K/Glasgow City Health & Social Care Partnership, Glasgow Children’s Services
Children and Young People (Information Sharing) (Scotland) Bill

By Glasgow Getting It Right For Every Child, Service Managers Group, which is a multi-agency group with responsibility for improving joint working and the implementation of the Named Person and Child’s Plan as legislated in the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 and Children and Young People (Information Sharing) Bill.

Consultation

1. Did you take part in any consultation exercise preceding the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made?

   Yes. In 2012, a number of senior officers from Health and Social Work representing Glasgow children’s services, took part in national groups and discussions with civil servants on the financial estimates of delivering the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014.

2. If applicable, do you believe your comments on the financial assumptions have been accurately reflected in the FM?

   Not Applicable.

3. Did you have sufficient time to contribute to the consultation exercise?

   Not Applicable.

Costs

4. If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that they have been accurately reflected in the FM? If not, please provide details.

   No.

   This financial memorandum focuses on costs relating to one aspect of practice; the effect of the amended provision and new provisions on how information sharing should be carried out under Part 4 and 5 of the 2014 Act. Detailing costs for Health and Education Services as Named Persons.

   However, the FM also states that training is required for those “who will have significant contact with the named person or primarily involved with the Child’s Plan”. Therefore, we would suggest training backfill expenses should include the following significant partners: Social Work, Police Scotland and the Third Sector.

   Changes brought in, in the 2014 Act and subsequent Information Sharing Bill to assist and consolidate good practice and ensure we operate to best current
practice. There is a significant piece of work that needs to be done to reiterate the necessity and conditions of good information sharing.

To get this right we need joint training sessions, for all staff from across partner agencies in the City, to ensure there is a consistent approach, understanding and procedures for sharing information.

5. **Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM are reasonable and accurate?**

   No. A City the size of Glasgow cannot have a one day training event for even one staff group. Training needs to be staggered to ensure there is no disruption to services. Staff cover enables other staff to be released to attend training.

   The FM calculates teaching time at 40%, for Glasgow Primary Depute/Principal Teacher's teaching time is 100% and this would be the same for Health staff, not 60% as stated. If we were to estimate the cost of backfill at 100% the estimated costs in the FM statement fall far short of the actual cost.

   As previously stated, in Glasgow we work in partnership with the Third Sector, Police Scotland, SCRA, Education Services, Health, Social Work and Adult Services Staff to deliver services for children in the City.

   We intend to provide the information sharing training jointly, planned and delivered by Service Managers, in each of the three areas (South, North East and North West) and providing a number of training sessions to ensure all relevant staff are included.

   This approach is more beneficial than individual agency training as it reinforces local partnership working, provides a consistent message across partner agencies, and enables relationship building and networking amongst staff. All of which is necessary for the effective implementation of the Named Person information sharing approach.

   We question the logic behind the proposal to establish a “small project team of 4 people to engage in a programme of design and co-produce generic and topical resources for stakeholder groups”, at the cost of £180,000. The reason we question this approach, is because of past experience, in 2016 a National CPD Named Person programme was delivered to Health Visitors, the reports back were that the training was too basic and did not meet their needs. They felt the knowledge they had gained from local training, meant they knew more than the trainers.

   Why not use the £180,000 to support local training? Local training is about putting the legislation into practice. It is about the practicalities of implementation; how partner agencies should work together and specific training to meet the needs of staff across the partner agencies in Glasgow.
6. If applicable, are you content that your organisation can meet any financial costs that it might incur as a result of the Bill? If not, how do you think these costs should be met?

No. This does not take into account the cost of on-going training provision for new staff or the cost of planning and developing training.

As previously stated the estimated backfill costs will not meet our needs and in addition there are hidden costs, such as venues, staff traveling expenses, etc. These costs could be met from the £310,000 that is proposed for NHS Education for Scotland to develop support materials and online modules.

- As stated in our response to Q5 above, the national training previously provided did not meet the needs of the staff group as it was intended for one national training approach for an individual agency and this does not work.

- We do not want published information as we have many boxes of support material provided by the national GIRFEC team, that we cannot use due to the changes to the 2014 Act. These would have been costly to produce, design, print and distribute across the country.

We need clear and comprehensive guidance from Scottish Government on the implementation of the amendments detailed in the Bill.

We would suggest you share the £310,000 across local authorities to enable the local design and delivery of training that is based on the training need of local frontline staff.

7. Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the Bill’s estimated costs and with the timescales over which they would be expected to arise?

This question needs clarification, the multi-agency group who developed this response, were unsure how this question related to the Information Sharing Bill, Financial Memorandum.

Wider Issues

8. Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures any costs associated with the Bill? If not, which other costs might be incurred and by whom?

No. The other costs that may be incurred are:

- Need for a number of staggered training sessions across three areas of the City.
- Planning and delivering training
- Cost of Venues
- Staff travel and parking expenses
- Possible legal fees as a result of local challenges in implementing the Bill.

9. Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation? If so, is it possible to quantify these costs?

Yes. We need time to implement the amendments to the 2014 Act, before this can be quantified.