

Minutes of Meeting

RECORD OF DISCUSSION - STRATEGIC

DATE: 20th February 2006

PROJECT NAME: Commissioning Body Meeting

PRESENT:

Colin Slasberg – Head of Business Management, Chair of Commissioning Body

Eric Aryee – Assistant Chief Probation Officer

Ian Rydings – Head of Housing, Accountable Officer

Les Billingham – Supporting People Manager

Ann Turner – Supporting People Performance Co-ordinator, Minute Taker

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Zena Deayton – Head of Health and Social Care, Director of PCT

Item	Matters Discussed/Agreed	Action By	Completed by
1.	<p><u>Minutes and Matters Arising - Strategic</u></p> <p>Minutes Agreed.</p> <p><u>Actions Outstanding:-</u></p> <p><i>Information to Service Users:-</i></p> <p>All literature pertaining to information to Service Users was sent to the CB members.</p> <p>The CB felt that this literature contained all the necessary information.</p> <p><i>Voluntary Sector:-</i></p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>LB to write to the Board of the Voluntary Sector to request a representative for the Core Strategy Group (CSG).</p> <p><i>Gables Service Developments:-</i></p> <p>CS wrote to the Head of Planning regarding the Gables new service development.</p> <p>See Agenda Item 10.</p> <p><i>Service Evaluation Update – Project Teams:-</i></p>	LB	ASAP

<p>CS spoke to EA regarding the Ex-Offenders Project Team.</p> <p>LB spoke to Rite Cheatle and Catherine Wilson regarding links to Primary Care.</p> <p>See Agenda Item 4.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>LB to send IR dates of the project team meetings.</p> <p><i>Performance Indicator Report:-</i></p> <p>AT contacted Essex and Southend regarding obtain PI data for benchmarking purposes. There has been no response from Essex County Council but Southend Borough Council has agreed to provide their PI statistics. However, the data has not been provided yet.</p> <p>AT has prepared a more detailed report on service performance for this meeting. See Agenda Item 7.</p> <p><i>Performance Management:-</i></p> <p>A workshop was held regarding the performance of the Supporting People programme as a whole.</p> <p>See Agenda Item 7.</p> <p><i>Risk Report:-</i></p> <p>The Risk Log was amended in light of the changes agreed by the CB at the last meeting.</p> <p><i>Amended Charging Policy:-</i></p> <p>The revised Charging Policy has been sent to all providers and has been placed on the Supporting People website.</p> <p><i>Inspection and Recommendations:-</i></p> <p>LB sent the Social Care Review Report and the CPA Assessment to the Audit Commission.</p> <p>An Improvement Plan has been drafted for the CB – See Agenda Item 9.</p> <p><i>Representation on the CB:-</i></p> <p>CS spoke to EA regarding the CB's concerns over the lack of representation on the CB. This has now</p>	LB	ASAP
---	----	------

	been resolved.		
2.	<p><u>Budget Update</u></p> <p>A budget report to date was provided to the CB. Currently, Supporting People are £2,046.33 under-spent. As there are only two payments until the end of the financial year (one full payment and one part payment), it is likely that Supporting People spend will be on target or may have a slight over/under spend for 2005/06.</p> <p>CS queried what happens if there is an overspend of SP grant. LB explained that this could either be rolled over into the following financial year, or that it would need to be picked up by the Council's general fund.</p> <p>A predicted spend report for 2006/07 was also tabled at the meeting. The CB have agreed a 1.5% inflationary increase for all providers, with a view to review this position after 6 months to assess whether an additional 1% can be awarded. Providers have been informed of the decision taken.</p> <p>The predicted spend report included the 1.5% increase and showed that there is a predicted overspend of approximately £84,560.17. However, LB was confident that these required savings could be met.</p>		
3.	<p><u>The Future of SP 2006/07</u></p> <p><i>Administration of the SP Programme Post April 2006:-</i></p> <p>After April 2006, the 3 year Service Review programme will come to an end. After this time, there will be no requirement to continue with Service Reviews in their present form, although there will be an expectation to ensure the services are maintaining (and improving) their quality.</p> <p>The CB will need to decide on how the Supporting People Programme will be administered after April 2006. However, LB felt that it was important for the SP Team to meet first to discuss this issue and report their recommendations to the CB.</p> <p>The CB agreed this position and asked that a Business Plan be tabled at the next CB meeting, detailing the recommendations of the Team.</p>		

