

Essex County Council

People and Families Policy and Scrutiny Committee (PAF)

6 June 2018

WHAT ARE WE LOOKING AT?

Review Topic (Name of review)	CARE PROVIDERS - RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT
Type of Review	TBC

WHY ARE WE LOOKING AT THIS?

Rationale for the Review	<p>To review what progress has been made in implementing the Relationship Management Review report (Right Time...Right Place...Right Conversation) https://www.livingwellessex.org/vision/market-shaping/ and to ascertain whether this has been sufficient to ensure improved relationships with care providers</p> <p>There has been some anecdotal feedback from providers since then that they have welcomed a change in approach and more openness that was expressed by ECC in that review but how significantly is it changing and is it going to be sustained? A repeat survey of care providers started late 2017 with results expected early in 2018 and there is the opportunity to challenge progress being made against the recommendations and highlight issues still not being addressed or progressed.</p> <p>The issue is relevant to the Council's strategic objectives and corporate priorities, namely that:</p> <p>(i) residents Enjoy Good Health and Wellbeing http://www.essex.gov.uk/Your-Council/Strategies-Policies/Documents/Enjoy_good_health_wellbeing.pdf</p> <p>(ii) people in Essex can Live Independently and Exercise Choice and Control over their lives http://www.essex.gov.uk/Your-Council/Strategies-Policies/Documents/Independent_living_choice_control_over_lives.pdf</p> <p>A member focus can also approach the issue in a non-partisan way and provide challenge to the wider system on collaborative and partnership solutions. It can raise the profile of issues that may need a wider system approach.</p>
---------------------------------	--

WHAT DO WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE?

Indicators of success	Poor relationship management would manifest itself in delays in assessments, client choice, and providers deciding not to work with ECC and thereby further reducing choice and capacity. Through challenging progress made on improving relations with care providers the intention of the review is to identify and highlight where issues still remain which could impact on the choice and quality of services being offered to clients and suggest mitigating actions.
------------------------------	---

HOW LONG IS IT GOING TO TAKE?

Timescales	The review should be conducted over a three month period. Any extension beyond that would need to be approved by the Scrutiny Board and justified in terms of anticipating and achieving significantly improved outcomes (conclusions and recommendations) by spending further time on it.
Provisional Timetable	January/February 2018 - Scoping Document to be further developed in conjunction with discussions with other officers and Cabinet Member. February/March 2018 – Start of review February to April/May 2018 – Seek evidence and data from witnesses, site visits etc. May 2018 – Finalise report

FOR COMPLETION FOR AGREEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE

WHAT INFORMATION DO WE NEED?

Terms of Reference	To consider the current relationships with care providers and identify areas for improvement that will further improve the quality and choice of services available.
Key Lines of Enquiry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) To what extent have recommendations made previously been pursued and implemented? ii) To what extent have relationships with providers improved? iii) To what extent are there still issues around provider relations needing further attention and what can be done about them?
What primary/new evidence is needed?	Evidence to understand the views of care providers, members and officers as to the level of improvement in relationships and has this been sufficient?
What secondary/ existing information is needed?	TBC
What briefings and site visits might be relevant?	Possible site visit to particular care providers
Other work being undertaken/Relevant Corporate Links	

WHO DO WE NEED TO CONTRIBUTE/CONSULT? (INITIAL MEETING TO ESTABLISH THIS)

Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cabinet Member, Health and Adult Social Care Cabinet Member, Children and Families
Key ECC Officers	Commissioning Directors ECC Commissioners (Heads of commissioning) Adult Operations - Local Delivery Directors Head of Procurement – Steve Ede
Partners and service users	Care providers

WHAT RESOURCES DO WE NEED?

Lead Member and Membership	TBC
Co-optee's (if any)	TBC
Lead Scrutiny Officer/Other	Graham Hughes, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Expected Member commitment	TBC – a guide would be two commitments per month for the duration of the review.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS/CONSTRAINTS?

Risk analysis (site visits etc.)	
Possible constraints	

WHAT WILL BE REQUIRED FROM STAKEHOLDERS?

Internal stakeholders	Is any support from the Communications team likely to be needed?
External stakeholders	

WHO ARE WE DIRECTING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS TO?

Recommendations to (key decision makers):	To relevant Cabinet Member(s), health and social care partners
Reporting arrangements	
Follow-up arrangements	

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/NOTES

--	--

LESSONS LEARNT/SCRUTINY EVALUATION

To be completed in an end of review Workshop* (align to findings of Scrutiny Survey to be attached as an annex). This form should be used in the evaluation of the process adopted by the Scrutiny review Committee/Task and Finish Group and will be used to inform future Scrutiny Reviews.

**Evaluation workshop at the end of the review will typically involve Committee Chairman/T&F chairman, other T&F group members, scrutiny officer, topic proposer and key stakeholders (if applicable)*

DATE OF REVIEW EVALUATION:	
1. Organisation & Planning	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
What were the strengths and weaknesses of the approach used? Proposed and actual start/completion dates: Was the time allocated adequate?	
2. Resourcing	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
Was officer time/resource adequate for this review?	
3. Evidence sessions/site visits	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
4. Stakeholder and Communications	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
5. Report and Recommendations	
What could have gone better?	Recommendations for future reviews
Was the purpose of the review achieved? Has there/is there likely to be any influence on service delivery as a consequence of the review?	