

# Public Document Pack



To: **Members of the Supporting People Commissioning Body**

## ***Notice of a Meeting of the Supporting People Commissioning Body***

**Friday, 9 December 2011 at 10.30 am**

**County Hall, New Road, Oxford**

*Peter G. Clark.*

Peter G. Clark  
County Solicitor

December 2011

Contact Officer: **Sue Whitehead**  
Tel: (01865) 810262; E-mail: [sue.whitehead@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:sue.whitehead@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

---

### **Membership**

Chairman – Councillor Debbie Pickford – Cherwell District Council

#### *Councillors*

Councillor Dorothy Brown	- South Oxfordshire district Council
Councillor Roger Cox	- Vale of White Horse District Council
Councillor Arash Fatemian	- Oxfordshire County Council
Councillor Verena Hunt	- West Oxfordshire District Council
Stephen Czajewski	- Thames Valley Probation
Graham Stratford	- Oxford City Council
Fenella Trevillion	- Oxfordshire CCG

#### **Notes:**

- **Date of next meeting: 23 March 2012**

***The agenda is attached***

County Hall, New Road, Oxford, OX1 1ND

[www.oxfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk) Fax: 01865 783195 Media Enquiries 01865 323870

# AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence and Substitutions (if applicable)**
2. **Declarations of Interest (all members of the Body shall be responsible for deciding whether they have a declarable interest, in accordance with the Codes of Conduct of their own organisation , if applicable)**
3. **Minutes (Pages 1 - 4)**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2011 (**SP3**) and to receive information arising from them.

## 4. **Petitions and Public Address**

Members of the public may speak on a matter included on the agenda by giving notice to the Contact Officer by the deadline of 9.00 am on the morning before the meeting.

Advice on addressing a meeting can be found on the Council's website.

### For Decision

## 5. **Supporting People Programme Review 2011-12 and Supporting People Strategy 2012-16 (Pages 5 - 34)**

Report attached at **SP5a** provides the progress update on this review.

Verbal progress update on work in progress, namely review of the eligibility criteria, evaluation of existing pathways of service delivery and of administrative arrangements for the programme will be provided at the meeting.

Needs and gaps analysis and commissioning intentions for 2012-16 are set out in a paper **SP5b**. These commissioning intentions form the basis for the Annual plan for 2012-13 and future years.

Financial strategy for 2012-16 attached at **SP5c** has been produced to illustrate how these commissioning intentions could be implemented within the allocated budget and current contractual commitments.

These reports will be considered by the members of the Core Strategy Group on 7 December. Any revisions to these reports made at that meeting will be reported on a by exception basis.

**Members of the Commissioning Body are requested to approve proposed commissioning intentions for 2012-16, subject to amendments made at the meeting.**

#### **For Information**

### **6. Supporting People Budget 2011/12 (Pages 35 - 38)**

The budget monitoring report for 2011-12 attached at **SP6a** shows the budget set by the Commissioning Body and expenditure incurred in the first seven months of the year (April to October).

Expenditure excludes in-year cashable efficiencies already agreed this year. Contractual processes to implement these efficiencies are in progress and payments would be reconciled once this process is completed.

Report attached at **SP6b** shows progress made with delivering the 2011-12 efficiency savings programme.

This report shows that proposals received to date have collectively identified £300k or 94% of the target. Majority of these proposals have been approved by funding partners. One third of the target (£100k) has been fully implemented. Work on identifying proposals for delivering remaining £20k or 6% of the overall target is being given priority.

Formal steps are being taken to ensure that any planned underspend delivered by the programme in 2011-12 is allowed to be brought forward in full to off-set planned reduction in financial allocation in 2012-13. Having this brought forward secured would also assist the partnership in managing these changes in a planned and considerate manner.

### **7. Annual Plan 2011-12 Progress Report (Pages 39 - 42)**

A report attached at **SP7a** gives information about any items in the Annual Plan which the administering authority is not on track to deliver and a table is attached at **SP7b** showing progress against the Annual Plan.

### **8. Date of Next Meeting and Future Meetings**

The next meeting will be held in Meeting Room 3, County Hall, Oxford on 23 March 2012.

---

This page is intentionally left blank

## **SUPPORTING PEOPLE COMMISSIONING BODY**

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Friday, 30 September 2011 commencing at 1.00 pm and finishing at 2.00 pm

### **Present:**

### **Voting Members of Commissioning Body:**

Councillor Debbie Pickford (in the Chair)	Cherwell District Council
Councillor Dorothy Brown	South Oxfordshire District Council
Councillor Roger Cox	Vale of White Horse District Council
Stephen Czajewski	Thames Valley Probation
Graham Stratford	Oxford City Council
Fenella Trevillion	representative for Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust

### **Supporting Officers and Members:**

Oxfordshire County Council Social & Community Services	– Simon Kearey Natalia Lachkou Duncan Hall
Law & Governance	– Sue Whitehead
West Oxfordshire District Council	– Lesley Sherratt
South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council	– Paul Staines
Cherwell District Council	– Gillian Greaves

*The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.*

### **26/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (IF APPLICABLE)**

(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Arash Fatemian (Oxfordshire County Council) and Councillor Verena Hunt (West Oxfordshire County Council).

**27/11 MINUTES**

(Agenda No. 4)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2011 were approved and signed.

**28/11 SUPPORTING PEOPLE BUDGET 2011-12**

(Agenda No. 5)

The Supporting People Commissioning Body considered and noted the budget monitoring report for 2011-12 (SP5a) that showed the budget set by the Commissioning Body and expenditure incurred in the first five months of the year (April to August). They also considered and noted a report (SP5b) that showed progress made with delivering the 2011-12 efficiency savings programme.

**29/11 SUPPORTING PEOPLE PROGRAMME REVIEW 2011-12**

(Agenda No. 6)

Cabinet considered a report and supporting papers (SP6a-i) that provided the second progress update on the programme review.

In commenting on the papers the Commissioning Body urged that amendments take account of the personalisation budget and the need for flexibility.

With regard to the Gap Analysis officers were asked to include in the analysis some form of ranking, together with a recognition of the contractual implications and some detailed analysis of the implications at District level.

**30/11 DEPARTMENT OF WORK AND PENSIONS CONSULTATION 'HOUSING BENEFIT REFORM - SUPPORTED HOUSING JULY 2011'**

(Agenda No. 7)

The Supporting People Commissioning Body received the public consultation proposals from the Department of Work and Pensions concerning Housing Benefit Reform and its potential implications on the future of supported housing sector (SP7).

The Supporting People Commissioning Body AGREED that Commissioning Body members receive a copy of the draft response. The Head of Strategy and Transformation in consultation with the Chairman, to agree the final response for submission.

**31/11 ANNUAL PLAN 2011-12 - PROGRESS REPORT**

(Agenda No. 8)

The Supporting People Commissioning Body noted the report and table (SP8a&b) that gave information about any items in the Annual Plan which

the administering authority was not on track to deliver and detailed progress against the Annual Plan.

**32/11 PERFORMANCE IN 2010-11 AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

(Agenda No. 9)

The Core Strategy Group had considered a set of detailed reports which analysed Oxfordshire performance against key performance indicators for Supporting People services for 2010-11 compared with 2009-10 local data. In order to establish whether there is continuing improvement in performance year on year by client group and by district area, and if not, to address issues contributing to different performance trends.

The Supporting People Commissioning Body noted the analysis of performance by client group and by district area and client group.




..... in the Chair




Date of signing .....



