vale are happy to carry out joint reviews of services. PT explained that this was something that should be discussed at the joint team meeting between the Vale and Cardiff as this will cut down on the duplication of work.**Action: SP teams to discuss joint reviews of services across the region**NS agreed to share information re the reviews but explained that individual projects are different.DL told the RCC that Swansea and Neath are carrying out joint reviews. SE advised that SE and KH are attending the Gwent RCC on Friday 15th January as she wants to make this committee live up to its name re collaborative working. CE advised that if the two LAs are looking to carry out joint commissioning then each LA should look at the termination dates for projects across the region and where similar schemes have same termination dates the LAs could look at joint commissioning these schemes. SE asked if there was a place for the two LAs to come together and discuss CE’s suggestions.CE suggested the finance group.PT advised that there isn’t a finance group anymore, and that the regional joint finance project was pre RCC.JT advised that the Gateways were getting good information on needs in the area, especially around mental health, where there is more need than provision. JT suggested that there could be opportunities there and asked CE to talk to NS about this. **Action: CE and NS to discuss joint commissioning around areas where there is more need than provision** | HJ and NSCE and NS |
| 1. **RCP Task and Finish Group**

MSadvised that the group have not met because of people’s diaries but that the RCP is nearly completed and will be brought to the next RCC in March.DL advised that it needs to be submitted to WG by 15th February.MS advised that we will circulate the RCP to the RCC for comment so that it is ready for 15.02.16.**Action: MS to distribute RCP to RCC for comment**gather the number of people with needs. WG have tasked the RCC with changing Older People'need as a LA so as not to dup | MS and KH |
| 1. **Outcomes Task and Finish Group**

Paper circulated with agenda.PR explained that the FAQ document was driven by the questions the LA get asked and that the two CMOs involved (one from each LA) put the FAQs forward. PR explained that it in some ways it is very similar to the guidance.DL advised that the document would be beneficial for everyone in Wales and asked if she could put it on the WG website. PR agreed that he was fine with this as it is not specific to the Vale and Cardiff. DL explained that a lot of the information is already on the guidance but this document is a lot easier to read. NS asked if the FAQs were about the outcomes spread sheet.PR agreed that they were. PR explained that the outcomes framework document was completed with providers, CMOs and the RDC. It is still in draft format as he wanted to run it by the RCC before taking it to SPODG. PR will update it if there are any issues. DL advised that the next SPODG meeting is on the 25th January and she would like to share the document with SPODG so that they can put together a draft as a first indication as to what outcomes could look like. PR advised that Sue Gershenson sits on SPODG as well as the group that have completed this piece of work, so he will speak to Sue about feeding the information to SPODG on 25th January. **Action: PR to speak to Sue Gershenson re feeding back information from the task and finish group to SPODG**CE asked if SP is performance measured on unplanned outcomes.DL confirmed that SP is performance measured on unplanned outcomes and that the reasons for positive and negative outcomes need to be considered. MS queried the response to question 8 on the FAQ document re death as a planned outcome.CE added to this, explaining that people going to prison will be unplanned but that we have no influence over a magistrate or a person’s negative behaviour.DL said that this is the same issue for SP, as people who are repeat offenders will be in and out of custody.SE asked if there was enough in 8.CE agreed there was.PR explained that the issue is about how the data is used/perceived to be used. PR asked whether they should close the group down if there is nothing else to be added.SE agreed and thanked the group for all of their work.  | PR |
| 1. **Older Persons Services Task and Finish Group**

PT gave update as HJ had sent her apologies.PT advised there is a meeting on 28th January for the task and finish group in which feedback is to be given on the needs assessment collection.KH advised that JT had requested to attend but unfortunately was unable to, due to other commitments. KH reminded JT that she was welcome to attend if her diary became clear.  |  |
| 1. **Service User Involvement Task and Finish Group**

KH updated the RCC as CM had sent her apologies. KH explained that she had met with CM and discussed a new plan in light of the fact that the Service User involvement events had not taken place as planned. KH reminded the group that Service User involvement was in the MoU and was therefore keen to push this. KH explained that she and CM had come up with the idea of getting a small group of service users together to arrange a bigger service user involvement event towards the end of the year. KH explained that she and CM had discussed the idea of rewarding people who attend the sessions with time credits but that this still had to be considered in more detail because of the cost involved. KH acknowledged that any group willing to be involved was not going to be completely representative as many people will not want to be involved and there are so many different groups of service users that it would not be possible to make the group entirely representative of the sector, but that some service user involvement would be better than none. FB stated that she was frustrated that so many opportunities have been missed for Service User involvement. FB suggested that moving forward that maybe the group could look at events that are already planned rather than working with just one group of people as in the past events have been arranged and then not happened. FB suggested that the groups looks at a year’s programme of events so that there is consistency across the region. JT agreed that it would be good to arrange different ways of gathering Service User’s views. SE asked agencies to liaise with KH to let her know when events are planned.**Action: Providers and Landlords to advise KH of any Service User events they have planned**PT advised that the Vale SP team already attend all the events in the Vale but there is not a consistent approach to questions being asked across the region. PT requested that the RCC put together some questions to ask Service Users across the region. **Action: Service User Involvement group to put together questions to ask service users and circulate for approval by RCC** DL agreed with PT, and advised there needs to be more Service User involvement with the RCC, and thinks a lot more could be done. SE asked people to get any suggestions to KH within two weeks of the meeting. **Action: RCC members to give any suggestions to KH re Service User involvement with RCC** CE offered to share health’s Service User involvement framework with KH. They have a robust framework and involve Service Users in procurement, after giving them full training in this area. **Action: CE to share Service User Involvement framework with KH**DL stated that term Service User has been frowned on in some areas and requested that we start using the term “people who use services”.FB stated that people have the right to self determination and at an event six months ago they wanted to be called Service Users. CE advised that his Service Users wanted to be known as “people who use drugs”, rather than “drug users”. | Providers and landlordsKHallCE and KH |
| 1. **Feedback from RCC survey**

