

## Supporting People

### Minutes of the Supporting People Strategic Core Group meeting held on Tuesday, 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009 2 - 4pm, Board Room, Carlisle Business Centre

**Present:**

David Shepherd (Chair)	Assistant Director Housing Service, CBMDC
Jayne Hellowell	Supporting People Lead Officer
Sheila Bamford	Executive Director-Horton HA (Provider Rep)
Mike Harney	City Homes in Mind (Provider Rep)
John Hill	Foundation Housing (Provider Rep)
Harry Whittle	Incommunities (Provider Rep)
JB	SP Service User
EW	SP Service User
AK	SP Service User
Val Balding	Safer Communities, CBMDC
Sarah Possingham	Access to Housing Manager, CBMDC
Gary Furze	SP Finance Manager
Jennifer Moran- Whitehead	Bradford District Care Trust (Provider Rep)
Katie Nutman	SP Service User Involvement Officer
Pip Tibbetts	West Yorkshire Probation (Replaces Peter Hart)
John Howarth	Principle Commissioner Older people's Service, Adult & Community Services BMDC
Neal Heard	Service User Involvement Worker – Bradford Alliance on Community Care)
Farah Mahmood	SP – Minute Taker

**1. Apologies / Introductions**

Guy Van Dichele	SP Accountable Officer and Assistant Director Commissioning
Pam James	Service User Advocate
Nina Smith	Safer Communities, CBMDC
Liz Barry	PCT

**2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

Neal Heard – Item 7

Welcome & introductions were made around the table

**3. Minutes and matters arising from the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009**

*Pg 3 – Supported Housing Units – Report on issues identified.*

John Hill explained that quite a lot has happened in the last few weeks, the main being an establishment of a partnership group where providers and InCommunities look at the issue of access to housing, how supported housing works and how the pathway into that works. It has been decided through the relevant forums to delay the paper by a month as this will give them a chance to look at how the group has embedded and hopefully to feedback on some initial outcomes from it. The paper should hopefully come to the next meeting.

*Page 4 – Providers not performing on level c. What action has been taken?*

Jayne explained that where providers are not performing to the minimum requirement, providers are asked to attend a contract meeting. An immediate improvement plan which asks the provider to address the weaknesses is put in place immediately.

Jayne also mentioned that in the future if providers fail their QAF, then default notices will be issued. A default notice will never be issued until a meeting has taken place with the provider to give them an opportunity to address any concerns.

Jayne spoke to members about closure of items i.e on reports that have been sent to the CB to make a decision on. She explained that when an approval is required by the CB, the respective person is made aware of the decision but SCG members are not informed of the outcome. After a brief discussion on this all agreed that SCG members should be informed of any outcomes by the CB. This is to be done via the Lead Officers Update as a standard item.

**Decision** – To include “Decisions made by CB” in the lead officer report as a standard item.

The minutes were then agreed as a true and accurate record.

#### **4. Lead Officer Update – Jayne Hellowell**

##### **4.1 Incommunities – Homelessness Annual Review**

Incommunities have now achieved 100% to level B of the QAF. This now completes the review of Incommunities and the transfer of provision of the homeless hostel from Norman Bank to Octavia Court.

##### **4.2 Bradford City Centre Project - Young Person’s Review**

Jayne gave some background information about BCCP and reported that SP have been working closely with BCCP and have been monitoring their improvements. BCCP have now just reached level b of the existing QAF. The recommendation that Jayne would like to put to the members is that due to concerns around continuous improvement SP recommend that the contract for BCCP is extended for 12 months on the current basis and then an annual review will take place in line with the rest of the young person services to determine that the provider is working towards continuous improvements.

Sheila raised concerns about this recommendation/approach. She commented that on one hand we are saying that BCCP have reached level b and on the other hand we are saying that despite that they are going to be treated differently to other providers. Sheila stressed that we need to treat all providers the same. This means by offering BCCP a contract as per the other young persons providers and if they fail within the 3 year period, then they go through the contract management process.

David summarized the recommendation set out in the report as well as Sheila’s recommendation of using the existing terms. The group agreed to go with Sheila’s variation.

**Decision** – Members all agreed that BCCP should be on the same contractual arrangement as the other young person’s providers.

Members were asked to note that BCCP have a partnership arrangement with InCommunities but they are still a registered charity.

