

PROPOSAL FORM FOR AGENDA ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY COMMITTEES					
<b>NAME OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>		Communities			
<b>DATE OF MEETING / TIMESCALE FOR CONSIDERATION</b>		17 <sup>th</sup> October 2013			
<b>TITLE OF REPORT</b>		Supporting People Local Commissioning Plan			
<b>PURPOSE</b>	<b>1. Why is the report being proposed? (see also the checklist overleaf)</b>	<p>The Supporting People (SP) programme enables vulnerable people to live independently and contributes to the prevention of homelessness.</p> <p>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 recent changes to SP services and on allocation of Supporting People Programme Grant (SPPG) including proposals to manage a minimum 5% cut to Denbighshire's SPPG funding.</p> <p>The SP Local Commissioning Plan replaces the previous Supporting People Strategy and Operational Plan (SPOP).</p>			
	<b>2. What issues are to be scrutinised?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation of spend and projects for 2014-15 and outline plans for 2015-16</li> <li>Proposals to manage significant budget cuts</li> </ul>			
	<b>3. Is it necessary/desirable for witnesses to attend e.g. lead members, officers/external experts?</b>	Yes: the Supporting People Manager, the Strategic Development Manager for Adult & Business Services and the Director for Planning and Wellbeing.			
	<b>4. What will the committee achieve by considering the report?</b>	Scrutiny of ring-fenced grant funding proposals for housing related support services in Denbighshire currently valued at approximately £6.7million per year. To note the impact of funding cuts for Denbighshire.			
	<b>5. Score the topic from 0 – 4 on aims &amp; priorities and impact (see overleaf)*</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Aims &amp; Priorities</th> <th>Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Aims & Priorities	Impact	3
Aims & Priorities	Impact				
3	3				
<b>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS</b>		Under revised Supporting People guidance, local SP commissioning plans and spend plans are reported to the new regional collaborative committee (RCC) and then to the Welsh Government. 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.			
<b>REPORTING PATH – what is the next step? Are Scrutiny's recommendations to be reported elsewhere?</b>		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 November 2013, when the strategy and spend plan are finalised.			
<b>AUTHOR</b>		<b>Katie Newe, Supporting People Manager.</b>			

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

### Aims & Priorities

4	Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately	Priority topic for Scrutiny – for urgent consideration
3		
2	Reject topic for Scrutiny – topic to be circulated to members for information purposes	Possible topic for Scrutiny – to be timetabled appropriately
1		

0                      1                      2                      3                      4

**Impact**