

Well-being Partnership Board (WBPB)

Date: 22 October 2007

Report Title: Workshop to discuss restructure of sub-groups to support WBPB

Report of: Mun Thong Phung, Director, Adult, Culture and Community Services, Haringey Council

Summary

As part of the development of the WBSF, it was decided to review the subgroups which fit under the WBPB, to ensure that the structure is fit for purpose for its implementation. Following June's Well-being Chairs Executive, it was noted that some of the Well-being sub-groups had not been meeting whilst others had been very active. The aim of the workshop was to review the existing sub-groups structure and agree/disagree/amend the proposed structure.

The proposed structure seeks to reflect the seven outcomes adopted by the WBPB by aligning sub-groups in a more outcome focussed approach.

The participants of the workshop broadly agreed to restructure the groups and the terms of reference and membership should be agreed at the appropriate outcome focused group, to be ratified at December's Partnership Board. A revised structure chart, incorporating participants' comments, will be presented at December's WBPB.

Recommendations

For the Well-being Partnership Board to note progress and comment on the proposed structure.

For more information contact:

Helena Pugh
Interim Head of Policy
Commissioning & Strategy
Adult, Culture and Community
Services
Haringey Council
Tel: 020 8489 2943

Helen Constantine
Head of Business Management
Commissioning & Strategy
Adult, Culture and Community
Services
Haringey Council
Tel: 020 8489 3905

Helena.pugh@haringey.gov.uk

Helen.Constantine@haringey.gov.uk

1. Background

Following June's Well-being Chairs Executive, it was noted that some of the Well-being sub-groups had not been meeting whilst others had been very active. It was agreed by the Executive that where sub-groups were not adding value to support the Well-being Partnership Board, they would be suspended pending review of the new structure. The aim of the workshop was to review the existing sub-groups structure and agree/disagree/amend the proposed structure. Attendance consisted of those who currently sit on existing sub-groups and were best placed to comment on the proposal put before them (see Appendix 1 for a diagram of the current Well-being structure)

2. The Proposal

The whole concept of the well-being agenda is to shift from the narrow focus of treating illness to a more preventative, holistic approach of achieving well-being. Since the adoption by the WBPB of the seven outcomes stated in the White Paper (*Our, Our Care, Our Say*) it was felt that the Well-being Sub Groups structure should reflect these seven outcomes and become more outcome focussed in its approach.

This has been reflected in the proposed Well-being structure (see Appendix 2). The proposal which the attendees had to deliberate was threefold:

- 1) Overarching groups are now outcome focussed in order to ensure delivery of the Well-being agenda and priorities.
To cut down the number of groups, four outcome focussed groups and a Joint Commissioning Group which manages finance and performance were suggested:

Group	Outcome
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved health & emotional well-being
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved quality of life• Economic well-being
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Making a positive contribution
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased choice & control• Freedom from discrimination & harassment• Maintaining dignity & respect
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joint commissioning

- 2) Check to see if the right sub-groups are placed under the correct outcome focussed group.
- 3) Who should form the group membership of the outcome focussed groups.

3. Feedback on Proposal

All those present agreed in principle to the proposed structure. However, below is a summary of points made by the participants:

Area	Concern
Omissions/Additional areas to be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where would health issues that have not been covered sit? e.g. dental health; Culture and Well-being; effective transition from younger people to adults
Fear of groups working in silos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 3 (Making a Positive Contribution) could possibly be in danger of being labelled as the voluntary sector group • Joint Commissioning group needs to ensure they are in contact with sub-groups and are not completely cut off. • Links across sub-groups need to be clearly defined • Structure is too hierarchal and needs to be more of matrix set up
Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that service users and carers are included in all groups • Chairs of outcome focussed groups, to rotate between Haringey Council, HTPCT and the Voluntary Sector • In order to ensure continuity of planning, structure should highlight where permanent / occasional representatives should sit within the various groups.

4. Conclusions and Next Steps

- Outcome groups were broadly accepted; with the terms of reference and membership to be agreed at the appropriate outcome focused group, and be ratified at December's Partnership Board.
- In addition, it was noted that the structure chart does not mark the boundary of sub-groups or outcomes, but rather provides clarity and direction. The two-dimensional structure chart is a starting point but does not reflect the complexity and inter-relationships of the various sub-groups. The structure chart will be reviewed and a new model to represent the linkages between the groups will be presented at December's Well-being Partnership Board.