	PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES						
NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE		Communities					
DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION		6 th December 2012					
TITLE OF REPORT		Supporting People strategy and Spend plan					
PURPOSE	1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf)	The Supporting People (SP) programme enables vulnerable people to live independently and contributes to the prevention of homelessness. The programme supports people who need housing and contributes towards tackling the issues of transience, poverty and multiple deprivation. The purpose of proposing the report is to consult with members on the changes proposed to SP services and on allocation of the new Supporting People Programme Grant (SPPG) Significant changes have been introduced by the Welsh Government into the SP programme effective from 1/8/12. A report was taken to cabinet in September 12 with a recommendation that there should be in depth scrutiny of the changes. A report will be included in the scrutiny forward work programme in February 2013, to allow this to take place. By 2013 we will be clearer about the impact of the changes which have been introduced. The SP Strategy and spend plan report will update members on the developments in the programme so far, as a basis for the report in 2013. The SP strategy and spend plan report was originally proposed for partnerships scrutiny on 8 th November; however, members allocated this to the communities scrutiny meeting on 25 th October 12. Due to a regional exercise looking at comparable spend across the region; it has not been possible to complete this work for 25th October meeting. It is therefore proposed that this should be considered at the following communities meeting on 6 th December.					

2. What issues are to be scrutinised?	 Allocation of spend and projects for 3 years from 2012 to 2015 Update on Supporting People Strategy actions for 2013-14 Update on recent developments within the SP programme as a basis for further scrutiny (scheduled for 2013), of the impact of changes introduced. 		
3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts?	Yes: the Supporting People Manager and Director for Planning and Wellbeing.		
4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report?	Scrutiny of ring-fenced grant funding proposals housing related support services in Denbighshir currently valued at approximately £6.7million pe year. To note the impact of funding cuts for Denbighshire.		
 5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims & priorities and impact (see overleaf)* 	Aims & Priorities	Impact 3	
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	The Supporting People programme in Wales was reviewed by Welsh Government in 2010. New guidance and SPPG conditions where issued late July 2013 for implementation within very tight timescales on 1 st August 2013 It is a requirement of the new grant conditions for local SP commissioning plans and spend plans to be reported to the Welsh Government via a new regional governance group called a regional collaborative committee (RCC). Once plans have been agreed in Denbighshire, they will be collated into a regional plan for North Wales and submitted to the Welsh Government to allocate SPPG. The role of the RCC is to scrutinise local and regional plans and make recommendations to the minister on the allocation of SPPG in future years.		
REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny's recommendations to be reported elsewhere?	Scrutiny recommendations will be reported to the Supporting People Planning Group (a multi agency commissioning group chaired by the Corporate Director for Planning & Wellbeing. Recommendations will also be included in the cabinet report in December 12, when the strategy and spend plan are finalised.		
AUTHOR	Jenny Elliott, Supporting People Manager.		

Please complete the following checklist:

	Yes	No
Is the topic already being addressed satisfactorily?		No
Is Scrutiny likely to result in service improvements or other measurable benefits?		No
Does the topic concern a poor performing service or a high budgetary commitment?	Yes	
Are there adequate resources / realistic possibility of adequate resources to achieve the objective(s)?	Yes	
Is the Scrutiny activity timely, i.e. will scrutiny be able to recommend changes to the service delivery, policy, strategy, etc?	Yes	
Is the topic linked to corporate or scrutiny aims and priorities?	Yes	
Has the topic been identified as a risk in the Corporate Risk Register or is it the subject of an adverse internal audit or external regulator report?	Yes (in relation to financial impact??)	

*The following table is to be used to guide the scores given:

Score	Aims & Priorities	Impact
0	No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities	No potential benefits
1	No links to corporate/scrutiny aims and priorities but a subject of high public concern	Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/customer/client group
2	Some evidence of links, but indirect	Minor benefits to two groups/moderate benefits to one
3	Good evidence linking the topic to both aims and priorities	Moderate benefits to more than one group/substantial benefits to one
4	Strong evidence linking both aims and priorities, and has a high level of public concern	Substantial community-wide benefits

SCORING

COORING								
Aims & Priorities								
4	Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately		Priority topic for Scrutiny – for urgent consideration					
3								
	Reject topic for Scrutiny – topic to be circulated to members for information purposes		Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately					
2								
1	F = F = F							
0	1	2	3 Impact	4				
			mpaor					

PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS- JUNE 11/L.doc