	Papers	*Action*
1. **Apologies**		
2. **AOB**		
3. **Minute of Meeting 07 June 2016**		
4. **Learning and Development** – update a) Secondment/Mentoring opportunities	*Verbal*	*SD* *NH/TP* */AH*
5. **Equalities Network** a) Women into Leadership b)	*Verbal*	*SD*
6. IT update a) IT operational Plan - status b) CMS Hosting Plan – update c) Egress Switch – report d) Joint IT Oversight Board	*To confirm status* *To confirm EMT position*	*NH* *EM*
7. **Finance** a) 16/17 – Q1 update b) 15/16 Annual Accounts update c) 2016 Spending Review	*Verbal* *Verbal* *Verbal*	*EM*
8. '**Defining complexity** ' – paper		*LB*
9. **Staff Event** – future options		*NH* */MMcl*
10. **Strategic Risks**	*For Review*	*NH* *EM*
11. **Forward Plan** a) SCRA Board b) Audit Committee c) Operational Group d) Other e)		
12 **New Risks**		
13. **Date of next meeting**	*10 August 2016*	

Present:
Neil Hunter (Chair), Ed Morrison, Malcolm Schaffer, Susan Deery, Lisa Bennett, Alistair Hogg

In Attendance:
Janis McDougall (Minute), Pamela Armstrong (Minute)

Apologies:
Tom Philliben, Lawrie McDonald

		Timescale	Action
1.	**Minute of meeting held on 10 May 2016** The minute was agreed as a correct record. **Matters Arising** **Noted:** **1.** Unison Facilities Time - discussions continue in order to finalise arrangements for facility time in Lanarkshire, Dumfries & Galloway locality. **2.** Historical Abuse Inquiry – The issue around storage of files was raised at the recent IG Leads meeting. Work is now underway to identify sites where there is a shortage of space and to identify solutions with a report scheduled for the IG Leads Group in September. This issue will be taken forward by the IG leads Group. **3.** Pay – The pay claim has now been settled and agreements have been completed in time for the June payroll. **4.** Remote Access to CMS – The template has now been agreed. The Head of HR will write up and circulate to EMT. **5.** Budget 2016/17 – Property savings are being discussed via routine meetings involving Senior Operational Managers and Head of Finance & Resources. **6.** Facilities Management Contract – Carillion have an improvement plan in place and the next scheduled meeting will take place 20th July. Carillion will provide performance information monthly and it is hoped there will be an improvement in the service provided. Head of Property continuing to look at alternatives in the event of continued poor performance under the contract. There will be a report back to the EMT in August. **7.** IT Operational Plan – Draft plan discussed at National Partnership Forum. There was recognition of the significant investment proposals and a wider understanding of the objectives. The Joint head of IS		

		Timescale	Action
	will finalise the plan in terms of resources and people. There will be a further update this month via the routine Chief Executive's report to the Board. **8.** Going to a Hearing Business Case - The Principal Reporter / Chief Executive will report back to the Participation and Engagement Group that the business case has been agreed in principle but there is currently no funding available. This will be revisited in July in the context of other priorities. The main driver for the refreshed film was compliance with legislation. The business case will be revisited to check the exact detail of this.		
2.	**Draft Board Agenda 22 June 2016** The draft agenda was reviewed and it was agreed to include an Update to the Corporate Plan to routine business. **1.** There was general discussion around the need for all EMT members to be sighted on papers scheduled for Board discussion. **2.** Where feasible papers should be brought to the EMT in advance of the Board, in particular the OPR. Where this is not feasible another short EMT meeting to be organised to discuss reports in advance of the Board meeting. **3.** The need for reports to be submitted timeously and within submission deadlines to allow sufficient time for reports to be checked and papers assembled for issue to Board members.	**Completed**	**PA**
3.	**Preparation for Managers Event** **Noted:** **1.** The draft programme has been issued. Corporate Parenting will be the theme running throughout the day. **2.** The event will focus on leadership and development. **3.** The event is scheduled to finish at 4pm. This is later than normal to allow a further session to be included within the programme.		
4.	**Property Strategy** The Head of Finance & Resource spoke to the Joint Property Strategy (CHS/SCRA) for the Children's Hearing System 2016-2021. **Noted:** **1.** The Strategy is scheduled for approval at the September Board meeting. **2.** An action plan detailing plans to work on key objectives is being prepared. **Agreed:** Amendments to the strategy as follows:	**Sep 16**	**EM**

