

## Supporting People

### Minutes of the Bradford Supporting People Commissioning Body & Strategic Core Group Special Meeting at 10.00am on Monday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2011 in Committee Room 1, City Hall

**Present:**

**CB Members:**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Moira Wilson      | Strategic Director Adult and Community Services, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (Chair) |
| Maggie Smallridge | West Yorkshire Probation Service Liz Barry Bradford & Airedale PCT (Substitute for Matt Neligan)        |

**SCG Members :**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Pip Tibbetts      | West Yorkshire Probation   |
| Jayne Hellowell   | SP Lead Officer and Service Manager Commissioning (Adults and Housing Related Support) |
| Sheila Bamford    | Executive Director-Horton HA (Provider Rep)  |
| Sarah Possingham  | Access to Housing, CBMDC   |
| John Hill         | Foundation Housing (Provider Rep)  |
| James Purdie      | Children's Services  |
| Mark Hird         | Bradford Foyer (Provider Rep)  |
| Claire Blacka     | Stonham (Provider Rep)   |
| Gary Staniforth   | SP Service User  |
| Neal Heard        | BACC, Projects Manager   |
| Emmerson Walgrove | SP Service User  |
| Martin Stubbs     | Revenues & Benefits, CBMDC   |
| Pam James         | Service User Advocate  |

**CB & SCG Officers in attendance**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Jen White         | Business Support                       |
| Phil Howell       | Strategic Commissioning Manager, CBMDC |
| Harry Whittle     | Incommunities                          |
| Alex Mullett      | Transitions Officer, CBMDC             |
| Cllr Amir Hussain | Adult & Social Care portfolio holder   |

**1. Apologies and Introductions:**

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| David Shepherd  | Assistant Director Housing Service, CBMDC   |
| Guy Van Dichele | SP Accountable Officer and Assistant Director Commissioning, Performance and Business Support |
| Dave Coe        | Bradford Youth Offending Team   |
| Nina Smith      | Safer Communities, CBMDC  |
| Tim Sanders     | Strategic Commissioning, CBMDC  |
| Katie Pierce    | Service User Involvement Officer  |

Introductions were made around the table.

**2. Minutes of the special meeting held on 18 January 2011**

Agreed as an accurate record.

### 3. Lead Officer update –

#### **Feedback from minutes of meeting held on 18 January 2011**

Following on from agreement at the last meeting about agreeing in principle for contract clauses to be added to manage poor performance against the Quality Assessment Framework, Jayne reported that the recent review of homeless sector has shown a marked improvement in QAF submissions with many submitting at level A and others at level B. This is excellent news for both providers and the authority and has therefore been decided that quality will continue to be managed through the cyclical contract reviews.

#### **Strategic review**

- Reminder that 4 reviews are currently underway and are on the agenda
- Note issue around funding to housing related support. There is a big efficiency agenda and there is an expectation from the authority that savings come as a result of this agenda rather than a savings agenda.
- Termination of first contact contract. – Funding from SP has stopped at the end of March but Age Concern is continuing with this service through its own budget up until June. A report will be going to the older person's partnership board on 14<sup>th</sup> April.

**Vulnerable person's housing strategy** – This is nearing completion and a full update will be presented to the next SCG meeting in May.

### 4. Older Persons Strategic Review

#### **Declaration of interest** – Moira Wilson & Harry Whittle

Phil presented the reports and explained that that the older persons' strategic review is separated into the following 2 reports:

#### **a. Community Alarms**

Following on from the agreement made at the January special meeting, Phil explained that project teams have been set up to initiate a project appraisal for the community alarms services for the district.

Phil summarised this report and the following key points were highlighted from the report.

- Current funding streams for this service
- Efficiencies – The charges and contract rate at which the community alarms are charged vary and a standardised of the commissioning approach would deliver long-term savings.
- The results from Impact Assessments (including EIA)
- Consultation with careline staff and management over the preferred model
- Risks associated with moving to the preferred model
- Options Identified with option 5 being the preferred option. "Establish district wide community alarm call centre with monitoring capacity for the existing user base.

