

## Scrutiny Review Terms of Reference Document

<b>Scrutiny Review</b>	Adult Social Care: Equality and Inclusion
<b>Responsible Committee</b>	People Scrutiny Committee
<b>Author</b>	Beth McGhee
<b>Version</b>	1.0
<b>Date</b>	7 July 2022

### 1 Background

1.1 At its meeting on 24 March 2022, the People Scrutiny Committee heard that the Adult Social Care (ASC) Department had developed an ASC Equality and Inclusion Strategy, which was now in its second year of delivery, and welcomed People Scrutiny's consideration of this strategy and the Department's work to deliver it. This could help identify any possible gaps in the approach and future priorities for the work.

1.2 The Committee agreed to appoint an Initial Scoping Board to consider whether the Committee should undertake a Scrutiny Review of this area.

1.3 The Scoping Board met on 1 July 2022 and considered a presentation from the Department on the Equality and Inclusion Strategy. The Strategy and the action plan for 2021/22 were also circulated to the Board for review as part of the scoping exercise.

1.4 The main issues discussed by the Scoping Board were:

- **Seldom heard/ hard to reach groups.** The Board heard that in delivering the Strategy, the Department had made progress in building a better understanding of East Sussex residents, their backgrounds and social care needs through better data collection and research. There was, however, need for a better understanding of health and social care inequalities faced by residents, clients and carers, particularly among groups the Department seldom heard from. The Department had also made progress in undertaking inclusive engagement of communities in its commissioning and planning but had more work to do to ensure people who did not usually engage with the Department were included in that engagement. The Department recognised that more work was needed to ensure they had identified and were engaging with seldom heard (sometimes also called 'hard to reach' groups), which included ethnically diverse groups, trans people, Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, people in rural areas and those who are homeless. The Board heard that it would be important to look closely at the available data to understand where seldom heard groups were, and whether there were seldom heard groups within broader communities that ASC should be engaging with.
- **Barriers to engagement and service use.** The Board discussed the importance of engaging with seldom heard groups and barriers to this being achieved. The Board also discussed the importance of ensuring all residents, including those groups, were aware of, and knew how to access, culturally appropriate services to ensure the Department was meeting the eligible needs

of all demographics. This discussion included recognition that borough and district councils may have links to communities seldom heard from by ASC that could be utilised; that sometimes seldom heard groups did not engage with public services by choice, perhaps because they did not trust or have confidence in them; and that residents may just not have awareness of the services they were entitled to. The Department had commissioned research by Activmob Community Interest Company (CIC) (in response to a recommendation of a previous Scrutiny Review of ASC Information and Signposting) which had found that the general level of understanding of what the ASCH Department offer, how ASC services work, how ASC is funded, and personal contributions was low. The Department knew it had work to do in tackling misconceptions about ASC and looking at the way it described itself to the public.

- **Ukrainian refugees.** The presentation the Board received had noted that the arrival of new migrants and Ukrainian guests created a need to consider ways to strengthen community cohesion. The Board discussed the services needed to support Ukrainian guests and heard that the variation in national support schemes for people arriving from different parts of the world could create risks for community relations and cohesion. The Board noted that while Ukrainian refugees would not necessarily be regarded as seldom heard or hard to reach, because the support package local authorities were delivering meant they were closely engaged with, other refugees and migrants might fall into this group.

1.5 The Board also sought assurance on other areas covered by the presentation including work to address workforce vacancies; work to provide enhanced support for staff from minority backgrounds; work to extend a safe, fair and inclusive work environment to agency staff; and how respecting clients' requests in how their care is delivered was balanced with not complying with discriminatory demands.

## 2 Scope of the Review

2.1 The Board concluded, on the basis of the discussion with officers, that while they were encouraged by the presentation demonstrating the level, and detail, of work underway to tackle equality issues, have inclusive services, and create a safe, fair and inclusive work environment for staff; there were issues that could benefit from closer examination by scrutiny. The Board therefore resolved to recommend to the Committee that it undertake a scrutiny review of ASC equality and inclusion work.

2.2 To refine the scope of this review, Members recommend that the Scrutiny Review should explore how the Department engages with seldom heard communities and whether residents of all backgrounds know how to access ASC services. Members recommend that this is explored through the following **key lines of enquiry**:

### 1. Defining and engaging with seldom heard groups

- Who are the key communities in East Sussex that ASC seldom hears from in its engagement but should?
- How could the Department improve its engagement with those groups?

