

December 2011

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Better Deal for Residents Programme
Standing Scrutiny Review
Progress Report – December 2011

Members of the Challenge Panel

Councillor Stephen Wright (Chairman)

Councillor Nana Asante

Councillor Kamaljit Chana

Councillor Ann Gate

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

Councillor Paul Osborn

Councillor Bill Phillips

Councillor Krishna Suresh

Community Co-optees:

Seamus English

Elizabeth Hugo

Linda Robinson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | 1 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 2 |
| OBSERVATIONS | 3 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 6 |
| APPENDIX ONE..... | 7 |

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In April this year, the Better Deal for Residents (BDfR) Standing Scrutiny Review group produced a report from the first phase of its investigation ("Interim Report on Programme Management"). This report recommended changes the group wished to see with regard to the council's project / programme management processes.

In September, the group embarked on the second phase of its investigations to identify how effectively the anticipated outcomes from the BDfR projects have been delivered and what the impact of these outcomes has been on residents. The scope for this second phase is attached as Appendix One.

So far, the group has considered the implementation of the VERTO projects system managed by the Programme Management Office. This database records and monitors all the Council's BDfR Projects and maintains full details on each project. We are grateful to Mala Kripalani, Service Manager of the Programme Office and Kelly Jack, Project Manager, for attending to discuss and answer questions on VERTO.

Additionally, the group has commenced the review of each of the BDfR Projects, taking the Reabling Focused Care project as its first assessment. We are most grateful to Bernie Flaherty, Divisional Director of Adult Social Care and to Jonathan Price, Head of Reablement and Personalisation for meeting with the BDfR Standing Review group to brief us on progress and to respond to our questions.

In accordance with our reporting protocol, we have committed to report our findings to the Overview and Scrutiny committee on at least a quarterly basis. This report constitutes our first quarterly report under the second phase. We have made a number of recommendations regarding the Reabling Focused Care project that we feel will benefit both the organisation and residents and as such, we request that this progress report be referred to Cabinet.

Cllr Stephen Wright
Chairman of the Better Deal for Residents Standing Scrutiny Review

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that:

VERTO

1. The Better Deal for Residents standing review receives regular reports from the VERTO system in order to ensure that the group is able to:
 - Monitor the quality of project documentation being produced for new projects prior to implementation,
 - Monitor the implementation and outcomes of completed projects.

REABLING FOCUSED CARE

2. It is possible the term “reablement” is not well understood by residents and this might impact on the number of applicants for the service.
3. The “Triageopoly” poster is detailed and full of useful information but it would be better suited as a leaflet/handout rather than as a wall poster. A new wall poster should be designed that briefly explains the service, eligibility and how to apply, taking note of point two above.
4. The group also considered there was a need for continuous communication of the service not only through existing channels but also to a wider audience including grant and non-grant aided voluntary and community organisations to increase the awareness and understanding of residents who would be potential users of the service,
5. The service should monitor the number of residents applying to utilize the scheme in order that increasing demand, if any, is identified early.
6. The service should consider piloting different models for the delivery of reablement to identify if changes to the length of the reablement period may give rise to further savings without detrimental impact to the residents.

OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND VERTO

In October, the group received an update on the project management process in the council following our report in the summer. We were advised that the council has now introduced a mandatory project management framework, designed in Harrow, which will be launched in November. This includes a sizing process which enables officers to consider the size of their project and customise the framework accordingly. A corporate training programme is being delivered to offer basic and advanced project management skills. Prince2 accredited training is also being delivered as required across the organisation. Workshops to support managers who are initiating new projects are being developed and piloted and will be rolled out in the New Year by the PMO.

We also received a demonstration of the recently acquired VERTO system. This web-based system will significantly improve the reporting/monitoring process. We understand this is at an early stage of implementation and the content of the reports will be enhanced.