This page is intentionally left blank

# Project Progress Report

<b>Project:</b>	<b>Supporting People Programme Review 2011-12</b>
<b>Ref:</b>	<b>PPR005/CSG &amp; CB/20111207</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>28 November 2011</b>
<b>Author(s):</b>	<b>NL/DRH/LD</b>
<b>Project Manager:</b>	<b>Natalia Lachkou, Supporting People Programme Manager</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Simon Kearey, Head of Strategy and Transformation</b>
<b>Version No:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Approvals:</b>	<b>Core Strategy Group</b>
<b>Distribution:</b>	<b>Core Strategy Group, Commissioning Body, work stream lead officers, Provider forum</b>

Period:		November 2011		Summary position	
Author(s): NL/DRH/LD		Last period: (R/A/G)* 		This period: (R/A/G)* 	
<b>1 - Status update</b>					
All three work streams are taking forward priority pieces of work and are on target to deliver most of their key deliverables in time for December Commissioning Body.					
<b>2 - Status report against key criteria</b>					
Key		Status (R/A/G) *	Commentary	Planned actions / recommendations	
<b>Work Stream 1 – Strategic Context and Governance</b>					
1a. Proposals for strategic direction of travel, governance and administration of the programme beyond 2011-12			<p>Strategic priorities questionnaires and needs and gaps analysis have been revised further and informed commissioning intentions presented for decision today.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council started the restructure of its commissioning functions, which include the administration of the Supporting People programme.</p> <p>The future of these arrangements would be considered in phase two of the restructure, with proposals for staff consultation expected in late January 2012.</p> <p>The group met twice and produced SWOT analysis tabled today.</p>	<p>Next milestones:</p> <p>A) To seek approval of the commissioning and investment plan for 2012-16 at December 2011 and March 2012 meetings of the Commissioning Body</p> <p>B) To use SWOT analysis to inform the county council restructure and wider strategic conversations that are taking place, notably the development of the Health and Wellbeing Board and its sub-boards</p> <p>C) To seek approval of governance and administration arrangements for the programme by end of March 2012</p>	

1b. Proposals for how to structure the programme and deliver its outcomes beyond 2011-12		<p>Good progress on reviewing key elements of the programme has been made by all work streams. Personalisation workshop took place on 30 September and was successful. A proposal for how the programme may wish to embrace the localism agenda has been produced for discussion by Cherwell District Council lead.</p> <p>Revised eligibility criteria have been discussed with stakeholders in October-November. Amended criteria would be submitted for consideration to January CSG and approval to March Commissioning Body.</p>	<p>Next milestones are:</p> <p>A) To analyse comments received on draft eligibility criteria and revise the document in time for January Core Strategy Group</p> <p>B) To draw together key themes emerging from the refreshed needs and gap analysis, revised eligibility criteria and best practice in commissioning for outcomes to inform commissioning plan and administrative arrangements for 2012-16 – by March 2012</p>
1c. Commissioning and investment plan for 2012-16		<p>Examples of commissioning plans used in other areas have been evaluated.</p> <p>Commissioning plan for 2012-16 is on the agenda for approval today.</p>	<p>Next milestones are:</p> <p>A) To seek approval of the commissioning and investment plan for 2012-16 at December 2011 and March 2012 meetings of the Commissioning Body</p>
<b>Work Stream 2 – Needs and Gap Analysis</b>			
2a. Needs and gap analysis for housing related support provision		<p>Maps of Supporting People funded services and strategic pathways were refreshed.</p> <p>District local strategic</p>	<p>Next milestones are:</p> <p>A) To seek approval of refreshed needs and gaps analysis that informed the commissioning plan for 2012-16</p>

		<p>position statements and responses from providers have been analysed.</p> <p>Various datasets have been assessed and informed refreshed needs analysis.</p>	
<b>Work Stream 3 – Benchmarking and Best Practice</b>			
<p>3a. Eligibility criteria and over-arching outcomes for housing related support provision beyond 2011-12</p>		<p>Short consultation exercise completed with providers informed revised Eligibility Criteria.</p> <p>This document was considered by the Commissioning Body in September and then further considered by stakeholders in October-November.</p> <p>Feedback from service users informed this document.</p> <p>Amended criteria would be submitted for consideration to January CSG and approval to March CB.</p>	<p>Next milestones are:</p> <p>A) To analyse feedback received and revise the document in time for January Core Strategy Group</p> <p>B) To continue to take account of key messages from service user feedback in completing all aspects of this review</p>
<p>3b. Proposals for types of future provision and commissioning models to deliver over-arching outcomes that embrace personalisation and localism agenda</p>		<p>The group has evaluated best practice in other authorities and consulted with providers, districts and other stakeholders about pathways and future models of provision.</p> <p>Personalisation is being considered as</p>	<p>Next milestones are:</p> <p>A) To incorporate evaluation of pathways with best practice in service delivery and personalisation to inform the delivery plan for 2012-16.</p> <p>B) To consider emerging approaches to delivering the localism agenda further</p>

		part of consultation on eligibility criteria.  Discussion on localism is taking place with wider stakeholders.	
<b>3 – Key milestones</b>			
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Due date</b>	<b>Progress/comments</b>	
Discuss, review and revise programme review methodology	June 2011, including Commissioning Body on 17 June 2011	Delivered on time	
Complete 2nd round of work across all work streams	July-September 2011	Most objectives were delivered on time	
Produce 2nd set of proposals	End of September 2011	Most objectives were delivered on time	
Consult, review and revise	October 2011	Delivered on time	
Produce 3rd set of proposals for approval	November 2011	Delivered on time	
Submit 3rd set of proposals for approval	Commissioning Body in December 2011	Most objectives are on target to deliver on time	
Publish approved proposals	January 2012	Subject to approval in December 2011	
Implement first part of the delivery plan	January- March 2012	Subject to approval in December 2011	
Seek approval of final version of commissioning and investment plan, and Annual Plan 2012-13	March 2012		
Begin delivery of Annual Plan 2012-13	April 2012		

**\*Project Key:**

- Major problems identified which mean the project is unlikely to deliver on time, on budget or to required standard.
- Remedial plans are not proving effective.
- Escalate to the next level with costed options.



- Significant problems identified which may put the project timetable, costs and/or benefits at risk.
- Remedial plan is in place and is being monitored closely to ensure that risk is mitigated.
- Escalate to the next level.



- Project is proceeding according to plan.
- Risks / issues are being managed within the project.
- There is no need to escalate to the next level.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Housing related support in Oxfordshire: Needs and gaps analysis**

This report presents results of the needs and gap analysis of housing related support services in Oxfordshire undertaken in 2011. It has been produced to inform the development of the Supporting People commissioning intentions and financial strategy for 2012-16.

### Content of the report:

Section 1 – Key pressures and priorities for investment reported by commissioners

Section 2 – Needs and gaps analysis based on key data sources

Section 3 – Recommendations

## **Section 1 – Key pressures and priorities for investment reported by commissioners**

### Introduction

- 1) From the South East Needs model (2009-10) data set it is clear that currently in Oxfordshire we do not have sufficient services to address un-met need. This is true even if the parameters of the modelling are adjusted; need far outstrips supply. This state of affairs should not come as a surprise, since this has been true from the commencement of the Supporting People Programme.
- 2) What has been more unclear is the distribution of services and/or funding across the county. Most of these issues are due to historical development and partial restructuring of pathways carried out since 2003, and impact on all the districts.
- 3) By undertaking this needs and gaps analysis, we aimed to obtain greater shared understanding of these issues by reviewing existing provision, identifying and contextualising emerging pressures, and developing priorities for future investment.

### Key pressures by type of need and district area

- 4) **Generic services, substance misuse services, learning disability services, mental health services and domestic violence services** have not been highlighted as particular issues of distribution by the districts. Each area may of course still have un-met need.
- 5) **Travellers:** Services for this client group are not currently funded by Supporting People and could therefore be considered as a gap in provision. The current data on un-met need has been aggregated into homelessness.
- 6) **Older people with support needs:** There are certainly demographic pressures on all districts with an aging population.

- 7) **People with a Physical or Sensory Disability:** The supply of services is very limited and unevenly distributed. This represents a gap in provision.
- 8) **Single Homeless with Support Needs, Teenage Parents, Young People at Risk:** These services were highlighted by all districts as being a cause for concern; mainly due to changes in government regulations and the impact of changing economic and supply issues.
- 9) From the district profile submissions, significant additional amounts are being spent by Oxford City (£1.7m) and to a lesser extent Cherwell (£0.4m) in supplementing those services funding by Supporting People, especially with regard to single homeless and young people's services.

