

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?

- Local residents and the general public
- Patient and service users representative groups such as Public Partnership Forums and Carers groups
- Community Councils
- Community Planning Partners
- Owner occupiers as well as social housing providers

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

Participants made the following points:

- Overall, the standard list includes the correct people
- Some definitions are too vague and there needs to be further clarification about terms used to describe some of the consultees; including a definition of 'health professionals', 'commercial and non commercial' providers and 'third sector bodies'
- The third sector is very diverse and includes national charities as well as small neighbourhood projects – the regulations should have defined this more clearly and placed a duty on HSCPs to engage across the third sector at all levels
- Commercial providers have their own agenda - concerns about their inclusion
- Concerns were raised about how HSCPs would carry out the consultation given the timescales involved and the lack of resources available
- Suggested that the consultation should make use of existing structures such as housing associations, carers forums etc to engage the public
- Need to make better use of traditional and social media but also need to tailor engagement approaches to ensure vulnerable groups can have their say – one size doesn't fit all
- Face to face engagement is still important – there is a lot of responsibility put on service users and carers to feed back from engagement events – they require support and resources
- Engagement needs to be followed up by sharing the outcomes – often this doesn't happen
- Localities in Glasgow look likely to be aligned to the current three sector arrangement – these have between 175,000 and 220,000 people – NOT a workable size for a locality
- Regulations should have been more explicit – HSCPs might be tempted to do the minimum, especially on public engagement
- There are not enough service user/carers representatives on the joint Board for HSCPs

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:

- Higher number of community members – three is absolutely not enough
- Homeless people and those with addiction issues
- Community Council representatives
- Housing sector representatives
- Staff side representative required from both organisations – terms and conditions, issues etc are distinct

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

- Regulations should have given criteria for selecting the service user, carer and third sector rep
- This might have included making use of existing recognised patient, user and carer groups to select reps
- Anyone who expresses an interest should be considered – no role profile or person specification as this puts up barriers to participation
- Non voting reps should be able to nominate deputies – volunteers often have more time/commitment pressures that might prevent attendance on occasion

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

- It was noted that attendance by certain groups at other formal structures is often problematic e.g. GPs, other health professionals and elected members in particular, therefore the joint Board will need to ensure that all voting and non voting members are aware of and able to fulfil their responsibility to participate
- What sanctions will be in place for non participation?
- Will voting members be paid/remunerated for their involvement in the joint Board?
- Both voting and non voting members need to be impartial and understand that their role is to reflect the issues and concerns of the public and not their own 'agenda'. This is particularly important for elected members from different political parties
- The role of the public reps needs to be made explicit – their duty being to reflect public opinion and offer a degree of scrutiny on decision making. They will require support to enable them to effectively feed back to the public and also to feed in public issues, concerns etc
- The Board meetings should be open to the public, held in accessible venues
- Consideration needs to be given to the times of the meetings – if open to the public then evenings are better
- Notice of meetings, papers etc need to be available in advance within a reasonable timescale
- Support/training required for the public members, including an officer available for pre-meetings etc
- The term of office should be two years maximum – four years is too long

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:

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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?

- There needs to be a higher level of patients, service users and carers on these groups
- Housing representatives should be specifically mentioned given the recognised impact/links between health, housing and inequality

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

- Will the representative on the strategic planning groups be expected to be the same person elected to the joint Board – this could be a huge issue for the non voting patient, service user and carer representatives in terms of workload
- A mechanism needs to be in place to nominate others (using a formal process) to these groups
- Need to involve the right people at the right time – the wider public will not be interested in strategic planning unless it is presented in an accessible way and involves those actually affected by the process e.g. involve homelessness service users in decisions about housing and homelessness services – targeted engagement
- Public reps need to be treated as equal partners in the planning process – their status as non voting members should not have an impact on their ability to participate fully in decision making
- The role of the third sector is essential however it is distinct from the community sector – community bodies, forums and groups are made up of people using services – their voice is equally if not more important
- Specific care needs to be given to engaging under represented groups such as younger people and people from a minority ethnic background

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:

- Wherever both adult and children's' services are being integrated there should be specific outcomes identified and reported on
 - Performance reports should contain a high level of financial reporting however it must be written in an accessible format
 - A website should be created recording a variety of performance reporting measures that the public can easily understand and make comments on
 - There should be another level of scrutiny below the formal performance reporting requirements – people who use services should be invited to contribute to performance monitoring - this would need to be done in a more creative and inclusive way
 -

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?

n/a

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

- The regulations should have been more explicit about the duty placed on HSCPs to share performance reporting information with the public
-