		Timescale	Action
	• An objective to be added around participation of children and young people in planning and design. • Include a reference to communities. The property strategy is to be scheduled for discussion at the Joint Board meeting (CHS/SCRA) in October. It was agreed that the paper as it stands is a good piece of work and is much improved from earlier versions. A further draft with action plan to be reviewed before going to respective Boards.		
5.	**Review of Complaints** The Head of Practice & Policy spoke to the report providing a review of complaints over the last year. This report is scheduled for the Board meeting in June. **Noted:** Some amendments to tables within the report are required. **Agreed:** The report to be amended to include: • Reference to positive feedback on the training. There is evidence in responses to complaints that staff is using the training material to make a qualitative difference. • Include a sentence to give a sense of time and effort involved in complaints. • Clarify that the time limit for complaints is following Ombudsman Guidance. It is possible however to use discretion around the time limit on an exceptional basis. • The Chief Executive will introduce the revised report at the June Board meeting.	**Completed**	**MS**
6.	**Strategy Development** The Head of Strategy/OD gave a verbal update on work underway on Strategy Development. **Noted:** 1. A paper is being developed for the Board around feedback from the corporate planning session. Timelines for production of the corporate plan are also included within the paper. 2. The paper focuses on the three main strategies, financial, OD (Organisational development) and resources.	**Sep 16**	**LB**
7.	**PIN/PQN Review** **Noted:** The request for a review of the PIN and PQN in terms of lines of accountabilities and the fit within the current structure of established groups. There has also been a request to have a forum/network for		

		Timescale	Action
	Locality Reporter Managers. **Agreed:** A review to be taken of the existing meeting/network structures (to include PIN/PQN.Operational Group as a minimum) with an emphasis on effectiveness, streamlining, stripping out duplication and making best use of peoples time. The Head of strategy/OD will lead on this short piece of work.	**??**	**LB**
8.	**Budget Outturn 2015/16** The Head of Finance and Resources spoke to the report detailing the draft revenue and capital outturn positions for the year to March 2016. **Noted:** 1. The Head of Finance and Resource is working with the Senior Operational Manager to finalise the position on the Northwest Budget. 2. There will be a final check of all the figures within the report prior to submission to the Board. 3. Budget holders have delivered a revenue spend largely on target. This is a significant achievement in the context of financial constraints. **Agreed:** Amendments to the report for submission to the Board as follows: • References to be included in the report that the Board agreed to the strategy of acceleration IT spend to offset deferral of Tranent spend. • Reinforce the message in the conclusions section that it was an exceptional result to bring the budget so close tobalance, and the clear signal that the organisation was at the outer edge of financial sustainability. These are important key messages to carry forward in SR16. .	**Completed**	**EM**
9.	**Biodiversity** The Head of Finance & Resources spoke to the report which set out proposals to promote and develop the organisation's culture and awareness of biodiversity and wider climate change factors. **Noted:** 1. 2016 is the first year of mandatory climate change reporting. Biodiversity is an area is included within this reporting steam. 2. A sum his been allocated in the minor works budget for this area of work. 3. The Health and Wellbeing Group remit will be expanded to include this area of work. **Agreed:**		

