
To: Renfrewshire Integration Joint Board

On: 22 March 2024

Report by: Head of Strategic Planning & Health Improvement

Heading: Sustainable Futures Programme: Final options for consideration

Direction Required to Health Board, Council or Both	Direction to:	
	1. No Direction Required	X
	2. NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde	
	3. Renfrewshire Council	
	4. NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde and Renfrewshire Council	

1. Summary

- 1.1. This paper is the second of two Sustainable Futures papers to be considered by the IJB at this meeting. It follows on from the programme update provided and sets out further details on the findings of the impact assessment processes for four proposals initially presented to the IJB in November 2023. The paper seeks a decision from the IJB on whether each proposal should now proceed to implementation. Consideration of the Mirin and Milldale proposal at this meeting has been paused following the lodging of a petition for Judicial Review. Further information is provided in Section 7.
- 1.2. The paper also sets out in further detail how this assessment process has been undertaken between December 2023 and February 2024, including the engagement carried out, and the criteria and scoring utilised in the subsequent options appraisal. These have been informed and reinforced by a robust equality impact assessment process. It is important to note however, that as this paper sets out, it is not possible to include the depth of detail developed within this report. To address this, IJB members have received several updates, in writing and through development sessions, to inform their decision making.
- 1.3. The proposals set out within the paper have been developed within a continuing challenging and volatile financial context. Consequently, further savings proposals will be required and will be brought to future meetings of the IJB at the appropriate time.
-

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that the IJB:

- Note the overview of engagement undertaken between December 2023 and February 2024, including the process adopted for updating the IJB on proposal development (Sections 4 and 6);

- Note the updates provided on the process of development for EQIAs and options appraisals (Section 5);
- Note the update provided on the Mirin and Milldale proposal (Section 7);
- Consider the assessment of the option to close the Flexicare service, and approve or reject implementation of this proposal (Section 8);
- Consider the assessment of the option to reduce internal care homes from 3 to 2, and approve or reject implementation of this proposal through closure of Montrose Care Home (Section 9);
- Consider the assessment of the option to permanently close Montrose and Falcon Day Services for Older People, and approve or reject implementation of this proposal (Section 10); and
- Consider the assessment of the option to reduce the capacity of the Disability Resource Centre (DRC), and approve or reject implementation of this proposal (Section 11).

3. Background

- 3.1. At its meeting in November 2023, the IJB considered the update provided on the progression of the Sustainable Futures programme and assessed a range of indicative savings proposals. In addition to proposals which the IJB was asked to note or approve, there were several options where approval was sought to move to a process of engagement and more detailed impact assessment. Specifically, approval was provided by the IJB to further explore and assess the following options:
1. A proposed reduction in the internally managed Care Home estate from three homes to two homes.
 2. Closing the Flexicare service.
 3. Permanent implementation of a stabilised Older People's Day Support model through the confirmed closure of Falcon Day Centre and Montrose Day Centre, pending the outcome of the Residential Care proposal.
 4. Aligning capacity within the Disability Resource Centre with reduced occupancy.
 5. Combining the Mirin and Milldale day services.
- 3.2. In line with the approach agreed at that meeting, this paper sets out final proposals relating to options 1 to 4 above. A Judicial Review petition has been served on the IJB and Renfrewshire Council in respect of Option 5, which assessed the potential to merge Mirin and Milldale day services. Accordingly, the IJB will require legal advice on the content of the Judicial Review before further consideration of this proposal.
- 3.3. Further detail on each of the elements of assessment is provided in Sections 4 and 5 of this paper. Following consideration of this additional information, the IJB is asked to decide whether each proposal should proceed to implementation.

