

CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA

DINAS A SIR ABERTAWE

CIIr Rob Stewart

Chair of Swansea Public Services

Board

CC CIIr Robert Francis-Davies Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Development & Regeneration

BY EMAIL

Please ask for: Gofynnwch am:

Direct Line: Llinell Uniongyrochol:

Llinell Uniongyro

e-Bost: Our Ref

Ein Cyf: Your Ref Eich Cyf:

Date Dyddiad: 10 January 2016

Overview & Scrutiny

scrutiny@swansea.gov.uk

01792 636292

Summary: This is a letter from the Service Improvement and Finance Scrutiny Performance Panel to the Chair of the Public Services Board following the meeting of the Panel on 6 December. It contains recommendation from the Panel regarding the Public Services Board's priorities for 2016/17.

Scrutiny of the Public Services Board's Priorities for 2016/17

Dear Councillor Stewart,

This letter is to provide you and the members of the Public Services Board (PSB) with feedback from the meeting of the Public Services Board Scrutiny Panel (the Panel), which took place 6 December 2016.

We were briefed on the Board's work streams and associated projects for 2016/17 by Chris Sivers, Councillor Robert Francis-Davies and Phil Holmes, and we are grateful to them for taking us through the details of the projects and explaining how the Board is expected to support them.

We wished to examine these work streams in detail, as one of the main areas of concern arising from the work of the former Local Service Board Scrutiny Performance Panel was the issue of performance management and monitoring. That Panel previously indicated that it believed that the work of the (former) Local Service Board did not demonstrate effectively the difference it made to the citizens of Swansea, and had made the following recommendations:

- Clear arrangements need to be put in place to monitor the outcomes of the PSB's work.
- Consult with the scrutiny panel about the format of future performance monitoring reports for the work of the PSB and ensure that the panel receives regular performance monitoring reports.

Therefore our intention was to scrutinise the performance monitoring arrangements for the PSB's work streams and also to provide any recommendations that we feel would improve the performance management framework of the PSB. We also plan to ask the individual core group members to provide details on how their organisations are contributing to the delivery of these projects; therefore this process has enabled us to gain a better grasp on what is to be achieved prior to our Q&A sessions with them.

Overall

We were satisfied that the projects will benefit from oversight from the Board and we now have a much better understanding of why these projects were selected and the outcomes that are being sought as a result of the projects and the intervention of the PSB. Whilst our discussion with the project sponsors was wide-ranging, we have focussed on a number of recommendations that we believe would improve the performance management of the projects and they are outlined below.

Domestic Abuse – The Key 3 Project

We felt that the aims of the project (to provide an integrated referral pathway for women who are experiencing domestic abuse/sexual violence, substance misuse and mental health issues) are clear and we were satisfied that this project will benefit from PSB intervention due to the complex nature of the issues and the multitude of agencies involved.

However, we considered there to be a lack of robust data regarding the number/size of the cohort that is being targeted through this project. We felt that as the project is focusing on a very specific group experiencing three issues: domestic abuse and sexual violence, substance misuse and mental health issues, there should be more data regarding the numbers who need to be targeted. We also believe that the PSB should look at ways to quantify the cost/service savings that this approach could provide. A better understanding of this data would enable a clearer picture to be developed regarding the outcomes and success of the project. Therefore, we recommend that the PSB considers ways that this could be improved.

Ageing Well

Given the significant impact that an aging population is having on public services we agree that the Ageing Well work stream is a major piece of work that requires the support of the PSB. We noted the five projects that are within this work stream.

We were encouraged to hear of plans to provide joint funding through the PSB for additional Local Area Co-ordinator (LAC) posts, as this is a positive step forward for partnership working and, if successful, would clearly demonstrate the commitment of organisations to the work of the PSB and the partnership approach it is developing.