Priorities for investment by type of need and district area

10) Priorities for investment identified by the commissioners are set out below:

<b>Increase investment –</b>	Homelessness in Oxford and Cherwell Generic services in South, Vale and Cherwell Young people in West Domestic violence outreach – countywide
<b>Maintain investment –</b>	Mental health in Oxford, West and Cherwell Older people – countywide Physical disabilities - countywide Substance misuse in Oxford Young people and teenage parents – countywide Domestic violence refugees – countywide Offenders – countywide (but most in Oxford)
<b>Reduce investment –</b>	Learning disabilities & Shared Lives – countywide Equalising spend by district via redistribution Looking for replacement/alternative funding from other sources

Section 2 – Needs and gaps analysis based on key data sources

- 11) Current supply of housing related support and future demand for this type of provision have been analysed following a two-fold approach:
- By Primary Client Group by district area
  - By Super Group by district area
- 12) From the **Primary Client Group Supply and Demand** data (attached at Annex 1, Tab 1), the following observations can be made:

## SP5b

- a) **People with learning disabilities:** Supply seems to be distributed broadly with current demand.
- b) **Older people with support needs:** Supply seems to be distributed broadly with current demand. Although demographic pressures identified in Oxford.
- c) **People with mental health issues:** Supply seems to be distributed broadly in line with current demand. There has been a recent strategic investment in this pathway which starts with a concentration of supply in Oxford prior to subsequent re-distribution to other district areas over the next 3 years. There is no evidence to suggest that this strategic intention need to be revised at this point in time.
- d) **People with physical or sensory disability:** There is a clear gap in provision for this group in Oxford, South and Vale. Supply is biased by location of countywide rehabilitation service in Cherwell.
- e) **Generic floating support:** Supply is generally in line with demand in all areas, apart from Oxford where demand is higher than supply. In practice, there are no waiting lists as such for these services suggesting that there is no evidence of a gap in supply. Supply in Oxford for this type of service needs to be considered alongside greater supply for services for single homeless people. It is arguable that the issue is not about the supply per se, but about types of service available to address homelessness in this area.
- f) **People with drug problems:** There is a clear gap in supply in South, West and Vale. There is also pressure in Cherwell according to population health profile for the district. This type of comparison is limited as it does not factor in services catering for this client group through generic floating support and homelessness services. Supply also biased by location of countywide rehabilitation service in Oxford.
- g) **Single homeless with support needs:** There is a clear gap in provision for this group in Cherwell. There are pressures in South, Vale and West according to homelessness data. This type of comparison is limited as it does not take into account provision of generic floating support. It also masks existence of hybrid services i.e. young people and older homeless people service in West. It is arguable that supply should be viewed in regard to “Super Group 2” which captures homelessness in all its complex forms.
- h) **Teenage parents:** There is a clear gap in provision in South and Vale. The development of new service in South in 2010 was unsuccessful due to lack of suitable accommodation. There is pressure in Oxford depending on data source used. It is arguable that supply should be viewed in regard to “Super Group 2” which captures homelessness in all its complex forms. Services were strategically re-aligned two years ago, when a new pathway of services

was commissioned. There will be a review of this pathway and its achievements to date in early 2012.

- i) **People at risk of domestic violence:** There seems to be some mis-alignment of supply and demand across the county, notably in Vale and South. This has to be considered in the context of services offering direct access across the county and nationally. The opening of a new refuge in the South in 2009 played key part in achieving more equitable distribution and is seen as a resource for both South and Vale. This provision needs to be seen in the context of other services available for this client group, many of which are commissioned and funded through other sources, such as housing authorities and community safety initiatives.
  - j) **Young people at risk:** There is a clear gap in provision for this group in Oxford. In other areas supply seems to be distributed broadly with current demand, with an exception of reported growing pressure in Cherwell for those 18 years old and over.
  - k) **Offenders:** Supply is generally in line with service provision, apart from growing pressures in Oxford evident in one data source.
  - l) **Travellers and gypsies:** No specific services ever commissioned due to relatively small numbers. It is proposed that the needs of this group are covered in "Super Group 2" services for homelessness prevention.
- 13) The analysis of needs and supply by primary client group presented above closely matches issues identified by commissioners. This adds confidence to the prioritisation of gaps and pressures facing the programme across the board. Secondly, this analysis provides strong evidence in support of the argument that strategic investment solely by primary client group has run its course and needs to be replaced by alternative methods. This proposition is being put to the test by considering the same type of need in a Super Group context.
- 14) From the **Super Group Supply and Demand** data (attached at Annex 1, Tab 2), the following observations can be made:

#### **Super Group 1**

- a) This group contains services for people who are more likely to be in contact with statutory health and social care services and have a range of services available to them depending on their level of need. For this group the programme provides support located on the preventative end of the care and support pathway. In doing so, housing related support acts as relatively low intensity and low cost preventative service that enables people to delay or avoid altogether the need for more intensive and expensive health and social

## SP5b

care services. It retains its strong focus on sustaining secure housing in the community, and is often of short, medium and long term nature.

- b) In this analysis supply and demand for services for people with learning disabilities, older people with support needs, people with mental health issues and those with physical or sensory disability has been aggregated at district level.
- c) Data suggests that supply of these types of service is broadly in line with demand in Cherwell, South and Vale. There is a clear gap in provision in Oxford, where combined supply of services for people with learning disability, older people and people with mental health issues is lower than demand. Supply in the West is higher than demand, primarily for people with learning disability and mental health issues.
- d) Uneven distribution of services for people with physical or sensory disability is masked in this type of analysis, due to its very low proportion in the aggregated super group.

### **Super Group 2**

- e) This super group contains services for people who are usually referred to as 'socially excluded and disadvantaged groups' and who are less likely to be in contact with statutory health and social care services. For this group the programme is often the key, if not sole, provider of support. The role of housing related support here is to enable people to achieve and sustain independent living in the community and prevent re-occurrence of homelessness. While retaining its strong focus on sustaining secure housing, it also aims to address complex needs associated with homelessness, such as history of substance misuse, offending behaviour or domestic violence. Support is often of short term nature.
- f) In this type of analysis supply and demand for services for all primary client groups not included in Super Group 1 above has been aggregated at district level. In other words it looks at homelessness in all its complex forms. Data suggests that supply of these types of service is broadly in line with demand in Cherwell and West. There is a clear gap in provision in South and Vale, where supply of services for teenage parents, people with drugs problems and those at risk of domestic violence (the latter mainly in the Vale) is lower than demand. Overall supply in Oxford is higher than demand, primarily due to higher supply of services for single homeless people; which masks lower than demand supply of services for young people.
- g) This picture suggests that at district level overall supply of services aimed at preventing homelessness is more aligned to demand comparing to the picture presented in the segmented analysis of primary client groups. It does not

mask specific gaps and pressures identified in the earlier analysis, which may continue to require specific intervention. Instead it supports the proposition that we should be seeking solutions to these pressures by addressing homelessness in all its complex forms, by adopting a whole system approach and optimising the use of limited resources.

### **Section 3 – Recommendations**

15) Based on the needs and gaps analysis presented in this report, priorities for investment in housing related support in 2012-16 have been translated into commissioning intentions for the programme set out in the table below. These commissioning intentions and timescales have been used to produce draft financial strategy for 2012-16 presented in a separate report. Delivery plan for 2012-16 will also be produced as a separate document. It will expand on delivery mechanisms by adding specific objectives, targets and measures of success.

<b>Commissioning intentions</b>	<b>Delivery mechanism</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b><u>Super Group 1</u></b>			
1	Maintain investment in services for people with mental health issues across the county	Implement strategic alignment and geographical distribution of services built into the 'Supported to Independent Living' pathway of services commissioned in March 2011.	2012-14  Services are closer aligned to strategic aims of the pathway  More equitable geographical distribution of services  Investment is maintained in line with current contractual commitments
2	Maintain investment in services for older people with support needs across the county	Continue to implement strategic alignments and geographical distribution built into the Alert service commissioned in April 2010.	2012-13  More equitable geographical distribution of services  Investment is maintained in line with

SP5b

		Review strategic alignment of services, including those provided by Home Improvement Agencies and via Direct Payments to individuals, in the light of the Older People Commissioning Strategy being produced by Oxfordshire County Council.	2012-13	current contractual commitments  Services are closer aligned to strategic aims set out in the new strategy
3	Maintain investment in services for people with physical or sensory disabilities across the county	Implement recommendations of the 2011-12 strategic review of these services	2012-13	Services are closer aligned to strategic aims set out in the review
		Remodel existing services to ensure support is available in all areas of the county	2012-13	More equitable geographical distribution of services
		Achieve better value for money by rationalising service provision and costs	2012-13	More efficient use of limited resources
		Review strategic alignment of services, including those provided by Home Improvement Agencies, in the light of the Physical Disability Commissioning Strategy being produced by PCT and	2012-13	Services are closer aligned to strategic aims set out in the new strategy

