**Outcomes of Consultation on Supporting People Eligibility Criteria
December 2011**

Introduction
1. The 30 September 2011 Commissioning Body recommended further consultation on the draft Eligibility Criteria which the Benchmarking and Best Practice Group had written.

2. Supporting People set up an electronic consultation on the Oxfordshire County Council website and invited key stakeholders and providers to take part. The consultation period was from 24 October to 21 November 2011. The consultation received a total of six responses.

Summary of responses and actions taken
3. This is a summary of the main points from the consultation feedback and the action taken and changes made to the Eligibility Criteria.

Response	Action Taken
Minor wording amendments and additions such as the addition of signposting and 'on average' for 20% ancillary tasks, and including the provision of psychosocial interviews as well as counselling under what is not eligible in the alcohol or substance misuse ineligible column	These wording amendments have been changed and added to the Eligibility Criteria
Start with tasks table rather than having as an appendix	This was noted and the tasks table is no longer an appendix but is part of the main document albeit at the end
Make tasks table more linear across rows	This was noted but was not possible to do whilst keeping the current headings
Keep to being reasonably defined criteria (descriptive rather than prescriptive) rather than narrowing down any further or being much more open	No change needed as this is a recommendation to keep the document as it is
Expand on personalisation and how this could change housing related support but the focus should be in line with developing and enabling independence	Expansion on personalisation has been added to the document
Recognising that those receiving statutory support may also be eligible for support from Supporting People funded projects	This recognition has been added to the document under Exclusion of Statutory Duties

Responses by questions
4. The following is further detail on the six responses.

Question1:   Are there any additions or other amendments that you would wish to see made?

- Suggest rewording 20% time spent on ancillary tasks to 'on average'
- Personalisation - if this is to be a key feature of new services it should be recognised that developing and sustaining personalisation initiatives will take staff input
- Are we arguing that if person placed in SP funded supported housing by Homelessness Dept (stat duty) the support, rather than the accommodation is funded by SP and thus the stat requirement bit of the service is funded from elsewhere ie HBen? Seems to suggest placement in supported housing by Homelessness Dept might not be possible
- Include signposting in the task ' The needs and risk assessment of service users to decide their eligibility for a housing-related support service and ensure fair access'.
- Organise so there is as much linear connection as possible across rows in App 1 as more user friendly. Recommend organising as 'tasks as part of support' and 'tasks to do with systems' rather than relating to numbers of outcomes.
- Pleased to see alignment with QAF
- Start with list of tasks (App 1) rather than 5 pages of professional management speak
- Concern that it is implied that people who already require statutory provision to meet other needs will not be eligible for housing related support if they became in need of this

Question 2:   Please detail below any proposed amendments that you consider would have a detrimental impact on service users and explain why

- The narrowing down of EC would have an adverse effect on 'generic' user groups who currently cannot access other funding streams (presumably this is a comment rather than an amendment).

Question 3:   Do you find the table giving details of eligible tasks helpful?

5 responded YES
1 Blank

Question 4:   How would you see this document working in the context of making support services more personalised?

- Think main document will help as it describes rather than prescribes the services. The appendix works against that slightly but as long as the appendix is an indicator of types of activity this should be ok.
- Perhaps add something at the end of App 1 saying ' as services become more personalised, the range of activities that count as housing related

support may change but the focus of these should be in line with the ethos of enablement and developing independence'.
- Helps in small ways. Appropriate that the focus of the support is reasonably defined as per these criteria than much more open. Personalisation champions may argue for the more open approach that there could be a range of ways of delivering support and activities to deal with isolation which might lead more towards individual budgets.
- Document could usefully contain suggestions for top-slicing some elements of SP to introduce Individual Service Funds which could be managed to reduce dependency on services and increase throughput.

Question 5:   Is the document clear and easy to understand?

5 responded YES
1 Blank

Question 6:   Do you have any other comments?

- Introduction of Individual Service Funds (free resource) may help to promote the psychologically informed environment initiatives as it may give better opportunities to access psychological therapies, currently excluded from SP funding eligibility criteria.
- In terms of the support and advice to service users on how to deal with alcohol or substance misuse problems and what is not eligible - could this include the provision of psychosocial interviews as well as counselling?

Lorraine Donnachie
Quality & Performance Officer
26 January 2012