We welcome the introduction of the VERTO system and the associated enhanced reporting and monitoring capacity and we welcome the offer to scrutiny of reports from the system which will enable the group to be alerted to milestones in the delivery of projects and to develop a timetable through which to consider their impact. Representatives of the group will meet with officers from the PMO to determine the content of reports which can be presented to the group on a regular basis. We anticipate that the following information will support our investigations:

- Project name
- Baseline
- Objectives
- Impact
- Start date
- End date
- Progress against milestones
- Value of the project – cost and projected savings
- Early warning re potential problems

We remain concerned that the documentation being produced in respect of new projects is sufficiently detailed in order to assess the impact of the projects on residents. We will schedule into our work programme the opportunity to consider the new projects documentation in order to safeguard both the interests of residents and the authority.

RE-ABLING FOCUSED CARE

The Project Initiation Document for the Reabling Focused Care project was issued in June 2010. We were pleased to be advised that its design has been heavily influenced by service users. In November we received an update on the implementation.

The project has completely reconfigured the adult social care service from 4 'client specific services to 'generic' reablement, personalisation and long term care services. By supporting vulnerable residents who previously would have received a formal care package, subject to the Fair Access to Care criteria, adults referred for care will be provided with a tailored reablement service for a period of up to six weeks to increase their independence and to reduce service users eventual need for formal care. Early evidence suggests there are high levels of satisfaction with the service with the well-being of residents enhanced and at the same time delivering significant savings for the authority.

Whilst we were generally very impressed with the service, we have a number of comments which we hope will assist the further improvement.

Our resident co-optees were able to provide examples from their own experience which suggest that awareness of the scheme is not yet as widespread as it could be. In particular, it appears that information regarding the service may not have reached all *potential* users of the service and that information with regard to the implications of the scheme for *existing* users may not have been well publicised. We were pleased that the service managers were able to respond positively to this information with a proposal that the project publicity will be reviewed and could always be improved. We welcome this offer. In spite of our concerns, we are pleased that the Department has achieved its target of 7, 000 users in its first year.

In this context we have also been able to offer our comments on the style and content of existing communications. In particular, we were able to discuss the content of the poster used to publicise the scheme – Triagopoly. Whilst we think this poster provides excellent information with regard to how the scheme works, we feel it is more appropriate as a leaflet than as a wall poster. As such we would suggest that this is considered during the proposed communications review.

We were pleased that the new service is on target to deliver savings in the region of £350K in the first year of service delivery and that further savings are projected to be delivered over the next two years. **We have requested a copy of the financial spreadsheet documenting the savings achieved to date.** We were advised that the scheme had based its initial funding and savings estimates on assumptions made via initial research that the scheme would engage with 7,000 users per year. Officers advised us that this had proven to be a very good estimate both from which to plan their service and in estimating savings.

Our concern is regarding the potential increase in demand for the service as awareness increases. We are advised that the service is already extremely popular and as such we wonder if its success might be its down-fall. The service is free and

not subject to more than basic qualification criteria (3 questions at the application stage). If demand increases, it may require additional funding. We offer no recommended action in these circumstances but hope the eligibility criteria are not manipulated to reduce numbers. We would urge the service to monitor demand closely.

Service management advised that their research indicated the potential for savings would peak after 3 years. We would suggest that management begin to consider different delivery models for the scheme. For example, if care is offered over a different time period would the service still deliver the independence and care improvements to users whilst also delivering savings. Similarly, if service were offered over a slightly longer period, will more vulnerable service users who require a more intensive set up period be able to achieve enhanced independence?

CONCLUSION

This is the first report from the second phase of the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents. It is our intention to now assess the detail and impact of projects included in the Better Deal for Residents programme to ensure that the outcomes anticipated and the impact on residents are fully understood. We hope that our findings will support the organisation through what is a difficult and challenging time for the organisation and our residents

