

Supporting People

Minutes of the Supporting People Strategic Core Group meeting held on Tuesday, 30th March 2010 2 - 4pm, Lockwood Room, Design Exchange

Present:

David Shepherd (Chair)	Assistant Director Housing Service, CBMDC
Jayne Hellowell	Supporting People Lead Officer
Sheila Bamford	Executive Director-Horton HA (Provider Rep)
Rachel Lorimer	SP Service Development & Research Manager
Mike Harney	City Homes in Mind (Provider Rep)
Harry Whittle	Incommunities (Provider Rep)
JB	SP Service User
AK	SP Service User
Katie Nutman	SP Service User Involvement Officer
Sarah Possingham	Access to Housing, CBMDC
Jennifer Moran- Whitehead	Bradford District Care Trust (Provider Rep)
Pam James	Service User Advocate
Dave Coe	Youth Offending Team Manager
Val Balding	Safer Communities, CBMDC
Mairead O'Donnell	LD Commissioner
Yusaf Karolia	Principal Strategy Manager, CBMDC (attended for Item 10&11)

1. Apologies / Introductions

John Hill	Foundation Housing (Provider Rep)
Guy Van Dichele	SP Accountable Officer and Assistant Director Commissioning
Pip Tibbetts	West Yorkshire Probation (Replaces Peter Hart)
John Howarth	Principle Commissioner Older people's Service, Adult & Community Services BMDC
Nina Smith	Safer Communities, CBMDC
Denis Gale	Children's Services

Welcome & introductions were made around the table

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

Item 8 – AK, Jenny Moran Whitehead, Mike Harney, Sheila Bamford, JB
Item 10 & 11 – Sarah Possingham

3. Minutes and matters arising from the meeting held on 2nd February 2010

Page 2 – Generate Project

Sheila questioned who the contact is for this Project. David responded Chris Brown from the housing services is the main contact for this project. David gave some brief information about this project and explained that Chris will be looking at proposals which are around employment / training based

initiatives. David added should a provider be interested in submitting a proposal, they are more than welcome to.

Should anyone require further information on this then they can contact Chris Brown direct.

Page 2 – Appeals Process

Jayne informed members that the 2 stage appeals process went to the CB and they were not happy with this. Jayne will be meeting with legal to try and revert it back to the 1 stage appeals process. Jayne will keep members informed of any updates.

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

4. Lead Officer Update – Jayne Hellowell

4.1 Integration of the Supporting People Team into the wider Adult and Community Services structure

Jayne reported that the integration of the SP Team is still at the consultation stage with staff and union. The final outcome of this will be a few months away. Jayne will keep members updated.

4.2 Changing Lives

Jayne gave brief feedback about the development of the Learning Disabilities (LD) Housing Strategy. Consultation will take place early May with the launch of the strategy in June during the LD week. Jayne pointed out that this strategy will have a whole chapter on pathway to housing for people with a LD. This is also a key PSA 16 target.

4.3 Bradford Supported Housing

Jayne reported that they are now having 3 weekly meetings with BSH. The lead officer report highlights some of the key objectives that SP team are expecting them to adhere to. SP is micro managing the service to get BSH to where they need to be.

4.4 Attendance Monitoring

As per the information in the lead officer's update.

5. SCG terms of reference

Jayne explained that the SCG ToR sets out the basis on which the group operates. The report circulated sets out the detail of the revisions highlighting suggested amendments and new additions.

Discussion took place on:

- Who would be responsible for informing providers that they need to attend a meeting
- Provider representation – does this relate to contract review reports only or anything that may be discussed re their organisation.

Jayne responded that the responsibility for informing providers would lie with Rachel and the Contracting Officers. They will inform the provider that their item is being tabled on the agenda and will give them an allocated timeslot. Sheila requested for this to be added to the ToR's.

David summarized that should a provider want to attend this meeting then this should be around contract reviews only and not any other item that they may have an interest in. This is because if providers are present because they have an interest in an item other than their contract review then this could result in having a large representation at every single meeting which will make it difficult for David to chair the meeting and have some sort of continuity. More importantly this will also undermine the provider reps role.

David also added that he does not want providers to think that this is some sort of appeals process where providers come here lobbying on their behalf of their organisations. The purpose of this group is to have a look at provision of service and ensure it gets an operational input for the CB to make any decisions. SP Team have set out a separate appeals process for providers to get an independent and fair hearing.

Concern was raised about the following sentence in item 5.6 “Provider substitutes must be nominated via the provide forum”. It was commented that this should be in the Provider Forum’s ToR and not the SCG ToR’. After a brief conversation David summarized that SCG ToR’ should have a general clause that states “substitutes should be able to speak and vote on behalf of the organisation/group that they are representing”. This should suffice the provider forum. Provider Forum could add the sentence from Item 5.6 as well so that it ties things up.

