## Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

**Scrutiny Board Inquiry: Personalisation** 

Working Group Meeting: 18th September 2009

## Present Members

Cllr Judith Chapman – Chair (JC) Cllr James McKenna (JM) Cllr Vonnie Morgan (VM) Cllr Valerie Kendall (co-opted member) (VK) Joy Fisher (co-opted member) (JF) Sally Morgan (co-opted member) (SM) **Officers** John Lennon – Chief Officer, Access and Inclusion (JL) Emma Lewis – Business Change Manager (EL) Jemima Sparks – Service Delivery Manager (JS) Claire Matson – Business Change Leader (CM) Susan Morrell – Leeds Centre for Integrated Living (SMo) Sandra Newbould – Principal Scrutiny Advisor (SN)

Apologies Cllr Penny Ewens (PE) Cllr Alan Taylor (AT)

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	
	The draft notes of the meeting were presented and agreed.	
	<ul> <li>With regard to the written answers to questions issued after the August meeting SM and JC commented on the following:</li> <li>Peer Support for PA's</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Language and interpretation support</li> <li>Resource Allocation System – SN to forward details for 1<sup>st</sup> Personalisation meeting to SM for information.</li> </ul>	SN
3	Partnership Working	
	The Self Directed Support – Partnership Working paper was introduced by JS who explained that the principal was to approach the whole area of SDS as one council to ensure collaborative working. This also involved working closely with service users. Particular focus is being undertaken to streamline the 1 <sup>st</sup> point of contact by working closely with Customer Services to improve the resolution of enquires to the contact centre.	
	Beneficial aspects of the project board were highlighted including the opportunity to learn from others. The Group were advised that all partners were well represented and meetings take place approx every 6 weeks.	

	The working group were advised of ongoing discussions relating to the provision of adaptations however it has been decided that this would not be included as part of the SDS project.	
	The following points were raised:	
	JM – Referring to the report most of the discussions seem to have taken place with professionals not users. This could create a large information gap. In response the group was advised that a large amount of discussion has taken place aspects of which were not referred to in the report as it is specifically relating to work with partners rather than stakeholders. The group was reassured that the neighbourhood networks of voluntary organisations would be/are involved.	
	JC – The council needs to be fully aware of the types of services available. The group was advised that further information regarding this would be presented to the working group in November when the commissioning evidence is due to be presented.	
	VK – raised concerns regarding duplication within the NHS and their own agenda for personalisation. It was explained to the group that this does not impact on ASC as expenditure relates purely to health matters. The area of personalisation within the health service is very much in its infancy, 8 pilot schemes have been set up across the country (Leeds is not one). The working group requested further information relating to this area for circulation.	JL
	Members of the working group also requested further information relating to the current situation with Extra Care Housing.	JL
	VM – Raised a query relating to an individual case and asked if people are required to have an personal budget. The group were advised that everyone has to be offered the choice of a personal budget but people can choose to stay as they are with a more traditional support package.	
4	Brokerage	
	SMo introduced the Brokerage update report to the working group.	
	The Brokerage Service is still in a stage of early development however a progress report on the first phase of the programme was presented.	
	JF commented on the USP service, saying that service users are confident knowing that the Brokerage service is run by those who benefit from the service themselves. SMo added that reference groups need to be broadened and more inclusive so that other	

	service user groups get the most out of it.	
	VM expressed concerns about the creation of the post for an Independent Living Guide, asking if just one post was enough to cover the needs of all service users. SMo assured the group that funding has been sought for two posts if two are needed . The initial post will be used as a learning point for the future.	
5	Single Assessment Process – So people ' only need to tell their story once' .	
	JS presented a paper on the Single Assessment Process, a challenge that faces all organisations. The process involves a two-phased solution.	
	JMcK expressed grave concerns about the security of personal details and requested further information about what action would be taken to ensure that said information did not fall into the wrong hands.	
	The Chair concurred with this statement and requested regular updates on this issue and further information on how other local authorities will tackle this.	SN/JL
6	Further Action	
	With reference to Session 6, the Commissioned Services and Social Enterprise inquiry will be removed from the agenda due to an absence of staff. This item will be rescheduled for the November meeting.	
	SM gave her apologies in advance prior to the next meeting.	
	Session 6 - 15 <sup>th</sup> October	
	During this session of the inquiry the working group scheduled to examine:	
	<ul> <li>Financial Budgets and Value for Money.</li> <li>Early Implementer evaluation update and experiences of care managers and support officers.</li> </ul>	
6	Future Meeting Dates	SN
	<ul> <li>15 October - 10am Committee Room 2</li> <li>11 November – 2pm Committee Room 3</li> <li>10 December – 10am Committee Room 3</li> </ul>	