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Are we nearly there yet? Feedback from the participants on the state of co-production in Scotland

First of all, the good news: Most public services in Scotland have embarked on the co-production journey. With only a few exceptions, workshop participants could easily identify examples of co-production approaches in their organisation. Examples provided by the participants included:

- **Co-commissioning:** *Transformation and redesign of support services provided to people with a learning disability in East Renfrewshire* – the council has formed a Public Social Partnership with a number of social care providers to realise a three-year change process using the principles of co-production with the following objectives:
  - to review the existing Supported Living services (in-house and externally provided services);
  - to understand and articulate the future demand for supported Living Services and more importantly the aspirations of the people using these services;
  - to involve the people who use our services along with stakeholders and partners in the design and piloting of new service models;
  - to maximise choice for people as the CHCP moves to individualised budgets.

- **Co-design:** *Experimentation with an assets-based approach in Fife* – Templehall was chosen as a test site for trying out new ideas to redesign and refocus public services, concentrating on anti-social behaviour in relation to alcohol and under-age drinking. Even though health inequalities generally take a long time to overcome, the test site showed a number of positive short-term outcomes such as double figure reductions in street disorder and vandalism in 2010/11.

- **Co-deliver:** *The Garden Buddy and Home Buddy schemes of the CVO East Ayrshire* – The CVO supports voluntary organisations who can provide support services for older people such as garden maintenance and help around the home combined with befriending services. Importantly, the Garden Buddy programme also provides training opportunities to young people and improves their employability. The CVO is also developing a Seniors Hub within Belford Mill which will provide training, information and services for older people, delivered by older people.

- **Co-assess:** *Citizen-led service inspections in West Midlothian*: In 2011 West Lothian Council initiated citizen-led inspections to empower local people to inspect and improve public services. So far, two teams of citizen inspectors have reviewed the winter maintenance and pupil placement services. The key successes of this process have been the improvements being developed by services, driven by the feedback of citizen inspectors.
These examples show that there are different ways into co-production, depending on the outcomes to be achieved and windows of opportunities in organisations and partnerships. But, of course, there is also some bad news: we could not identify one organisation or partnership in the training workshops which was has realised all four Co’s of the Governance International Co-Production Star.

Some optimistic participants suggested that ‘co-production was a glass half full’, another view was that ‘co-production is a nice thing to do but difficult’. This raises the questions: what are the barriers and obstacles to integrating co-production into organisations and mainstreaming it in public services and how can we overcome these barriers?

**Barriers and obstacles to co-producing better outcomes and ways forward**

Clearly, it is always easier to identify why something does not work than to find solutions for overcoming barriers. This is also true in the case of co-production. The table below summarises all the proposals resulting from the workshops. It shows that there are more solutions than problems but there are still some gaps. We welcome your suggestions of smart ideas for how to close these gaps!
Overview of barriers and obstacles for effective co-production, together with some suggested solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier/Obstacle</th>
<th>Issues at stake</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fear of loss of power                    | • Fear by managers (or politicians) of losing control  
  • Power dynamics in contracting  
  • Lack of buy-in of CEO/Board                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | • Using the personalisation agenda as driver  
  • Story telling about improved personal outcomes (testimonials)  
  • Business case with hard evidence                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Culture unsympathetic to giving citizens more of a role | • Entitlement culture  
  • Current ‘deficit’ model  
  • Lack of respect on part of professionals in relation to potential contribution of ‘user experts’ | • Rewards and recognition for co-production (e.g. volunteering ‘passports’)  
  • Asset-mapping of individuals and communities  
  • New Co-production Pledge by public service staff, charters for co-producing citizens                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Lack of time                              | • Need to make short-term savings/lack of seed funding of co-production  
  • Co-producing solutions may take more time than is allocated to staff in current service planning and delivery model                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • Manage expectations of all parties – public service providers, commissioners, users and communities  
  • Development of peer support, virtual support                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Dysfunctional systems                     | • local priorities/targets being different from national priorities  
  • Statutory obligations  
  • Governance arrangements  
  • Separate funding streams                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | • Change targets to reflect personal/organisational outcomes  
  • Use other system changes (e.g. merger) as opportunity to make system fit for co-production  
  • Pooled budgets                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Concerns about risks from giving citizens more of a role | • Fear of service failure  
  • Fear of repercussions for staff or organisation from service failures                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | • Celebrate every little success and forgive every little failure  
  • Put community engagement at early stage  
  • Prioritise actions which will reduce risk of failure of outcomes for service users, |
rather than simply reducing risks to staff or their agency

### Dysfunctional language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>• Awkwardness of term ‘co-production’ and other jargon</th>
<th>• Allow people to use their own language but also adapt language to target groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Next steps

So what is needed to catalyse co-production champions, organisations and partnerships to continue their co-production journey?

The trainers pointed out the following support mechanisms to the participants:

1) Tailored training programmes for partnerships and coaching programmes for corporate management teams based on the Governance International Co-production Star to take organisations and their partners through the change management process.

2) Peer reviews designed and facilitated by Governance International to enable councils and partnerships to learn from peers in the UK how to deal with the ‘nitty gritty’ bits of public service transformation.

3) Networking and learning events organised by the Scottish Co-Production Network, which has launched its new website featuring case studies, resources and discussions at http://www.coproductionscotland.org.uk/.

4) The second national Co-Production Conference hosted jointly by the Joint Improvement Team and the Scottish Co-production Network, which will take place in Edinburgh on 20 February 2013.

### Feedback and further suggestions on how to overcome barriers to co-production

If you have any comments on the workshops or this summary please get in touch! Governance International is also gathering further smart ideas on how to overcome barriers to co-production. We will publish the best ideas in a co-produced pamphlet with all the idea-givers!

Contact: elke.loeffler@govint.org