	<p>LB explained that there are certain processes that must remain after April 2006, for example, validation visits that focus upon the views of the service users.</p> <p>EA highlighted concerns around how the changes in the processes of administration may affect providers, particularly small providers. LB explained that once the Business Plan has been agreed, it will be tabled at the Provider's Forum for consultation.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>LB to table Business Plan to the next CB meeting regarding the future of the SP Programme.</p> <p><i>Briefing Note – The Integration of Social Care and Supporting People Procurement and Contracting Processes:-</i></p> <p>A Briefing Note on the Integration of Social Care and Supporting People Procurement and Contracting Processes was presented to the CB.</p> <p>Several meetings between the SP Contracting and Finance Officer and the Social Care Contract and Commission Manager have taken place to discuss the possibility of this alignment.</p> <p>The position at present is that the current processes are very different and it would not be possible to integrate the processes at this time. However, quarterly meetings will continue to try to move this forward.</p> <p>The CB agreed with this present position but felt that this possibility must remain open and work should continue to try to move in this direction.</p>	LB	Next Meeting
4.	<p><u>Service Evaluation Update</u></p> <p>LB presented a Briefing Note to the CB on the progress of the Enhanced Service Evaluations (ESE's) to date.</p> <p>LB stated that the 3 project groups (Disabled Adults, Single Homeless and Older People) currently in operation are working well, but requested an extension to the deadline to the end of June to produce the Commissioning Plans. This extension is required because there was a delay to starting the project groups. However, LB stated that</p>		

	<p>he was confident that the 3 groups will deliver good commissioning plans.</p> <p>The CB agreed the extension until the end of June. However, this decision will need to be ratified by ZD as she was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The last Enhanced Service Evaluation to be undertaken this year for Ex-Offenders has still not begun, due to difficulty in arranging meetings. LB explained that as we are nearing the end of the first year of the annual plan, this Enhanced Service Evaluation will need to be put into the next year's annual plan. However, as it will be a smaller piece of work than some of the other ESE's, this should not delay the next ESE's timetabled for next year.</p> <p>The CB agreed this approach and LB will meet with Kate Goodchild-Allen from Probation in March to agree the membership of the project group.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>ZD to approve the CB decision to extend the deadline for the Commissioning Plans to the end of June.</p> <p>LB to meet with Kate Goodchild-Allen regarding the Ex-Offenders Project Group in March.</p>	<p>ZD</p> <p>LB</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>March</p>
5.	<p><u>Diversity</u></p> <p>CS asked how the Council's diversity agenda is being moved forward in the Supporting People remit.</p> <p>There are currently three Equality Impact Assessments that need to be externally validated. These will then be translated into a Service Diversity Action Plan (SDAP).</p> <p>It was suggested that IR speak to Simon Black regarding the independent validation of the Equality Impact Assessments.</p> <p>In terms of Supporting People, the Enhanced Service Evaluations will be looking at diversity issues and the services required for minority ethnic groups.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>IR to contact Simon Black regarding an independent</p>	<p>IR</p>	<p>ASAP</p>

	validation of the Equality Impact Assessments.		
6.	<p><u>Value Improvement Project (VIP)</u></p> <p>A report was tabled at the CB meeting outlining the results of the VIP so far and the subsequent decisions required by the CB.</p> <p>LB gave an outline of the aims of the Value Improvement Project. The VIP is to introduce outcome-focussed contracting to Supporting People contracts. This requires identifying a number of hard and soft outcomes for each service user group that will form part of the providers' contracts. This will allow better performance monitoring of the services (through contract management) and better procurement processes.</p> <p>A pilot study has been undertaken with two Supporting People providers (one providing services for single homeless people and the other providing services to people with learning disabilities), where outcomes have been identified and monitored over a period of time to assess whether it will be successful.</p> <p>The project is due to end in June, when contracts for single homeless people will be re-tendered.</p> <p>The CB are required to decide whether they agree with the findings of the VIP and whether they want to roll this out to all providers. If the CB decide to do so, a timetable for re-tendering would need to be agreed and whether the current Interim Contract will be extended until such time that it can be replaced with an outcome based contract. A decision will also need to be made as to whether all services will be tendered for.</p> <p>A discussion took place regarding the VIP. IR raised the concern that whilst a provider may on the surface look like they are failing to meet the required outcomes, it may be that the provider has done everything they can and the unsuccessful outcome may have been caused by something beyond their control.</p> <p>LB addressed this concern and explained that this is no different to the performance indicators measured at present. Whilst these are outputs rather than outcomes (e.g. void levels etc), providers are still seen to be under performing if they do not reach the</p>		