4. Further assessment of options: approach to engagement

4.1. The update to the IJB at its meeting in January provided a summary of the engagement activity being undertaken on each of the proposals set out in November 2023. This process extended into February 2024 to ensure appropriate opportunity to engage with service users and residents potentially impacted by the proposals under consideration. IJB members have had the opportunity to attend several of these sessions to hear feedback, with the overall engagement programme for proposals being considered today including the following activity. It is noted that these figures do not include the breadth of engagement undertaken in relation to the Mirin and Milldale proposal:

- A total of 6 sessions to engage with families and carers both online and in person. Engagement sessions for Older People and Disability Resource Centre families and carers were not held due to low demand, with those interested engaged with on an individual basis.
- A total of 12 staff engagement sessions across all proposals, held both online and in person and including ad hoc sessions, supported by opportunities for staff to discuss questions with their line managers outwith these sessions.
- Reflecting the HSCP's duty to engage with service users as part of any change process, officers have sought to engage with residents and service users on an individual basis where this was possible. For example, 12 individuals were engaged within the Disability Resource Centre and 21 with Older People's Day Centres.
- In total, 209 attendances (86 family and carer attendances / 123 staff attendances) have been recorded through the 18 sessions included in the engagement process across the proposals considered today. An additional 37 online or paper feedback forms were received.
- It should be noted however, that the figures above include both staff and family members / carers who attended more than one session.
- The provision of a write up of key points raised in engagement sessions to show that discussions had been captured, supported by factsheets and FAQs.
- A broad range of Sustainable Futures updates provided through existing fora, including Care Planning Groups, the Providers Forum and the Strategic Planning Group. In total 32 updates (as at the end of January 2024) have been recorded.

4.2. In addition to the engagement outlined above, the HSCP has continued to respond to enquiries, Freedom of Information requests and complaints received. IJB members have also received a range of communications during this time and engaged with individuals and groups separately.

4.3. The HSCP has sought to reflect lessons learned through the engagement process to ensure that issues that have arisen in relation to distribution lists, access to online meetings, and the provision of notes following engagement events are addressed as far as possible. Following this IJB meeting, the HSCP

will also continue to review emerging lessons to inform the future programme approach.

5. EQIA and options appraisal process adopted

Development of Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs)

5.1. The feedback received through the engagement process set out above in Section 4 has been combined with available HSCP data, professional expertise and research into relevant national policy, legislation, and examples of good practice elsewhere to develop EQIAs for each of the proposals considered within this paper. These impact assessments enable consideration of whether any proposed changes have a disproportionate impact on people with one or more of the 9 protected characteristics covered under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

5.2. To undertake an EQIA, the HSCP utilises the process, guidance and templates made available by NHSGGC's Equality and Human Rights Team. This is utilised for all relevant proposals and strategies developed by the HSCP (both health-related and social care-related) as it ensures a consistent, logical, and robust assessment is carried out each time, so that the IJB and HSCP meet their legal duties under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty in Scotland. Other HSCPs also follow the process developed by NHSGGC for EQIAs they carry out. In doing so, the following steps have been undertaken:

- Draft EQIAs were developed, utilising data available and drawing upon the feedback provided during engagement sessions and related research.
- These draft EQIAs were submitted for review to the Equality and Human Rights Team for review, comment, and further guidance for development.
- The EQIAs were updated and reviewed by each Project Board.

5.3. In developing the EQIAs, the HSCP recognises that these assessments are intended to be 'live' documents that are subject to future review and update. Where additional evidence becomes available, this will be included within future iterations of the assessments.

5.4. Reflecting the points set out above, the range of proposals submitted to the IJB in November, and agreed for further assessment, sought to be equitable and fair in identifying savings across all service user groups. Should the IJB decide to proceed with a subset of the proposals set out, this may result in an increased proportion of current savings falling on one or more service user groups. This will be considered in future iterations of the equality impact assessments as appropriate.

The Options Appraisal process and criteria

5.5. All of the options have been assessed using the following consistent criteria and weighting as part of this options appraisal, as set out in the table below.

These criteria have been developed to align with good practice options appraisal processes and were considered and approved by the Sustainable Futures Programme Board. This assessment has also been informed by the feedback received and the equality impact assessment process.