The chair opened up this agenda item for questions and comments.

The following points were noted:

- This proposal is much broader and should be regarded as a potential element for a much broader service user base than just older people
- Concern re equipment. There is a whole raft of issues re equipment i.e. who will supply it, who will service and maintain it, who moves it around etc.
- Capacity on responding services, how the calls are dealt with and triaged appropriately.
- Joint working with partners, ambulance services etc.
- The effect this would have on service users who's providers have national call centres
- To dovetail this into the prevention agenda

In response to some of the above points Jayne spoke about the complexity of this service hence the unusual decision of bringing the service in house in the first instance and then to tender out later on as there is a tidying up job to be done at this moment in time.

Jayne highlighted some of the issues around the current responding services and stressed the need for training. She also spoke about how the authority is looking into equipment and the potential investment into this service to get it fit for purpose. She also pointed out that there will be no difference in cost for those service users who are with providers who have national call centres.

Moira commented that as this report is suggesting for the service to be bought back in house on a short term basis then approval needs to be sought from council executives before this can happen. She requested for a slight change in the recommendation.

**Decision** – members accepted the following recommendations with the amendment requested.

- Members are asked to approve the recommendation after the report has been forwarded and approved by council executives in the first instance.
- The preferred model for future deliver of community alarm services funded through SP and Adult Social Care (option 5) be implemented by December 2011 in line with contract expiry dates

#### **b. Sheltered Housing Support Service**

This report is also following on from agreement made at the January special meeting, As part of the council's corporate efficiency agenda 2011/12 an options appraisal for the future model of sheltered housing for the district has taken place. This report sets out intended outcomes, benefits and efficiencies linked to budget consideration.

Phil summarised the following key points from the report

- At the time of project initiation SP funding was undetermined locally and modelling for services was predicated on an overall 25% cut to funding.
- Bradford council has now taken the decision that SP funding will remain at the level of 2010/11 through the financial year 2011/12 and so this report is presented on the basis of efficiency.
- Current model of SP funded sheltered accommodation for older people does not lend itself to personalisation with support a prerequisite to tenancy and no option for opting out of support services. Nor is it an equitable service across the district with people receiving different arrangements and standards of support across sheltered accommodation for example cost, level and type of support available.

A discussion took place and the following points emerged after this discussion.

- Major concern for service users and the importance of reducing the stress/fear for this client group. It was noted that this is the responsibility of the providers to have dialogue with their service users about what the future will look like. The authority will work with providers in getting that message across to SU.
- Concern for SU losing their manager on site. SU will require reassurance.
- It was stressed that no services are being taken away from vulnerable older people. What is being offered is a range of options in sheltered and more importantly funding so that those people that are not living in sheltered get a support service.
- Concern re providers who will not be working to this model. Also concerns about how there providers will disseminate any message to the tenants.
- Marketing/PR is the Providers responsibility. The authority will support this through the access teams.
- The plans to develop links with changes in health as they are going forward / working with the GP consortium.
- With this to succeed there is a need to get as many service providers working with the authority in order to take this forward.
- There are about 3 service providers that will not be in a position to work with the authority on this model and those are national providers who have got a national strategy on what they believe is the best service model

Moira summarised that the direction of travel is the right thing to do but it is going to be quite challenging. She emphasised on the importance of service user engagement and the need for a strong engagement strategy so that the authority get as many service providers working with them and the end result is fairer service and a differentiation between people with high level support needs and low level rents and keeping people in their own homes/tenancy. She also asked that the service user engagement strategy is used to help with this.

**Decision** – members accepted the following recommendation

- Members are asked to approve the recommendations
- That the preferred model for future deliver of sheltered housing support in the district be implemented in December 2011.
- That a full implementation plan, including timescales, with an end date of 1<sup>st</sup> December 2011 as the date the new model of delivery will begin.