SP5b

		Oxfordshire County Council.		
4	Reduce investment in services for people with learning disability across the county	Continue to implement planned reduction in the programme's contribution to the Learning Disability Pool	2012-16	Investment is more proportionate to the number of service users supported
<b>Super Group 2</b>				
5	Maintain investment in generic floating support services for people with a history of or at risk of homelessness	Maintain service configuration implemented in April 2011	2012-13	Services remain aligned to strategic aims
6	Maintain investment in services for people at risk of domestic violence	Maintain current service configuration	2012-13	Services remain aligned to strategic aims
		Implement recommendations of the 2011-12 review of the Oxfordshire Domestic Abuse Strategy	2014-16	Future services are closer aligned to strategic aims set out in the new strategy
7	Maintain investment in services for young people and teenage parents	Review all services in the Young People pathway commissioned in April 2010 to evaluate achievements of the pathway to date	2011-13	Services remain aligned to strategic aims
		Remodel and/or re-commission all services for young people and teenage parents to address gaps and pressures highlighted in the 2011 needs and gaps analysis	2012-13	Services are closer aligned to strategic aims set out in the review  More equitable geographical distribution of services

SP5b

				More efficient use of limited resources
8	Maintain investment in services for people with a history of or at risk of homelessness	Remodel and/or re-commission all services for homeless people of working age to address gaps and pressures highlighted in the 2011 needs and gaps analysis	2012-13	<p>Future services are closer aligned to strategic aims and need profiles</p> <p>More equitable geographical distribution of services</p> <p>More efficient use of limited resources</p>
9	Overarching intentions - Strive to equalise investment by district and to seek additional or alternative funding from other sources	<p>Address gaps and pressures identified in 2011 needs and gaps analysis by redistributing services geographically</p> <p>Adopt a whole systems approach to remodelling and commissioning new services</p>	<p>2012-14</p> <p>2012-16</p>	<p>Future services are closer aligned to strategic aims and need profiles</p> <p>More equitable geographical distribution of services</p> <p>More efficient use of limited resources</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Annex 1 - Supply and Demand Analysis - Proportion per District for each Primary Client Group

### Methodology:

Supply is based on 2011-12 predicted cost.

Demand is based on two key data sources agreed by the commissioners.

Each client group has a Supply line(s) and Demand line(s) "Demand 1" is the primary data source used in super groups

These lines show the proportion of supply per district and the proportion of demand per district.

The highlighted red cells are where the proportion of demand is 7 or more points above the proportion of supply for the only demand measure or all the demand measures used for that client group.

The highlighted amber cells are where the proportion of demand is 7 or more points above the proportion of supply for one of the demand measures used for that client group.

For ease of reference analysis of primary client groups is presented in the same order as they appear in the super group analysis.

### Analysis:

#### SUPER GROUP 1

##### People with learning disabilities

	Cherwell	Oxford City	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Supply	19.2%	25.2%	21.5%	15.3%	18.8%	2011-12 Cost Projection
Demand 1	21.5%	26.8%	19.1%	17.4%	15.2%	PANSI 2010 LD pop (Age 18 to 64)
Demand 2	23.4%	21.3%	19.6%	17.5%	18.2%	JSNA LD Clients aged 18 to 64 2008-09

##### Older people with support needs

	Cherwell	Oxford City	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Supply 1	24.7%	20.7%	19.9%	19.2%	15.6%	2011-12 Cost Projection - All Costs
Supply 2	25.2%	21.2%	19.7%	18.9%	15.0%	2011-12 Cost Projection - Alert Costs
Supply 3	21.2%	17.7%	21.0%	21.0%	19.2%	2011-12 Cost Projection - HIA Costs
Supply 4	25.2%	21.2%	19.7%	18.9%	15.0%	2011-12 Cost Projection - Direct Payment Costs
Demand 1	22.3%	23.7%	19.1%	18.0%	16.9%	SE Model 2009
Demand 2	22.4%	23.6%	19.3%	17.8%	17.1%	ONS Pension Credit claims Aug 09

##### People with mental health issues

	Cherwell	Oxford City	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Supply	13.4%	61.0%	6.7%	9.4%	9.4%	2011-12 Cost Projection
Demand 1	11.1%	64.2%	9.0%	8.4%	7.3%	SE Model 2009
						Local data from PCT not currently available

##### People with physical or sensory disability

	Cherwell	Oxford City	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Supply	72.5%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	20.8%	2011-12 Cost Projection
Demand 1	24.7%	25.8%	17.9%	17.2%	14.5%	ONS Incapacity PD Disorder 2009
Demand 2	12.5%	56.1%	11.6%	10.6%	9.3%	SE Model 2009

## **SUPER GROUP 2**

### **Generic**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	23.1%	33.2%	14.4%	12.6%	16.6%	2011-12 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	29.3%	41.5%	8.5%	7.6%	13.1%	SP Client Rec generic service starts 08-11
<b>Demand 2</b>	10.2%	51.4%	10.1%	15.1%	13.3%	Districts basket of measures data 2011

### **People with drug problems**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	14.4%	85.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2011-12 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	11.1%	64.3%	9.0%	8.3%	7.3%	SE Model 2009
<b>Demand 2</b>	21.4%	46.5%	12.1%	10.5%	9.4%	Health Profile Drugs Misuse 2008-09

### **Single homeless with support**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	0.0%	94.7%	0.0%	2.1%	3.2%	2011-12 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	10.2%	51.4%	10.1%	15.1%	13.3%	Districts basket of measures data 2011
<b>Demand 2</b>	7.9%	76.7%	5.4%	6.3%	3.7%	SE Model 2009 (Revised)

### **Teenage parents**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	50.7%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	2011-12 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	24.3%	25.2%	19.5%	17.7%	13.2%	Health Profile Conceptions 2007-09
<b>Demand 2</b>	12.1%	59.0%	10.4%	10.1%	8.4%	SE Model 2009

### **People at risk of domestic violence**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	38.4%	37.2%	13.3%	0.0%	11.1%	2012-13 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	26.2%	33.8%	12.8%	14.8%	12.4%	SE Model 2009
<b>Demand 2</b>	21.3%	24.1%	20.2%	18.3%	16.0%	2009 Female 16+ / London Model rate DV

### **Young people at risk**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	18.9%	45.4%	7.6%	13.9%	14.1%	2011-12 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	15.4%	58.9%	9.5%	8.9%	7.4%	SE Model 2009
<b>Demand 2</b>	14.9%	62.0%	9.0%	8.2%	6.0%	2009 16 to 24 yrs weighted by deprivation

### **Offenders**

	<b>Cherwell</b>	<b>Oxford City</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>Vale</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>Data Source</b>
<b>Supply</b>	23.1%	33.2%	14.4%	12.6%	16.6%	2011-12 Cost Projection
<b>Demand 1</b>	24.2%	49.7%	9.7%	9.4%	7.1%	SE Model 2009
<b>Demand 2</b>	19.7%	29.6%	19.7%	17.7%	13.4%	Probation Data - Young Offenders

## Annex 1 - Supply and Demand Analysis - Proportion per District for each Super Group

### Methodology:

Supply is based on 2011-12 predicted cost.

Demand is based on one key data source agreed by the commissioners.

This mirrors the approach taken in the analysis of the primary client groups.

Then proportion of demand is weighted by the proportion of spend at super group level.

This is repeated for each primary client group by district and then aggregated to arrive at proportion of demand at super group level by district.

Formula: Demand proportion at primary client group level x Spend proportion at super group level = Demand proportion at super group level

The highlighted red cells are where the proportion of demand for a super group is 2 or more points above the proportion of supply.

### SUPER GROUP 1

Supply by Primary Client Group / District	2011-12	Proportion	District area	Funding	Proportion
People with learning disabilities	£4,779,949	52%	Cherwell	£1,893,305	20.4%
Older people with support needs	£2,559,633	28%	Oxford	£2,830,665	30.6%
People with mental health issues	£1,778,022	19%	South	£1,654,922	17.9%
People with physical or sensory disability	£145,700	2%	Vale	£1,388,912	15.0%
			West	£1,495,501	16.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£9,263,304</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>£9,263,304</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Demand by Primary Client Group / District	Cherwell	Oxford	South	Vale	West	Data Source
People with learning disabilities	21.5%	26.8%	19.1%	17.4%	15.2%	PANSI 2010 LD pop (Age 18 to 64)
Older people with support needs	22.3%	23.7%	19.1%	18.0%	16.9%	SE Model 2009
People with mental health issues	11.1%	64.2%	9.0%	8.4%	7.3%	SE Model 2009
People with physical or sensory disability	12.5%	56.1%	11.6%	10.6%	9.3%	SE Model 2009

Demand by Super Group / District	Cherwell	Oxford	South	Vale	West	Data Source
People with learning disabilities	11.1%	13.8%	9.9%	9.0%	7.8%	PANSI 2010 LD pop (Age 18 to 64)
Older people with support needs	6.2%	6.5%	5.3%	5.0%	4.7%	SE Model 2009
People with mental health issues	2.1%	12.3%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	SE Model 2009
People with physical or sensory disability	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	SE Model 2009
<b>Aggregated demand</b>	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	100%

Supply and Demand Comparison	Cherwell	Oxford	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Supply	20.4%	30.6%	17.9%	15.0%	16.1%	2011-12 Cost Projection
Demand	19.6%	33.6%	17.0%	15.7%	14.1%	Weighted Demand Proportion
Difference	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>-3.0%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	
Comments:	Supply and demand within 2%	Lower LD, OP and MH supply than demand.	Supply and demand within 2%	Supply and demand within 2%	Higher LD and MH supply than demand.	