KH tabled paper (see attached)KH explained that most people had responded and that she had completed a report of the views expressed. KH said that some of the feedback suggested that development days could be useful and this was also something that had been suggested outside of the review. KH explained that most of the other RCCs have been having development days for some time and that the feedback was that these were helpful in breaking down boundaries and moving the RCC forward. KH suggested that starting with the feedback from the review could be a good place to start with the RCCs development days and asked whether people would be happy to have their first RCC development day based on this piece of work in order that the group could discuss what was working/ not working.DL explained that she was sceptical when Gwent first suggested a development day but that it had actually been very effective. SE asked if the March RCC could be used as a development day.DL agreed that it could as most RCCs run three monthly, rather than bimonthly as the Vale and Cardiff does. SE asked whether the development day in Gwent was run by an external person.DL advised that it was. SE said that she and KH will discuss with Gwent to get more information as we are attending the Gwent RCC on Friday (15.01.16).All agreed that the March RCC will be a development day instead of the usual RCC format.**Action: Arrange development day for March RCC** |  KH and SE  |
| 1. **Work with Communities First, Families First and Flying Start**

MD advised that he would talk about the Vale. He told the RCC that there had been an 11% cut to the budget and this will have an impact on the whole set up of the programme. MD explained that the PAGs are about supporting the whole family, especially Team Around the Family (TAF). They work closely with Flying Start and increasingly with the SP team. MD advised that originally all of the PAGs were managed under one funding stream. Families First jointly funded parts of Flying Start and shared staff which helped to make them feel like one team. MD advised that the PAG meets once every six weeks to drive things forward. The different groups cover different schools etc but interlink. The PAG created Venn diagrams to see how they interlink. The group worked jointly on NEET young people and low birth weight babies, which helped them to see what work each group was doing, in order that they could move forward. MD advised that the PAG is now looking at mental health and having a shared post between Families First and Flying Start, The group has also done work around parenting together and have providers under each directorate attend events together. MD advised that they groups all feed their work together and a senior reporting officer will present the work to the Local Service Board. MD said that they have travelled some distance together.LB explained that in Cardiff there are clusters that work closely together and that they meet monthly. LB explained that the main difference between Cardiff and the Vale is that Communities First is delivered by the Third Sector and Flying Start sits in education. LB told the RCC that the PAGs have developed subgroups that have similar aims to look at how services can move forward. She explained that they have six neighbourhood partnership groups with action plans for each re the cuts that have amounted to approximately £700 000 in Cardiff. Communities First will stay the same but they have lost PAG work with schools.LB distributed booklets and annual reviews for more information. CE queried the importance of getting the PAGs to the RCC.DL explained that they have been separate to SP services and agreed that it was important to get them to the table.MD said that they were trying to get the three strands into one. DL explained that there were a variety of people around the table looking at different pieces of work. She confirmed that a report has gone to the Minister but nothing has come back. LB said that she has tried to get a copy.DL confirmed that she has not seen it, but that I had been a massive piece of work and that more streamlined processes with less bureaucracy would be helpful. MS explained that providers from PAG and SP services have worked together before.DL agreed that this happens on the ground but need that work to follow up.MI queried should MD be invited to the Local Commissioning Group? |  |
| 1. **Risk Log Arrangements**

KH tabled a paper and explained that it was based on the WG risk log but adapted in line with what the other RDCs have done.CE advised that the RCC should maintain a log of closed risk.PR queried what the mechanism for reviewing the document was and advised that the risk log needs to be a working document.CE asked how the RCC will review this?MI advised that it should be for the RCC to agree.MS advised that we need to be able to see what has changed.CE advised we keep risk log as a standing item on the agenda.**Action: Monitor risk log** | KH and SE |
| 1. **New Legislation**

KH asked how the RCC were planning to deal with the new legislation that is coming in such as the Social Services Wellbeing Act and the Future Generations Act etc?KH queried do we need some task and finish groups to look at this?DL stated that the issue with sub groups is that they are onerous and maybe it would be better for the RCC to focus on Acts by asking someone who is an expert on each area to talk to the RCC.MS suggested that the RCC needs to be looking at the consequences of any new legislation on SP such as the issues around the introduction of Supported Housing potentially being capped at LHA levels. MS is hopeful that hostels will be exempt but this is not definite, which will make things impossible if there are caps in young person’s accommodation. SE said that she is taking up DLs suggestion as she thinks presentations will be more useful. DL pointed out that MS had raised a useful point.MS reiterated that the issue is how we handle issues such as the Renting Homes Act, especially is hostels.CE stated that the RCP needs to take other Acts into account. DL said that this is what has been missing from other RCPs, as they tend to list Acts without taking into account the effects they will have on SP services.SE advised that they need to be a standing item on the agenda.MS suggested that people should tell KH what they would like to see on agenda in terms of new legislation. **Action: RCC members to inform KH of items they would like on the agenda re new legislation** | all |
| 1. **MoU**

(discussed after item 3) |  |
| 1. **AOB**

VH explained that there have been lots of developments in probation and will bring more information to the next meeting.**Action: VH to bring information re probation to RCC**  | VH |

**Date of Next 2 Meetings**

1st March 2016 (to be rearranged)

Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, Barry CF63 4RU

2pm, Tuesday, 3rd May 2016

Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, Barry CF63 4RU