			Timescale	Action
		• The report will be scheduled for consideration at the next Health and Wellbeing Group. The development of this area and introduction of activity should be on a staged basis at locality level.		
		• Continued positive engagement between Property and SOM's and a sense that we needed to continue the discussion about moving to a Business Partnering model. This will be discussed at the next SOM/Property meeting partner model within localities. The Property Team to move to a business partner model within localities.		
10.	**2016 Children & Families Survey** The Head of Practice and Policy spoke to the results of the National Children and Families 2016. **Noted:** 1. The results are consistent with previous survey findings. 2. Positive comments were received about reception staff. 3. The On-going issues about reported non receipt of 'All About Me Forms' 4. Little investment in actually conducting the survey from operational staff with the exception of one or two localities. 5. Digital Strategy may provide an opportunity to move to electronic Having Your Say forms. **Agreed:** • The issue of sending out All About Me forms to be raised at the Participation and Engagement Group. • Both Digital Strategy and Better Hearings projects are looking to more effective methods for children and young people to give their views. • Increasing service users understanding of the Role of the Reporter. Further consideration to be given to this with a view to feature in a future Corporate Plan. • Survey results will be reported to the Board via the Chief Executives report in September. The results will also be scheduled for the August Operational Team Meeting. • Survey results to be sent to Children's Hearings Scotland • Feedback should be provided to children and families via a poster to be put in waiting rooms. • Tayside & Fife Locality conduct monthly surveys. Other localities should be encouraged to adopt this approach. • Information and Research Manager has highlighted that future surveys need to be conducted differently. This will be discussed further between Head of Practice and Policy and the Information and Research Manager.	**June 16** **Aug 16** **Jul 16**	**MS/NH** **MS** **MS** **AH/TP** **MS**
11.	**Performance Management Framework – Update**		

			Timescale	Action
	The Head of Strategy and OD spoke to the briefing paper on further development of the Performance Management Framework. **Noted:** 1. A significant improvement in locality planning, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation is evident since the introduction of the framework. 2. Further refinements have been identified and will be implemented by the end of March 17. This will result in a new corporate plan, business plan, new three year locality plans and Head Office plans which will all be in alignment. **Agreed:** The approach and recommendations set out in the paper subject to further consideration to how performance reviews will work for small teams at Head Office. One option proposed was via the Head office Managers' meeting tracking progress on action plans.			LB
12.	**CHIP**			
12.1	**CHIP Final Draft Vision & Values Statement for the Children's Hearing System.** **Noted:** This is scheduled for approval at the June CHIP meeting.			
12.2	**CHIP Secondment – Learning and Development Work stream – National Learning Programme Co-ordinator.** **Noted:** 1. The request to participate in the recruitment strategy for the National Learning Programme Co-ordinator post, up to and including the secondment without back fill of non-operational posts (if required). 2. Other potential options around funding could be explored i.e. monetary contribution from partners rather than an individual. **Agreed:** To approve participation in the recruitment subject to: • Flexibility around length of secondment although 2 years is preferred. • Flexibility around full-time/part-time/job share. • Discussion with Scottish Government about funding requirements if the secondee is from an 'essential' role which would require being backfilled.			NH
13.	**General** **Use of experiential opportunities/secondments in SCRA's wider management and leadership**			

		Timescale	Action
	development. **Agreed:** The need to look at internal/external opportunities for management development for SCRA Managers.		**EMT**
14.	**New Risks** There were no new risks identified.		
15.	**Date of Next Meeting** Wednesday 13th July 2016		

Measuring complexity in child protection

1. Introduction

Several commentators have raised complexity as an important issue in child protection (Darlington et al., 2004; Hood, 2014; Stevens & Cox, 2008). Complexity can be defined in various ways, and this paper focuses on complexity in the sense of intricacy, defined in terms of the number of elements in the system, and the number and kinds of connections between these elements. Thus far there are few attempts to measure or quantify this complexity. Moreover, some consider that the lives and needs of vulnerable children and families and/or the social work field in general have become more complex over recent years (Scottish Executive, 2006; Stevens & Cox, 2008), but lack evidence for this claim. This paper considers several different kinds of complexity in child protection, and suggests ways of measuring them.