## SUPER GROUP 2

Supply by Primary Client Group / District	2011-12	Proportion	District area	Funding	Proportion
Generic	£1,520,708	24%	Cherwell	£1,017,606	15.9%
People with drug problems	£187,590	3%	Oxford	£3,878,985	60.8%
Single homeless with support	£2,388,269	37%	South	£394,588	6.2%
Teenage parents	£402,403	6%	Vale	£451,070	7.1%
People at risk from domestic violence	£371,465	6%	West	£640,479	10.0%
Young people at risk	£1,359,610	21%	Total	£6,382,728	100.0%
Offenders	£152,684	2%			
Alcohol	£0	0%			
Travellers	£0	0%			
<b>Total</b>	<b>£6,382,728</b>	<b>100%</b>			

Demand by Primary Client Group / District	Cherwell	Oxford	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Generic	29.3%	41.5%	8.5%	7.6%	13.1%	SP Client Rec generic service starts 08-11
People with drug problems	11.1%	64.3%	9.0%	8.3%	7.3%	SE Model 2009
Single homeless with support	10.2%	51.4%	10.1%	15.1%	13.3%	Districts basket of measures data 2011
Teenage parents	24.3%	25.2%	19.5%	17.7%	13.2%	Health Profile Conceptions 2007-09
People at risk of domestic violence	26.2%	33.8%	12.8%	14.8%	12.4%	SE Model 2009
Young people at risk	15.4%	58.9%	9.5%	8.9%	7.4%	SE Model 2009
Offenders	24.2%	49.7%	9.7%	9.4%	7.1%	SE Model 2009

Demand by Super Group / District	Cherwell	Oxford	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Generic	2.4%	12.2%	2.4%	3.6%	3.2%	SP Client Rec generic service starts 08-11
People with drug problems	0.5%	1.7%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	SE Model 2009
Single homeless with support needs	6.0%	22.7%	2.3%	2.6%	3.8%	Districts basket of measures data 2011
Teenage parents	0.7%	4.1%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	Health Profile Conceptions 2007-09
People at risk of domestic violence	1.4%	1.5%	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	SE Model 2009
Young people at risk	6.2%	8.8%	1.8%	1.6%	2.8%	SE Model 2009
Offenders	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	SE Model 2009
<b>Aggregated demand</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>51.9%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	100%

Supply and Demand Comparison	Cherwell	Oxford	South	Vale	West	Data Source
Supply	15.9%	60.8%	6.2%	7.1%	10.0%	2011-12 Cost Projection
Demand	17.8%	51.9%	8.8%	10.0%	11.5%	Weighted Demand Proportion
Difference	<b>-1.9%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>-3.0%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>	
Comments:	Supply and demand within 2%	Higher SH supply than demand. Lower YP supply than demand.	Lower DP and TP supply than demand.	Lower DP, DV and TP supply than demand.	Supply and demand within 2%	

## **Financial strategy 2012-16**

### **Background**

1. In 2010-11 Oxfordshire's allocation for Supporting People has been made, for the first time, via the Formula Grant – main mechanism by which the council receives funding from central government. This four year allocation failed to adequately recognise the level of need evident in Oxfordshire.
2. In its Medium Term Financial Plan Oxfordshire County Council has compensated for this low national allocation by keeping local investment in housing related support services at 5% per year reduction compared with the 2010-11 figure of £16.167 million. This in effect kept the programme's allocation at the level planned by the previous government and the one we have been working towards.
3. This financial trajectory is presented below:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Financial allocation</b>	<b>Planned reduction</b>
2011-12	£15,359,116	-£808,375
2012-13	£14,591,160	-£767,956
2013-14	£13,861,602	-£729,558
2014-15	£13,861,602	Nil
<b>Total</b>	<b>£57,673,480</b>	<b>-£2,305,889</b>

4. In total this represents £2.306 million of savings over four years which reduce funding by 14% to £13.861 million in 2013-14 – the destination budget for Oxfordshire, planned by the previous government.
5. On our journey towards this destination budget we delivered savings required in 2011-12 and are on target to deliver most savings required in 2011-12. This means that to reach the destination budget in 2013-14 we need to deliver in total additional savings of £1.497 million over the next two years.
6. Our current Supporting People strategy covers a period of five years from 2011-12 to 2015-16. Our financial allocation mirrors four-year national and local financial plans. Therefore we would not know our allocation beyond 2013-14 until central government announces the next Comprehensive Spending Review. Therefore it is proposed that we make provisional plans based on an assumption that local financial allocation remains stable in future years.

### **Proposals for achieving savings in 2012-14**

7. Approach to delivering required savings set out in this paper is informed by commissioners and providers collective experience in successfully delivering good quality services alongside planned budget reductions since 2003.

It recognises that:

- All client group areas without exception have already delivered significant savings ranging from five percent to twenty five percent;
- These reductions have been delivered by freezing inflationary uplifts and negotiating better value for money under old contracts, commissioning more cost effective and strategically relevant services through competitive tendering over five years and by seeking additional cashable efficiencies;
- Most recent experience of securing two percent cashable efficiencies in-year has clearly demonstrated that there is no room for manoeuvre in the sector under constraints of current contracts.

8. It is proposed that our strategy to reaching the destination budget over the next two years should be based on:

- Commissioning for outcomes, quality and personalised delivery of support – We should place service users at the heart of the programme and make a strategic shift from commissioning inputs and outputs to commissioning outcomes;
- Adopting an evidence-based approach to commissioning by implementing service models that are proven to deliver outcomes we are seeking; and consider adopting payment-by-results approach where it has potential to reward innovation and excellence, whilst optimising use of resources;
- Phased alignment of the needs-based commissioning intentions to financial allocation at super group level – We should move away from micro managing service delivery, while making sure that services are cost effective and sustainable for the duration of contracts we award;
- Within each super group due consideration should be given to specific gaps and pressures identified in the needs and gaps analysis – Commissioning solutions should be evaluated and approved for implementation based on their ability to deliver both strategic and financial aims, despite current challenging financial climate;
- Robust assessment of impact proposed service changes might have on individuals and groups of population covered by provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act;
- Robust approach to demand and market management, and a shift to whole systems approach to commissioning, with more formal arrangements for joint-commissioning and risk sharing where appropriate;
- Making sure that each time we take a decision to commission services for a group of people after 2011-12, whether through formal contracts or other methods, we need to be commissioning the services we can afford for those people when our funding reaches its final level of £13.861 million.