Decision – members agreed to adopt the revised terms of reference.

Action – SP Team to add the following sentence to the SCG ToR “where a report relates to a contract that a provider holds they will be informed of this by the contract compliance manager”

6. Fixed Capacity Contracts (FCC)

Jayne explained that the report contains a proposal and detail on the introduction of fixed capacity contracts.

Brief discussion took place on Implementation of the FCC and also the difference between the 2 contracts.

Sheila requested for a distinction to be made in the paper before it is sent to the CB for approval that this will only apply to those people who are on a Block Gross Non Chargeable contract (BGNC).

Action – SP Team to include a sentence in the report which states “This applies to those who are on BGNC”

Decision – SCG members agreed for CB to recommend the approval and adoption of fixed capacity contract.

7. Domestic Violence Sector Review Final Report

Rachel referred to the 3 recommendations highlighted in the report and brief discussion took place as per the following:-

- **1st Recommendation – Provide SSC for 3 years to the existing DV providers**

It was pointed out that the DV Sector volunteered to work with new QAF even though it was not mandatory at that time. Had it been mandatory then SP team may have been making different recommendations. The DV sector worked to the regional guidance as the local ones were not in place at that time.

Decision – SCG members accepted this recommendation.

- **2nd Recommendation – Commission of 20 short term floating support provision for victims of DV either male or female with male teenage children**

Brief discussion took place about the gaps in the service for male victims of domestic abuse.

It was suggested whether the 20 units can be split between male and female (having 1 service just for male and 1 service just for female). Val raised extreme concern that having just the one service that covers both men and women will exclude certain providers straight away.

It was agreed that the SP Team will work with Val and her team on the service spec.

Jayne also pointed out that SP Team can only work with those providers who are on the approved provider list

Action – SP Team to work with Val on the service spec and provide an update to the SCG.

Decision – SCG members accepted this recommendation

- **3rd Recommendation – SP note the request to take up the funding of existing services but at this point decline the request due to resource implications.**

Rachel gave a brief introduction to this recommendation and explained that the key areas that are funded by other pots in the district are likely to be services that fall under the SP programme however due to resource implication within the team and placing individual providers onto the approved list of

contract and the strain on the sp grant, sp propose that them funding pots are actually not taken up by sp grant at this point in time.

Val disagreed with this view and informed members that the domestic abuse partnership commissions some services including floating support and that pot of money is already spent up. As identified by the sp review there are gaps in service provision where that pot of money could actually be spent on whereas sp money couldn't, so it's about freeing up some of that money to be spent on the gaps so that sp can fund what sp can fund and that pot can fund the things that sp can't.

Jayne responded that SP would consider picking up funding of housing related support services to release funding to be prioritised elsewhere. What SP is not prepared to do is pick up a service and the funding that goes with it where those services are not on the approved list.

A discussion then centred on Bradford Women's Aid and the £60,000

Jayne advised she will go back and look at that 60k within the BWA contract and see whether or not that is still a feasible option.

Action – Keep the recommendation as it is but to include a 4th recommendation that states “to review the 60k with BWA in light of the discussion that has taken place at the SCG meeting and report back to the next SCG meeting.

Decision – SCG members accepted the 3rd recommendation.

8. Mental Health Annual Review Report

Rachel reported that the SP team have undertaken an annual review of the MH services and the purpose of this report is to provide members with an update on the current situation with regards to the outcome of the annual review of MH services.

Sheila referred to Fairweather's request of an uplift of 2k which was refused. Sheila argued the fact that this provider is delivering a quality service and has achieved a good QAF score. SP team's decision of not making that minimal award is unfair. All the provider reps around the table agreed with Sheila's comments.

Discussion took place about other providers whose request for uplift has been accepted. SP Team argued that there were clear reasons as to why any uplifts were agreed.

Jayne responded that in terms of consistency she will support the recommendation of not supporting the uplift for the reasons that there is no real justification and no indication that this will financially destabilise this contract.

David summarised that he is conscious that the aim of this programme is to efficiently manage the programme which means driving costs down whilst driving quality upwards. He also agreed to support the recommendation as it is.

Brief discussion took place about Airedale Homes and the reasons to why it has been decided to replace the support provided by Airedale Homes.

Decision – SCG members accepted both recommendations as outlined in the report.