Whilst we were informed that the widespread opinion is that the LAC role has been successful, we are concerned that the plans to expand the number of posts are being progressed before the first year evaluation report has been completed. We were advised that there have been delays in finalising the report; therefore we recommend that the expansion of the LAC posts is postponed until the PSB has had the opportunity to consider the evaluation, in order to ensure that it is the most effective way to focus important joint resources. We would also like to be informed when the report is available.

We recommend that the aim to develop an "age friendly" city centre should be widened in its scope to include "age friendly" communities as our belief is that the interactions older people have in their communities are equally, if not more important, to those they experience in the city centre.

Good Start in Life

We were informed of the key message campaign to promote children's readiness for school. We were interested to hear about the reasons for the Board's involvement, due to the large reach it has in terms of employees and services and agree that this is a practical application of the support that the Board can provide, through ensuring consistent messages are spread by all relevant professionals and that the messages can also be promoted internally to their staff.

Our particular area of concern was regarding the sustainability of this project and how it would be taken forward in the future. We were informed that a full evaluation would take place in summer 2017 to look at outcomes and to consider ways to take the campaign further. We will be interested in the results and plan to follow this up at the appropriate time, i.e. when the End of Project Updates for the Public Services Board Priorities for 2016/17 are reported to the Board.

We were also concerned that the key message campaign should not just focus on deprived areas, as the issue of readiness for school is apparent across the city and county. We were reassured that the key message campaign would be promoted by all professionals coming into contact with families regardless of where people live.

Our view is that in achieving a 'good start for life', it is vital that early intervention with families, where there are potential problems, is imperative. The sooner such problems are identified, action can be taken to minimise the risk of the problems escalating. Early intervention could resolve such

problems before they escalate and have a future major detrimental effect on the child's development.

Consequently, as it is maternity staff and health visitors, who have the first contact with families, the Health Board should train staff in and stress the importance of recognising families, where there could be potential problems. This would enable the appropriate authority(ies) to intervene at an early stage, for the benefit of the child.

Additionally, for your information, there is currently a scrutiny in-depth inquiry underway looking at how children's readiness for school can be improved. The findings and recommendations will be reported by the end of March. We will send a copy of this letter to the Convener so she is aware of our views on this matter.

City Centre

We were pleased to hear of the ambitious plans for re-developing and revitalising the Kingsway through developing a proposal for a technology led business district in order to address the lack of modern, flexible working space in the city centre. We were also pleased to hear that the proposals are being developed in partnership with Tech Hub Swansea and are intended to complement and extend their work in supporting tech start up business and not to be a competitor. We held a detailed discussion about the value of the Council intervening in the property market and the need to support Swansea's growing technology sector. We were satisfied that this project will benefit from the Board's intervention, given the range of relevant key local partners that are represented on the Board.

However, we feel that the project should also consider how it will contribute to dealing with social deprivation and tackling poverty. We posed a question on how this project would impact on the lives of people in deprived communities and whilst we support the view that the development of well-paid technical jobs has a positive impact overall, we were expecting some more specific details on how this project will contribute to tackling poverty. We believe that there is an important opportunity for this to be made explicit within the project and its aims, for example development of an outreach programme/work experience programme to provide schools/colleges with direct links to businesses and to assist in ensuring that the skills that are developed match the requirements of firms. We believe that as the suite of performance indicators remains to be developed for this project, then a clear opportunity remains to include targets relating to tackling poverty.

Forthcoming meetings

Our next meeting will take place on 18 January and we will be considering the findings of the Wellbeing Assessment (as scrutiny is a statutory consultee),

We will also hold the first of our Q&A sessions with members of the PSB core group and will be meeting with Amanda Carr, Director of SCVS. The focus of

our discussions will be to understand the contributions being made by the individual organisations to the work of the Board. This will provide us with the opportunity to follow up recommendations made by the former Local Service Board Scrutiny Performance Panel including:

- The level of commitment from individual partners to the work of the Board
- The effectiveness of the Board in communicating its work, objectives and outcomes to its stakeholders
- The effectiveness of the Board in addressing the issue of pooled funding to tackle priorities

I have attached our updated work plan for your information, as we have now confirmed dates for attendance from all the PSB core group members, and we appreciate them making themselves available.