9. These principles inform two financial models proposed for consideration below:

Model 1 seeks to allocate savings targets over the next two years, while keeping proportion of spend in the destination budget by super group at the current level: Super Group 1 – 60% / Super Group 2 – 40%

Model 2 seeks to allocate savings targets over the next two years, while also equalising proportion of spend in the destination budget by super group:  
Super Group 1 – 50% / Super Group 2 – 50%

### Model 1

10. Savings of 5% are allocated for each super group, weighed by their proportion of the total spend, as illustrated in the table below:

	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Super group 1 (60%)	-£460,773	-£437,735
Super group 2 (40%)	-£307,182	-£291,823
<b>Total</b>	<b>-£767,956</b>	<b>-£729,558</b>

11. Draft budget for 2012-16 is attached at Annex 1 and is explained in more detail in remaining sections of the paper.

12. Proposals for savings in 2012-13 identified to date:

<b>Super Group 1</b>	<b>Saving target</b>	<b>Status</b>
5% reduction in contribution to Learning Disability Pool	£125,970	Agreed and built into Adult Social Care savings plan.
5% reduction in contribution to Shared Lives scheme	£25,995	Agreed and built into Adult Social Care savings plan.
2% reduction in contribution to Alert service for older people	£40,200	Proposal - This saving will be managed by continuing to determine service eligibility based on current, rather than historic need.
7% reduction in funding for physical disability services	£10,000	Proposal - This saving will be delivered by rationalizing services and securing better value for money.
<b>Net effect (adjusted for planned increases in other contractual commitments): Reduction of £123,831 or 1% of spend in this group.</b>		
<b>Super Group 2</b>	<b>Saving target</b>	<b>Status</b>
2% net reduction in funding for homeless services (end of grant for one service- £71,4k; remodeling of another service- £50k; planned increases in other commitments.)	£37,401	Agreed

4% reduction in funding for domestic violence services, due to securing alternative funding	£16,769	Agreed in the contract
	£52,941	Subject to permission to carry forward
Contingency target delivered in 2011-12		
<b>Net effect (adjusted for planned increases in other contractual commitments): Decrease of £33,404 or 0.5% of spend in this group.</b>		

13. These proposals amount to a total saving of £157,235. It is proposed that remaining savings of £577,317 are allocated as follows:

Super group 1 – Additional savings of £336,943

- It is proposed that these savings are delivered by further reducing investment in services for people with learning disabilities and older people. It is recommended that proportion of savings for learning disability services is higher than for older people services, to reflect overall proportion of spend, but also takes into account planned savings set out above for which agreement is already in place.
- Exact split between two areas will need to be negotiated with commissioners of Adult Social Care as it is likely to have an impact on their existing savings plans.

Can these savings be delivered?

- Services funded by the Learning Disability pool are well established comparing to other services in the group and are going through a planned programme of transformation through personalisation and greater use of technology. It is therefore arguable that this presents opportunities for greater ability to deliver additional savings across all funding streams.
- The Alert service which provides support to older people is in second year of operation and is subject to a planned programme of service realignment. It is possible that additional savings could be managed alongside existing financial targets for the service. There may also be opportunities to make better use of the funding allocated to direct payments for older people, for services that sit outside of the Alert service. There are plans to review these services over the next six months.
- For services provided by Home Improvement Agencies 2012-13 will be the final year of extension under current contracts. Commissioning intentions and funding for these services beyond March 2013 will need to be agreed with all commissioners yearly next year.

What services are not included in this proposal and why?

- This proposal reflects the fact that commissioning priorities recommend that investment in services for people with mental health issues is remained at

current level, to allow new services to embed in what would be their second year of operation and begin to deliver significant savings already allocated by the Mental Health Pool for this pathway of services.

- It also recognises that services for people with physical or sensory disabilities represent just one percent of the total programme spend and any further reductions will seriously undermine viability of these services and likelihood of achieving better geographical distribution of services. It is also recognised that any future ambitions for growing service provision for this group will need to be funded from other parts of the programme and/or by attracting alternative sources of funding, for example from health and social care or housing sector.

Super group 2 – Additional savings of £240,374

14. It is proposed that these savings are allocated at super group level and are delivered within the following parameters:

- Services for younger homeless people and teenage parents are in second year of current contracts and are subject to a planned strategic review. Commissioners have already agreed to bring work on identifying gaps and pressures forward, with a view to inform potential remodelling of services in year three of the contract. This presents opportunities to align service provision in remaining two years of these contracts with a savings target.
- All other services in this super group are falling into one of two categories:
  - Contracts approaching final year (2012-13) – generic floating support (including for offenders) and people at risk of domestic violence
  - Contracts can be extended for up to two further years (2012-14) – people with drugs problems and single homeless people.
- It is proposed that services for people at risk of domestic violence and those with drugs problems are extended for one year. Any possibility to link these extensions to cashable efficiencies or savings should be carefully considered by commissioners and providers. Longer term plans for these services would be informed by current developments in the commissioning structures for community safety services and the new pathway of services being implemented by the DAAT. They also need to be linked to the reconfiguration of services for homeless people of working age described below.
- It is proposed that all remaining services are remodelled and/or re-commissioned together to implement a new pathway for homeless people of working age. Primary objective of this exercise will be to build on past achievements in the sector and design more effective and efficient services fit to deliver increased aspirations set out in the national policy 'No second night out'. It is clear from recent feedback provided by service users that new services should be outcomes based, smaller in size, more person centred and and flexible. We also need to develop new ways of managing demand as it is expected to increase in future.

- Exact split of savings between these areas will need to be negotiated with funding partners with whom we jointly commissioned these services, commissioners of Social Care for Children and district council partners, as it is likely to have an impact on their existing savings plans.

#### Can these savings be delivered?

- It is recognised that this is going to be a challenging task. Having said that, recent evaluation of pathways as a commissioning model carried out as part of the programme review suggests that we have a strong foundation of services and partnership working on which to build future arrangements.
- We need to develop new creative solutions to preventing homelessness jointly across the whole system of housing, support and care. We also need to get better at forward planning and managing pace of change together with providers who in many cases invested significant resources into existing services be it their staff, expertise or accommodation.
- To achieve these challenging objectives we need to move forward swiftly so that service redesign is aligned with delivery of savings, which may not be realised in full until second part of 2012-13, especially if a new procurement exercise is required. This would mean stepping up the savings, to compensate for mid-year implementation. It may also require twin track planning, i.e. having alternative solutions on standby should there be unforeseen delays in delivery.

#### Proposals for delivering savings in 2013-14

15. Further proposals for delivering savings of £729,558 are shown in the budget attached at [Annex 1](#). These proposals allocate additional reductions in funding across most of service areas, in recognition of the fact that many existing contracts would have either ended or been reviewed, and hopefully, re-commissioned by April 2013. Income received from other sources has also been reduced. It is difficult to produce a more precise forecast for this final year of savings, as there are many options, all of which would need to be informed by detailed savings agreed for 2012-13.

#### Model 2

16. To achieve 10% shift in proportion from super group 1 to super group 2 would mean that super group 1 would need to deliver even greater proportion of savings over the next two years. This is illustrated in the table below:

<b>One year journey</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Super group 1 (50%)	-£1,334,323	-£364,779
Super group 2 (50%)	+£1,334,323	-£364,779
Spend in each group	£7,295,580	£6,930,801
<b>Total spend</b>	<b>£14,591,160</b>	<b>£13,861,602</b>

17. It is most unlikely that this fundamental shift in investment could be achieved in 2012-13, as this time scale is insufficient to adequately plan and facilitate such large scale change. Taking two or more years to deliver this objective makes it more feasible, as it would allow more time to design, agree and manage these changes across wide range of services.

<b>Two year journey</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
Super group 1 (60%)	-£460,774	-£1,718,641
Super group 2 (40%)	-£307,182	+£989,083
Spend in each group	£7,295,580	£6,930,801
<b>Total spend</b>	<b>£14,591,160</b>	<b>£13,861,602</b>

18. It is also possible to pursue this option over longer period of time, by combining savings required to balance the budget with redistribution of commitments within the budget. This approach can be implemented across two to four years (2012-16) with varied degree of front-loading or back-loading redistribution to ease implementation of required savings.

19. Budget for 2014-16 could therefore be based on either of these two models and their variations, depending on the agreed approach to redistribution. It would also need to reflect future financial allocation for the programme beyond 2-13-14.

