

ANNEX 1(D)

PRESCRIBED GROUPS WHICH MUST BE CONSULTED WHEN PREPARING OR REVISING INTEGRATION SCHEMES; PREPARING DRAFT STRATEGIC PLANS; AND WHEN MAKING DECISIONS AFFECTING LOCALITIES RELATING TO THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do these draft Regulations include the right groups of people?

Yes

No

2. If no, what other groups should be included within the draft Regulations?

3. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on these draft Regulations?

- Members agreed with the prescribed groups with flexibility for local variation in terms of additional consultees
 - There is a need to have a solid definition and process for consultation as members experience variable standards from the NHS and the Local Authorities. The NHS approach is favoured
 - Members welcome the requirement to involve local residents in work and decision making at locality level

ANNEX 2(D)

MEMBERSHIP, POWERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF INTEGRATION JOINT BOARDS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Are there any additional non-voting members who should be included in the Integration Joint Board?

Yes

No

2. If you answered 'yes', please list those you feel should be included:

3. Are there any other areas related to the operation of the Integration Joint Board that should also covered by this draft Order?

- PPF members are concerned that there will be too much interference from local politicians in the work of the Integration arrangements. There are also concerns that where the Integration Joint Board has an elected member as chair, they will have the casting vote, despite the fact that the majority of budget and staff will be from the existing health service.
 - Given the above , there is a need to provide absolute clarity around the financial arrangements and rules

4. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on this draft Order?

- PPF members strongly believe that they should be represented at all levels of the Integration arrangements. There is a track record of good working with the health board. This should be extended to include the wider social care aspects either by working with other existing groups representing service users, carers and the public or by extending the scope of PPFs. Also, at present, members are supported via the PPF process and would be concerned if this support was lost.
- The Integration Joint Board should not be split into voting and non-voting members. If the views of service users, carers and the public are valued and if we are serious about equality, then their input to these arrangements should be on an equal footing. At the very least, if members are not allowed to vote, they should have their views and concerns noted specifically in the minutes
- We support the emphasis on locality planning and again we would see PPF's as integral members of any local arrangements
- There needs to be much more clarification and sub division on who the "Representatives of staff, carers, service users and the third sector" are, to ensure that the different interests of these groups of people are met. The number of seats available for representatives needs to be defined. It was also seen as important that older people are represented as around 75% of people affected by the changes being brought about by Integration are older people. Young carers also need to be considered
- Expenses associated with travel and subsistence should be paid to user, carer and public representatives and for carers, replacement care costs should be included as a reasonable additional expense.
- The phrase "any costs incurred in connection with their membership of the joint integration board" should be extended to include any additional meetings outwith board meetings to enable representatives to consult with their constituent groups and/or communities in order to represent their views e.g. to attend a local service user forum
- Regulations should include a responsibility on partnerships to provide carers and service users (and indeed other members of integration joint boards) with induction as a minimum and training and support if required
- Non-voting members should also have the opportunity to have someone to deputise for them in their absence
- We have general concerns around how any joint budget will be managed and the lack of clarity around this e.g. how will cuts to Local Authority or Health budgets affect the joint resource?; what if one organisation decides to reduce funding to a critical area, will this have to be agreed across the NHS Board area etc
- Some of our members have expressed concerns around integration that does not bring staff together under one employer and we are worried about the potential to create dissatisfaction where staff working in an integrated team see that others are being paid more for the same or a similar level job. On the other hand, we would be concerned about the potential impact on finance and therefore on supports and services through equal pay claims

ANNEX 3(D)

ESTABLISHMENT, MEMBERSHIP AND PROCEEDINGS OF INTEGRATION JOINT MONITORING COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

Consultation Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed minimum membership of the integration joint monitoring committee, as set out in the draft Order?

Yes

No

2. If you answered 'no', please list those you feel should be included:

3. Are there any other areas related to the operation of the integration joint monitoring committee that should also covered by the draft Order?

4. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on this draft Order?

Does not apply to our area

ANNEX 4(D)

PRESCRIBED MEMBERSHIP OF STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUPS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) ACT 2014

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. The draft Regulations prescribe the groups of people that should be represented on the strategic planning group. Do you think the groups of people listed are the right set of people that need to be represented on the strategic planning group?

Yes

No

2. If no, what changes would you propose?

3. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on these draft Regulations?

- Comments about mechanisms to ensure the meaningful involvement of non-voting members within Integration Joint Boards e.g. expenses, training and appropriate support would apply equally to involvement in strategic planning groups.

**PRESCRIBED FORM AND CONTENT OF PERFORMANCE REPORTS
RELATING TO THE PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING)
(SCOTLAND) ACT 2014**

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree with the prescribed matters to be included in the performance report?

Yes

No

2. If no, please explain why:

3. Are there any additional matters you think should be prescribed in the performance report?

Yes

No

4. If yes, please tell us which additional matters should be prescribed and why:

5. Should Scottish Ministers prescribe the form that annual performance reports should take?

Yes

No

6. If you answered yes, what form should Scottish Ministers prescribe?

7. Are there any further comments you would like to offer on these draft Regulations?

No comments on this section