Your response

In your response we would appreciate your comments on any of the issues raised in this letter. We would be grateful however if you could specifically respond to the following recommendations:

- Improve the baseline data of the cohort being targeted as part of the Key 3 Project, to include number of people to be targeted, and look at ways to quantify the cost/service savings that this approach could provide
- Ensure that the evaluation of the first year of the Local Area Co-ordinator roles is considered prior to the expansion of these posts and inform the Panel when the report will be available.
- Consider widening the scope of the Ageing Well work stream project to include "age friendly" communities as well as an "age friendly" city centre.
- Ensure that the Scrutiny Panel receives the End of Project Updates for the Public Services Board Priorities for 2016/17, when available.
- Include an outcome for tackling poverty/dealing with deprivation within the Economic Development/City Centre work stream.

I would be grateful if you could reply to this letter by 31 January 2017.

Yours sincerely,

Councillor Mary Jones

Convener, Public Services Board Scrutiny Performance Panel

⊠ cllr.mary.jones@swansea.gov.uk

Public Services Board Scrutiny Performance Panel Work Plan 2016/17

December 2016 V3

Meeting Date Meetings will take place between 10am-12pm	Agenda items
Meeting 1 26 September 2016	Introduction to Swansea Public Services Board/Scrutiny Process, to include the Board's objectives/priorities/outcomes, timeline, well-being goals and how they will link with the current population outcomes. Dave Mckenna Future Generations Commissioner Role of Commissioner Role of Scrutiny
	Draft work plan discussion , including Panel's Terms of Reference Rosie Jackson
Meeting 2 6 December 2016	 Public Services Board Priorities for 2016/17 Project sponsors: Cllr Robert Francis-Davies – Cabinet Member for Enterprise, Development & Regeneration (standing in for Cllr Rob Stewart – Chair of PSB) Chris Sivers – Director of People Phil Holmes – Head of Planning & City Regeneration
Meeting 3 18 January 2017	Phil Holmes – Head of Planning & City Regeneration Statutory Consultation on Wellbeing Assessment Dave Mckenna/Steve King Q&A Session with PSB Core Group Members
	SCVS – Amanda Carr (Director)
Meeting 4 15 February 2017	 Q&A Session with PSB Core Group Members ABMU Health Board – Andrew Davies (Chair of ABMU Health Board) Council – Cllr Rob Stewart (Leader of City & County of Swansea and Chair of the PSB)
Meeting 5 15 March 2017	 Q&A sessions with PSB Core Group Members SW Police – Chief Constable Peter Vaughan and Chief Superintendent Joe Ruddy Welsh Government – Helen Lentle (Deputy Director of Legal Services, Welsh Government) Natural Resources Wales – Martyn Evans (Head, Ecosystems Planning & Partnerships) Can attend from 11.15am

Future Items for work plan (2017/18)

The work of the scrutiny panel is planned on the basis of the municipal year i.e. May 2016 to April 2017. Some of the key items from the Public Services Board's work plan will carry over into the 2017/18 municipal year so are not included in the above work plan. In order to ensure that there is clarity over the items that the Panel will need to consider they are noted here. These include:

- Public Services Board Priorities for 2016/17 End of project update: due to be reported to PSB in July 2017, by sponsors and co-ordinators. To be reported to scrutiny panel August 2017. NB 6 monthly up-date of PSB priorities removed from work plan as it is unlikely to report much change from initial session on 6 December. A better use of the Panel's time will be to receive the end of project update scheduled for later in 2017.
- **Wellbeing Plan** due to be produced a year following the completion of the Well-being assessment. The Scrutiny Panel is a statutory consultee for both the wellbeing assessment and the wellbeing plan.