

CPP Management Committee 8 February 2006

ISDGMP session notes – 7 December 2005

The workshop took place on the 7th December. There were 11 attendees and these were divided into 2 groups. The outputs from each group are given in the appendix to this report. The following sections provide a summary of the collated outputs from both groups.

There was a strong sense that the specific rural nature of Argyll and Bute has a significant effect on integrated service delivery from both groups. In some aspects this rurality creates the necessity for close integration, such as delivering multiple services through a single point in a remote community. Another aspect of this rural context is the existence of close relationships between service delivery organisations. Many are physically close in terms of their primary office locations, and personnel in each tend to know one another. This removes some of the identified barriers to integration at the outset. When considering integrated service delivery it is essential to realise that a different model may be applicable to a rural context than an urban context.

What are the key drivers for Integrated Service Delivery?

The capacity to form a partnership to deliver the service in question is a key driver. This includes the pre-existence of staff with the required skills and the ability to draw on the expertise of others. A clear overlap in the service being delivered is essential as are shared accountabilities and existing mutual interactions between the partner organisations.

There may be natural partners who already have a synergy between them. This existing contact between partners is common in Argyll and Bute due to the rural nature of the area. Innovation, a mix of people bringing a range of ideas to a certain service delivery arena also drives integration.

The existence of a clear goal or purpose and clear benefits for all stakeholders is a pre-requisite for integration. Another driver is the change in staff roles that is facilitated by integration. This can make better use of skills and develop more interesting job roles.

Not simply relying on the assumption that integration is best, but pro-actively working to provide service improvement through integration is essential. There is a current national, political context which favours partnership working and service integration, but it was felt that there was no need to force this within Argyll and Bute. This is because of the existing close interaction between service delivering bodies due to the rural nature of Argyll and Bute. This relationship was seen as a driver of integration within the area.

Political drive from Scottish Executive has generated a local political response and brought others to table which in turn creates the climate and opportunity that should drive greater service integration.

The financial climate surrounding public service organisations creates a drive for increased efficiency and a need to cut costs. There are limited resources available to deliver the service effectively and increased demand for services, leading to a strong desire to examine integrated service delivery as a cost saving option. This factor is tied to the need to demonstrate successful outcomes.

A change in the culture of public service organisations has resulted in more partnership working. This has lowered barriers to successful service integration.

Who are the main beneficiaries?

People/Citizens

Improved service delivery should be the outcome of service integration. This could be in terms of delivery time or a reduction in effort required by the service recipient.

Staff

Staff benefit through the increased variety of opportunities available through service integration. The potential for extended roles can be attractive in terms of career development.

Organisation

The organisations involved benefit through better chances for recruitment /retention. Integration will extend the outlook of the organisation and allow it to go beyond traditional boundaries. There should be tangible time and cost savings and other efficiencies.

Business

Local business may benefit from integrated service delivery either directly as partners or indirectly through other outcomes.

The environment/biodiversity

Some service integration may be of benefit to the environment or local biodiversity.

What helps and what hinders integrated service delivery?

Both groups identified a similar range of factors that help and hinder service integration. Sometimes the same factor can help and hinder, e.g. the absence of something that helps can be a hindrance.

Things that help

Factors which mitigate toward good governance figure highly in the list. The ability to maintain democratic accountability and transparency within the integrated service delivery context would help to keep such service delivery models viable. Measuring success in integrated service delivery is essential as partners working in an outcome driven context will require measurable outcomes.

Commonality between partner organisations was regarded as key including; core competencies and skills, organisational culture and service overlap. Organisations need to be flexible and open to change. Here the nature of the organisational culture and the leadership of both the individual organisations and the partnership will have a pivotal effect on success.

Willingness to engage in integrated service delivery on the part of individuals and organisations would be beneficial and the presence of strong, committed leadership was seen as an advantage.

A clear identity or brand linked to an obvious service need was identified as a contributor to the success of the service.