No.	Criteria	Weighting
1	Contribution to budget sustainability and ability to deliver cost effective services (e.g., net savings or opportunity for increase in income)	35%
2	Impact on service quality / outcomes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on service users • Impact on families and unpaid carers • Impact on staff • Impact on Service Level Agreements • Impact on local, board level and national targets 	25%
3	Alignment with Strategic Plan themes, Workforce Plan and relevant policy & legislation	10%
4	Risk Impact	10%
5	Reputational Impact	10%
6	Ability to implement	10%

5.6. In using this options appraisal approach, the following points provide further detail on the nature of the process and how it has been applied:

- It is important to weight criteria to reflect that some have greater importance than others. For example, the contribution to budget sustainability should have higher importance than the difficulty of implementing a proposal. Weighting means that some criteria will contribute more to the overall score than others.
- Linked to the above point, reflecting that the current focus of the Sustainable Futures programme is on achieving financial sustainability, this has been weighted at 35%. However, it is essential that the impact of proposals on service quality are given equal weighting, which is provided through the combination of criteria 2 and 3. Implementation requirements account for the remaining 30% of the weighting.
- Each proposal is given an initial score between 0 to 10 against each of the criteria. These scores can then be multiplied against the weighting identified to provide an overall weighted score for comparison. The maximum weighted score any option could achieve across all of the criteria is 10.
- Where a single proposal has been identified, for example the proposed closure of the Flexicare service, this has been scored against the current 'As Is' position to provide a comparison, in line with good practice for options appraisals.

5.7. In addition, the following examples explain how scoring has been undertaken for each of the criteria included in the appraisal process:

- The contribution to budget sustainability scores are scored comparatively against one another. For example, if an option was proposed to save £200k, this would be given an initial score of 10, to give a weighted score of 3.5. If the alternative option was expected to save £100k, this would be given an initial score of 5, to give a weighted score of 1.75.
- For the scores for 'impact on service quality' and 'alignment with strategies, policies and legislation', the more positive the impact and alignment, the higher the initial score on the scale of 0 to 10.
- However, for the risk impact and reputational risk criteria, the higher the associated risk or reputational impact, then the lower the score on the scale of 0 to 10 will be to reflect the more negative impacts that have identified. For example, a proposal that had no risk attached would score 10, however an alternative proposal which was deemed high risk would be scored closer to 0.
- The easier a proposal is to implement, the higher the initial score provided on the scale of 0 to 10.

5.8. The progress made in developing options, and each options appraisal assessment has been considered by each Project Board and the Sustainable Futures Programme Board. Further details on the assessments are provided in the following sections of this paper and supporting appendices. As noted above, IJB members have received additional details through the development session process, alongside briefing documentation, to support their decision-making. This is set out in the following section.

6. Options development and detailed discussion with the IJB

6.1. The IJB approved the broad scope of the Sustainable Futures approach in March 2023 and agreed the scope and structure of the programme at its following meeting in June 2023. Following this agreement, programme governance arrangements were put in place and detailed work commenced on the development of potential savings options.

6.2. The update papers provided to the IJB have continued to set out the breadth and complexity of the activity that has been undertaken to identify these initial options, and subsequently to engage with stakeholders on these prior to development of options appraisals and equality impact assessments. However, given the scale of ongoing activity, it is not possible to include all of the detailed analysis undertaken in the papers that the IJB is asked to consider.