### 2. Accessing services

- Building on previous research, what is the level of understanding and awareness of ASC services among residents, including those from seldom heard groups, and are there ways this can be improved?
- If residents, including those in seldom heard groups, are aware of ASC services but choosing not to access them, why is that?
- Are there barriers preventing residents, including seldom heard groups, approaching ASC services?
  - Is lack of trust or confidence in services a barrier?
  - Is use of digital communication and services a barrier? [*This item has been added following a recommendation of the Initial Scoping Board of Use of Digital and Technology in ASC*]
- If there are barriers, how could they be addressed?

2.3 The Board wanted to reflect in the terms of reference that refugees and migrants might form one of the seldom heard communities considered in the review. However, this was expected to exclude Ukrainian guests on the basis they are generally well-known to services and being actively engaged with.

### **3 Review methods**

3.1 It is anticipated that the Review Board will review documentary evidence, question witnesses and undertake research in order to gather evidence to inform its recommendations. It is anticipated that these will include:

- Using equalities data, research and information about communities in East Sussex to identify key seldom heard groups
- Speaking to representatives of the groups identified
- Considering learning from the work of other partners, including the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector and local borough and district councils, in engaging with those communities
- Considering any national best practice or guidance in ASC services
- Refreshing understanding of the findings of Activmob CIC research regarding accessing ASC services and the Department's response

### **4. Review Organisation and Responsibilities**

#### **4.1 Initial Scoping Board**

The initial scoping for this review was undertaken by Councillors Geary, Ungar and Webb.

#### **4.2 Review Board**

The Review Board is: *to be confirmed by the People Scrutiny Committee*

The Chair of the Review Board is: *to be confirmed by the People Scrutiny Committee*

#### **4.3 The Review Board is responsible for:**

- making decisions regarding the scope and direction of the review;
- monitoring and control of the overall progress of the review;
- agreeing how Board members will undertake evidence gathering activities as required by the review;

- considering and providing challenge to all evidence presented to it; and
- developing and agreeing the final report, including the findings and recommendations of the review.

## 5 Scrutiny Review Support

5.1 Support for the review will be provided by the Policy Team to:

- manage the review process;
- undertake research as agreed by the Board;
- draft the final report.

5.2 The Lead Officer who will support the review from the Policy Team is Beth McGhee, Senior Policy and Scrutiny Adviser. Their role is to manage the review, ensuring its aims and objectives are met and that the final report is delivered to the People Scrutiny Committee within the agreed timescales.

## 6 Scrutiny Review Completion

6.1 When the review has been completed the Lead Officer will co-ordinate the production of a final report outlining the findings and recommendations for agreement by the Review Board. Once agreed, the Review Board will present this to the People Scrutiny Committee for it to agree the recommendations.

6.2 The report will then be presented to Cabinet for comment and County Council for approval. Progress updates on how the recommendations are being implemented by the Department will be presented to the People Scrutiny Committee in due course (usually six and twelve months after the review has been approved by County Council).

## 7 Review Timetable

7.1 Based on the initial scoping of the Review, the Review Board aims to submit the final report to the People Scrutiny Committee at the meeting to be held on 16 March 2023.

7.2 An initial timetable of the meetings and activities required to complete the review is outlined below. [*The number of review board meetings is not fixed and there can be more or less depending on the nature of the review. The Review Board will agree the number and content of the meetings and review activity*].

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timescale/Date</b>
<u>Review Board Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider initial evidence</li> <li>• Review lines of enquiry/terms of reference</li> <li>• Agree further evidence gathering/requirements</li> </ul>	Mid-September 2022
<u>Review Board Activity/Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence gathering</li> </ul>	October – December 2022
<u>Review Board Activity/Meeting</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence gathering</li> </ul>	October – December 2022

Draft Scrutiny Review report and finalise findings and recommendations of the review.	January 2023
<b><u>Final Review Board Meeting to agree Report</u></b> Review Board meeting to agree draft report, findings and recommendations with input from key officers.	February 2023
Deadline for Report Dispatch	8 March 2023
<b><u>Report to People Scrutiny Committee for agreement</u></b>	16 March 2023
<b>Report to Cabinet</b>	18 April 2023
<b>Report to Council</b>	9 May 2023