1.1. Complexity of vulnerable children's lives

Complexity in children's lives can take several forms. One is **family composition**. Gault (2005) found that only 21% of children referred to the reporter were living with both birth parents—much fewer than in Scotland overall ('Facts about Families in Scotland', 2016). Children who live in other arrangements might be experiencing greater complexity as a result—for instance, as a result of gaining additional step or half siblings, living in more than one household, or negotiating relationships with parents' new partners. This could be assessed following Manning et al. (2014), who measured the complexity of family structure in the USA, focusing upon sibling complexity (in terms of half and step siblings) and parent complexity (in terms of single parenthood and step parenthood). Ideally their approach should be expanded to include other kinds of complexity, such as connections with birth family with whom child is not living, siblings living in different households, and residence with extended family.

Complexity is also impacted by the **number of changes** that children experience over time. This would include changes of care arrangements, contact with birth family, home address, education provision (including school exclusions), and people residing in child's place of residence. The frequency of each could be measured over a certain period of time.

An additional measure of case complexity is **duration**. One would expect that more complex cases would tend to endure for continue for longer periods of time. This could be assessed by measuring the length of time from first referral to the termination of the CSO.

Another form of complexity for children is the occurrence of **multiple problems** within one family. Devaney et al (2008) cite studies which find that domestic violence often coincides with other social problems including alcohol and drug misuse, parental mental illness, and learning disabilities. They suggest that these have a cumulative or interactional effect on children and their outcomes.

Kazdin and Whitley's (2006) study is useful here as they measured case complexity in children with a DSM-III diagnosed psychological disorder, primarily in terms of the

co-occurrence of other difficulties. In addition to assessing comorbidity of psychological disorders, they also measured (1) scope of child dysfunction (including scope of symptoms, academic impairment, history of clinical problem); (2) socioeconomic disadvantage to family; (3) parent and family functioning (e.g. psychopathology, stress, family relationship problems) and (4) obstacles in accepting treatment (in the form of resistance from family). These domains of complexity were measured using various scales, completed by the practitioner or the parents, a research diagnostic interview, and background information from the family.

Similarly, CMS records could be used to assess the complexity of children's lives on the basis of the extent of child and family dysfunction. A simple approach would be to simply add up the number of grounds. A more revealing approach would be to use reports on CMS to establish the number of issues noted for the child and family in question. This could include all the grounds, but need not be limited to these. Again, a simple numerical total number of issues might be noted, or a rating scale developed, requiring the rater to judge the existence and severity of various dimensions of 'comorbidity', such as (child's or parent's) alcohol misuse, drug misuse, school attendance, domestic violence, child abuse and neglect.

Kazdin and Whitley (2006) suggest that **socioeconomic disadvantage** contributes to case complexity in children with disorders because it 'plays a pervasive role in mental and physical health outcomes' and 'is associated with many complexities of living, managing daily routines, and receiving services' (p.456). The Scottish Executive (2006) notes that social polarisation has increased in Scotland in recent years, meaning that 'some families have experienced four generations of deprivation, worklessness, and declining life expectancy'. Deprivation is probably hard to assess objectively from CMS records, but employment status of parents might be used if this information is provided, or deprivation could be estimated by using the postcode in conjunction with the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation. However, while socioeconomic disadvantage undoubtedly makes life harder for families, it is not clear that it does so primarily by increasing complexity. It could however be counted as one of several elements that a family has to contend with.

Finally, Kazdin and Whitley (2006) suggest that a family's **resistance to intervention** can make a case more complex. In the current study, resistance to SCRA or other involved agencies might be gleaned from case files or judged from the presence of otherwise of appeals to hearing outcomes or instances where grounds are not accepted by children or relevant persons.

An alternative approach would be to estimate the complexity of children's lives in Scotland overall, via **national records of proxies** known to be associated with social problems. These might include levels of alcohol addiction (Scottish Government, 2015b), problem drug use (Scottish Government, 2011; UK Focal Point on Drugs, 2014), crime levels (Scottish Government, 2015a), and poverty (Scottish Government, n.d.). Tracking levels over several years could give an approximation of whether children's lives are becoming more or less complex over time, in that the higher the levels of these problems nationally, the more likely it is that specific families will be experiencing more than one of them.