Members of the Standing Scrutiny Review of the Better Deal for Residents

APPENDIX ONE

BETTER DEAL FOR RESIDENTS PROGRAMME STANDING REVIEW PHASE TWO- FINAL SCOPE

VERSION HISTORY

Initial draft

Comments from review group meeting 26th September

Final Version agreed at O&S 1st November

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | SUBJECT | Better Deal for Residents Programme |
| 2 | COMMITTEE | Overview and Scrutiny committee |
| 3 | REVIEW GROUP | Councillors Cllr Nana Asante Cllr Chana Cllr Ann Gate Cllr Macleod-Cullinane Cllr Osborn Cllr Phillips Cllr Krishna Suresh Cllr Wright (Chairman) Co-optees Elizabeth Hugo Linda Robinson Abigail Matsika Seamus English |
| 4 | AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES | To consider the content of the Better Deal for Residents programme in terms of ambition, relevance, appropriateness To consider the impact of the programme on: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the Council – is it achieving the outcomes envisaged – linked to the effectiveness of project management processes• residents:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ is the council complying with its duties under the disability and equalities legislation when proposing changes to services○ what impact are the changes having and how are these being mitigated – Better Together/Big Society,○ how far do residents understand/appreciate the need for significant change are their opinions being taken into account, are they being actively engaged/convinced in the delivery of change• partners – are we working more efficiently with partners to deliver change, what is the impact on their services• managers – how well are they being supported in delivering change whilst at the same time being subject to that change |
| 5 | MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW | Review is able to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Programme delivers real change in service delivery• Programme delivers anticipated savings |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme delivers change in residents'/service users' attitude to service delivery and responsibilities |
| 6 | SCOPE | The content of the Better Deal for Residents Programme |
| 7 | SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept) | |
| 8 | REVIEW SPONSOR | Tom Whiting, Assistant Chief Executive |
| 9 | ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER | From relevant service area |
| 10 | SUPPORT OFFICER | Service Manager Scrutiny |
| 11 | ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT | From within Scrutiny Team |
| 12 | EXTERNAL INPUT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents • Partner organisations • Service users |
| 13 | METHODOLOGY | <p><u>FUTURE PROJECTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of Project Documentation (Business Case) BEFORE project goes to Cabinet and before implementation commences. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Scope of Project</i> – Current services baseline – operational and admin resources engaged, timescales for service delivery, service delivery costs incl. salaries, ○ <i>Services to be changed</i>, resident groups affected, how service delivery will be changed, i.e. resources, service timescale changes, new technology, costings, etc. ○ <i>Project Objectives</i> – clear and measurable – service delivery, staff, financial, etc. ○ <i>Full Description of Impact on resident groups</i>, staff, partners, etc. - including Equalities Impact Assessment ensuring the documentation will allow decision makers to comply with their responsibilities under equalities legislation by having due regard to the impact of the changes being proposed. ○ <i>Description of Resident Consultations undertaken</i>, which residents groups, when and how, i.e. questionnaire, meetings, web, etc. ○ <i>Full Statement on project implementation costs</i>, ○ <i>Anticipated Savings</i> – cost reductions, resources, other • Discussion with relevant officer where necessary <p><u>COMPLETED PROJECTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of project completion details – Project completed on time, was all phases and scope fully implemented, any other variations to project scope, budget, resources, etc. that impacted project? • Assessment of the extent to which anticipated outcomes were realised • Assessment of impact on Staff delivering service. • Assessment of <u>actual</u> service impact on resident group/s – |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | improved, same, worse and in what way. |
| 14 | EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS | It is anticipated that the Better Deal for Residents programme will deliver significant change in the way the council organises itself to deliver services to local people. Harrow is an extremely diverse borough and the organisation cannot make assumptions about service needs of the population. As such changes to services and changing the expectations and behaviours of our residents will need to reflect the differing needs and experiences of the population. The council must ensure that adverse equalities implications for staff or residents are identified and where possible, mitigated. The review will monitor the extent to which the organisation is taking due regard to its duties under all equalities legislation. |
| 15 | ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS | |
| 16 | SECTION 17 IMPLICATIONS | This could be a component of the project in so far as the Better Together stream is implemented. |
| 17 | TIMESCALE | Ongoing |
| 18 | RESOURCE COMMITMENTS | The project will be delivered from within the existing scrutiny budget |
| 19 | REPORT AUTHOR | Lynne Margetts |
| 20 | REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS | <p>Quarterly reports on progress to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Final report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at end of project</p> <p>Outline of final formal reporting process:</p> <p>To Service Director [] TBC</p> <p>To Portfolio Holder [] TBC</p> <p>To CMT [] TBC</p> <p>To Cabinet [] TBC</p> |
| 21 | FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS (proposals) | TBC |