

RAG Feedback to Performance Management Scrutiny Committee 12 February 2014 – Key Points

1. Economic Growth RAG Feedback	
What did the Group focus on?	The budget for Economic Growth and specifically Business and Enterprise within the Business Plan and whether the £80M savings were achievable.
How did the Group go about its work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with key Officers in the service area • Customer journey mapping evidence • Evidence from the Action Plan for employment and skills and grants available to businesses • Evidence from the Budget Plan for the service area
Key findings from the Group	<p>Redesign in this area is in its infancy and it is vital that the Enterprise and Growth Scrutiny Committee becomes involved in the redesign work as it progresses.</p> <p>The redesign will be part of the commissioning process – challenge with economic growth is the identification of what will be ‘in scope’ as Shropshire Council is not the sole player in this area; co-creation is key and constant challenge of ‘why’ is very useful.</p>
Key comments from Performance Management Scrutiny Committee	<p>Clear that there is more work to be done in scrutinising this area as redesign progresses.</p> <p>Concerns that RAG intervention untimely and premature given the early stage of service redesign – how can scrutiny have a positive impact in building for the future?</p> <p>Further challenge needed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants available to businesses – what is awarded/ why/ benefits? • Business engagement and relationship with the Business Board/ Local Enterprise Partnership etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationship with outside organisations and input from them in future service redesign
2. Performance Management RAG Feedback	
What did the Group focus on?	The work being done to align performance management to the Council's change agenda and the outcomes identified in the draft Business Plan.
How did the Group go about its work?	<p>A series of sessions between the members of the Group and members of the Performance Management Team bringing in the Portfolio Holder at various times during which the following issues were looked at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenging the basis of the outcome approach being adopted Looking at the measures being included and whether they indicated progress towards an outcome Insight into the level and presentation style of information within the framework How the different levels of the framework will be used and by whom
Key findings from the Group	<p>A RAG should look at the new framework for the 4th quarter of 2013/14</p> <p>The new business planning cycle should be used to develop the future working model for scrutiny</p> <p>The outcome framework should be used by scrutiny to inform and assist their future work programme</p> <p>Training should be provided on the framework to ensure clarity of the approach and the information available to users</p>
Key comments from Performance Management	<p>This Group had worked well and its presentation was clear and concise.</p> <p>Recognition that this was evolving – need to consider inclusion of targets in future information, ensure consistency of data and how it is measured.</p>

Scrutiny Committee	<p>Need to engage with partners both inside and outside the organisation</p> <p>Recognise that the Group was looking at data presentation rather than data collection – aim to illustrate performance in a meaningful way i.e. are we doing what we need to be doing? ‘Can hit a target but still miss the point’</p> <p>Exception reporting as a focus</p> <p>Accept that more refinement yet to do</p> <p>Integrate performance management closely with the work of the Scrutiny Committees</p>
3. Regulatory and Business Support RAG Feedback	
What did the Group focus on?	<p>Looking at the essential direction and progress of the RaBBS programme and undertaking an initial critique of this programme.</p>
How did the Group go about its work?	<p>Largely through meetings/workshops with key Officers developing the RaBBS programme and consideration of written information that they provided including the Position Statement, the Action Plan and additional information on external legal advice provided on the programme.</p>
Key findings from the Group	<p>The RaBBS team has worked extremely hard in devising a blueprint for a completely new way of operating.</p> <p>The new service is not quite ready to be launched and any judgement of its ultimate success would not be fair or appropriate at this time</p> <p>Concerns on the level of support that the Council would need to commit to the project in its initial phase through a substantial marketing budget</p>

	Concerns on the gap between the ambitious intentions and the likelihood of success of the RaBBS, although not quantified
Key comments from Performance Management Scrutiny Committee	<p>Concern that the timing of the RAG intervention may have been a little premature at this stage of project development</p> <p>Acknowledged complexity of this work – delivery options still being explored before a key decision is made. Noted the objective of the programme is to find the best delivery model for the future.</p> <p>Acknowledged ‘risk based approach’ being taken in development of the project i.e. expertise focussed on high risk business, maintenance of core statutory work</p> <p>Consultation to be undertaken once the RaBBS project developed – too early for this to be done yet</p> <p>Challenge of developing programme should be considered as an opportunity [the aim to ‘get it right first time’] rather than being considered as a threat</p> <p>Recognised that trading vehicle still under consideration and ip&e being considered as one of several other opportunities.</p>
4. Waste Review RAG Feedback	
What did the Group focus on?	To review the existing arrangements and explore opportunities to produce efficiency savings and to identify potential income streams [including but not limited to trade waste] through contract variations.
How did the Group go about its work?	<p>Given the time constraints, the Group met with and questioned staff of the Waste Management Team and examined appropriate documentation to understand which areas of the operation would provide the focus for internal review to produce either cost savings or increased income.</p> <p>The Group would have liked to visit recycling and transfer stations as part of its work but time was not available – this</p>

