

Supporting People

Minutes of the Supporting People Strategic Core Group meeting held on Tuesday, 9th November 2010 2 - 4pm, Lockwood Room, Design Exchange

Present:

Pip Tibbetts (Vice chair)	West Yorkshire Probation
Jayne Hellowell	SP Lead Officer and Service Manager Commissioning (Adults and Housing Related Support)
Guy Van Dichele	SP Accountable Officer and Assistant Director Commissioning, Performance and Business Support
Sheila Bamford	Executive Director-Horton HA (Provider Rep)
Katie Pierce	SP Service User Involvement Officer
Sarah Possingham	Access to Housing, CBMDC
Pam James	Service User Advocate
John Hill	Foundation Housing (Provider Rep)
James Purdie	Children's Services
Graham Mynott	Key House (Provider Rep)
Mark Hird	Bradford Foyer (Provider Rep)
Claire Blacka	Stonham (Provider Rep)
Tim Sanders	Strategic Commissioning, CBMDC
John Hannon	SP service user
Tim Sanders	Strategic Commissioning, CBMDC
Chris Cobb	Contracts & Quality Assurance Manager, CBMDC
Alex Mullett	Transitions Officer, CBMDC
Trudi Wilson	Contracts & Quality Assurance Officer, CBMDC
Liberty Mupakati	Contracts & Quality Assurance Officer, CBMDC
Rominder Dhothar	Contracts & Quality Assurance Officer, CBMDC

1. Apologies / Introductions

David Shepherd	Assistant Director Housing Service, CBMDC
Dave Coe	Bradford Youth Offending Team
Val Balding	Safer Communities, CBMDC
Nina Smith	Safer Communities, CBMDC

Welcome & introductions were made around the table

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

- Item 5 – John Hill
- Item 6 – Graham Mynott
- Item 7 – Sheila Bamford, Graham Mynott & Mark Hird

3. Minutes and matters arising from the meeting held on 14th September 2010

Pg 4 - Last paragraph, 1st bullet point "One of the QAF requirements is SU involvement and this is part of it"

John queried this bullet point as it was felt that this is not part of the QAF nor has it been agreed by anyone.

Jayne responded that there is still a lot of work to be done to refine this piece of work. SP Team believe that it is part of the QAF in the sense of supporting providers to get to where they need to be with Service Users, but technically speaking it is not part of the QAF.

It was noted that this item will be discussed at the next provider forum which is to take place on 16th December to try and map out a way forward with it.

Item 6 Service User Reward & Recognition Policy

This policy has been approved and signed off by the Homelessness core group.

The minutes were then agreed as a true and accurate record

4. Lead Officer Update – Jayne Hellowell

4.1 Feedback from Commissioning Body meeting 23 August 2010

Jayne referred to her report and informed members that all recommendations submitted were endorsed by CB members.

Jayne reported that Maggie Smallridge from probation has highlighted that probation would like to look at the SU reward and recognition policy in relation to probation's policy so that it can be dovetailed in. It was also noted that carers need to be incorporated into this policy (i.e where carers are not being paid). Katie is looking into these 2 items.

4.2 Outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR)

Jayne went through the key points of the CSR as highlighted in the lead officer report

Jayne gave the following clarity on each of the key points :

- The settlement is 6 billion over 4 years which is a reduction of 400 million which represents 6%. Once inflation is added it could be 11 – 12% .
- For local settlement Bradford Council have to make 28% savings in the next 4 years.
- SP grant is allocated into the area base grant which means that corporately a decision has still got to be made on what happens to local allocation. This will not be known until the New Year. The council are currently working around priorities and savings.
- The government is looking at settlements determined through a distribution formula and until this is known we cannot be sure of the final allocation to Bradford.

4.3 Open for Business

Jayne spoke about the two conferences that have been held in Bradford which invited care and support providers along to consider how the authority change the face of business to account for changing needs and personalisation. Jayne stressed how important it is for housing related support (HRS) providers to be involved in this as market development affects HRS as much as it does the care market.

Paul O'Brien the Market Development Manager took the opportunity to give a presentation at the last provider forum to take providers through the key issues.

Jayne informed members that the authority will be producing a strategy on this in the New Year which will provide some more information and Paul will be producing some guidance on supporting providers on where they need to be.

4.4 Strategic approach to service delivery

Jayne spoke about the potential need of remodelling the market by sector. Members were asked to note the necessity to start thinking of what this will mean in partnership with stakeholders, providers and service users.

Jayne informed members that the commissioning team have started to engage with Violence against Women sector and have started to talk to them about some of the implications.

Jayne stressed that this doesn't mean that any decisions will be made without engaging with the sectors.

4.5 Vulnerable persons strategy – update

Jayne reported that a tender document is being pulled together now and the team are looking at going out to tender for that piece of work to be carried out. The outcome of this work will be used to feed into the local investment plan which is due to be submitted to the HCA in the New Year. This will give a strategic overview on what the priorities are and investment in the supported housing sector.

The reality is nil capital for investment but what this strategy will do is tell us what is fit for purpose and help us to make those strategic plans of where we go in the future.

4.6 Attendance monitoring

To note

5. Langley Trust report and impact assessment

Tracey Wild was present at this part of the meeting and was introduced to members around the table.

Rominder informed the meeting that as requested by members of the SCG 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 term 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.

