

Supporting People

Minutes of the Bradford Supporting People Commissioning Body Meeting 1-3pm on Monday, 21 September 2009 5th Floor, Olicana House

Present:

CB Members:

Moira Wilson Strategic Director Adult and Community Services,
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (Chair)
Neil Moloney Assistant Chief Officer – West Yorkshire Probation

CB Officers in attendance:

Guy Van Dichele Assistant Director Commissioning, Performance &
Business Support, City of Bradford Metropolitan
District Council (Accountable Officer)
Jayne Hellowell SP Lead Officer City of Bradford Metropolitan
District Council
Wendy Hall Programme Manager Partnerships City of Bradford
Metropolitan District Council
JB Supporting People Service User
Katie Nutman SP Service User Involvement Officer
EW Supporting People Service User
Tyler Moore SP Transitions Manager
Rominder Dhothar SP Service Development Officer (Minute Taker)
Pam James Service User Advocate Representative
Neal Heard Service User Support
Walter O'Neal Primary Care Trust
Rachel Lorimer SP Service Development/ Research Manager
David Shepherd Assistant Director Housing Service, City of Bradford
Metropolitan District Council, Chair of the SCG

1. Apologies:

Cllr Dale Smith Portfolio Holder
AK Supporting People Service User

2. Declarations of interest

JB – Service user representative as a board member of Horton HA.

3. Minutes and matters arising from the meeting held on 1 June 2009

Matters arising

Page 2 – Impact Property Services – Item 4 - JH not heard on final decision of ombudsman. GVD – housing benefit issue has been resolved. Met with them about relations with the council. They could continue to meet with us but not comeback to us yet.

Page 3 – One commissioner was there last time. The terms of reference need looking at.

Action: JH to look at terms of reference for service user involvement and SP, then align terms of reference and bring back to CB.

The minutes were agreed as correct record and need to include MW apologies.

4. Lead Officer Update

4.1. Total Place

JH – Will have an impact on future commissioning body decisions. Total Place looks at how a ‘whole area’ approach to public services in a local area can lead to better services at less cost through 13 pilot areas in England. Bradford has been chosen to be one of these pilot areas. Our Total Place project will ask fundamental questions about how public spending in Bradford fits with the priorities of the Bradford District Partnership, and how services can be improved to drive improved outcomes and greater efficiency.

Bradford District Partnership own the Total Place Project and have worked together to identify an overall theme of providing a ‘gateway to integrated services’ and has agreed to develop the methodology by focusing on three key themes:

- Children leaving a care environment
- Older people leaving hospital
- Offenders leaving prison

Bradford is one of the test sites and there will be some financial mapping by a consultancy firm. The idea is to see where we could do things better. Bradford is very fortunate to be one of the test sites. There has been quite a lot of planning meetings about it.

We were in the process of commissioning young peoples service. However if we do commission, with Total Place we may find we need to do things differently.

NM – Need for services on local level to continue. TP looks at local and national level.

WH – The October deadline for TP is issues with the plan to come later. With solutions coming January 2010.

MW – Check with YP commissioners and provided they are in agreement then press ahead.

JH – those services identified in commissioning plan. The outcome of sector review were sent to the key commissioners review to say this was happening and to see if we press ahead with these services for young people. The commissioning plans are for carers who are sexually exploited and that's not necessarily for young people leaving care. Then it's whether or not we want to press ahead with those priorities and see what comes up after.

GVD – would like to see that.

MW – that is generally the feeling.

JH - Older peoples are then to be held until the TP outcomes and YP to press ahead.

MW – talk to Janice between now and next commissioning body and bring this back to next CB meeting.

MW – queried money in these areas.

JH – approx £250,000.

GVD – agree we leave the programme as it is.

4.2. Commissioning Table

Primary Client Group	Service Type	Capacity
Budget 2009/10	£2,738,480	
Teenage parents	Floating Support	10
Young people living at home		Total Place
Young people who are carers		Total Place
Young people who are sexually exploited		Total Place
Older persons hospital discharge		Total Place
Extra care investment	Accommodation based	240
Substance misuse	Accommodation based	10
Substance misuse	Floating Support	10
Complex needs	Floating Support	20
Complex needs	Accommodation based	10

JH – Table included as a reminder of key commissions coming up. We will move Total Place for Young People and put capacity back in there. For

Extra Care investment we need to be picking up tab where we are not in, work has not started there however Older People's review is to start and will tap into this. Generic floating support will be going out to tender (not on table). A site has been identified with asset management, we are gearing up for 10 accommodation based and 10 dispersed units. This is progressing well. With substance misuse group and complex needs group we want to look at existing services and possibly expanding on them, will look at coming back to this in Novembers meeting.

Agreed to commission young persons services and hold on older persons.

4.3. Supporting People Commissioners away day

JH – This is a strategic planning day to look at the future of Supporting People and will be at a director level.