9. Safe Haven Transfer of Provider Report

Rachel explained that Yorkshire Housing (YH) who currently has the overall group responsibility for Safe haven Yorkshire (SHY) have made a strategic decision to concentrate on core business and no longer recognise the work undertaken by SHY as being part of the core business for their organisation. Therefore YH have approached SP to request approval to transfer the service provided by SHY to Metropolitan Support Trust (MST)

Sheila expressed the following concerns:

- MST is on the provider list but not a current provider and never has been. SP team have no knowledge about this provider.
- With the review coming up in July and given that TUPE can be a costly expensive process she wondered whether or not it might well be worth waiting until July to see the outcome of the sector review.
- If we do it in this order what if after the transfer we find out that MYH are not up to scratch. We will have already gone through the TUPE process and then we will have to go through another TUPE process

Sheila questioned why they can not deliver the service for another 3 months after the sector review has been completed. They have been delivering it all this time. It's only another 3 months.

Jayne noted Sheila's concern and commented that Yorkshire Housing have a number of projects throughout Yorkshire & Humber which they are looking to transfer out completely to.

She pointed out that SP team have had a discussion with YH and SH and we have stressed that if they transfer to MST then they do this at their own risk. SH have given SP confidence that they are happy to work with this organisation. They have done all this at risk but this will not affect the programme whatsoever.

David questioned whether SP envisage any affect on SU during this transfer. It was answered no affect on SU or staff.

Decision – SCG members agree to recommend to CB to approve the transfer of SHY to MST for the interim period until the sector review has been complete.

10. Vulnerable Persons Housing Strategy & Investment Plan

Yusaf gave a brief introduction to the report and explained that the report sets out the rationale for completing a housing strategy & investment plan for vulnerable sections of the population and seeks Supporting People grant towards the costs of the project. Yusaf went through the key points in the report.

A lengthy discussion took place and the following concerns were raised:

- This is the 1st time SP budget has been asked directly to fund in something that is not going to result in provision of a service.
- What the implication of this will be for those providers who have contractual relationships with registered social landlords (RSL). This has not been recognised in the report.
- No consultation with providers prior to the report coming out.
- Number of assumptions has been made in the report.
- Statements about the condition of stock in Bradford which is not entirely accurate.
- The research undertaken is 6 years old and is not relevant to the stock in Bradford.
- Disappointment that the Strategic Market Housing Assessment did not pick up on vulnerable adults.
- Reason to why funding has been sought from SP budget and not the local authority base budget.
- What if other department's now come forward asking for funding from the SP budget for projects etc.
- The need to invest in existing stock instead of building new stock.

In response to the above concerns the following points were raised:

- The involvement of the different agencies where investments can be secured i.e Homes & Communities, HCA etc. This will help to secure the investment we require.
- The linkages with Total Place pilot, PSA 16, HCA single conversation.
- Any research in the report is there as example only.
- Consultation with stakeholders and key partners will take place after the go ahead for commission is received.

- Did try to secure funding from the base budget but due to budget pressures in all organisations because of the affects of the recession it was knocked back.
- Funding sought from SP budget because of the massive under spend within SP and because of the eligibility of this project.
- Window of opportunity to use some of SP money at this point to invest in a vital piece of work which will ultimately put SP in a stronger position to invest in the sector.
- The benefits of doing this project in this financial year

Decision:-

The SCG recommends to the CB approval to fund this project with the following caveats:

- SCG will be the steering group for this project. Key decisions will be passed through this group
- The specification will be put together jointly.
- Project Management will be undertaken by Yusaf & his team.
- SU representative will be part of the steering group

11. Older Persons (OP) Housing Strategy & Investment Plan

Yusaf gave a brief introduction to this report which sets out a case for developing a strategy to meet the housing needs of an ageing population within the district.

Pam requested clarification on the OP review and where this work fits in with that and the role of Jacqui Thompson.

Jayne explained that Jacqui is working on the OP Contracts and looking at the revenues that go into the services whereas Yusaf & his team are looking at the stock & condition of stock for older people. The work will eventually come together at some point.

Discussion also took place about the role of the OP Housing Action Group and how the steering group which both Jacqui and Will run has now merged into the Action Group. It was suggested that the reporting route for this project should be via the Action group to the CB.

Decision - SCG recommends to the CB approval to fund this project with a caveat that the reporting arrangement will be via the Older Person Action Group.

12. Any other business

12.1 Pam spoke about the older person week and whether SP have thought of a way to raise the profile / celebrate OP. Jayne responded that Yvonne has been speaking to Nick Farrar about ways of promoting SP.

12.2 Jenny asked about the situation on the area base grant for SP. Jayne answered that there is no more grant conditions on SP. SP will now be held to scrutiny by local authority on how SP money is spent.