

ANNEX 1(D)

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?

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

There must be a degree of local flexibility permitted, to allow partnerships to consult in a manner most appropriate to local structures and local needs.

An explanation of what is meant by 'consultation' would be of benefit given the usually very different expectations of the named consultees of the results or consequences of their being afforded the opportunity to make comment. Consultation isn't about getting what you say you want. Consultees need to be clear about the purpose and limitations of a consultation.

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 Glasgow CHP

No Glasgow City Council

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

Glasgow CHP believes a professional advisor from Nursing should be included

Glasgow City Council believes that the regulations are sufficient. The Glasgow partnership has locally agreed to include an advisor from nursing on the IJB, and this will be included within our integration scheme.

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 provision that an individual who has resigned as a councillor can remain a member of the Integration Joint Board is democratically unsound, and contradictory to the vision that voting members of the IJB are either accountable to the electorate via membership of the local authority or to ministers under the Public Appointments system. A resigned councillor is accountable to nobody and therefore should not be permitted to continue as a voting member of a public body such as the Integration Joint Board.

Clarity must be given on the nature of the 'appropriate person' who can represent the health board on the IJB, namely if this excludes only health board members who are councillors of the local authority in question or who are councillors from any local authority within the health board area.

(cont.)

It is unclear why there should be a need to notify ministers of a vacancy on the board remaining unfilled for six months, particularly when the regulations are clear that a vacancy on the board does not affect the validity of any decision made by the board.

Clarity should be given within the regulations whether the criteria for disqualification from being a member of the IJB applies only to voting members, or to all members. We believe this disqualification should apply to all members. The regulations as drafted prevent members who have committed crimes punishable by three months imprisonment within the UK, Isle of Man, Channel Islands and Republic of Ireland serving on the board but in their current form permit those who have committed crimes outside of these areas to serve on the board. The board should strive to uphold the highest standards in public service, and therefore members who have ever committed a crime of such severity anywhere should not be permitted to serve.

The proposed Quorum for the Integration Joint Board is too high, and well above the norm for democratic decision making processes. We would recommend 50% of voting members from both Health Board and local authority.

The regulations provide that the Integration Joint Board can remove members on the grounds of persistent non-attendance or bringing the board into disrepute. However, as members are nominated by either the local authority or health board, a decision on their removal should be made by the nominating body. The role of the IJB in cases of persistent non-attendance, disrepute etc should be to censure the individual concerned and provide a full report to the nominating partner, with a recommendation that they should act.

The one staff member from each of the authorities who must be involved in the provision of the integrated services should be a representative of a recognised trade union

ANNEX 3(D)

ESTABLISHMENT, MEMBERSHIP AND PROCEEDINGS OF INTEGRATION JOINT MONITORING COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

Consultation Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed minimum membership of the integration joint monitoring committee, as set out in the draft Order?

Yes

No

2. If you answered 'no', please list those you feel should be included:

3. Are there any other areas related to the operation of the integration joint monitoring committee that should also covered by the draft Order?

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

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?

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

In general these regulations are too prescriptive. It should be for local areas to determine the nature and membership of strategic planning fora, relevant to the size and scale and complexity of the area. In Glasgow for instance, the scope of integration is too great for there to be an effective singular strategic planning group for all adult services combined, and the only realistic way of delivering a coherent city strategic plan is to build on the existing strategic planning fora in different care categories in adult services in line with the Draft Regulations re membership and scope etc, and ensure that there is strategic oversight by a an Executive group working to the Integration Joint Board.

ANNEX 5(D)



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:

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?