6.3. The HSCP has therefore continued to engage with IJB members throughout the Sustainable Futures programme to date through a services of development sessions both in-person and held online, to provide further detail on emerging proposals and provide the opportunity for additional discussion and questions. These sessions have also been supported by supplementary

documentation covering questions relating to national policy, the current baseline of services within scope, the nature of proposals, and mitigating actions for risks or negative impacts identified. The development session briefings have been intended to support IJB decision-making, and a summary is set out in the table below:

Date	Nature of Development Session Briefing
27 October 2023	Discussion on updated approach to Sustainable Futures programme and identified proposals to be included within November IJB papers.
17 November 2023	<p>Session for IJB voting members providing further opportunity to discuss options for consideration at November meeting and to ask further clarifying questions.</p> <p><i>Note: At its November meeting, the IJB gave approval to proceed with further assessment of the options set out in the Sustainable Futures paper, to be brought back for final consideration in March 2024.</i></p>
15 December 2023	Update on early engagement process and initial feedback received.
25 January 2024	<p>Development Session for IJB voting members covering content of papers prior to IJB meeting on 26 January covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme update, including an update on engagement process undertaken to date, including lessons learned. • Opportunity for in depth discussion and consideration of scenarios to articulate potential impact of proposed changes to non-residential charging policy captured in IJB paper, supported by FAQs. <p><i>Note: At its January meeting, the IJB agreed that recommendations should be submitted to a subsequent Leadership Board meeting.</i></p>
23 February 2024	<p>Development session for all IJB members covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on residential care proposal covering its rationale, engagement carried out and implications including staffing models and impact on residents and families affected. • Focus on the Mirin and Milldale proposal, recognising challenges raised through engagement process. Further details provided on the national policy context, current demand, benchmarking against other HSCPs, and key

	<p>features of the proposed model. Supported by detailed policy and proposal briefing documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of current position of wider projects and update to be provided at the March IJB.
13 March 2024	<p>Session for IJB voting members covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content of papers to be considered at the March IJB meeting, including the assessments which the IJB would be asked to consider. • An update on the options appraisal process and EQIAs. • Update and discussion on the petition for Judicial Review.

7. Merging Mirin and Milldale day services: position update

7.1. As noted earlier in this paper, the proposal to merge the Mirin and Milldale day services was considered by the IJB in November 2023 and approval was provided for further assessment to be undertaken, alongside stakeholder engagement and the development of an options appraisal and EQIA.

7.2. This work has been undertaken however a petition for a Judicial Review of the IJB's decision, as set out in 7.1 above, in November 2023 was lodged with the Court of Session on 4 March 2024. Accordingly, the IJB will require legal advice on the content of the Judicial Review before further consideration of this proposal.

8. Closing Flexicare service: assessment

8.1. The assessment for the closure of the Flexicare service included a comparison of the proposal against the status quo position which would maintain provision of Flexicare. The results of this assessment are provided in the table below. The IJB is asked to consider the assessment and decide to approve or reject implementation of this proposal.

Options Appraisal Summary: Closure of the Flexicare Service	
Option	Overall score (Max score 10)
Closure of the Flexicare service	5.10
No change (As Is position)	3.55
Commentary on assessment:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment undertaken shows that the proposal to close the Flexicare service scores more highly than the 'As Is' position. • The assessment also recognises that there is less risk and reputational impact associated with maintaining the current position. 	

- It is also noted that Flexicare is not a registered service and the nature of the service provided is based on a time-limited period for individuals who may access support for a short time each week. The highest service provision provided is once per week for two hours of informal social activity.
- The overall scoring reflects reduced service utilisation and challenges in engaging with registered service users. 45 service users have been identified as priority, not all of whom are actively engaging.
- The service has also lost volunteers following the pandemic and has been unable to resume business as usual activity as a result.
- Concerns have been raised during the engagement process regarding the closure of the service. These have been captured within the EQIA and include impact due to age and disability, and mitigating actions have also been identified.
- **The proposal would provide savings of £170k.**

9. Reduction from 3 to 2 internal care homes: assessment

9.1. The assessment carried out in relation to the proposed reduction from 3 to 2 internal residential care homes has considered two elements:

- An assessment of the proposal against the as-is position; and
- Should the IJB approve a decision to close a care home, an assessment of which care home would be most appropriate.

9.2. Further details on scoring are provided in Appendix 1. The IJB is asked to consider the assessment and decide to approve or reject implementation of this proposal.

