

# Cwm Taff Regional Provider Forum

17 November, 2014

VAMT, Merthyr Tydfil

Supporting you  
Supporting people

**CYMORTH  
CYMRU**

Cefnogi chi  
Cefnogi pobl

## RCC Representatives Present

Name	Role (Organisation)
Sue Preece	Cwm Taff RCC
Barry Gallagher	Drive
Helen Jones (Deputy Rep)	Hafod Care

## RCC Representatives Apologies

Name	Organisation
Shelagh Iles	Rhondda HA

## Present

Name	Organisation
Nicola Evans	Cymorth Cymru
Ben Griffiths (Chair)	Gwalia
Hazel Yates (Vice Chair)	Gofal
Rakhshanda Shahzad	Bawso
Keith Pope	Age Connects Morgannwg
Amy Jones	Women's Aid RCT
Vic Slade	Merthyr Valley Homes
Audrey Broome	Rhondda HA
Craig Smith	Gwalia
Angela Joyce	Hafan Cymru
Sam Lewis	Llamau
Dave Jones	Adref

## Apologies

Name	Organisation
Martin Davies	Habinteg

Agenda Item	Action
<b>Welcome and Governance</b> Ben Griffiths chaired the meeting. Introductions were made and apologies given as per above.  <u>Purpose of RPF</u> The chair re-iterated the purpose of the RPF which is to enable provider reps who are members of the RCC to seek the views of	

<p>providers in the Cwm Taff region.</p> <p><u>Mins of the last RPF</u> The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
<p><b>RCC Feedback</b></p> <p>Sue Preece, Regional Development Coordinator for the Cwm Taff RCC informed providers that the last RCC meeting was not able to go ahead due to not enough voting members in attendance.</p> <p>The conversation focussed on outcomes and covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcomes - issue that all regions are doing it differently, no feedback from LAs, being used to commission and decommission services. RCC planning day will look at outcomes and there will be an additional development day on outcomes for providers early next year;</li> <li>• clear directions and guidelines wanted;</li> <li>• only contact has been to verify data - not give specific feedback from LAs;</li> <li>• lack of consistency between how providers are completing the information;</li> <li>• value in using outcomes to find good practice and share this;</li> <li>• providers should get front line staff to attend the RCC development day;</li> <li>• national snap shot issued - need to get a copy (80 page doc)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Overview of indicative budgets</b></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Paper on the Cwm Taff Cuts</u></a></p> <p>Providers were given an update on the cuts which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters had been issued to LAs on the week prior to the RPF – these are still indicative budgets only;</li> <li>• Nationally there is likely to be a 7.4% cut to SPPG as stated in the draft budget;</li> <li>• This will mean a 5% ish cut to both local authorities in the Cwm Taff region;</li> <li>• This year, the money to fund the RDC posts have been taken out before the money has been allocated to LAs;</li> <li>• Currently looking at cuts year on year – there will be a working day to look at how to make the cuts, including a service user day</li> <li>• WG are conducting research into management costs –not sure of process at the moment.</li> <li>• RCC planning meeting: it was agreed to spend this year planning on how to implement cuts in years 2 and 3. Merthyr will therefore be making no cuts for one year.</li> </ul>	

<p>Comments from providers included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feeling that LAs haven't planned for cuts;</li> <li>• RCT and Merthyr need to plan properly rather than top slice;</li> <li>• Merthyr and RCT having been planning for a 10% cut</li> <li>• The RPF needs to propose what providers think should be done and go to LAs with this;</li> <li>• RCT has been conducting an Older People's Review – same consultant as Merthyr being used to do this;</li> <li>• Providers need to challenge if top slicing is happening in RCT</li> <li>• Different agendas are happening in RCT - no feedback from formal reviews;</li> <li>• Older person's review wasn't about the cuts, it was to rationalise services but has now turned into a cuts exercise - rather than float the support back out into the community they are cutting it instead – dealing with cuts but can't be a long term solution with an ageing population.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Workshop: Current issues &amp; best practice</b>  <b>Working together to find solutions to manage the cuts</b></p> <p>Discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RCT is in the middle of a change process – 7 senior housing managers have gone as part of RCT internal savings;</li> <li>• Management charges research – management charges are a percentage of contract. Each LAs will have their own polices and will therefore have the info on management charges already – waste of money which could have been used on frontline services;</li> <li>• If you are funding on full cost recovery - voids make a huge difference - not so much on tariffs. What if you are relying on referrals for LAs?</li> <li>• Concern that working across regions isn't working - very difficult to work across regions;</li> <li>• Maybe look at voids to save the 5% - could buy a year while the review in RCT takes place?</li> <li>• Want more transparency around the reviews and the data that savings/cuts are being based on;</li> <li>• Innovation: RCT provider remodelled because of voids – now takes younger people rather than families domestic abuse</li> <li>• Issue with SP nationally is that we can't evidence need;</li> <li>• Issue around referral forms not being completed - providers aren't get the referrals;</li> <li>• 2 different assessments taking place – eligibility and then needs.</li> </ul>	<p>Reps – request info on the data behind any cuts made to services  strategic review didn't look at need in Merthyr</p>
<p><b>Service User Involvement Framework Implementation Plan</b></p> <p><a href="#">Service User Framework</a>  <a href="#">Paper on Service User Framework Implementation Plan</a></p>	

<p>Sue Preece gave an overview. Points covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Implementation Plan is to ensure that all providers implement it in the same way;</li><li>• Planning group will monitor implementation and service user involvement;</li><li>• 6 monthly or annually? Provider views requested;</li><li>• Providers requested that any returns should not clash with Outcomes return - Dec to May period was suggested;</li><li>• Want to involve service users in cuts process.</li><li>• Currently looking at service user standard and trying to get a base line of what's happening.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Dates of next meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>10<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b>, 1.30-3:30, Rhondda Cynon Taff (Venue TBC)</li><li>• <b>21<sup>st</sup> April 2015</b>, 1.30-3.30, Merthyr Tydfil (Venue TBC)</li><li>• <b>21<sup>st</sup> July 2015</b>, 1.30-3.30, Rhondda Cynon Taff (Venue TBC)</li><li>• <b>4<sup>th</sup> November 2015</b>, 1.30-3.30, Merthyr Tydfil (Venue TBC)</li></ul>	