

SUPPORTING PEOPLE COMMISSIONING BODY – 17 JUNE 2011

Supporting People Strategy 2011-16 – Feedback report

Progress update

1. We requested formal feedback on the latest draft of the strategy. This document had been revised following comments from the March meeting of the Commissioning Body and split into two separate documents.
2. We sought comment on the direction of travel for the programme.
3. We received seven formal replies by Friday 20th May – 3 provider, 1 service user group and 3 commissioning partners. We have also received three further replies, all from commissioning partners, by 1st June. We believe that this number reflected the fact that the draft strategy has been co-produced and had already gone through a number of revisions in the light of discussions at CSG, CB and provider forum in the last year.
4. The responses were greatly received and the comments appreciated. Thank you.
5. The full record of submissions is available on request.

Feedback

6. *Context*: The first few of sections of the draft strategy (1. Introduction; 2. Oxfordshire context in 2009-11; and 2.1 Key facts and figures) were generally accepted.
7. *Strategic priorities*: We received quite a few responses concerning the next few sections (3. Taking the programme forward in 2011-16; 3.1 Vision and values; and 3.2 Strategic objectives). They can be characterised into the following three groups: changes; requests; observations, questions and concerns (see below).
8. *Delivery*: The remainder of the responses concerned the delivery aspects of the commissioning plan and were related to the strategic priorities.

Overall Summary of Responses

9. *Changes*

- **Outcomes**: (Not) in Education Employment or Training (NEETS) – there needs to be a stronger statement of how this is to be tackled- strategically and then in planning and partnerships

SP5a

- **Accommodation:** How accommodation based services are de and re-commissioned and their relative importance to floating support services
- **Partnership:** Need to get working together right. Peer/service user input needs to be developed. There needs to be more structured linking up of associated services (CAB) and group efficiencies

10. Requests

- **Strategy:** more detail on process and timings of review. General formatting issues
- **Savings:** Open book accounting – how efficient are providers?
- **Clusters:** Definitions and implications – will they improve things or make some groups invisible? Need strong buy-in by statutory commissioners

11. Observations, questions and concerns

- **Housing related support:** Concern over perceived/potential prioritisation of statutory services over non-statutory. Is housing related support becoming a preventative but secondary function?
- **Funding:** Concern over how reduced budget will affect services. Also how changes (e.g. HB rules) will affect services. Local(ism) impact
- **Personalisation:** Concern around personalisation developments, how to do it and safeguarding

Analysis of responses

12. The observations, questions and concerns reflect the uncertainty of the current political and financial situation. There are also a number of potential national policy developments on the horizon. The worries are real and are being felt across the sector. The perception that housing related support might be less important should be seen in the light of the increased co-commissioning using diverse funding streams. This demonstrates an ongoing commitment to retaining housing related support from within the partnership.

13. With regard to the requests, a number have already been addressed.

- More information has now been provided to the Core Strategy Group on the detail of the review process
- We already have the contractual facility to gain more budgetary information from providers and will be looking at taking this forward more often in future

14. The definitions and implications of the “clusters” are more difficult to ground as it can be seen as both useful and potentially confusing depending on your perspective. It is an important observation and may need to be revisited. The “clusters” should be seen in light of their relationship to the care pathways that lead through them, rather than as barriers; also to the preventative effect that they have to various funding streams.
15. The outcomes, accommodation and partnership issues are quite clear and are subjects that we all have been struggling with for some time.
16. There is a synergy between the need for more defined outcomes, the personalisation agenda and partnership working. This is reflected in our vision and values and is covered by the current strategic objectives.
17. However the well being and aspirations of our service users should to become more of a focus for commissioners and providers. The responsibility and engagement that service users share in return for the support they receive needs to be translated into how we do business. Do the strategic objectives finesse and highlight this clearly enough though?
18. The links between the Supporting People Programme and related community and education fields need to be strengthened. The partnerships we currently have could be wider and deeper.

Recommendations

- An additional strategic objective is adopted reflecting the compact that we have with service users.

“Work in partnership with service users to engage them in developing self reliance, respect and social connection”

This additional objective has been inserted after the first strategic objective (see revised section 3.2 Strategic objectives).

- The capital development programme for supported accommodation services should be included in the review process in order to make sure that we co-ordinate this work in future
- More formal arrangements and partnerships need to be developed between the Supporting People Programme, providers and the wider social, educational and training sectors (voluntary and statutory). This can be achieved through performance/outcome targets via contracts and can be picked up as part of the strategy review process
- The table of content for the document has been revised (see revised Table of content) to indicate more clearly the purpose of each section. This would also facilitate the process of refreshing the strategy in

SP5a

future, for example by updating local context and/or adding delivery plans for future years, once these have been produced.