## 5. Homeless Strategic Review

**Declaration of interest** – Emmerson Walgrove, Neal Heard, Sheila Bamford, Sarah Possingham & Harry Whittle

Jayne commented that even though the SP funding remains the same for 2011/12 the sector review focuses on the reduction of the Community Funding Unit (CFU) which funds some of the provisions within these services of 8.8%. She stressed that the ultimate aim is to keep diversity in the sector in terms of providers while improving the customer journey so that homeless people don't fall through the net for a number of different reasons.

SP team have been working with the sector for the last few months to get to this point and are proposing a selection of remodelling and a tender to get to where we they need to be.

She also pointed out that consultation with the sector has been very positive by large. Even though there is a need to make cashable efficiencies, there are non cashable efficiencies built into this which needs to be recognised.

It was also noted that a review is being undertaken of all these services at the moment so whatever happens it will be the outcome of those quality reviews which will need to feed into this. It is important to maintain that diversity in the sector which is why there is the opportunity to remodel with some of those providers rather than put the whole lot out to tender.

Jayne then summarised the paper which looked at the following key points:

- Background of the homeless sector and services, the 23 different services and the other areas within this, such as Bradford Day Shelter and other services i.e. childcare funded by CFU.
- Incommunities have given their notice on their contract at Octavia Court indicating that they no longer wish to continue because the service is not financially sustainable.
- Funding from SP & CFU investing in this sector will now be from 1 pot rather than 2 separate pots.
- The results from the full impact assessments (EIAs) will be built into it.
- Consultations – project group is a combination of CFU, stakeholders, access to housing and children and young people. Consultations took place with providers through a number of workshops and there have also been 1 to 1 meetings with providers to give them plenty of opportunity to have dialogue with the authority.
- Catalogue of risks.
- The 4 different options. The project team have arrived at a preferred option that it is recommending to the meeting which is Option 4.

A lengthy discussion took place from members around the table. The following concerns were noted from members around table.

- Extreme concern with the changes in benefits and the increase in living costs and the affect these changes will have on the sector. There will be an increase in demand and a cut in supply.
- Concern over the loss of Salvation Army and the 63 bed spaces for homeless people.
- The timescales involved in the replacement of Salvation Army.
- If decommissioning then there should be a sign posting service within Salvation Army to other services.
- The prevention agenda and what preventative measures will be in place and how and when they will take place.
- Will the preferred option (option 4) include 16/17 yr old care leavers? There is work going on around trying to procure services for care leavers and that will also include homeless 16 / 17 year olds. There is an opportunity to join these things up together so that there is a unified hold for young people in Bradford who require access to services.
- Community Care Grant and Crisis Loan are under review. There is a suggestion that it will be taken from the DWP and brought back into the authority. Can the sector be enhanced because of this?
- A hostel replacement programme is currently underway which looks at the closure of large hostels and institutions and replace these with appropriate smaller accommodation in the community. There is a parallel process going on now where cold weather provision is being provided in churches etc which is an inappropriate form of accommodation for homeless people.
- Lack of knowledge from access point re other services available in the area other than Salvation Army.
- Lack of access and increase of service users.
- Promoting the 4 new hubs and the services they offer.
- Contractual arrangements – prime contract holder / subcontractor – how will it work?

In response to the above points officers around the table gave the following reassurances:

- Benefit changes are coming. The authority will make sure that they incorporate the impact of benefits on the changes that is being proposed here. The need to work with colleagues and not in isolation is crucial in order to ensure that all the changes are factored in.
- The authority have commissioned Sitra do to a research on hostels and the outcome of that research is supporting what is known locally that that there are a lot of people living in Salvation Army that don't need to be there in the first place. There is an urgent need to proactively engage with tenants about moving them on.
- We will be encouraging the floating support provision and doing a lot of prevention work with service users to prevent people going into large hostels. We can use existing accommodation provision for any new people coming into that system and when people come out we need to ensure that they have a continued support service that doesn't break down that customer journey. There is a lot of hard work that goes on in supported housing unless that support service follows them in to private rent then that can break down and with the lack of furniture then that can end up coming back into the system. So the combination of all that we believe we don't need that 63 bed hostel.
- Salvation Army is temporary service and they should be working with those tenants to proactively move them on. If service users are moved on with support, this will reduce some of the anxiety and stress.
- Services that are currently being delivered by open moves (homeless, prevention) are currently being reviewed and we will ensure that whatever comes out of this review will dovetail with the whole system approach.
- Cold Weather Provision and emergency services will be incorporated in this review.
- Whatever the outcome of the Community Care Grant /Crisis Loan, the furniture package still needs to be integrated into the system so furniture will be available for people moving on from a temporary accommodation setting.
- Jayne has met with Lal Sakhi and Vaughan Chapman from children services to discuss future provision of 16/17 year olds.
- It was stressed that the authority would never go down a route of decommissioning a service the size of Salvation Army without any sort of back up or service in place for vulnerable homeless people.

After this discussion the chair summarised that people around the table are in agreement with option 4 and people recognise the issues and sensitivity about decommissioning any services. There needs to be a very careful plan that the new services are up and running before the decommissioning takes place. She stressed the importance of minimising any impact on vulnerable homeless people. The SCG and CB would welcome this as part of the implementation plan.

The whole PR issue needs to be thought through very carefully.

**Decision** – Approval to start this work and accept the recommendation as outlined in the paper.

## 6. Violence against women strategic review of the sector

Val went through the report which sets out detail of the strategic review of the Violence against Women (VAW) sector.

She summarised each of the following key points

- Drive for efficiency across the sector.
- Loss of funding from Working Neighbourhood Funds to the sum of £125,000 but with the need to consider maintaining service at the same level or above.
- Local Authority has consulted with the VAW sector and negotiated proposals over a period of time which has changed through agreement.
- Full Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out.
- Options for remodelling and tender and presents a new sector with efficiencies and minimal impact on frontline service delivery and capacity.

She went through each of the options and asked members to consider the recommendation for approval of option 3.

Maggie commented that she was surprised to note that victim support will not form part of future options for this sector.

Val responded that victim support has been included in all consultation but they have not engaged at all. She doesn't know the reason why.

Moira asked whether Maggie can do anything from the probation perspective to make a stronger link for victim support.

Maggie welcomed this suggestion as she is involved in safer communities etc so would like to take the victim support forward in that way.

James spoke about how the children's services fund some work with people experiencing DV so it will be interesting to see whether work streams can be linked up.

Jayne welcomed this idea.

Jayne informed members that the net loss to this sector is 3 units. Negotiations are currently underway for capital funding for 2 extra units for the ANAH and Shipley arrangement, one which will be a fully wheelchair accessible unit. Even with the loss of the Neighbourhood fund a level of service will still be maintained. Due to no funding from the neighbourhood Fund there is efficiency of 125K for this sector.

John raised concerns about the new contract monitoring arrangements with providers and sub providers and asked how the authority will maintain the oversight of this new arrangement without the providers being overburdened.

Jayne clarified that the provider was responsible for the cost up and the responsibility lies with the provider to make it work within budget. It is not necessary for the authority to interfere with that if they can make the service work within budget.

In terms of the contractual arrangement the team wanted to keep the diversity in the sector and in order to do that providers were able to have this subcontracting arrangement in place. The only other alternative was to tender the whole lot out. So whoever holds the prime contract holds the responsibility. The commissioning team's monitoring services would account for the whole service regardless of the sub contracting underneath.

**Decision** – Members agreed to approve in principle option 4 with final approval to be given on 6 June 2011.

**7. Any other Business**

In response to a request for an update on BSH it was noted that this is on the forward plan and will be made available at the next SCG meeting in May.

**Date, time, venue for next meeting**

SCG Meeting - 10th May 2011, Lockwood Room Design Exchange

CB Meeting - 6th June 2011, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room, Olicana House.