Options Appraisal Summary: Reduction from 3 to 2 Residential Care Homes	
Option	Overall score (Max score 10)
Reduction from 3 to 2 Care Homes	7.05
No change (As Is position)	3.85
Additional Analysis: Most appropriate Care Home (pending IJB decision to reduce from 3 to 2 Residential Care Homes)	
Close Hunterhill	6.35
Close Montrose	6.48
Close Renfrew	4.33
Commentary on assessment:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the proposal to reduce from 3 to 2 care homes scored more highly than the As Is position. 	

- This reflects that a reduced care home estate would be more sustainable and enable more stable staffing models.
- Further assessment also highlighted that Montrose scored most highly when considering the most appropriate care home to close, although this will not deliver the greatest level of savings.
- The assessment has shown that the cumulative impact on residents and staff is lower for Montrose care home, whilst this proposal also enables continued provision on internally delivered residential care in both localities.
- The closure of Montrose would also align with the proposed permanent closure of Montrose day centre.
- The EQIA undertaken has identified potential related risks for residents, families and staff, arising due to age, disability and sex and include the impact on individuals' health, additional travel requirements and the recognition that a greater proportion of residents and staff are female. Further detail is provided in the appendix.
- **This proposal, based on the selection of Montrose, would provide a saving of £399k.**

9.3. Should the above proposals be approved by the IJB, admissions to all three HSCP residential homes would be paused, in order to allow bed numbers to be balanced and for capacity to be used for affected residents. There would be a timescale of at least four months before any resident would move to a new home, unless any individual and their families wish to move sooner. This is to enable full consultation and person-centred planning to take place with every person to understand what is important to them and their loved ones, and to reduce the impact of the moving process as far as possible.

10. Permanent closure of Montrose and Falcon day services: assessment

10.1. This assessment necessarily follows on from the options appraisal carried out in relation to the proposal to close a residential care home. Both Montrose and Renfrew Care Homes have day centres attached and consequently any decision in relation to those care homes would have a knock-on impact on required decisions to close or re-open an older people's day centre.

Options Appraisal Summary: Permanent Closure of Montrose and Falcon Day Services	
Option	Overall score (Max score 10)
Current position (maintain closure of Falcon and Montrose day centres)	7.25
Revert to pre-pandemic model of all five day centres open	2.75
Commentary on assessment:	

- The proposal to maintain the closure of Falcon and Montrose day centres for older people scored more highly than reverting to the pre-pandemic position of utilisation of five day centres, and was assessed as the most appropriate and effective action to take.
- This reflects that the permanent closure is the 'As Is' position and is easier to implement, whereas investment in resources and potential building works would potentially be required to reopen the centres.
- The proposal aligns with observed occupancy and aligns with feedback from staff and service users who have broadly indicated that they are settled at their current location.
- The proposal also aligns with the findings of the residential care homes assessment.
- The proposal will not provide a financial saving as current staffing models have been enhanced to reflect the needs of those accessing current building-based services.
- The EQIA does not identify any disproportionate impacts on the majority of protected characteristics from the proposal to permanently close the day centres, reflecting that this is the current, interim, position. Whilst it does note a potential impact due to age, alternative provision is currently in place and available.

10.2. The IJB is asked to consider the above assessment and decide to approve or reject implementation of this proposal.

11. **Reduction of Disability Resource Centre capacity: assessment**

11.1. This proposal was to reduce the current establishment in the Disability Resource Centre by 2.04 FTE through vacancy management processes. This would align service capacity with service occupancy which has been observed over the last 12 months.

11.2. As such, this proposal does not require changes to the current service model and therefore a detailed options appraisal scoring has not been carried out. However, a summary of the assessment and equality impact assessment carried out are provided below. The IJB is asked to consider the assessment and decide to approve or reject implementation of this proposal.