1.2. Complexity of inter-agency collaboration

Complex social problems require inter-agency collaboration (Hood, 2014). This collaboration itself contributes to complexity, by adding extra elements and connections to the child protection system. Issues that can result from inter-agency complexity include problems with communication (including information sharing), role clarity, competing primary focus, and competing views on problem definition (Darlington et al., 2004). Inter-agency complexity could be determined via CMS as the number of agencies involved in a given case, the number of persons attending a hearing, and/or the number of relevant persons.

1.3. Complexity of legislation

In England, government guidance on child abuse has become dramatically longer and more complex between 1974 and 2010 (Parton, 2011). During this time, the object of concern has shifted from 'non-accidental injury' to 'safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children'. This change represents a growing expectation placed upon professionals to protect children and promote their welfare (Parton, 2011), exemplified in the outcomes framework which England, Wales and Northern Ireland have set out for all children (Fish et al., 2008).

It is likely that in Scotland too, legislation has become longer and more complicated, as the Scottish government has also shifted towards a model of child protection focused on safeguarding and wellbeing with *Getting it Right for Every Child* (Scottish Executive, 2012). The amount of legislation pertaining to the role of reporter increased dramatically with the advent of the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act in 2011. Such legislation can increase complexity in two ways; (1) if the legislation itself is complex and difficult to understand and/or apply; (2) if the legislation increases complexity of working practices.

The most straightforward approach here would be to follow Parton (2011) by comparing the sheer volume of guidance and legislation at different points in time. This could be measured as the number of Practice Instructions in place, and/or the number of pages / word count of the Children's Hearings System training resource manuals, reference books, or legislation.

Complexity might also be measured by a count of the number of additional processes triggered or removed by new legislation. For example, in the case of the reporters' role, one complexity triggered by the 2011 Act was that reporters no longer had the authority to make someone a relevant person; instead, this had to be done via a pre-hearing panel, creating additional complexity.

The effects of legislation in practice can be assessed over time using CMS records to note the frequency with which certain processes are enacted. Examples of processes which could be measured in this way include number of court appearances and number of pre-hearing panels. A fuller analysis of court activity would be useful (e.g. number of expert witnesses called), but it is not clear that all relevant data would be available.

1.4. Complexity of organisational processes

One further aspect of complexity which could be considered is the job content of those working in child protection organisations. In the case of reporters at SCRA, this dimension could be assessed in various ways. One aspect is the number of different elements to the reporter role. This could be assessed with reference to the job description and/or annual SCRA figures for the total number of referrals received, pre-hearing panels, hearings, applications for proof, cases requiring translation, new CSOs and CPOs, children on CSOs and CPOs at a specific point in time, ICSOs, and appeals.

Other aspects of organisational complexity which might be considered for measurement are the number of colleagues with whom reporters interact regularly in order to complete their work, and the efficiency with which tasks can be carried out (although the latter might be difficult to measure).

> **Comment [ROW1]:** Maybe scope to add complexity measure based on records of how reporters spend their time?

2. Proposed research

2.1. Measurements of complexity

It would be useful to assess whether these various kinds of complexity have changed over time. In order to do so, it will be necessary to collect data that tap two or more points in time (e.g. from the years 2005, 2010 and 2015). For each time period, three kinds of data would be required:

A. A randomly selected sample of CMS cases which were active in the year in question
B. Totals for various events in the years in question (e.g. numbers of panels, pre-hearing panels, appeals)
C. Texts (e.g. legislation, training, job descriptions)

Statistical analyses on the sampled data can assess for significant changes over time. With these data, the following kinds of complexity could be measured. The letter in brackets indicates which of the three kinds of data would be required for measurement.