	should be included as part of future work.
Key findings from the Group	<p>The Internal Review Team is keen and enthusiastic and their efforts are commendable.</p> <p>Support the general direction and approach being taken by the Review Team but recommend that a Task and Finish Group should be established to support their work [the RAG members would be interested in continuing this work]</p> <p>Recognise that waste disposal is main cost element but also the area where most benefit could be seen in future</p> <p>Strongly recommend that any proposed changes are piloted across the County and that the public need to be fully informed when any service changes are introduced – communication is key</p> <p>Believe that some issues could be started sooner rather than later for the benefit to society as well as reducing costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of food waste reduction • Lobbying for less packaging by suppliers • Looking at ways to influence young people
Key comments from Performance Management Scrutiny Committee	<p>Recognition that the Council's contractors, Veolia, understand the budget savings to be made and working with the Council to make the savings – cost reductions by both parties and working together to bring to fruition.</p> <p>Understanding that a range of options being discussed, both parties agree reductions are needed but how this is to be done is still in development and under discussion e.g. reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill, possibilities re cardboard collection, issues re co-mingling of recycling, anaerobic digester – food waste etc, the potential for the development of the collection and disposal of trade waste.</p> <p>Support the need to change people's behaviour and understand the customers' perspective [how effective are waste prevention programmes in this?]. The need to do things differently.</p> <p>Recognition that this is a massive work area and may take months to develop – the timescales for the RAG were very</p>

	short and there should be further scrutiny of the key issues.
5. Adult Social Care Operating Model RAG Feedback	
What did the Group focus on?	<p>The Group focussed on two key areas:</p> <p>The STEPS pilot programme currently operating in the north west of the county – an understanding of the programme and how this could be considered for further roll out across the county</p> <p>The People2People project currently operating in the Craven Arms area</p>
How did the Group go about its work?	<p>The Group concentrated its work on looking at the two pilot projects [above] and by receiving information from key players within those projects.</p> <p>The Group experienced some difficulties in working to the very tight time limits for this RAG work and having insufficient opportunity to meet together given the diary constraints of its Group members.</p>
Key findings from the Group	<p>New operating models should be considered for roll out across the county whilst also recognising that a ‘one size fits all’ approach may not be appropriate. More time is needed to test and challenge the prototype schemes.</p> <p>Fundamental need to match resources to the design systems</p> <p>Significantly more time needed to continue scrutiny work in this area – there is ample scope for the establishment of an onward Task and Finish Group to carry on what has been started. Future work recommended between Officers, customers, carers and cross border communication</p> <p>Recognition that the new operating model will focus on helping people in good time and in advance of the need for nursing care – initiatives to keep people in their own homes for as long as possible. Scrutiny has a clear role in assisting with the redesign of this service area.</p>
Key comments	Recognition that savings in ASC are being implemented and savings are achievable with the service design changes

from Performance Management Scrutiny Committee	<p>that are taking place</p> <p>Recognition that other parts of the Council need to support the aims of the new service redesign and there is a collective move to support the changes.</p> <p>Leaders have a role to help shape customer expectation in future</p> <p>Wholehearted agreement that further scrutiny work in this service area would be beneficial and the initial findings of this RAG have scratched the surface of the issues.</p>
6. Adult Social Care Impact of Personalisation RAG Feedback	
What did the Group focus on?	<p>The impact of Personalised Budgets [PBs] on Adult Social Care</p>
How did the Group go about its work?	<p>Separately and together Group members spoke with service users, carers, Council staff, advisory groups, service providers and the voluntary sector</p>
Key findings from the Group	<p>PBs save the Council money and offer an element of choice to users and to those who are helped to navigate the process. Although there are examples of PBs working well the Group identified issues that need further examination, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current situation confused and confusing with a lack of transparency and consistency. • Administration and audit of the PBs bureaucratic and causing difficulty and stress for some users and a resultant loss of trust and confidence in the Council. This experience is not universal though.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of flexibility to use budgets more creatively. No incentive for users to save money from the budget by finding a cheaper supplier. Complexity and style of the audit process gave cause for concern. • Monitoring of the service provided needs attention – focus is on the monitoring of ‘cost’ • Communication need improving and need for an identified point of contact to deal with enquiries <p>The Group strongly recommends that further work is carried out based on the work started– feel they have only scratched the surface. Scrutiny has a vital role in shaping future improvements to the PB process.</p>
<p>Key comments from Performance Management Scrutiny Committee</p>	<p>Recognition that Council doing things differently and a steep learning curve in some areas – aim to design the frustrations identified out of the system. The RAG has drawn attention to areas that may benefit from redesign.</p> <p>Recognition that PBs, whilst being a flagship project, have current elements that need attention and that will be addressed.</p> <p>In future things will be done differently and better – scrutiny can help with the identification of the solutions. Take on board the positive aspects and the onward challenge will be to address any negatives and make improvements.</p>