DRC Capacity Reduction Commentary on assessment:

- This option will have minimal impact on service quality, outcomes and provision. There may be some impact from the deletion of posts as responsibilities are realigned.
- The option reflects observed reductions in service occupancy and maintains the continued flexible model of provision including community outreach, digital and building-based support.
- The risk associated with this proposal has been deemed as low. The assessment, including EQIA, considered that demand for the service may increase in future however this is not anticipated considering

recent trends for occupancy at the DRC and building-based services in general.

- The full saving will not be realised immediately as it is based on vacancy management once these arise.
- **This will provide a saving of £65k.**

12. Link between this paper and 2024/25 Delegated Budget Paper

- 12.1. A further paper to be considered by the IJB at this meeting sets out the proposed budget for 2024/25. Following previous discussions with IJB members, the Delegated Health and Social Care Budget paper sets out the CIPFA guidance on the Chief Finance Officer's responsibilities for setting a balanced budget and ensuring that spending plans are appropriate to maintain the balance of available resources and ensure that the IJB remains in sound financial health. The CIPFA guidance also sets out the IJB's responsibilities for setting a balanced budget, and the role of voting members. This includes responsibility for medium term financial planning, budget setting and associated monitoring. Voting members have responsibility for the organisation's financial health and long-term viability and the IJB should collectively set the tone that financial management is core to achieving strategic aims, and to demonstrate that public money is used well.
- 12.2. Should the IJB not agree to all of the proposals set out in this paper, the IJB will be able to set a balanced budget on a non-recurring basis for 2024/25 however this will require further utilisation of available reserves to the amount of the savings proposals that do not progress. As such, the reserves held by the IJB would be drawn down at an accelerated rate potentially impacting on the general reserves balance which will likely fall below the commitment within the IJB's Reserves Policy to hold reserves amounting to at least 2% of the IJB's budget. This would reduce the IJB's financial resilience. It has been prudent and necessary to hold this level of reserves to account for any unforeseen circumstances which have arisen or will arise, such as the current requirement to meet additional pay costs relating to the re-evaluation of frontline staff roles.
- 12.3. Considering the use of reserves outlined above, the IJB's budget will not be in recurring balance for 2024/25 and this will require the Chief Officer to continue to bring a rolling programme of savings to the IJB for consideration. In doing so, and reflective of the CIPFA guidance, the HSCP seeks direction from the IJB on areas which members would wish to prioritise for savings.
- 12.4. Where a balanced budget cannot be delivered, for example where there are insufficient reserves to bridge any projected gap, a financial recovery plan will be required. As set out previously, this will require (i) suspension of ongoing development initiatives where necessary; (ii) the establishment of waiting lists; (iii) the restriction of overtime to critical cover only; (iv) holding non-frontline vacancies and (vi) all discretionary spend decisions to be made jointly by the Chief Officer and Heads of Service. The IJB may request additional funding from its partner organisations to meet any gap however, as set out in the

Integration Scheme, this would be on the basis of an agreed plan for repayment in future years.

Implications of the Report

1. **Financial** – This paper captures the final proposals for options initially considered by the IJB in November 2023. Approval was provided to undertake further analysis of these. The paper also sets out the full year savings impact of the proposals, should they be approved.
2. **HR & Organisational Development** – HR colleagues, alongside Staff-side and Trade Union colleagues are members of the Sustainable Futures Programme Board and retain oversight of programme progress and the development of options appraisals. Proposals set out will have an impact on staff and the HSCP will continue to apply existing HR processes and policies to support staff impacted.
3. **Strategic Plan and Community Planning** – This paper aligns with the Sustainable Futures theme set out within the IJB's Strategic Plan 2022-25.
4. **Wider Strategic Alignment** – This paper also aligns with the IJB's Medium Term Financial Plan 2022-25.
5. **Legal** – All updates in this report are consistent with the HSCP's statutory duties and support delivery of the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014.
6. **Property/Assets** – The proposals considered, should they be implemented, will to impact on the HSCP's existing use of property. Ownership of property currently utilised remains reserved to NHSGGC and Renfrewshire Council and engagement with these partners will remain ongoing.
7. **Information Technology** – No implications from this report.
8. **Equality & Human Rights** – The proposals discussed in this paper have been subject to the development of full equality impact assessments (EQIAs). These are live documents which will be reviewed and updated as appropriate in future.
9. **Fairer Scotland Duty** – Any implications on the Fairer Scotland Duty from the proposals identified have been captured and assessed as part of the EQIA process.
10. **Health & Safety** – The proposals considered, should they be implemented will impact on the property and assets currently utilised. Implementation of changes to service models, staff ways of working and building usage, should they be approved, will continue to involve engagement with Health & Safety.
11. **Procurement** – No implications from this report.
12. **Risk** – Risks and issues arising from the contents of this report are tracked and managed on an ongoing basis and incorporated into reports to the IJB Audit, Risk and Scrutiny Committee as appropriate.
13. **Privacy Impact** – No implications from this report.

