
Meeting	Personalisation Scrutiny Review Task Group
Date	13 February 2014
Present	Councillors Funnell (Chair) and Jeffries
Apologies	Councillor Doughty

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests which they may have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

5. MINUTES

Resolved: That the minutes of the Personalisation Scrutiny Review Task Group meeting held on 18 September 2013 be approved and signed as a correct record.

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

7. DRAFT INTERIM REPORT-PERSONALISATION SCRUTINY REVIEW

Members considered a report which set out the draft findings of the Personalisation Scrutiny Review Task Group to date and highlighted some emerging trends arising from the review.

Members were asked to take into account the key priority areas which it had identified at its last meeting in November 2013 (as outlined in paragraph 35 of the report) and to formulate some recommendations for inclusion in the final report. A representative from In Control was in attendance to provide

information as to what support they could offer the Council in any of the three identified priority areas.

Discussion took place around the following issues:

- The need to make clear that personalisation was about more than personal budgets. Some of the key outcomes, for example friendships and not feeling isolated, did not require funding.
- The important role played by the community. This could be neighbours providing support informally (kinship) as well as Churches, schools (eg encouraging intergenerational volunteering), voluntary organisations and community groups.
- Ways of developing community resilience and building stronger communities. Encouraging and nurturing citizen leadership was important.
- A need to raise awareness of what was available and how this could be developed – helping people to make links.
- Exploring further ways of how neighbourhood care teams could work together more effectively.
- The possibility of putting into place a charter. Examples were given of how a charter had been developed from the “Making It Real” programme.
- Ways of being more innovative in support planning. The quality of the conversation was key to successful support planning with the emphasis being on personal outcomes.
- Consideration as to how to deliver services in places other than traditional venues eg by advisers visiting community centres and cafes to meet people rather than the other way round.
- The importance of good quality planning for self-funders as well as for others.
- The need to link better care funding with the rewiring of public services through the transformation programme that was taking place.
- Ensuring that engagement was meaningful and enjoyable and that a range of methodologies and innovative communications were used. Language should be easily understood. It was also helpful to use human stories.
- The “Shared Lives” programme.
- The importance of sharing of good practice and extending initiatives that were working well.
- The need for different parts of the Council to work more closely together in the provision of services and support.

Initiatives such as the appointment of a community facilitator for health were welcomed.

- The benefits that could be achieved by addressing issues in an innovative way. An example was given of how a shortage of good quality personal assistants in one local authority had been tackled by offering training to those interested in social care. The involvement of the Workforce Development Unit in such initiatives could be considered.

Members agreed that more consideration needed to be given to the Council's arrangements in respect of the provision of mental health support.

It was noted that, arising from the workshop that had been held, a list had been compiled highlighting the positive and negative comments that had been put forward. It was felt that when the comments were presented in this way they told a story.

It was agreed that, based on the discussions that had taken place, draft recommendations would be drawn up and circulated to Members via email. The recommendations would then be presented to the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

Resolved: That the draft recommendations arising from the review be circulated to Members via email prior to their presentation to the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Reason: To conclude the review in accordance with scrutiny processes.

Councillor Funnell, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.00 pm and finished at 5.20 pm].