



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

Personalisation and Supporting People Services

Amanda Johnson
Head of Supporting People
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea



What Does Personalisation Mean For Supporting People (SP) Services?

- Giving people access to information so they can make their own choices – i.e. advice centres and community hubs
- Tailoring support to people's individual needs – specialist housing schemes offering a 'core' service and then a menu of support
- Giving people choice about the services they use – remember Choice Based Lettings vs. previous allocation schemes
- Encouraging providers to think in creative, innovative and person centred ways – the RBKC Well Being Centre offers SP service users access to a range of services
- Moving from a service led to a user led model
- SP services are already 'personalised' and are becoming more flexible

What Have We Done In RBKC?

- Developed a virtual Personalisation Team – ensuring that personalisation is a core part of our work plan
- Suspended all ‘new’ PBs due to financial pressures on the SP grant
- In 2007 RBKC began to pilot Individual Budgets, now Personalised Budgets (PBs) for SP services. This was managed in two ways:
 - Converting funding of one existing accommodation based service for people with learning disabilities to PBs for each service user
 - Offering PBs to SP service users living in independent accommodation

How Did The Accommodation Based Pilot Work?

- Westgate Terrace provides 24 hour support for six adults with learning disabilities. It is joint funded by Adult Social Care (ASC) and SP. All service users were assisted in applying for PBs
- Support Brokers assisted services users to complete a Single Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) which captured information on housing support needs and measured eligibility for SP services
- SP developed a Resource Allocation System (RAS) based on local benchmarks for learning disability services
- The SAQs were put through the RAS to determine the SP PBs
- Support Brokers then assisted service users to draft a support plan using their PB

What Were The Outcomes?

- Pilot was largely unsuccessful - a number of challenges were uncovered that eventually led to its suspension
- The primary challenges were:
 - Business processes
 - Commissioning arrangements
 - Managing the 'market'
- Identified the need for a pro-active approach, early piloting of ideas, combined with a cautious approach to implementation

Challenge 1: The Single Assessment Questionnaire

- New process – not a clear division of responsibility or agreement around who was best placed to assist service users – the provider or the local authority?
- There was inconsistency of approach in how the SAQs were completed
- There were delays in turnaround times between SAQs being completed and PBs being allocated
- SAQ evaluated housing support needs, but people completing the form did not have an understanding of how to capture these
- Did brokers have a good understanding of housing support needs?

Challenge 2: The Resource Allocation System (RAS)

- The RAS:
 - led to a decrease in overall funding at Westgate Terrace - it did not accurately reflect current SP contract costs – **was this a problem?**
 - resulted in significant changes in the respective contributions of SP and ASC which is **linked to eligibility**
 - highlighted the significant difference in the cost of housing support vs domiciliary care **and the implications for the provider market**
 - delivered vast differences in the PB entitlements of different service users. Some differences fundamental to the principles of PBs, but also indicated inconsistencies in filling out the SAQs and flaws within the RAS

Challenge 3: Delivering PBs In An Accommodation Based Setting

- De-coupling accommodation from support offers advantages for service users to personalise support
- However, also makes all accommodation based support potentially non-sustainable for providers
- Is there value in retaining some accommodation based support – more comprehensive service user support? value for money? economies of scale? A ‘core’ service?
- The need to strike the right balance was highlighted in the recent Audit Commission report on the SP programme
- How can we retain some accommodation based support and roll out personalised PBs?
- Should some accommodation based services be exempt – hostels, refuges?

Challenge 4: Council And Provider Contracts And Sustainability

- Nomination Rights – will Councils lose nomination rights within schemes as Council and provider contracts become obsolete?
- How can providers be assisted through the transformation period? Can a framework be developed to offer some guarantee of funding?
- How can the SP budget be protected during the move to PBs? SP funding is tied up in contracts through commissioning arrangements. There are significant pressures on our SP grant which does not always deliver statutory services; we need to find a way to ensure services and funding are targeted at those in greatest need. The introduction of SP PBs will make the use of eligibility criteria essential in order to cap costs

So What Is Working?

- In November 2008 work started to develop Individual Service Funds (non cashable PBs) at Church House
- Church House is a two unit 24 hour sleep-in supported housing scheme for people with learning disabilities

How Does The Church House Pilot Differ?

- In order to establish a fair price for the PBs we agreed to use the Care Funding Calculator rather than existing SP contract prices
- Analysis of the information collected using the calculators identified:
 - day events that would keep the service users out of the scheme in the day
 - Care and support needs
 - Level of out of hours support required e.g. sleeping, waking One to One
 - The split between SP and Adult Social Care funding was agreed after discussions with both team managers

- It was agreed that Adult Social Care would fund the personal assistance / care assistance and Supporting People would fund the Independent Living Facilitators
- The sleep-in time management and running costs would be shared 50:50

We Need To Think About The Following Issues:

- Review our assessment process and set out clear guidelines for completing SAQs. Staff training to ensure consistency of approach
- Review our current RAS and develop a system that is reflective of value for money SP costs
- Develop a process for managing changes in funding levels between ASC and SP
- Consult with providers to develop arrangements for managing any changes in provider funding levels, particularly during any transitional periods
- Establish preferred provider lists as part of procurement processes to promote choice, safeguarding....
- Develop a policy position in relation to accommodation based services

- Explore the impact of changes to the Council and provider contract?
- Consider how PBs can be implemented for socially excluded service user groups? We want to pilot Individual Service Funds (ISFs) and look at other ways to meet the needs of more vulnerable groups
- Safeguarding and the management of risks – how can we ensure this?
- How do we maintain the significant improvements in the quality of services that the QAF has delivered?
- Understand the differences in the costs of SP vs ASC services – is this sustainable? What are the implications for the provider market and the skills base of staff?
- Ensuring that assessment staff and brokers understand housing support

Floating Support

- Relatively straightforward to 'personalise' some services by respecifying floating/visiting support model where this is appropriate to service users' needs – same business process issues apply
- Existing floating support service users – need to ensure that block contracts for floating support take account of any PBs made outside of the SP payment process – do not double fund
- How do we ensure that providers can deliver an appropriate number of hours to sustain service delivery?

Final Note:

- Personalisation is not exclusively about PBs
- Their key aim is to improve service user experience in the five key outcome areas
- Keep the bigger picture in mind – not all services need to change
- Ultimate aim is always to improve the service user experience and their outcomes

Future Direction

- Commissioning of 'core' services with block contracts plus PBs
- A cautious approach
- Pro-active about ideas for implementation, but trial in pilot settings
- Explore different approaches for different services and different service user groups
- ISFs – virtual PBs
- Strengthened joint commissioning
- Developing the market – increasing choice and value for money