

PRESCRIBED GROUPS WHICH MUST BE CONSULTED WHEN PREPARING OR REVISING INTEGRATION SCHEMES; PREPARING DRAFT STRATEGIC PLANS; AND WHEN MAKING DECISIONS AFFECTING LOCALITIES RELATING TO THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do these draft Regulations include the right groups of people?

Yes

No

2. If no, what other groups should be included within the draft Regulations?

Everyone is a health and social care service user, knows one who is or has the potential to be one so consultation about plans, and any consultation generally, should focus on the community at large as well as specific groups of interest.

With self-management and anticipatory care policies already giving people more responsibility to manage their daily lives, they should also be more involved in all aspects of services/planning. People with long term conditions are under represented on groups.

We need to examine how we reach those who don't normally respond, especially in new locality areas, and engage differently to get people involved.

Meetings involving public representatives should be at a time of day which suits them and take account of any caring or care needs. Meeting times and papers need to be accessible.

Copies of draft strategic plans should be available in a range of formats to anyone who wants to see them and any consultation opportunities should be publicised widely.

The PPF has a vital role to play in all of this. The HSCP needs to be inclusive regarding involving everyone in the community and groups like the PPF need continued support to do this effectively.

The current relationship between the CHCP and PPF in East Renfrewshire has worked well. Senior CHCP managers regularly attend PPF meetings with plans regarding services. PPF representation at CHCP Committee meetings is valued. The regular PPF Bulletin is emailed to all CHCP staff. This should continue in the new structure in a similar fashion.

2. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on these draft Regulations?

There is a broad range of consultees but the question remains as to how one carer, for example on the Integration Joint Board, can represent all carers.

With regard to locality planning the PPF has some concern that this could result in unequal service provision in East Renfrewshire. Instead of the focus being on geographical areas could it be more about localities of interest?

A current example is the Early Years Collaborative (EYC) work currently operating in Auchinback, Barrhead. This involves the local community and services in work to improve outcomes and reduce inequalities for children and families.

The PPF feel that concentrating more on doing this type of specific work in small areas first and then rolling out East Renfrewshire wide is preferable to splitting East Renfrewshire into specific geographical locality areas.

ANNEX 2(D)

MEMBERSHIP, POWERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF INTEGRATION JOINT BOARDS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Are there any additional non-voting members who should be included in the Integration Joint Board?

Yes

No

2. If you answered 'yes', please list those you feel should be included:

The PPF or an equivalent forum should be included. This should be in addition to individual/public representation on the board and other groups. The PPF strive for diversity and equality and have a wide range of knowledge and links to other community groups. The group disseminates information to the public, organises events, raises awareness of good and bad practice and discusses solutions. It helps promote better understanding between the public and the CHCP.

The minimum number of public representatives listed is three (service user, carer, voluntary sector representative). We would like there to be the scope to increase this locally.

We would also like there to be the facility for these representatives to send a deputy to meetings if they cannot make IJB meetings. This system is in operation for PPF representatives on the CHCP Committee and works well.

3. Are there any other areas related to the operation of the Integration Joint Board that should also covered by this draft Order?

4. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on this draft Order?

The PPF/public has no public accountability unlike Councillors or NHS Non Executive Directors so we feel that it is understandable that the public will not have a vote. The public role is to scrutinise/influence decision making and not feel compromised by having to be involved in any voting that may be necessary.

With regard to public roles on the Integration Joint Board it would be helpful to have clarification on how people will be identified/chosen. The PPF should have involvement in this to ensure there is diversity of representation between the three public members.

There is also a need to provide more information on the expectation of the role and how representatives will be supported to function effectively as valued members on the IJB.

ANNEX 4(D)

PRESCRIBED MEMBERSHIP OF STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUPS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. The draft Regulations prescribe the groups of people that should be represented on the strategic planning group. Do you think the groups of people listed are the right set of people that need to be represented on the strategic planning group?

Yes

No

2. If no, what changes would you propose?

The PPF as a group should be represented on the strategic planning groups.

Why does public representation need to be so specific to service users and carers of health or social services? This is too prescriptive, especially given the integration agenda.

A diversity of views is needed. People who use services have a vital contribution to make to scrutiny and improvement.

How will the public members be chosen for the strategic planning groups? This should be decided by the community/relevant community groups themselves.

In relation to the national outcomes, how will priorities be chosen? What if these differ from local community/locality priorities?

It is important to reflect community priorities and ensure that the outcomes expected are what the community actually want.

There should be more explicit reference to co-production and involvement, principles, not just consultation, with the community in relation to strategic plans.

How do members of the public who aren't linked into groups/organisations. get their voice heard on strategic planning groups?

How will GPs be encouraged to be involved? GP involvement in East Renfrewshire has been positive. The PPF feel that it will be useful for the public to be more involved directly with doctors/health professionals on strategic planning groups.

3. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on these draft Regulations?

**PRESCRIBED FORM AND CONTENT OF PERFORMANCE REPORTS
RELATING TO THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING)
(SCOTLAND) ACT 2014**

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree with the prescribed matters to be included in the performance report?

Yes

No

2. If no, please explain why:

How will local circumstances be reflected in reporting on the national outcomes?

How will the new structure measure how effective locality arrangements have been in delivering services and what is the scope to change locality arrangements quickly if they are not effective?

How will the public be able to feed their views into performance reporting? To do this effectively any questions asked should not be “leading” and the difference this has made to service users should be demonstrated.

3. Are there any additional matters you think should be prescribed in the performance report?

Yes

No

4. If yes, please tell us which additional matters should be prescribed and why:

5. Should Scottish Ministers prescribe the form that annual performance reports should take?

Yes

No

6. If you answered yes, what form should Scottish Ministers prescribe?

7. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on these draft Regulations?

These questions appear to be “loaded” to ensure that responses are what the Scottish Government want them to be.