##### **4.3 Palm Cove (PCS)**

Jayne summarized the information on Palm Cove and asked the group to agree to the recommendation set out in the paper.

Although PCS is on the ALOC supporting people was keen to ensure that in reality they were capable of delivering housing related support. In order to establish this, a light touch assessment was undertaken which showed that they were on level c of the current QAF.

Jayne pointed out that this is funding for the refugees not the asylum side and it has a capacity of 30.

**Decision** – Members agreed to a recommendation to the CB to fund PCS to the sum of £100k and issue a contract to Sep 2010 which will dovetail with the end of the refugees sector review that is scheduled to run between July & September 2010. This will ensure strategic commissioning depending on the outcome of the review.

#### **4.4 Abbeyfield Ilkley/Menston**

Jayne summarized the information in the report asking the group to agree to the recommendations set out in the paper.

A discussion took place and the following concerns were noted:-

- Request for a more in-depth discussion of the implication on the budget by using this methodology.
- This approach could open up the flood gates for registered care homes causing massive implications on the budget.
- Applying the regional benchmarks as opposed to local ones.

In response to the above concerns the following points were noted for the minutes:

- Whilst there are local bench marks, regional ones have been used because these are the ones are looked at by the different authorities to provide guidance. The rate of £12.83 is less than the current rate of £17.00 that was being applied. This is because it links to the care staff.
- It was stressed that SP will not be funding residential care and there are no moves back into that, however there are a number of extra care services out there that SP are not currently funding. Adult Services have approached SP as to whether or not SP can pick up the funding of the housing related support element of that. Any potential service out there/ requests received for funding will be brought back to this group to consider.
- SP only contract to 1 extra care service but there are others in the district.

John Howarth added when these schemes initially developed they were to be eligible for sp funding but because of the budget situation at that time that wasn't possible. Adult Services have actually been supplementing the costs through their budget.

David summarized that the estimated cost is less than 200k for overall. It is important to recognise that SP have a significant budget under spend. David appreciated the concerns in terms of understanding the impact of this, however as Jayne pointed out there is a service review ongoing and there is an opportunity to do a detailed piece of work around the extra care / ongoing cost of the SP budget. David asked members to accept this recommendation for this particular service to allow funding at this stage.

**Decision** – members accepted the recommendation as outlined in the report.

#### **4.5 Attendance Monitoring**

The monitoring statistics are calculated as a percentage from the start of membership.

Paul O Hara has been contacted re his membership. He has delegated this role to Dave Coe who is a team leader. He comes with enough seniority to be able to make decisions on this group.

Pam James has also been contacted re status on this group. David asked members to feed any comments directly to Jayne.

#### **5. Appeals Procedures – amended versions**

Jayne updated members on the new Service Review and Accreditation Appeals Policy and procedures. She reported that the original policy was dated October 2007 and as such required a review. As a result of the review the October 2007 policy has now been separated to create two separate policies and procedural documents known as:

- (1) Service Review Appeals Policy & Procedure
- (2) Accreditation Appeals Policy and Procedure.

Discussion took place on the following issues:

- Misinterpreting of information
- Appeals Panel – who will it consist of
- Appeals panel – their knowledge of SP
- Competence of officers who will sit on the panel
- Including a verbal submission in the process

JH went through the report and process re the above comments and explained that this is an internal process and if people are still unhappy then there is the Ombudsman Process beyond that. The Ombudsman can make a decision about whether the officers have reacted as they would be expected to.

Jayne expressed her approval of a verbal submission – to be able to hear what is being appealed, iron out any issues, answer questions etc. She will include the verbal submission into the new procedures.

Jayne pointed out to members that what comes from this appeals process is an update to the contract management process. Training has been undertaken to make sure that staff are aware of the clauses within the contract so that any decisions are absolutely water tight. SP are always conscious that this could go to judicial review.

David summarised that there are a number of appeals processes operated within the local authority and is something that the local authority are very adept at now. The council have legal support to ensure that the appeals process is operated appropriately.

He requested for the procedure to be amended to include the potential for a verbal submission and also advised that these papers (with the amendments) are sent to legal services so that they can have a quick check to ensure all is ok.

**Action:** - Jayne to amend policy to include verbal submission  
Jayne to send papers to legal services

**Decision:** - To accept the recommendation as highlighted in the report but to build in the verbal submission in the policy.