Case complexity

- Family composition (A)
- Change over time (A)
- Duration (A)
- Comorbidity of problems in family (A)
- Number of appeals (B)

Complexity of inter-agency collaboration

- Number of agencies involved in a given case (A)
- Number of persons attending a hearing (A)

- Number of relevant persons (A)

Complexity of legislation

- Number of Practice Instructions of relevance at the end of the year in question (C)
- Number of pages / word count of the Children's Hearings System training resource manuals, reference books, and/or legislation (C)
- Number of processes triggered or removed by new legislation (C)
- Number of court appearances (A)

Organisational complexity

Number of:

- Tasks detailed in Reporter job description (C)
- Referrals received by the SCRA (B)
- Pre-hearing panels (B)
- Hearings (B)
- Applications for proof (B)
- Cases requiring translation (B)
- New CSOs and CPOs (B)
- Children on CSOs and CPOs (B)
- ICSOs (B)
- Appeals (B)

2.2. Validity and reliability

MORE HERE

3. Uses of the Research

The proposed research would provide a useful perspective on complexity in child protection. The data would be useful for understanding children's lives, and for ensuring that reporters are well positioned to manage the complexity inherent in their role. In addition the research would address the question of whether children's lives and the child protection domain more generally is becoming more complicated over time, as some have suggested.

The data could also provide a point of departure for further research exploring the relevance of complexity theory (also known as complex systems theory) for this domain. Complex systems are said to be characterised by spontaneous self-organisation, which occurs when interactions between elements of the system give

rise to high level organisation, from which novel properties emerge, rather than being caused directly by any given element. Another feature is non-linear causation, whereby the output from a system is not directly proportional to the input (Hood, 2014; Stevens & Cox, 2008), meaning that complex systems tend to be unpredictable.

Some researchers have suggested that complexity theory can be used to explain phenomena in the field of child protection (Hood, 2014; Stevens & Cox, 2008). These authors offer hypothetical examples to illustrate how the theory could throw light on this domain. Their proposal is an interesting one, but thus far it seems to lack empirical evaluation. It would therefore be interesting to conduct qualitative (ideally ethnographic) research to ascertain whether child protection is indeed characterised by features of complex systems, including spontaneous self-organisation, emergence and non-linear causation. Note however that such research would be quite time-consuming.

Comment [ROW2]: Need to check literature more thoroughly to be sure of this

References

Darlington, Y., Feeney, J. A. & Rixon, K. (2004). Complexity, conflict and uncertainty: Issues in collaboration between child protection and mental health services. *Children and Youth Services Review, 26,* 1175-1192.

'Facts about Families in Scotland'. Retrieved on 29th June 2016 from http://www.parentingacrossscotland.org/policy--research/facts-about-families-in-scotland.aspx.

Devaney, J. (2008). Chronic child abuse and domestic violence: Children and families with long-term and complex needs. *Child and Family Social Work, 13,* 443-453.

Fish, S., Munro, E. and Bairstow, S. (2009) Learning Together to Safeguard Children: Developing a Multi-Agency Systems Approach for Case Reviews, London, SCIE.

Gault, I. (2005). Study on Youth Offending in Glasgow. SCRA Report.

Hood, R. (2014). Complexity and integrated working in children's services. *British Journal of social Work, 44,* 27-43.

Kazdin, A. E. & Whitley, M. K. (2006). Comorbidity, case complexity, and effects of evidence-based treatment for children referred for disruptive behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74,* 455.467.

Manning, W. D., Brown, S. L. & Stykes, J. B. (2014). Family complexity among children in the United States. *Annals, AAPSS,* 654, July, 48-65.

Parton, N. (2011). The increasing length and complexity of central government guidance about child abuse in England: 1974-2010. Unpublished discussion paper, University of Huddersfield.

Scottish Executive (2006). Changing lives: Report of the 21st century social work review.

Scottish Executive (2012). A Guide to Getting it Right for Every Child. Retrieved on 6/7/2016 from http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0039/00394308.pdf.

