

## Appendix A: Options Appraisal

Options	Opportunities	Challenges	Ranking & Rationale
<p><b>1. Do nothing but continue to build on the joint training opportunities already in place</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least disruptive option and therefore promote stability in the short term</li> <li>• Easier to work in one LA area – no challenges regarding working to different LAs with different policies re staff development.</li> <li>• Staff are familiar with local partners and local need and partnerships may be less affected.</li> <li>• Staff would continue in same rolls working to their specialists with same terms and conditions</li> <li>• No loss of continuity / productivity that is sometimes experienced when teams restructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More difficult to meet the needs of the national and regional workforce development agenda with the current arrangements of having to provide a regional workforce partnership which is delivered from two separate LA teams.</li> <li>• Current model is not sustainable. There is a need to respond to changing demand (e.g. development of e-learning) and there is currently a lack of capacity and expertise to deliver this within current operational arrangements.</li> <li>• There are gaps in current provision (e.g. the vale does not have a workforce partnership coordinator) and duplication in others.</li> <li>• It is harder to achieve equity of provision with two separate teams delivering services in different ways.</li> <li>• The separate and different systems that are in place make it challenging for providers who operate across the regional (e.g. different</li> </ul>	<p>This was the least preferred option for the staff groups who felt that there was a missed opportunity if merging of the training units was not developed beyond the boundaries of current practice. The staff teams had an appetite for embracing change rather than things remaining as they are.</p>

		booking systems for training courses).	
<p><b>2. Appoint a Regional Manager who will be hosted by one of the LAs, who will oversee two separate Cardiff &amp; Vale teams (as they currently operate)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This model may make it easier to meet the needs of two LAs.</li> <li>• This would be less disruptive than full integration and the appointment of a regional manager could provide consistency of approach and delivery across the region where it is feasible to do so, whilst still operating two separate teams for Cardiff &amp; Vale.</li> <li>• This arrangement would strengthen the current joint working arrangements whilst retaining the LA identity of both teams.</li> <li>• This model already exists and works well in some areas of Adult Services where a manager, employed by one local authority manages staff located in two separate teams (e.g. Learning Disability).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This model would not address duplication / gaps in current arrangements as little would change.</li> <li>• There would be little benefit to customers other than the ability to provide some operational synergy across the teams.</li> <li>• Any developments are likely to be undertaken within separate teams rather than on a regional basis – therefore little benefit to the regional workforce partnership.</li> <li>• There would be no integration in practical terms.</li> </ul>	<p>The staff team felt that this option did not go far enough and would not future proof the services. They felt that this option would have little positive impact on customers. It was therefore felt that this option went some way to creating the conditions required for a sustainable social care training unit, but that it fell short of what was needed to provide a service that was up to date, and responsive to changing needs of both LAs.</p>
<p><b>3. Appoint a Regional Training Manager who will be hosted by one of the LAs and second staff to the host LA, who will carry out their substantive roles in the same way, under the management of the host LA</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As in <b>Option 2</b>, first 3 bullet points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As in <b>Option 2</b> above. Additionally,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Option 2 above</li> </ul>

<p><b>4. Appoint a Regional Training Manager who will be hosted by one of the LAs and TUPE staff from the other LA to the same LA so that all staff are employed by the same LA. Then restructure to create one team that covers the whole of the region.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There could be a risk of job losses if duplication of roles is removed from the new structure.</li> <li>• Individual LA teams will risk losing their identify</li> <li>• The smaller team may feel that they are being taken over by the larger team and there is a risk that the needs of the smaller LA may be lost amongst the demands of the larger LA.</li> <li>• Some staff may experience a negative impact on salary</li> <li>• Roles will change and this could be disruptive.</li> <li>• One team would have to meet the need of two different LAs and this will be challenging given the differences.</li> <li>• Some staff may need to be relocated and this could have a negative impact (e.g. increase in travel time). It may also make the team less accessible to those staff / providers who are located in the other LA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This creates a positive opportunity to create a training unit that is fit for purpose and future proof.</li> <li>• A fully integrated team will be best placed to consistently meet the needs of the region in a fair and equitable way.</li> <li>• This is the model that is most conducive to meeting the needs of the regional workforce partnership.</li> <li>• This model will provide the opportunity for staff to work at scale, using their specialisms.</li> <li>• This provides the best option for maximising the resources that are available and making best use of capacity and expertise.</li> <li>• This provides the best opportunity to standardise practice.</li> <li>• This provides an opportunity to stream line the available funding across the regional, administering it from one pot.</li> <li>• This model will reduce duplication and provide an opportunity to address current gaps.</li> </ul>	<p>This was the staff teams preferred option. They felt that this option would provide an opportunity for teams to be fully integrated, following a restructuring that allows one team to operate across the region in a consistent way, whilst responding to the individual need of the two LAs. It was felt that this option would provide the best opportunity to create a training unit that reflected current and future needs, making best use of resources and offering the maximum benefit to customers.</p>
<p><b>5. Externally commission the whole function with regional Training Unit being delivered by an external agency outside of both LAs.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could be more cost effective.</li> <li>• There may be an ability to generate income for the Local authority by delivering training at a profit for private</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be more difficult to achieve quality</li> <li>• There would be less ability of the service to be flexible and adapt to changing need.</li> <li>• There would be a risk that</li> </ul>	<p>Staff teams felt that this was not a viable option because it does not reflect the intentions of Welsh Government. It was felt that this option would pose significant risks to the two Local Authorities who</p>

	businesses.	<p>the service may not meet need and it may be difficult to retain control over provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was felt to be an extremely risky option – once the service was outsourced it would be more difficult to bring back in house in the future if unsuccessful.</li> </ul>	would have less control over the quality of training provided and the ability to be flexible and adapt to meet changing need.
<b>6. Merge both Training Units and locate within the Corporate Training Arm of one of the LAs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be economies of scale by merging with the corporate training arm of a LA</li> <li>• This could release capacity and provide opportunities to close some of the current operational gaps.</li> <li>• There could be advantages to the hosting LA of having all its training provision in one place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a risk that the social care training units in both LAs would lose their identity following the merger.</li> <li>• There is a risk that control would be lost and needs would not be met.</li> <li>• This does not seem to be in line with Welsh Government's view of regional working within the social care sector.</li> <li>• There is a greater risk of a disconnect occurring between the Corporate Training arm of the hosting Local authority and the provision of social care training to the other LA.</li> </ul>	Whilst staff were able to recognise the importance of an integrated regional training unit having a close working relationship with both LA corporate training arms, it was felt that there was a risk that the social care identity would be lost if the training unit merged with corporate training in one of the two LAs it was also felt that the loss of identity may make it more difficult to deliver training to the wider social care workforce and therefore may make it more difficult to meet the needs of the regional workforce partnership rather than strengthen existing partnership arrangements..