## **6. Outcome benchmarks – KPI1 (planned move on), cost and service user**

Gary went through the report which sets out the following:

- (a) Proposed SP service user outcomes targets
- (b) Client group benchmarks for NI 141
- (c) Updated cost benchmarks to be implemented.

### *(a) Outcomes targets*

Gary gave some background information on how the outcome data is collected.

In conjunction with the outcomes subgroup, SP has produced outcomes targets based on the service user outcomes from Bradford & national data for 2009-09. This outcome data has been analysed by client group and an average of "Outcomes achieved" for both Bradford & England calculated and used to calculate the proposed targets.

Members referred to the table on page 5.

Discussion took place about the figures and targets set out in the table & the questions on the outcomes framework form.

Jayne emphasised the need to set joint targets with the key partners and to attach this to services, so that each individual service has got its own basket. In response to a question asking how soon the information for each service would be available Jayne suggested for this to be discussed at the next provider forum meeting so that we can start the ball rolling.

*(b) KPI 2 benchmark – NI 141*

Gary informed the group that SP have now updated and refined the KPI 2 benchmarks on data relating to Bradford and Yorkshire & Humberside data for 2008-09. An average for both Bradford & Yorkshire & Humberside has been calculated and used for the proposed benchmarks.

Members referred to the table on page 7 which looks at the benchmarks by client group.

Concerns were expressed about the figures. Some figures show that the average percentage is set too high for some client groups and in some cases some client groups are actually achieving way above the set target.

After a brief discussion it was decided that more interrogation is required on this and it was also noted that not all the client groups are listed on this. More methodology is required on this.

*(c) Cost Benchmarks*

Gary informed members that the updated cost benchmarks data has been analysed by client group and an average for both Bradford & England are used to calculate the proposed benchmarks.

It is intended to implement these benchmarks commencing with the next round off client group level annual/sector reviews and to monitor achievement against benchmarks thereafter.

Members referred to the table on page 8.

Concern was expressed about the methodology behind the figures as the figures looked much skewed. A discussion took place on this and it was decided to go forward with these benchmarks to gauge where we are. The work that has gone into this has to be adopted but should be treated with extreme caution as the figures that are being stated is not what SP are going to use. Jayne stressed that this is a massive piece of work that needs to be done and it needs to be done in order to get efficiency savings in the future.

**Decision / Recommendation**

- (a) Accept the adoption of CLG service user outcomes at service level from April 2010 as a process of going forward.
- (b) Reject the NI 141 benchmark until more work has gone into the targets that are being proposed.
- (c) Retain the 3<sup>rd</sup> element of cost but with a caveat that it is not to be applied at this stage as more work needs to go into this.

**7. Bradford Alliance on Community Care (BACC) Contract**

Katie summarised this report asking the group to agree to the recommendation set out in the report. The following key points were highlighted from the report

- BACC have achieved all outcomes that were agreed in original service specification and have achieved more than the specification for example, by ensuring service users have an influence at strategic level
- Extension of the contract to ensure the continuity of the work between SU and SU officer
- SU involvement should be at the centre of everything that is done within SP and will therefore require the resources to achieve this.

Discussion took place about naming who the post holder is. It was felt that the report should not include anyone's name as it is up to BACC as the employer to decide who they would like this post holder to be.

**Action:** - Katie to amend report to take out personal reference to any named person.

**Decision:** - To recommend to CB that the BACC contract is renewed for a further year to continue the work of service user involvement.

**8. Unallocated Funding Outcomes 2008-9**

No report today. Will come to next meeting in February

**9. Any other business**

- 9.1.** Pippa reported that Neil Moloney, who is one of the commissioners for SP CB is leaving as Assistant Chief Officer in probation for Bradford as he has a new job. Maggie Smallridge will be replacing Neil.  
**Action** – Pippa to email Maggie’s details to Jayne so that she can inform the CB members.
- 9.2.** Sheila raised concerns about the procedure for declarations of Interest. She informed members that at the last meeting a discussion took place where some of the information was not accurate. Sheila was unable to say anything as she had declared an interest. She requested for some leeway on points of clarification or to answer any questions that is being asked in order to rectify a situation.  
**Action** – Jayne to look into the TOR’s and to provider some clear information on the declaration of interest procedure.