Scottish Government (2011). High level summary of statistics trend last update: Thursday September 15, 2011. Prevalence of problem drug users. Retrieved on 5/7/2016 from http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/TrendPrev.

Scottish Government (2015a). High level summary of statistics trend last update: Tuesday, September 8 2015. Volume of crime recorded by the Police. Retrieved on 5/7/2016 from http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/TrendVol.

Scottish Government (2015b). The Scottish Health Service 2014, Volume 1: Main Reporter: Alcohol. Retrieved on 5/7/2016 from http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2015/09/6648/318753.

Scottish Government (n.d.). Poverty and income inequality in Scotland: 2013/2014. Retrieved on 5th July 2016 from http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0048/00480301.pdf.

Stevens, J. and Cox, P. (2008). Complexity theory: Developing new understandings of child protection in field settings and in residential child care. *British Journal of Social Work, 38*, 1320–1336.

UK Focal Point on Drugs (2014). United Kingdom Drug Situation (2014 edition). *Annual report to the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction.*

SCRA Staff Event

Accountable Director:	Principal Reporter/CEO	**Date:**	6 July 2016

Report Author: Maryanne McIntyre

Recommendation:

1.   **EMT to consider the future of SCRA's Staff Event and review potential options.**

Reason for Report: Requested by Principal Reporter

Resource Implications: Within approved budgets

Strategy: Within approved plans

Consultation: Principal Reporter/Chief Executive Officer

Equalities Duties: An Equalities Impact Assessment has not been carried out

Document Classification: Not protectively marked

1. **Introduction**

1.1 This paper looks at the future of SCRA's Staff Event and potential options going forward.

2. **Background**

2.1 SCRA used to hold a three day Staff Conference. It was compulsory for all staff to attend on one of the three days and the conference programme was repeated over the three days. The last event (at the Dunblane Hydro Hotel in 2005) cost £44,000.

2.2 After a four year break, SCRA reintroduced a new format in 2009 – a Staff Event, with the opportunity for just under half of the staff group able to attend. This event was not compulsory, but managers were encouraged to ensure that a good mix of staff roles from across the country were able to attend the day, while ensuring covering back in the office.

3. **The current event**

3.1 The Staff Event has been held in its current format every year since 2009. The venue used (apart from 2013) has been the Royal Concert Hall in Glasgow. This was chosen for its central location, transport links, costs and technical support.

3.2 Following feedback from recent events, changes were made to the 2015 event, with different formats of presentations, new internal speakers and a focus on health and wellbeing with Mindfulness sessions and free massages etc. We also had the smoothie bike to encourage both healthy eating and exercise during the breaks.

3.3. The total cost of the 2015 event was £8,900 (within the allocated budget). This works out at approx. £59 per delegate. Due to the low numbers of staff attending the event and the cost (which tends to increase slightly each year – mainly due to catering), it is recommended that we now look at the future of the Staff Event, including:

- Should we continue to have an annual Staff Event?
- Should we consider a different format?

4. **Staff feedback**

4.1 Following every event, we carry out a short electronic feedback survey. Responses to the survey are traditional low, with 59 delegates responding in 2015 (just over a third of delegates).

4.2 Of the those who did respond, 56 said we should continue with an annual Staff Event.

4.3 In the 2015 Staff Survey, satisfaction with communications in SCRA rose by 5% to 61%. 52% of staff felt that EMT were honest and open in their communications, a rise of 6%. (A total of 302 members of staff completed the 2015 survey.)

5. **Options appraisal**

5.1 This section looks at different options going forward…

5.2 **Continue with the same format/same approach** – the Staff Event has had a similar format since it was introduced in 2009 – cabaret style room set up, internal speakers and presentations, keynote external speaker, input from young people, round table discussions, partner stalls during the break etc. This format has worked relatively well and has been refined in recent years. We always ask staff for their ideas before planning starts and then immediately after the event to help plan future events. Looking at last year's feedback from delegates, we could continue with this format, but factor in more time for networking as requested in the feedback survey.