**20. Members of the Commissioning Body are asked to:**

- **comment on the principles set out in this financial strategy**
- **approve specific saving targets set out in point 12**
- **discuss and agree overall approach to savings for 2012-13 set out in points 13-14, to enable officers to produce specific saving targets for these services**
- **discuss and agree overall approach to savings for 2013-14 set out in point 15, to enable officers to produce specific saving targets for these services**

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex 1 - Supporting People Budget Forecast 2012-16							
	Service Lines	Full Year Gross Budget 2011-12	Proportion of the budget	Draft Gross Budget 2012-13 - Model 1	Variance	Proportion of the budget	Assumptions made
	<b>SUPER GROUP 1</b>						
	<b>People with Learning Disabilities, of which:</b>						
	Contribution to Learning Disability Pool	4,260,058	28%	4,134,088	-125,970	28%	5% planned reduction
SHT218	Contribution to Shared Lives Scheme	519,891	3%	493,896	-25,995	3%	5% planned reduction
	<b>Older People, of which:</b>						
SKE151	Alert	1,969,800	13%	1,969,800	0	14%	2% reduction (40.2k)
SHT215	Direct Payments	246,092	2%	246,092	0	2%	
	Home Improvement Agencies	343,741	2%	347,582	3,841	2%	2012-13 contract values
	<b>Income (S&amp;CS contribution to HIAs)</b>	<b>(174,730)</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>(174,730)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1%</b>	2012-13 contract values
SHT216	People with Mental Health Problems	1,778,022	12%	1,812,314	34,292	12%	2012-13 contract values
SHT217	People with Physical Disabilities	147,803	1%	137,803	-10,000	1%	7% reduction
	<b>Grand Total 1</b>	<b>9,090,677</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>8,966,846</b>	<b>-123,831</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>1% reduction overall</b>
	<b>Additional savings to be allocated</b>			<b>(336,943)</b>	<b>-336,943</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>Reduction in learning disability / older people services</b>
	<b>Grand Total 2</b>	<b>9,090,677</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>8,629,903</b>	<b>-460,774</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>5% reduction overall</b>
	<b>SUPER GROUP 2</b>						
SHT211	Generic Services	1,520,708	10%	1,551,743	31,035	11%	2012-13 contract values
SHT214	People with Drug Problems	267,480	2%	272,939	5,459	2%	2011-12 level
		2,314,818	15%				
SHT212	Homeless People			2,277,417	-37,401	16%	2% net reduction explained in the paper
	<b>Income (contribution to Night Shelter)</b>	<b>(133,432)</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>(133,432)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1%</b>	2012-13 contract values
SHT219	Teenage Parents	443,355	3%	452,403	9,048	3%	2012-13 contract values
SHT220	Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	388,234	3%	371,465	-16,769	3%	4% planned reduction
SHT221	Young People	1,380,051	9%	1,408,216	28,165	10%	2012-13 contract values
	<b>Income (various sources)</b>	<b>(118,402)</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>(118,402)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1%</b>	2012-13 contract values
SHT213	Offenders	152,684	1%	152,684	0	1%	Keep at 2011-12 level
	Carry forward from previous year	0		(52,941)	-52,941	-0.4%	2011-12 contingency met and carried forward
	<b>Grand Total 1</b>	<b>6,215,496</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>6,182,092</b>	<b>-33,404</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>0.5% reduction overall</b>
	<b>Additional savings to be allocated</b>			<b>(240,374)</b>	<b>-240,374</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>Reduction in all services in the group</b>
	<b>Grand Total 2</b>	<b>6,215,496</b>		<b>5,941,718</b>	<b>-307,182</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>5% reduction overall</b>
	Income (budget allocation)	(15,359,116)		(14,591,160)	767,956		5% planned reduction
	<b>Overall Total 1</b>	<b>15,306,173</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15,148,938</b>	<b>-157,235</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	<b>Deficit/(Surplus) 1</b>	<b>(52,941)</b>		<b>557,778</b>			Savings allocated in step 2
	<b>Overall Total 2</b>	<b>15,306,173</b>		<b>14,571,621</b>	<b>-734,552</b>		
	<b>Deficit/(Surplus) 2</b>	<b>(52,941)</b>		<b>(19,539)</b>			

Porting People Budget Forecast 2012-16						
Service Lines	Draft Gross Budget 2013-14 - Model 1	Variance	Proportion of the budget	Assumptions made	Draft Gross Budget 2014-15 - Model 1	Draft Gross Budget 2015-16 - Model 1
<b>SUPER GROUP 1</b>						
<b>People with Learning Disabilities, of which:</b>						
Contribution to Learning Disability Pool	3,720,679	-413,409	27%	10% reduction	3,720,679	3,720,679
Contribution to Shared Lives Scheme	444,507	-49,390	3%	10% reduction	444,507	444,507
<b>Older People, of which:</b>						
Alert	1,851,612	-118,188	13%	6% reduction	1,851,612	1,851,612
Direct Payments	233,787	-12,305	2%	5% reduction	233,787	233,787
Home Improvement Agencies	309,348	-38,234	2%	11% reduction	309,348	309,348
<b>Income (S&amp;CS contribution to HIAs)</b>	<b>(155,510)</b>	<b>19,220</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>11% reduction</b>	<b>( 155,510)</b>	<b>( 155,510)</b>
People with Mental Health Problems	1,703,575	-108,739	12%	6% reduction	1,703,575	1,703,575
People with Physical Disabilities	137,803	0	1%		137,803	137,803
<b>Grand Total 1</b>	<b>8,245,802</b>	<b>-721,044</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>4% reduction overall</b>	<b>8,245,802</b>	<b>8,245,802</b>
<b>Additional savings to be allocated</b>						
<b>Grand Total 2</b>						
<b>SUPER GROUP 2</b>						
Generic Services	1,396,569	-155,174	10%	10% reduction	1,396,569	1,396,569
People with Drug Problems	245,645	-27,294	2%	10% reduction	245,645	245,645
Homeless People	2,049,676	-227,742	15%	10% reduction	2,049,676	2,049,676
<b>Income (contribution to Night Shelter)</b>	<b>(120,088)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>10% reduction</b>	<b>( 120,088)</b>	<b>( 120,088)</b>
Teenage Parents	407,163	-45,240	3%	10% reduction	407,163	407,163
Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	334,319	-37,147	2%	10% reduction	334,319	334,319
Young People	1,267,394	-140,822	9%	10% reduction	1,267,394	1,267,394
<b>Income (various sources)</b>	<b>(106,562)</b>	<b>11,840</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>10% reduction</b>	<b>( 106,562)</b>	<b>( 106,562)</b>
Offenders	137,416	-15,268	1%	10% reduction	137,416	137,416
Carry forward from previous year	0	0	0%		0	0
<b>Grand Total 1</b>	<b>5,611,530</b>	<b>-570,562</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>10% reduction overall</b>	<b>5,611,530</b>	<b>5,611,530</b>
<b>Additional savings to be allocated</b>						
<b>Grand Total 2</b>						
Income (budget allocation)	<b>(13,861,602)</b>	<b>729,558</b>		5% planned reduction	<b>( 13,861,602)</b>	<b>( 13,861,602)</b>
<b>Overall Total 1</b>	<b>13,857,332</b>		<b>100%</b>		<b>13,857,332</b>	<b>13,857,332</b>
<b>Deficit/(Surplus) 1</b>	<b>(4,270)</b>				<b>( 4,270)</b>	<b>( 4,270)</b>
<b>Overall Total 2</b>						
<b>Deficit/(Surplus) 2</b>						

Supporting People Budget Forecast 2011-12		Oct-11					
	Service Lines	Full Year Gross Budget	SAP Forecast Gross Expenditure	Forecast over/ (under) Budget	Previous Month	Variation/ Movement	SAP Actuals Year to date
SKE151	Alert	1,969,800	1,969,800	0	984,900	164,150	1,149,050
	People with Learning Disabilities	4,260,058	4,260,058	0	4,260,058	0	4,260,058
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6,229,858</b>	<b>6,229,858</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,244,958</b>	<b>164,150</b>	<b>5,409,108</b>
SHT211	Generic Services	1,520,708	1,520,708	0	786,132	129,312	915,444
SHT212	Homeless People	2,314,818	2,314,818	0	1,173,865	195,719	1,369,584
	<b>Income (contribution to Night Shelter)</b>	<b>(133,432)</b>	<b>(133,432)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(66,716)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(66,716)</b>
SHT213	Offenders	152,684	152,684	0		0	0
SHT214	People with Drug Problems	267,480	267,480	0	136,295	15,632	151,928
SHT215	Older People, of which:						
	Direct Payments	246,092	246,092	0	109,991	18,044	128,035
	Home Improvement Agencies	343,741	343,741	0	74,023	130,419	204,442
	<b>Income (S&amp;CS contribution to HIAs)</b>	<b>(174,730)</b>	<b>(174,730)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(87,365)</b>	<b>(14,561)</b>	<b>(101,926)</b>
SHT216	People with Mental Health Problems	1,778,022	1,778,022	0	872,432	110,388	982,820
SHT217	People with Physical Disabilities	147,803	147,803	0	752	22884	23,637
SHT218	People in Adult Placement	519,891	519,891	0	4,607	303270	307,877
SHT219	Teenage Parents	443,355	443,355	0	201,202	33,534	234,735
SHT220	Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	388,234	388,234	0	170,643	27,526	198,169
SHT221	Young People	1,380,051	1,380,051	0	732,552	122,210	854,762
	<b>Income (various sources)</b>	<b>(118,402)</b>	<b>(118,402)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(21,496)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(21,496)</b>
SHT222	People with Alcohol Problems	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>9,076,316</b>	<b>9,076,316</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,086,918</b>	<b>1,094,378</b>	<b>5,181,295</b>
	<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>15,306,174</b>	<b>15,306,174</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9,331,876</b>	<b>1,258,528</b>	<b>10,590,403</b>
	Income (budget allocation)	(15,359,116)	(15,359,116)	0	(15,359,116)	0	(15,359,116)
	<b>Deficit/(Surplus)</b>	<b>(52,941)</b>	<b>(52,941)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(6,027,240)</b>	<b>1,258,528</b>	<b>(4,768,713)</b>