Tracey was asked to report on any inaccuracies in this report. She commented that there were no inaccuracies but was very pleased that the report is much more positive. She commented that LHT are committed to working with the SP team in order to ensure that standards are met and maintained. She informed members that a lot of work is currently being done to improve the service and building and welcomed all the points in the report. She

commented on the impact of losing a niche service and recognises that mistakes have been made but are more than willing to rectifying the mistakes.

Guy and the chair commented that it is very reassuring to hear that LHT want to work with the SP Team in order to meet the quality standards and Jayne added that full support will be given from members of the Commissioning Team over the next 12 months which will be intensive in order to meet the standards.

Members all thanked Tracey for attending the meeting.

This agenda item was then opened up for comments from members. Discussion took place on the following points:

- Concern if the provider does not meet the standards in 12 months. What will happen next? At what stage are alternatives looked at if they are not meeting the standards.
- The need of looking at alternatives (new service provider, bricks & mortar) that could be put in place in parallel to the impact assessment being carried out.
- How the Vulnerable Person's Housing Strategy will link into this.
- Which part of the QAF they are failing on
- West Yorkshire Probation's stance that they would not support an ongoing provision if they felt that that service was putting someone in risk.

Sheila noted the following concerns for the provider

- The risk of financial investment in the building by LHT if the decision of decommissioning is made if standards are not met.
- Or for example if in 12 months time it is decided that the building is too big, has too many units etc. If the building is reduced then this will also reduce the revenue

From the above discussions the following actions were noted:-

Actions

- To do an interim report in 6 months time updating SCG members on the progress being made. (the 6 months will allow them time to improve, seek a decision on it and look at alternatives if needs be)
- To add the report on the forward plan
- To look at the outcome of the VPHS and see how "fit for purpose" the building is.
- To look at the standards within the QAF as an agenda item at the Joint SCG and CB Meeting in March 2011.
- Reminder to note Sheila's concern and incorporate it in the report.

Decision – Members accepted the recommendations in the report with a caveat that a progress report is brought back to the SCG in 6 months time.

6. Refugee sector review report (MST Impact assessment as appendix)

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

The key points focussed on:

- Details of each of the existing service provision within the sector and the proposals attached to each
- The gaps in provision

Sheila expressed concern that the context in this report is used from an unreliable source, the home office themselves do not know the exact numbers of asylum seekers and refugees in this country and failing a service just because the telephone reception is bad is very unreasonable.

Liberty commented that an extensive desk top study was carried out about the prevailing number of asylum seekers and refugees in the country. Most of the information is from the home office. Consultation was also sought from workshops for organisations who work with refugees and asylum seekers.

In response to the concerns above Jayne acknowledged the need to be more robust with information that is pulled together for sector reviews. She pointed out that as an authority the need to engage more widely with the provider sector is very important. Some providers may have a wealth of knowledge that can be used and may determine what the future demand is. She also pointed out that the team would never decommission a service on an issue such as the telephone reception. Officers were asked to pick this point up as a general point of clarity for future reports.

Sarah informed members that the authority will be entering into a very large tendering process for asylum accommodation in the next year and are looking at joining that. She raised concern that the 3 year contracts issued to Key House and Palm Cove Society may not allow the authority to do that.

Jayne noted this point and expressed the need to go back and look at the contracts again. She referred to a clause in the contract which states that the contracts can be broken providing 6 months notice is served.

Discussion also took place about MST wanting to speak to the 2 providers re TUPE regulations. It was noted that TUPE may not apply for these 2 providers providing that the additional capacity is absorbed within existing staffing arrangement.

Action :

- Officers to support Key House and Palm Cove Society re the TUPE issue if required.

Decision: Members supported the recommendations in the report and to take to the Commissioning Body for approval.

7. Young People/Teenage Parents 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.

John queried the issue on improvement plans and asked what message is being sent out to providers as past messages was saying no to improvement plans.

Jayne explained that if a provider is mid through a contract and is showing no signs of improvement or that they are not on level C of the new QAF then a time limited improvement plan will be put in place. If they do not adhere to that then a default notice will be issued in line with the contract clause stating that they are not adhering to quality.

Decision – Members took note the contents of this report

8. BSH progress report

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

Decision – As a next step members requested timescales for the PQQ process and the introduction of care management to be added to the report being submitted to Commissioning Body

9. Planning day on quality assurance January 2011

The date has been set for the 18th January 2011. The day itself will be around quality assurance and also the comprehensive spending review and some of the implications around that.

The last Joint meeting took place 2008 so it is quite imperative that this joint meeting takes place.

The Commissioning Team will be asked to deliver some aspects on the programme i.e. Kerry & Maggie will speak about the quality side of things and Jayne & Tim around commissioning and financial impact. This meeting will also allow members to iron out any issues and allow providers to feed back on how they are finding the process/changes.

It was noted that there will be no cycle of SCG and CB meeting. The next SCG meeting will take place in March.

Deleted: i.e

10. Any other business

Sarah updated members on the Older Persons Housing Strategy. The final draft of the research has been produced and is now available on the Bradford Website. This is due to be finalised next week.

Consultation on the 6 recommendations that is in the main body of this report which will form the final objectives for the strategy is currently taking place. This consultation can be found on Bradford's main website under consultations. Anybody can go on and do the online survey. The deadline is 11.11.10.