There has to be a clear benefit for the organisations involved. Some sort of mutual gain will help to foster a strong partnership and contribute to the success of the integrated service. In the rural context there is a high level of familiarity between individuals in different organisations and this can be an advantage or a disadvantage. The degree of empowerment at different levels in different organisations can help or hinder especially where these differ significantly between organisations.

A sense of camaraderie and a common problem were identified as being helpful. A stable team with continuity and people who've been working together for a significant time would have a positive bearing on the success of the integrated service.

The rural nature of the area was viewed as having an impact on the success of the integrated service. Rural areas have established networks between service providers including personal contact, familiarity, friendships and informal connections. Such contact and networking should help to produce successful integrated service delivery. In such a situation there may be a greater degree of trust and this too was seen as a key success criterion.

Research prior to embarking on an integrated service delivery project was also regarded as essential. Knowledge sharing and co-terminosity of partner organisations were regarded as being helpful.

Imposition of integrated working from above can work both ways. There will be less motivation/energy among the organisations but a push from outside may help get things moving.

Things that hinder

In terms of the organisations, differences in management systems and structure could prove to be a barrier to integration as could differences at a more technical level in IT systems.

Maintaining accountability is essential but may prove difficult within a partnership. There may be legislative hindrances, such as data protection legislation, which could constrain the freedom of organisations to work effectively together. Similarly the legislative framework surrounding funding from the Executive could become a barrier.

Political issues were identified as potentially hindering. These would include local politics and national level political issues.

Timescales and the timing of the project could work against achieving integrated service delivery. As an example, for certain projects aspects need to coincide with the Council committee cycles which may clash with the required response times of other bodies. Any time lag between the initial phases of building, planning and development, and services going in could cause problems in terms of missed opportunity and falling levels of motivation or enthusiasm.

Poor communication presents a barrier to service integration, both between partners or potential partners and between the Scottish Executive and local organisations. There was some concern as to how the Executive will respond and will they want to control. Uncertainty on these aspects would not be helpful.

Population density in a rural area can be a barrier. It can be difficult to reach the ideal size of population without covering a large and impractical geographic area. There is a need to compromise between population and geographic area.

What are the good examples that should be taken forward to the next stage?

Below is a list of the current integrated service delivery projects that were identified as being good examples to take forward to the next workshop. Further information on each of these is available on request.

- Mull and Iona Progressive Care Centre (also Jura)
- Mid-Argyll Hospital – GP, Dentist, Social Work, A&E, Ambulance, Community Hospital
 - >6 years planning
 - shared admin system across all partners
- Joint Futures
- 3 Islands Partnership
- Construction training centre (Argyll and Bute Council, Argyll and the Islands Enterprise and Argyll College).
- Fusions
- Integrated Coastal Zone Management of Loch Etive and Loch Fyne
- Other examples include; Community Transport Project, DriveSafe, Argyll Active, SLAM – management training with the NHS and Digital communities

Any other issues?

- There is a need for sound evaluation and monitoring of integrated service delivery projects.
- There is a need for evidence that integration is better
 - separate bodies may be better/easier for public to understand
 - Citizens Panel survey results could be used to get an idea of the public view.
- There is a need to identify how to pick up when things are wrong
- Lack of priorities was identified as an issue.
- Better coordination of this topic within the executive would be helpful.

Who takes part in the next stage?

- Andrew Campbell
- James McLellan
- Brian Barker
- Ron Arbuckle – (or Josephine/Erik?)
- Wilma Campbell
- Ken Abernethy (or HIE rep)

Contact

Brian Barker
Policy and Strategy Manger
Argyll and Bute Council
01546 604436
brian.barker@argyll-bute.gov.uk

Andy McKay-Hubbard
Research and Information Officer
Argyll and Bute Council
01546 604472
andy.mckay-hubbard@argyll-bute.gov.uk