List of Background Papers: None

Author: David Fogg, Strategic Lead and Improvement Manager

Any enquiries regarding this paper should be directed to Frances Burns, Head of Strategic Planning and Health Improvement (frances.burns@renfrewshire.gov.uk)
--

Appendix 1: Options Appraisal Scoring and Commentary

Closure of Flexicare Service

Option	Overall score (Max score 10)	Viability	Deliverability		Feasibility		
		Budget Sustainability	Impact on service quality	Alignment with Strategic Plan and Policy	Risk Impact	Reputational Impact	Ability to implement
Closure of the Flexicare service	5.10	3.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3
No change (As Is position)	3.55	0.0	1.25	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.5

Commentary on scoring

Findings

- The closure of the Flexicare service has a higher score than the current 'As-Is' position. This reflects the potential savings achievable. The scoring recognises that there is less risk and reputational impact associated with maintaining the current position.
- The scoring also reflects the removal of an element of choice from individuals' support.

Supporting Commentary

- The closure of Flexicare would achieve savings of £170k.
- Flexicare is not a registered service. The nature of the service provided is based on a time-limited period for individuals who may access support for a short period of time each week. The highest service provision provided is once per week for two hours of informal social activity.
- Due to a loss of volunteers post-pandemic, the service has been unable to resume business as usual activity.
- Continued provision of support to those registered to attend the service has proved challenging, as service utilisation has also decreased in recent years and the level of active engagement has also decreased.
- A total of 45 priority service users have been identified, not all of whom currently actively engage. Further work is underway to determine what proportion of service users may require a care package following closure of the service. This would potentially move costs to other remaining services.
- The service would require further review if not closed, as part of the planned strategic review of day services in 2024/25.

- Concerns have been raised during the engagement process regarding the closure of the service. These have been captured within the EQIA and include impact due to age and disability. Individuals impacted will be supported through individual plans and the HSCP will continue to promote equality of opportunity through its service models for people with learning disabilities and/or autism, providing alternative service options or signposting to wider support available, in line with the IJB's Strategic Plan and national policy.

Reduction from 3 to 2 Residential care Homes: Scoring Breakdown

Option	Overall score (Max score 10)	Viability	Deliverability		Feasibility		
		Budget Sustainability	Impact on service quality	Alignment with Strategic Plan and Policy	Risk Impact	Reputational Impact	Ability to implement
Move from 3 to 2 Care Homes	7.05	3.5	1.75	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.4
Current Position (As Is)	3.85	0	1.25	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.8
Additional Analysis: Most appropriate Care Home (pending IJB decision to reduce from 3 to 2 Residential Care Homes)							
Close Hunterhill	6.35	3.5	1.25	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.4
Close Montrose	6.48	2.53	1.75	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.5
Close Renfrew	4.33	2.58	0.75	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3
Commentary on scoring							
<u>Findings</u>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moving from three to two care homes scores more highly than remaining 'As Is'. Each Care Home has then been scored with Montrose achieving the highest score. Closure of Montrose would provide the lowest saving (£399k), followed by Renfrew (£407k) and Hunterhill (£511k). 							
<u>Supporting Commentary</u>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The findings reflect that continuing with the model of three care homes is not sustainable and does not fulfil staffing requirements to meet the needs of residents. A reduction to two care homes will reflect changes in demand and preferences for support within the community and will enable the capacity within remaining care homes to be utilised in a more sustainable service with a stable, enhanced staffing model. In addition, the changing complexity of need means individuals are more likely to require nursing care than residential care. A move to two fully utilised care homes provides increased opportunities for variety, activities and friendships to be developed. 							

