

Supporting People

**Minutes of the Bradford Supporting People Commissioning Body Meeting
1-3pm on Monday, 13th December 2010
Conference Room, Olicana House**

Present:

CB Members:

Guy Van Dichele	Assistant Director Commissioning, Performance & Business Support, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (Accountable Officer) (Substituting for Moira)
Stuart Macpherson	West Yorkshire Probation Service (Substituting for Maggie Smallridge)
Liz Barry	Bradford & Airedale PCT (Substituting for Matt Neligan)

CB Officers in attendance:

Jayne Hellowell	SP Lead Officer, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
EW	Supporting People Service User
AK	Supporting People Service User
Pam James	Service User Advocate Representative
Neal Heard	BACC – Support to service users
Jen White	Partnerships Services, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Trudi Wilson	Service Development Officer, CBMDC
Rominder Dhothar	Service Development Officer, CBMDC
Liberty Mupakati	Service Development Officer, CBMDC
David Shepherd	Assistant Director Housing Service, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council, Chair of the SCG
Alex Mullet	SP Transitions Officer, CBMDC
Chris Cobb	Contracts & Quality Assurance Manager, CBMDC
Katie Pierce	Service User Involvement Officer

1. Apologies:

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

2. Declarations of interest

Stuart – item 5

3. Minutes & matters arising from the meeting held on 23rd August 2010

All matters arising actioned.

Anne informed members that she will no longer be attending the CB meeting so this is the last meeting that she will be attending. She thanked all the members around the table. Both Jayne & Guy took this opportunity to thank AK for her contribution to this group. Jayne informed members that the SU have had an election for new members. Although Anne will still be a regular member of the SU involvement Group she will not be sitting on the CB meetings in the future.

4. Lead Officer Update

1. Special Joint Commissioning Body/Strategic Core Group meeting 18 January 2010

Jayne referred to one of the action points from the last meeting, a joint meeting with both Commissioning Body & Strategic Core group members. Jayne informed members that the meeting date has been set and the proposal is to consider the following items for the agenda for the joint meeting. Jayne asked members if they would like to include anything else on the agenda.

The proposal for the meeting is:-

- Quality Assurance
- Strategic Reviews.
- Build in working relationships with HB

Guy suggested having a presentation on some of the successes of the programme over the last 2 years. This will be a reminder of all of the hard work people have put into this programme and the different place the team is in now.

Action – Jayne to add this to the agenda for the joint meeting.

2. Service user outcomes – Impact Report

Katie referred to the attached appendix – “The impact report on service user involvement in the Supporting People programme in Bradford and district”.

She informed members that SP SU got selected out of 4 case studies to do an impact report to look at the things that are currently being worked on and how that makes a difference.

The report sets out how the group achieved the 3 objectives as set out in the strategy.

It was noted that new objectives have also been set for next year.

Discussion took place about having SU involvement/service user outcomes as an agenda item at the Joint Meeting in January. The following actions were noted from this discussion.

Actions for the Joint Meeting on 18th January

- To inform members of the direct link between SU engagement and the QAF work that Maggie is currently working on.
- To inform members of the SUIG objectives for next year and how this will be achieved and how that links to the QAF.
- The link between SU involvement with other groups e.g. housing partnership board

Jayne took the opportunity of expressing her appreciation and congratulations to Katie, Neal and the SUIG for all the hard work that they have put into this group. She gave her commendations for a job well done and commented that the group have made a remarkable difference to the programme.

3. Attendance Monitoring

For information.

5. Langley House Trust – Service Review Outcome

Rominder informed the meeting that an impact assessment has now been carried out and the report sets out further recommendations based on the impact assessment. Rominder summarised the report and highlighted the following key points:

- There is limited choice in Bradford for high risk offender accommodation however a soft market test has shown that there are 18 alternative providers on the SP approved list of contractors some of which have experience of supporting high risk offenders.
- Concern from key partners in the potential loss of this type of service.
- Majority of referrals made to this service in 2009/10 are from the Bradford district.
- There is currently no suitable provision in Bradford or West Yorkshire to take these referrals.

- Loss of this provision without replacement could pose a risk to the public.
- Box tree have a proven track record in supporting the work of the police and probation.
- The ability to actually find and fund a suitable alternative will be problematic because of finding an approved premise in a suitable location that will fit the criteria of West Yorkshire Probation's approved premises standards and finding the provision to meet this need.
- Box tree cottage does not appear to present problems in terms of its location. It would be difficult to locate an alternative area in terms of community and media issues.
- It has been learnt from partners that there is often very strong opposition to setting up accommodation for offenders
- Closing the LHT provision will result in moves outside of West Yorkshire into approved premises that already have waiting lists.
- The accommodation of Box Tree Cottage is owned outright by the provider whilst Rothera is owned by a housing management organisation. The provider has stated that they would not allow a new provider to use box tree cottage.

The following points were noted for the minutes:

- The link between this and the Vulnerable Persons Housing Strategy (VPHS). It was noted that Sitra has been commissioned to write the VPHS and if there is any capital investment then prioritizing will be done against those schemes. The outcome of the VPHS should show how "fit for purpose" LHT's building is.
- Even though the extension from the contract is for 12 months, a report will be bought back in 6 months time to check the progress. If progress hasn't been made after 6 months then 6 months notice will be served to the provider and the team will look at other alternatives.
- The recommendation is for this provider to achieve level C of the QAF. Brief discussion took place about the work that Maggie Colwill is doing with providers about changing their working culture so rather than working bottom up Maggie is asking providers to work at achieving a level A.
- It was pointed out to all members that there are omitting circumstances as to why LHT have been given a 12 months extension whereas MST have not been given an extension on their contract. The reason for this is because both services are very different as is the nature of the client group for both services. The client group was the exceptional circumstances which was part of the impact assessment for LHT.