	<p>specified targets. However, in this case, an investigation is instigated through the contract monitoring process to ascertain the reasons for the under performance. If those reasons are justified, no further action is taken.</p> <p>The CB agreed to have a separate meeting to discuss the Value Improvement Project in more detail before any decisions are taken. The CB requested that the SP Contracting and Finance Officer be present to answer any queries.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>AT to arrange a meeting as soon as possible to discuss the VIP.</p>	AT	ASAP
7.	<p><u>Performance</u></p> <p><i>Service Performance:-</i></p> <p>A report on the performance of services was presented to the CB.</p> <p>Further information is required on the outcomes of investigations into under performance to allow the CB to ascertain whether the under performance is justified or whether improvements can be made.</p> <p>CS asked AT to inform him when the next quarter returns are received to discuss the requirements in more detail.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>AT to inform CS when the next quarter performance returns are submitted.</p> <p><i>Corporate Performance (Workshop):-</i></p> <p>The SP Team held a performance workshop with CS to discuss performance indicators for the SP Programme as a whole.</p> <p>It was decided to use the current performance indicators collected from providers as a means of monitoring the SP team's performance. These will be treated as Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI's). A breakdown of these indicators was provided to the CB.</p> <p>Performance Reports in the future will need to include this information.</p>	AT	End April

	<p>The CB were also provided with a template for the Team Performance Plan, which will detail how the performance targets will be met.</p>		
8.	<p><u>Risk Report</u></p> <p>A current Risk Report was tabled at the CB meeting. The CB agreed the content of the report. However, this decision will need to be ratified by ZD as she was not present at the meeting.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>ZD to approve the Risk Report.</p> <p>AT to amend the Risk Log in light of the changes highlighted in the Risk Report, once approval has been received.</p>	<p>ZD</p> <p>AT</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p>
9.	<p><u>Inspection Update</u></p> <p><i>Result of the Audit Commission Inspection:-</i></p> <p>The final Inspection Report from the Audit Commission has been provided. The CB noted that whilst the report was favourable towards the SP Programme, this was not reflected in the final result of the inspection.</p> <p><i>Service Improvement Plan:-</i></p> <p>LB has produced a Service Improvement Plan in response to the recommendations of the Inspection Report. The CB were provided with a copy of this plan.</p>		
10.	<p><u>Gables Service Development – Lucas Road – Update</u></p> <p>IR gave the CB an update on the new Gables service developments. The planning permission for Lucas Road has been turned down by the Planning Department. However, this decision is going to be appealed by the Housing Association who is going to be the landlord of the new build.</p> <p>IR felt that there is a good possibility that planning permission will be granted as a result of the appeal. However, the Cabinet may still decide that the new build cannot go ahead, particularly as there is so much opposition from the residents of Lucas Road.</p>		

	<p>The Housing Association who will be the landlord of the new build are also currently looking at other premises in Dell Road and will be conducting a feasibility study on these premises to assess whether this would be a more practical location.</p>		
11.	<p><u>AOB</u></p> <p><i>Provider/User Representation on the Commissioning Body:-</i></p> <p>The CB discussed the possibility of having a provider and user representative on the Commissioning Body. They would only be present for the strategic agenda.</p> <p>The provider representative would have to represent all providers and feedback to providers at the provider forum's.</p> <p>The CB felt that it would be difficult to have a service user representative who would be able to represent service users from all client groups.</p> <p>The CB decided that this issue would be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Action/s</u></p> <p>AT to add provider/user representation to the CB agenda for the next meeting.</p>	AT	Next Meeting