**Family Support Services – Market Engagement Event, 26.09.2017**

Feedback from S.W.O.T. analysis workshop discussions in relation to the proposed integrated service:

**Table 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| * Integration would help achieve positive outcomes e.g. transitions could be more easily facilitated especially for vulnerable families * Community Assets * Would harness whole view of the family e.g. worklessness and therefore aid the tackling of deprivation * Timeliness – interventions can happen at an earlier stage (prevention) * Improved links with other organisations e.g. Job Centre plus * Whole community approach (see One Team example) * Consistent approach to dealing with other agencies/ clear pathways * Single entry point for families – single entry point for other organisations * Efficiencies – creation of new, mixed workforce | * Challenge of rural nature of Somerset. How can this be overcome practically e.g. mobile working * Issue of DNA on appointments – wasted time and travel time * Cultural changes required are a potential challenge when integrating services * Length of time to successfully change ways of working * Perception of ‘closure’ of buildings – need to make vision clear * Single point of access can be perceived negatively as ‘only one way in’ * Difficult messages re: - improvements in service when perception may be around reduction in spend = reduction in service provision |
| **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
| * Need to be clear from the start if we expect collaboration/ be clear about expectations * Don’t be over specific about KPIs from the start – outcomes are key; develop KPIs as part of on-going contract management – opportunity to be flexible * Create a balance between efficiencies and local provision * Expand mobile provision * Make increased use of technology e.g. staff could be home based with access to their rota etc. via tablet/ text message * Create an ability to post questions to Health Visitors and School Nurses online and build up a list of FAQ * Schools are critical to the model to support and enable the service (therefore need to be on board) * ‘Hub’ schools used in Wiltshire – more efficient way of dealing with schools * Think about the broader staff role | * Splitting contracts into Lots not as efficient – recreates the barriers addressed through integration * Requirements to make savings * Issue if schools are not consulted with sufficiently * Schools blocking access to online content (in line with policy for blocking applications such as Facebook and Twitter). Need to ensure that schools are able to have a separate policy so online content is permitted * Timescales – limited contract length can create issues when planning for cultural and technological change * Single submission procurement process – dialogue can potentially provide a better outcome |

**Table 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| * Strong local volunteer sector * Good HV skill-mixing * Teams are already used to working in Hub environment * Universal still present * Buildings will still be there and can be used differently | * Making sure having one Lot only will not detract from local need * Recruiting and developing the workforce |
| **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
| * Digital offer – good for service users and practitioners e.g. case files * Greater collaboration with the voluntary sector e.g. pathways in for volunteers * Extend HVs to 8 years old (supported) * Pathways across agencies important * ‘Activating’ the ‘communities’ around families * Evidence based community approaches * Working on pilot projects/grants to add value * Sharing of good practice e.g. training and create funding from this | * Fragmented/different local providers giving different approaches and may become confusing for families * Need to simplify tender process if more than one Lot * Network/signal issues for digital offer |