- The overall impact on residents is lower for Montrose as there is a lower number of residents, therefore requiring the lowest number of placements.
- Selection of either Montrose or Hunterhill enables the HSCP to maintain internal provision in each of the two localities in Renfrewshire, Paisley and West Renfrewshire.
- The day centre in Montrose is currently closed which would therefore reduce implementation considerations, this is also under consideration through a separate proposal. Closure of Renfrew Care Home would impact on the operation of the associated day centre which is currently in operation.
- Montrose currently has the lowest number of staff (FTE) in its staffing establishment, therefore the overall impact on staff is less than for Hunterhill and Renfrew. Montrose is less accessible than Hunterhill and Montrose and has typically found it more difficult to recruit staff.
- The EQIA undertaken has identified related risks for residents, families and staff, for example relating to travel to a new care home location and sets out mitigating actions to address these and/or address their likelihood, including consideration of continued locality provision.
- The EQIA reflects the potential impact on residents' health due to age or disability following the move, and the importance of familiarity. These impacts will be mitigated by the development of person-centred plans, maintaining familiarity where possible including friendship groups, and timelines designed around the needs of individuals.
- The EQIA also reflects that there would not be a disproportionate impact based due to the characteristic of 'Sex' however does identify that the majority of residents are female. The majority of staff are also female and established HR policy from Renfrewshire Council will be followed to support staff through any transition.

Permanent Closure of Montrose and Falcon Day Centres

Option	Overall score (Max score 10)	Viability	Deliverability		Feasibility		
		Budget Sustainability	Impact on service quality	Alignment with Strategic Plan and Policy	Risk Impact	Reputational Impact	Ability to implement
Maintain closure of Falcon and Montrose day centres)	7.25	1.75	2.0	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.0
Revert to pre-pandemic model of five day centres	2.75	0.7	0.75	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.1

Commentary on scoring

Findings

- Option 1, to formalise the current provision of three day centres for older people, scores more highly and is therefore the most viable option based on assessment. This reflects that reopening Montrose and Falcon would not reflect observed demand and occupancy and would be more difficult to implement, impacting on current staffing models and requiring additional resource and investment.

Supporting Commentary

- The current model of three day centres alongside community outreach is already in place and is operating efficiently with a settled, supporting staff structure and infrastructure. All three centres have sufficient and appropriate support in place based on needs, demand and occupancy.
- The three centres will continue to cover both localities ensuring those who require to attend a day centre can, regardless of where they live.
- Prolonged observed occupancy levels and projections of future demand align with reduced building-based services.
- Reverting to five day centres would involve further change for staff and service users who have primarily indicated they are settled.
- The option to formalise the closure of Montrose and Falcon will not provide a financial benefit.
- The proposal to formalise the closure of Montrose and Falcon aligns with policy around choice, control and flexibility and a reduction in reliance on building-based services, and also aligns with the residential care assessment undertaken.
- The EQIA does not identify any disproportionate impacts on the majority of protected characteristics from the proposal to permanently close the day centres, reflecting that this is the current, interim, position. Whilst it does note a potential impact due to the age of those that access

day services, alternative provision is currently in place and available. This reflects (i) that the proposed confirmed model has already been in operation on an interim basis and (ii) that service users and staff have provided feedback that they are settled in their current location. Any potential impacts which emerge will be managed using existing working practices and service / organisational policies.