



Buckinghamshire County Council

Minutes OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON PARTNERSHIP

AGENDA ITEM: 3

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE ON PARTNERSHIP HELD ON FRIDAY 22 MARCH 2002, IN
MEZZANINE ROOM 1, COMMENCING AT 10.00AM.**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Trevor Fowler, Bill Lidgate, David Rowlands, Mike Appleyard, Lesley Clarke,
Margaret Hamilton, Pam Bacon, Crispian Graves, Joy Kverndahl, Chester Jones

OTHERS PRESENT

Mr J Beckerleg
Mr H Carey

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr R Lingham-Wood

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none

1 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2002, were confirmed.

2 REPORTS TO VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS

A series of reports were discussed.

Mencap

Central branch has little contact with the County. Wycombe branch is in a fairly low state with difficulty getting officers and attendees at meetings. Generally local branch members are carers.

Mike Appleyard asked whether it would be possible to operate an “umbrella” organisation in the County to enable just one group to be contacted rather than a number of diverse groups.

The Chairman pointed out that the purpose of the review is intended to cover the County Council’s links with partner organisations generally. It also has to be recognised that they are all autonomous organisations and the Council cannot direct them.

Buckinghamshire Community Alliance

See attached paper.

Home Start

It was particularly interesting to note that Home Start had been able to streamline the monitoring process despite being required to report to a number of organisations.

Home Start not want a SLA as they thought it could be too restricting. Some members felt that it would be interesting to enquire whether and how the service could be extended further.

Concern was particularly expressed over the length of time that assessments take.

Red Cross

DELETE pages 13-16 inclusive of the notes. OT could be provided at day centres and the Red Cross would be keen to develop this service. It would be helpful for staff from Adult Social Care to discuss this in more detail with the Red Cross organisation.

It would be helpful in the report to draw attention to the statement that the “...County structure change has destroyed relationship” and to seek further examination of that issue.

Wycombe Women’s Aid

DELETE pages 13-16 inclusive.

Wycombe DC heavily supports the centre.

Age Concern – Aylesbury

Chester Jones provided a verbal report. 50% of their funding comes from the Council.

No problem with the contract. Things seem to work O.K.

3 LOCALITY FORUMS

Some uncertainty around the role of Locality Forums – What are they for? Recognised that they are still very new and developing – have been running only 18 months. There seems to be within the Forums a concern about their own future. Hugh Carey explained that the Locality Forums are intended to report to the Partnership Forum where health organisations, social care services and voluntary organisations meet to share information. Locality Forums are intended to act as the link between the Forum and services users in particular patients with long-term conditions, feeding information up and down. It could be helpful for the Council to work with the Locality Forums to develop further the relationship with voluntary sector providers.

THE LOCALITY FORUMS SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF A FUTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REVIEW.

4 DRAFT REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF SOCIAL PARTNERSHIPS

Add two further Appendices – one on the list of social care partners receiving funding the other of those put receiving grants.

It was agreed that the object of the report should be “...to consider the overall picture of partnerships in the County”.

A “map” is required of what partnerships are provided, in which areas and an examination of whether some areas are under-provided and some over-provided. It was recognised that this would be a major task that needs to be done within the social care teams. The report should make clear that the recommendations are to be seen as a beginning and that much more work is required. Also that it is a generic report intended to identify good practice that can be used for all partnerships.

Hugh Carey suggested that the Committee recommend that portfolios should be given responsibility for relationships with those partnerships that relate to the portfolio. So the 71 partnerships (and others) should be divided up primarily between the Community Services, Children and Families and Adult Social Care portfolios as appropriate.

It was noted as important to stress that the Council lacks a commissioning set up. Adult Social Care will have a “Head of Service” for commissioning. This principle should be extended.

The introduction to the report should recognise its limitations.

P27 Chiltern CVS is now Chiltern and South Bucks CVS.

P28 (and elsewhere) Social Services = Social Care.

P29 item 11 Delete “wherever possible”.

P30 The mapping exercise should be as comprehensive as possible.

P32 Delete “and consistency” in item 15 and “and consistent” in 17.

P33 Item 22 replace “test” with “review”.

Monitoring should be seen as an exercise that is valuable for both partners and adds value. The recommendations will be rewritten.

P34 “Cabinet Members” should be referred in all recommendations rather than Cabinet Member.

Item 26 – delete “should” and replace with “could”.

Item 27 Mike Appleyard agreed to liaise with the Chairman to produce a new form of words. The item should reflect the need for local members to know what organisations are in their area.

Item 28 Delete “Social Services should take a pro-active part ...” to “A Cabinet Member should champion.

Item 5 Chairman to discuss with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care whether he wishes to come to the next meeting or have a separate meeting.

Item 6 deferred to the April meeting.

5 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Friday 26 April 2002 at 10.00am in Mezzanine Room 3

CHAIRMAN