Budget implication – funding is available in the current year to cover the Staff Event. If there was no change to the event (i.e. the addition of break out rooms for workshops) the cost will stay roughly the same (as mentioned earlier, there tends to be a slight increase each year on catering costs).

5.3 **As 5.2, but look at a different time of the year or skip a year** – we traditionally have the event in November (this was initially as the first event was held to tie in with the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Bill discussions. Perhaps we could consider holding the event in the spring – tie in with the planning cycle/better weather which may encourage more people to travel etc?

Alternatively, we could skip a year. This might help increase the interest in the event when it does happen in a years' time. We could perhaps utilise the next Staff Survey to get some feedback on this suggestion? The survey is due to be issued at the end of August when the schools are all back.

Budget implication – if the event was moved to March 2016, funding is available in 2016/17. If we skipped a year, we could either put forward the money allocated as a saving, or direct it to other communication tools or other areas of the business.

5.4 **Reintroduce the old model** (compulsory, over three days to give everyone a chance to attend) – this would ensure every member of staff gets the chance to attend the event. We would need to ensure the same, or a similar programme on each of the three days to guarantee everyone gets the same information/key messages etc. As well as the cost and the staff extraction, it would involve more planning/organisation/time commitment to achieve a successful three day event.

Budget implication – the 2005 Staff Conference cost £44,000. Costs are likely to have increased since then (catering etc), so the cost of an event like this is likely to be much higher. Without exploring this option further, it is difficult to predict just how much this would be, as we wouldn't simply be multiplying the current cost of the event by three as we would need to factor in overnight accommodation for speakers etc.

5.5 **Try a new model** – perhaps it is time to consider a new approach? We could hold three smaller events based on geography (north, east and west) or two events based on the East and Central area and the North West area (this might be difficult to arrange - for example, Aberdeen and Glasgow are in the same SOM area).

Head Office staff could either attend which ever event was closest to their home or there could be a separate event for Head Office staff, so the programme could be tailored to their needs and the 'area' events could be focused on frontline activity/issues. There is likely to be some topics relevant for both operational and Head Office events.

This would mean different venues, different programmes, additional travel time for the internal speakers and it may be difficult to get the same keynote external speaker for each event. We would probably need to consider more locally-based external speakers.

The three smaller, geographically based events should perhaps be considered, but there will still be travel involved for staff. For example, if we chose Aberdeen as the 'north' venue, staff from Inverness would still have to factor in travel time (two hours and 25 minutes by train).

Budget implications – the costs for three events is likely to be more expensive than the one large event, as we would need three venue hires, three Audio Visual kits (sound, mikes etc.) There would still be staff travel costs and potentially overnight accommodation for the speakers and events team. The catering costs (depending on the venue used) should be roughly the same.

5.6 **Discard the Staff Event for now and focus on improving other internal communications** – we know from the Staff Survey, the recent Team Brief review and the Supervision Survey, that we still have some way to go to improve our face to face communications, particularly at team and one to one level. There may also be an opportunity to use part of the annual Locality development days for a briefing segment on key national topics (similar to the Management briefing events).

We could also look at smaller, office-based briefing sessions on key topics (information would need to be available for staff unable to attend afterwards. Or we could arrange specific briefing sessions at LMTs carried out by senior management and/or business partners. The LMT would then have the responsibility to cascade the information to all staff.

Budget implications – we would need to ensure that Localities have factored in a budget for a development day in the current year and next year. Previously there was a Support Services development day, but this hasn't taken place for two years and funding would need to be identified for a Head Office development day to include all staff. The funding allocated for the Staff Event in 2016/17 could be re-directed to these events.

6. **Next steps**

6.1 If there is a preferred option, we will need to explore geographical locations, venue options and the costs involved before a final decision is made.

6.2 We may also wish to consult with the National Partnership Forum and the wider staff group.

7. **Recommendation**

7.1 EMT to consider the future of SCRA's Staff Event and review the potential options outlined in section 5.