4.4. Unallocated funding – 2009 bidding round

JH – Opening up bidding round because unallocated funding is still available. However there needs to be conditions because some of the services that were expanded are now being considered for decommissioning due to quality. This time we want to home in on enhanced support planning and increased outcomes e.g. training older people around protection of abuse in sheltered housing. Also need to look towards who can get in (so should those not achieving a level B on QAF enter a bid – this would be no but with this there needs to be a balance against those who have not entered a bid).

GVD – Could we look to incorporating personalisation in bids? With a theme for providers on what they would do.

JH – this could be incorporated, we would need to draw out access with service users.

TM – initiatives such as building on support plans e.g. lowering carbon footprint

JH – Grow initiative (employment places) is one area with the need for more planning for service users, particularly around access as mystery shopping has brought up issues.

KN – Yvonne Latawiec will feedback to Service User Group on mystery shopping.

JH & MW – bid in for funding similar to last year, with bid proforma and but requires revision. There were 80 bids last year and lots of consultation taking place.

MW – JH to draw up revised criteria and MW and NM to sign off.

MW – JH to have delegated responsibility for bids.

4.5. PSA16

JH - Public Service Agreements (PSAs) have played a vital role in stimulating public service delivery and driving major improvements in outcomes.

The PSA focuses on four at-risk client groups, which are:

1. care leavers
2. adult offenders under probation supervision
3. adults in contact with secondary mental health services
4. adults with moderate to severe learning disabilities

A total of eight indicators underpin the PSA and will be used to measure progress for each at-risk group towards increasing the proportions in settled

accommodation and in employment, education or training.

Indicators 1-4: Proportion of socially excluded adults in settled accommodation.

Indicators 5-8: Proportion of socially excluded adults in employment, education or training.

At the local level, appropriate improvement targets should be negotiated between Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) and Government Offices, as part of Local Area Agreements (LAAs).

A diagnostic visit will take place on 28/29 September 2009 by the CLG on Bradford. The outcome will tell the government if there is any priority action required to help the most socially excluded adults to access and maintain settled accommodation, across both the social and private sector in Bradford.

The outcome of the CLG report (headed by Lorraine Regan) is to say where Bradford is and where it can work with CLG. We been selected (1 out of 9 sites) to work on LD services moving into secondary accommodation.

WH – Government are currently reviewing the indicator set (NI141). The CLG will do this and may change indicator sets, there is some kind of consultation taking place. I will keep JH informed.

JH - there also needs to be a dialogue on N142 as part of refresh

PJ – how was Bradford selected for NDTI (1 out of 9) and Total Place (1 out of 13)

NM – volunteered for Total Place

JH – opportunity given for NDTI

MW it would be useful to have an update of 28th and 29th visit (Changing Lives Programme) with a report on it from JH.

GVD – well done to supporting people, they would not have been able to do this and it has improved since last 2 years.

4.6. Needs and service mapping exercise

JH – approached by service improvement team on pulling together substance misuse report for SP. This is one to watch out for.

RL – Sector review had lots of representatives.

JH – nobody from SP went to the observatory
 MW – bring the observatory to Bradford. Contact them to brief the team and Service user group.

4.7. Attendance monitoring

Statistics have been compiled from the previous 10 meetings and assessed at the point of take up of membership.

Name	Role	27 July 09	% analysis
Members			
Moira Wilson	Local Authority (Chair)	0	70.00%
Matt Neligan	Health	0	70.00%
Liz Barry	Health (substitute)		
Neil Moloney	Probation	1	100.00%
Peter Hart	Probation (substitute)		
Officers in attendance			
Guy Van Dichele	Accountable Officer	1	80.00%
Jayne Hellowell	Lead Officer	1	70.00%
David Shepherd	Chair of SCG	0	80.00%
Wendy Hall	Strategic Partner Representative (LSP Partnerships)	1	55.56%
Pam James	Service User Involvement Representative (Advocate)	0	55.56%
EWWalgrove JB Ann Kaye	Supporting People Service user representatives	1	100.00%

5. Service User Involvement Group (SUIG)

KN - The 18th meeting of the group was attended by 15 service users and advocates from a variety of client groups and types of services. Items discussed included: -

- Update on SP
- Discussion around Service User (SU) representation at strategic groups & meetings
- Feedback from Commissioning Body meeting (27th July)
- Information on agenda items for Strategic Core Group Meeting (18th August)
- Presentation on other SU groups in the district & information on what people need to be in control of their lives as full citizens
- Presentation/discussion/game around what makes a good service

- Volunteers requested for 'Action Group' to review SP questionnaire

5.1 Outcomes:

- Service users who attended have increased knowledge of SP programme & links to other SU groups.
- Wider group of service users receive information through meeting reports
- Discussion & decision from the group to establish a governance sub group to improve & support SU reps at strategic meetings
- Discussion & consultation with service users about what makes a good service
- Opportunities to volunteer for further SU activities in SP programme.

