Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

Scrutiny Board Inquiry: Personalisation

Working Group Meeting: 20th April 2009

Present   **Members**
               Cllr Stuart Andrew - Chair
               Cllr Suzi Armitage
               Cllr Penny Ewens
               Cllr Alan Taylor
               Joy Fisher (co-opted member)
               Officers
               John Lennon – Chief Officer, Access and Inclusion
               Jemima Sparks – Service Delivery Manager West, Adult Social Care
               Robert Russell – Principal Financial Manager
               Sarfraz Khan – Financial Manager
               Sandra Newbould – Principal Scrutiny Advisor

Apologies   Cllr Judith Chapman
               Sally Morgan (co-opted member)

No.	Item	Action
1	**Attendance** The attendance and apologies as above were noted. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2	**Notes of Previous Meeting – 16th March 2009** The draft notes of the meeting were presented and agreed.	
3	**Personalisation Update Report** A general report was presented to members of the group to update them on the implementation of self directed support (SDS). It highlighted the changes and the impact that will occur. Early Implementer – An update is due to be presented to the ASC Scrutiny Board on the 6th of May. All those taking part in the pilot are doing so voluntarily and are aware that some of the systems in place are being trialled. No one taking part is being disadvantaged financially. Support Planning – The first version of the Single Assessment Questionnaire is now being trailed. So far 30 customers have completed it. Care Management and Workforce Development – There will be requirement for the workforce to adapt and learn new skills to deliver the transformed service.	

		Commissioning – Members recognised that service transformation will have a great impact on commissioned services and asked what was being done to support service providers through this uncertain process and also develop local social enterprise. They were advised that it is very difficult to commission for outcomes. Members requested that this area is discussed in greater detail at a future working group meeting.	SN/JL
		Information Technology and Management – there is a need to ensure that systems within Adult Social Services are in place to adequately record SDS cases. (Members may recall at the April ASC Board meeting they were advised that current systems do not have adequate functionality to ensure complete case management or provide relevant statistical information.)	
		Other initiatives such as on line resources being investigated such as Shop 4 Support (www.shop4support.com).	JS
		Communication – Information is being distributed in various formats, Newsletter, Web and shortly via DVD. Members requested a copy of the newsletter. Copy to be provided to SN	
		Concern was raised that I.T. based assistance will be of no benefit for those without I.T. skills, it was clarified however that this was not the only means of support available just one of the options being appraised.	
		Consultation – It was highlighted that there will be an element of consultation with Elected Members and the Public.	
		Self Directed Support Reference Group – It was highlighted that some members of the SDS reference group are on the Early Implementer Project. The group expressed a wish for some representatives from the EI project to attend a working group to give candid feedback of their experiences of using and applying for a personalised budget.	SN/JL SN/JL
		Peer Support – It was stated that peer support is an essential requirement to get systems up and running and the group would be interested to know at a future meeting what peer support arrangements are in place.	SN/JL
		Transition of Children to SDS in Adult Social Care – the Group also stated that they would like to know more about the arrangements to be implemented to manage to transition of young adults into the ASC system.	

4	The Resource Allocation System (RAS) Robert Russell introduced a report to the working group which explained the Resource Allocation System as a financial model for calculating the allocation of money to service users so that they can have greater levels of choice and control over the services they receive. The resource allocation system uses a points system which determines how much money is allocated based on a persons completed questionnaire. (SAQ) The group was advised that as individuals move to SDS, the historical anomalies of the current system should be removed, so that people with similar needs should receive similar amounts or funding. Currently local authorities are developing their own RAS' however there may be a move to develop a national RAS which should create some consistency, and where a person moves to another authority enable resources to be allocated based on the assessment of the previous authority. With ASC budgets being in local authority control the group noted that a postcode lottery could still exist depending on which local authority area someone lives in. The group was advised that there will be financial winners and losers with the RAS and that the system is still being trialled in order to iron out anomalies. A contingency is currently in place to minimise detrimental impact. The group noted that there is currently no appeals system in place and stated that there should be a formally documented process established for dealing swiftly with cases where the client wishes to dispute the level of budget provided. Those going down the SDS route should have access to information which advises them of the process should to be followed in the event of a disagreement. The group was also concerned that there may be disparity in amounts allocated due to age as reported by Age Concern and Help the Aged. The group was advised that Leeds operates only one RAS which means that those with similar support needs will be allocated similar amounts, regardless of age. Other authorities have operated more than one RAS where the type of RAS used was determined by age and other factors. This process has not been adopted by Leeds.		
5	Further Action Items to be incorporated into the groups work programme: • Peer support. • Changing Perceptions how to get service users to think differently about their own care. • Transition of children to Adult Social Care	SN/JL	

	• Commissioning and Social Enterprise. • Individuals included in the pilot to speak to the working group about their experiences. Newsletter and Survey to circulate to members of the group. Session 3 - June/July 2009 During the third session of the inquiry the working group scheduled to examine: The Common Assessment Framework, Single Assessment Questionnaire, and associated areas, • The Process of assessment and review • Partnership working - so people 'only need to tell their story once'. • Provision of urgent social care support, particularly outside normal working hours. • Advocacy Services The Common Assessment Framework may be deferred to a later session.	SN/JS SN/JL
6	Future Meeting Dates To be arranged at the first Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board	SN