Decision: - Members agreed to the recommendations as set out in the report.

6. Sector review refugees – final report

Liberty summarised the report asking members to agree to the recommendations set out in the paper.

The report focussed on the following key points focussed on:

- Details of each of the existing service provision within the sector and the recommendations attached to each
- Further commissioning priorities and gaps in provision

A discussion took place about the following points were clarified

- Even though SP are allowing MST's contract to come to a natural end, MST were not meeting the quality standards anyway.
- The capacity for both Key House and Palm Cove Society (PCS) is increased by 8 units each as efficiency savings. PCS and Key House can absorb the capacity at no extra costs.
- There should be no issues for TUPE (from MST to the other 2 providers) because the 2 providers will be absorbing to capacity and will not be employing additional staff to take that on.
- It was mentioned that a debate took place at the last SCG about the extension of the contracts. Members of the SCG felt that whenever a service is successful, contracts

should be extended consistently by 3 yrs. Jayne pointed out that in terms of budget SP can always give a provider 6 months notice for the contract to come to an end.

AK spoke about the findings from the peer reviewers which backs up the SP findings.

Jayne and the SU wanted this opportunity to note how well and proactive PCS are doing. PCS have just come into the SP world and have taken on the QAF. They are not far off from getting to a level B. The feedback on PCS that is received from partners is that they are doing an excellent job.

Decisions – Members accepted the recommendations as outlined in the report.

7. **Young persons annual review report**

Trudi went through the report which details the current position with Young Persons providers in the district as at the 2010 annual review. Trudi summarized the key points:

- The Young Persons services have been assessed against the new QAF (2009). In May 2010 a Light Touch Review Process was introduced whereby providers who had previously gained a level B under the old QAF (2004) could be pass ported through 72 out of the 145 standards as these were included within the old QAF. The services have therefore been assessed against just 73 out of the 145 standards as these have been introduced as new standards.
- Out of eight providers assessed at part of this annual review under the revised QAF (2009), six of the providers have achieved level C of the QAF therefore having two providers failing to achieve the minimum standard although improvement plans have been issued.
- One provider submitted evidence to be assessed against a level B of the QAF of which they achieved 90%. The provider has been made aware of what improvements are required in order to fully meet a level B and has agreed to ensure the improvements are implanted prior to the next annual review.

Discussion took place about future direction on strategic reviews for example if a provider has a contract for 3 years, the commissioning team are working with legal at the moment to put a contract clause in where it will be stipulated that there is an expectation that the provider is at the next level next time the annual review comes round. This will be presented CB & SCG members at the joint meeting in January.

Decision – Members noted the contents of the report.

8. **Bradford Supported Housing**

Both Alex and Chris presented this report which summarises the progress made working with Bradford Supported Housing (BSH)

The report highlighted the following key points:

- Since March 2010 the Authority (including all aspects of Care and Supporting People) and BSH have been working together on an Intensive Improvement process and the relationship between the Provider and the Authority had improved during that time.
- Due to risk issues, care management had previously withdrawn from direct involvement with tenants. Choice Advocacy was commissioned to undertake a tenant consultant exercise which has resulted in the planned reintroduction of Care Management.
- At the same time, the LD sector is introducing a new Provider Framework Agreement for domiciliary support, housing related support and supported living services and, similarly to all other Providers in the LD sector, BSH will have to pass this in order to still be eligible to receive business from the Authority.
- Any existing provider who fails to be included on the Framework will have their contract will end and the existing support function will be redistributed to another provider/s. Unlike Accreditation and the ALOC, the Framework is a closed process, therefore if the

provider fails at this stage they cannot re-apply immediately, it is expected that the Framework will not re-open for 3-4 years.

The following points were noted:

- SP team working with care management to engage care managers in developing better services via support planning process
- The involvement of Choice Advocacy, an organisation independent to both parties allowing service users to raise any issues through consultation.
- The fact that service users are happy with the service they are receiving.
- Care Management's approach is to manage expectations and the support planning will help ensure they receive the level of support they are entitled to, the way that support should be provided and give them the confidence to express their feelings.
- Assurance that the PQQ process is a sufficiently robust measure of whether an LD provider is fit for purpose
- Timescale of PQQ process
- Assessment process should be completed by Sept 2011 but that is if all tenants decide they would like an assessment but if some tenants decide not to engage in the assessments then that would shorten the timescales
- Principle is that the team continue to
 - (a) not make any placements there
 - (b) continue to ensure in what ever way possible that tenants in there get to see alternatives, once they see these alternatives that's when they actually make choices about what better opportunities there are for people
- SU's in Bradford have been offered the opportunity to become quality checkers and one SU from BSH has expressed an interest to go through the training. This is a really positive move forward because the individual has been someone that has been very vocal about commissioners to stay well away from this service. This SU involvement in the training should hopefully have a positive effect throughout the tenant group at BSH.

Decision – Members agreed to defer a decommission decision until all assessments have taken place and the results of the PQQ are known.

9. Any other Business

Date, time, venue for next meeting

4th April, 11-1pm, Olicana House, 1st Floor Conference Room