KN – look to establish a committee for representations

JB – Representative Support if somebody is off.

KN – what makes a good service? Those who attend meetings have a better understanding of SP.

5.2. Tenancy Ready Framework

KN – Service user group are going to explain to what tenancy ready is to people from service user perspective via a pack, presentation and leaflet.

NH – tenancy ready for frontline workers too.

5.3. Annual Service User Survey

KN - 9 Service Users from a range of services came together to review the annual service user survey. The group changed the wording of the questions to make them easier to understand as the feedback from last years survey was that it was confusing. The survey will be used to compare last years results to see if the targets set in the Service User Involvement Action Plan have been met. The results will also inform the new action plan which will identify the key priorities for the SP programme. The impact of service users being involved is that they have made the questions clearer to understand and therefore more service user should be able to complete the survey and give their opinion on the service they receive.

5 Service Users from the Bradford City Centre Project (BCCP) attended who had never been involved before. They were given information on the Service User Involvement Group and how they can have an influence on the service they receive. This was another opportunity for service users who are regularly involved to support new service users understand the SP programme.

At the end of October 2009 the service user survey is to go out.

5.4 Outcomes Sub Group

KN - Meeting focused on how SP set targets for services to improve outcomes for service users, as measured by Communities and Local Government (CLG) change the social care or welfare system where everyone is in control of their lives as full citizens outcomes monitoring forms. It also discussed training for providers on completing outcomes forms. 2 Service Users representatives were involved in this meeting and were therefore able to give their views of outcomes from a service user perspective.

5.5 Mystery Shopping

KN – 25 Service Users carried out mystery shopping. This was completed and they met this morning with Yvonne Latawiec (Link Worker). Yvonne is going to review Mystery Shopping and look at SP promotion further.
MW – the sooner we get the feedback it needs to be broader than the commissioning body.

5.6 Commissioning Body and Strategic Core Group

KN - 3 SU reps have continued to participate in strategic meetings feeding back to a wider group of service users via the SUIG and meeting reports. Service User voices heard at SCG so this can be passed onto other Service Users.

JH – report needs to look how above influences what we do.

KN – this will be looked at by the governance group.

NM – Thank you to NH and KN for SU feedback from offenders it was absolutely brilliant and well delivered.

KN – attendee of this group got lots out of it.

GVD – at our next meeting could we look at the Service User budget and could I receive copy of the questionnaire. Having this information allows us to see the work that's taking place.

JH – circulate minutes with questionnaire.

NH – how should we present to senior managers.

GVD – case studies.

KN – this could be a tool for promoting SP.

MW – met with chief executive this morning, was pleased as we came from a long way back. 1 suggestion made towards organising a celebration event of how far we have come and with service users would be a good idea.

KN – we are looking to also recruit a service user for SP team

JH – Yvonne Latawiec is looking to plan a conference and pull this in together April of next year.

6. Performance report

JH - The Commissioning Body to note the content of this report and consultation with service providers on an updated approach to target setting for KPI 2 at the client group level.

JH - shocked by poor performance of some providers e.g. one provider is a long way from achieving level B of the QAF and another submitting the approved list paperwork in French! Look at removing OP from performance data due to 2 year review of OP sector and performance data will be revised with Service Users in the New Year.

MW – we cannot carry on commissioning poor quality providers. We need to be prepared for decommissioning providers. Update the impact assessment.

GVD & MW – draft a letter to those providers performing at a level C and D of QAF to address poor quality providers.

NH – there is also the question of ‘People not knowing what a good service is?’

GVD – focus on A’s and B’s not just C’s and D’s

RL – letter to all providers on performance

GVD – both A’s and B’s with C’s and D’s

MW - KPI 1 and KPI 2 – 70% on KPI 2 is quite high for some service user groups, look at a benchmark. Also performance data needs revising for KPI’s and NI’s with a key.

7. Octavia Court and dispersed units

RL – SCG recommends Octavia Court. Service Contract Price will increase with a combined cost of £422,000 (approx £85,000 per annum, Horton Housing providing at £97,000).

DS – Core group have looked at this in detail and had a full discussion with vote. Favour of recommendation to go forward.

MW – a clear recommendation from the core group for this service.

WO – why an increase in cost?

JH – now InCommunities releases Horton by having the dispersed units.

RL – InCommunities have accepted 3 month plan and they believe this is achievable before the deadline in place.

GVD – queried generic?

RL & MW – the primary is DV but with generic.

GVD & JH – Contractual obligation for support provider and landlord.

MW – We would backdate to 1st April 2009 if this provider was operating at Level B throughout but will start payment from 21st September 2009, given their QAF score.

8. Delivery Plan

The delivery plan was tabled to note content and progress.

9. Any other business

None