<b>People Budget Forecast 2011-12</b>	
<b>Service Lines</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Alert	Actuals are proportionate to Supporting People contribution to the Alert budget, which is forecast to break even by year end.
People with Learning Disabilities	Budget is allocated in full at the beginning of the year
<b>Grand Total</b>	
Generic Services	Efficiency savings are being processed.
Homeless People	Efficiency savings are being processed.
<b>Income (contribution to Night Shelter)</b>	Income collection is up to date.
Offenders	Work is in progress to put new services into payment.
People with Drug Problems	All services are in payment.
Older People, of which:	
Direct Payments	
Home Improvement Agencies	
<b>Income (S&amp;CS contribution to HIAs)</b>	Income collection is up to date.
People with Mental Health Problems	Efficiency savings are being processed.
People with Physical Disabilities	Q1-2 invoices have been paid.
People in Adult Placement	Payments are up to date.
Teenage Parents	
Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	
Young People	
<b>Income (various sources)</b>	Outstanding income for Q1-2 is being processed.
People with Alcohol Problems	
<b>Grand Total</b>	
<b>Overall Total</b>	
Income (budget allocation)	Budget is allocated in full at the beginning of the year
<b>Deficit/(Surplus)</b>	

	2011/12 Budget, net of savings target	Indicative savings, £	Indicative savings, % of the target	Identified savings £	Identified savings, % of the target	Number of proposals requested	Total number of proposals, at stage of:		
							development	approval	implementation
<b>Expenditure by Client-Group</b>									
People with Learning Disabilities	4,260,058	91,614	29%	91,614	29%	1	0	0	1
Shared Lives Scheme	519,891	11,180	3%	11,180	3%	1	0	0	1
Older People, of which:									
Alert Service	1,969,800	40,200	13%	40,200	13%	1	0	0	1
Direct Payments	246,092	5,022	2%	5,022	2%	1	0	0	1
Home Improvement Agencies	343,741	3,841	1%	3,841	1%	4	0	0	4
Homeless People	2,314,818	47,241	15%	85,055	27%	4	0	3	1
People with Mental Health problems	1,778,022	36,286	11%	33,677	10%	4	0	0	4
Young People	1,380,051	25,796	8%	0	0%	6	6	0	0
Teenage Parents	443,355	9,048	3%	0	0%	2	2	0	0
Generic Services	1,520,708	31,035	10%	0	0%	2	0	2	0
People with Drug Problems	267,480	5,459	2%	2,409	1%	2	0	1	1
Offenders	152,684	3,116	1%	3,116	1%	1	0	0	1
Women at Risk of Domestic Violence	388,234	7,923	2%	22,634	7%	1	0	0	1
People with Physical Disabilities	147,803	3,016	1%	2,364	1%	3	1	1	1
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>15,732,738</b>	<b>320,778</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>301,112</b>	<b>94%</b>				
<b>Income</b>	<b>(15,785,679)</b>								
<b>Deficit/(Surplus)</b>	<b>(52,941)</b>		<b>Un-identified:</b>	<b>-19,667</b>					

**Key to progress status:**

Green = On target to deliver, no concerns

Amber = On target to deliver, minor concerns

Red = Not on target to deliver, major concerns

No fill = Target met, no further action.

Proposals approved by commissioners	Progress status	How efficiency will be delivered?
AA and Adult Social Care	Target met	Learning Disability pool managers accepted responsibility for managing this additional budget pressure on 14/07/11. Efficiency saving has been transferred back into Supporting People budget on 07/10/11.
AA and Adult Social Care	Target met	Reduction in administration overheads across the scheme. Contract value has been revised accordingly.
AA and Adult Social Care	Green	More effective management of service volumes at different levels and costs. Efficiency saving is being transferred back into Supporting People budget.
AA	Green	More effective management of service volume and costs.
AA, Adult Social Care and relevant district	Green	Effective management of budgets, including measures to generate higher income.
AA and OCC	Green	Utilising opportunities presented by planned restructure of staffing levels; by utilising existing vacancies for non-service critical posts and reducing various non-staff related expenditure; by forgoing planned contract value increase via efficient management of staffing costs.
AA, PCT and Adult Social Care	Green	Utilising one-off opportunities identified during the first transitional months of new contracts; efficient management of budgets by reducing over-heads while protecting expenditure on front-line activities, small scale reduction in salary costs.
AA, CEF, District leads	Amber	Work in progress to confirm identified proposals
AA, CEF, District leads	Amber	Work in progress to confirm identified proposals
AA, District leads	Amber	Work in progress to confirm approvals received.
AA, OCC and DAAT	Amber	Utilising opportunities to reduce central overheads following strategic review of organisational structures.
AA and Probation	Green	Setting robust service outcomes during service design and implementation.
AA, WODC and CDC	Green	Securing service continuity via identified alternative funding sources, following review of short-term plans for some elements of the service.
AA and Adult Social Care	Amber	Effective management of flexible costs.

## **OXFORDSHIRE SUPPORTING PEOPLE COMMISSIONING BODY – 9 DECEMBER 2011**

### **Annual Plan 2011-12: Progress Report**

#### Introduction

1. This monthly report shows status of the work being taken forward by the partnership under the Annual Plan for 2011-12.
2. Summary report attached at SP6b shows that all projects are on track to deliver their objectives.

This page is intentionally left blank

SP7b

**Oxfordshire Supporting People Annual Plan for 2011-12**

Item	Priority	Priority	Main aim	By when	Lead officer
Oxfordshire Supporting People Strategy 2011-16 - phase 2 review	Strategic	Financial	Review current arrangements and agree strategic and financial objectives for the programme for 2012-16	March 2012	Natalia Lachkou
Generic floating support services	Strategic	Financial	Implement recommendations of the strategic review and deliver required savings	March 2012	Lorraine Donnachie
Services for people with mental health problems	Strategic	Financial	Ensure smooth transition and deliver improved outcomes across new pathway of services	March 2012	Angelo Fernandes
Personalisation/ Customer service/ Service user engagement	Strategic		Improve focus on service user	Throughout	Natalia Lachkou
Delivering financial strategy		Financial	Balance the budget in 2011-12	March 2012	Natalia Lachkou

<b>Traffic light code:</b>
Yes
Yes, but concerns
No

**Note:**

Outcomes of the phase 2 review would identify additional priority items that may be added to the plan during the year.

SP7b

Latest activity	On track?	Risk	Factors
Strategy was approved by Commissioning Body on 17 June 2011. All work streams are on target to deliver most objectives for consideration by the partnership in December. Progress report and proposals for decision are on agenda for today.	Yes	Medium	Scale and pace of policy change outside of partnership's span of control
Services changes were implemented in March 2011. Monitoring data and feedback from providers suggests that these changes were managed well and did not raise major issues to date. Progress update is being prepared for January Core Strategy Group.	Yes	Medium	Scale and complexity of planned changes
New pathway of services became operational on 7 March 2011. Key priorities for 2011-12 are: greater personalisation of services, delivery of recovery outcomes and effective pathway management. Project evaluation report has been produced recently and will be tabled at January Core Strategy Group, together with the first report on performance of the new pathway. Project board met for the last time in November. It is proposed to continue work on monitoring and developing mental health housing and support strategy under a different set of arrangements, which are being agreed.	Yes	Medium	Scale and complexity of planned changes
SPUG members completed a programme of service visits from July to September. Feedback from service users has informed proposals for decision on agenda for today.	Yes	Low	Best practice structures are embedding locally and nationally; Within span of control of the partnership
94% of the target have been identified and 30% fully implemented. Progress report is on the agenda for today.	Yes	Medium	Strong track record in managing budget; early planning in place