



AGENDA

SUPPORTING PEOPLE IN KENT COMMISSIONING BODY

Thursday, 17th March, 2011, at 2.00 pm

Ask for: **Geoff Mills/Andy Ballard**

Medway Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone

Telephone **(01622) 694289/69497**

1. Introductions
2. Apologies
3. Declarations of interest
4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Commissioning Body (Pages 1 - 6)
5. Minutes of the Core Strategy Group (Pages 7 - 10)
6. Delivering the Savings Impact Assessment (Pages 11 - 36)
7. Administration of the Programme (Pages 37 - 40)
8. Finance Report (Pages 41 - 44)
9. Memorandum of Understanding (Pages 45 - 48)
10. Glossary (Pages 49 - 54)
11. Any other business
12. Date of the Next Meeting

Contact: Geoff Mills, Secretary, Room 1.95 Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone ME14 1XQ Tel (01622) 694289 e-mail: geoff.mills@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

SUPPORTING PEOPLE IN KENT COMMISSIONING BODY

MINUTES of a meeting of the Supporting People In Kent Commissioning Body held in the Medway Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 20 January 2011.

Present:

Ashford Borough Council:	Mrs T Kerly
Canterbury City Council:	Cllr T Austin and Mr P Peskett
Dartford Borough Council	Mr P Dosad
Dover District Council:	Mr P Whitfield
Gravesham Borough Council	Cllr T Pritchard and Mr W Adetoro
Kent County Council:	Mr M Hill (Chairman of the Commissioning Body)
Maidstone Borough Council	Mr J Littlemore
Sevenoaks District Council	Cllr Mrs C Clark and Mr G Missons
Shepway District Council:	Cllr Mrs K Belcourt and Mr B Porter
Thanet District Council:	Ms M Homer
Tonbridge & Malling BC	Cllr Mrs J Anderson and Mrs J Walton
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	Mr K Hetherington
Kent Probation:	Mr R Clark

Also Present: Mr M Angell, KCC Deputy Cabinet Member for Kent Adult Social Services

KCC Officers:

Mr O Mills, Managing Director for Kent Adult Social Services, Ms A Slaven (Director of Youth and Community Support Services) Ms C Martin (Kent Supporting People Team), Mr H Manuel (Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team) and G Mills, KCC Democratic Services.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

9. Apologies

(Item 2)

Noted.

10. Election of Vice Chair

(Item 1)

Mr Mike Hill proposed and Cllr Tony Austin seconded that Cllr Mrs Jill Anderson be elected Vice-Chairman of the Commissioning Body.
Carried unanimously

11. Minutes of meeting -21 September 2010 and matters arising

(Item 4)

The minutes of the meeting of the Commissioning Body held on 21 September 2010 were agreed as a true record. Matters arising were dealt with as appropriate.

12. Minutes of the Core Strategy Group

(Item 5)

The Commissioning Body noted for information the Minutes of the meeting of the Core Strategy Group held on 16 December 2010

13. Memorandum of Understanding

(Item 6– report by Angela Slaven, Director of Youth and Community Support Services)

(1) This report presented a revised version of the Memorandum of Understanding and suggested that further consideration should be given as to the opportunity to formally delegate control of the Supporting People budget to the Commissioning Body as well as strengthen the ability for negotiation between the Commissioning Body and the County Council in securing adequate funding to meet the housing related support needs of vulnerable people in Kent.

(2) During the course of discussion it was said, and agreed that legal advice should be sought as to the ability of the County Council to delegate the SPCB budget in the way suggested in the paper. It was also said that it was for each district partner to consider within its own constitutional arrangements what procedures it would need to follow in order to be able to sign the Memorandum of Understanding.

(3) The Commissioning Body agreed

(a) that subject to paragraph 3 (b) below, the revised Memorandum of Understanding be adopted in principle;

(b) two further reports be submitted to the next meeting. The first regarding whether there are any legal implications should the County Council wish to make a formal delegation of the SPCB budget to the Commissioning Body; and the second on what opportunities may exist in order to strengthen the ability for negotiation between the Commissioning Body and the County Council to secure adequate funding to meet the needs of vulnerable people who have a requirement for housing related support.

14. Delivering the Savings Proposal

(Item 7 – report by Angela Slaven, Director of Youth and Community Support Services)

(1) This report set out a proposal to the Commissioning Body to deliver the requirement for a saving of £7 million over the next two years in response to the adjustment of investment and the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review

2010. The Programme was profiled to achieve savings of £3 million in 2011/12 and £4m in 2012/13 by the County Council. The Programme proposed savings of £3.5 million in 2011/12 and £3.5 million in 2012/13. However, the savings in 2011/12 would be offset by the utilisation of £3.2 million of reserves, and the Supporting People Programme identifying a further saving of £300,000. The Commissioning Body would then need to deliver £7 million of savings in 2012/13. The report set out the opportunities to achieve the savings and aimed to provide a provisional assessment of the required activity and impact of a reduction in the grant allocation.

(2) During the course of a wide ranging discussion it was agreed that the Core Strategy Group would be presented in February with an impact assessment which set out the implications of Option One and Two in relation to districts and boroughs, and providers. The report to the Commissioning Body would be sent out prior to the Commissioning Body meeting with a covering letter from Mike Hill. However there was support expressed for Option 2 with it being said that this should be adopted in principle.

(3) The Commissioning Body endorsed a close working relationship between the Supporting People Programme and the Children's Trust Boards and Kent Adult Social Services. Particular concerns were expressed about the reduction in funding to floating support and the potential impact that this would have, and Canterbury City Council expressed concern about the reduction in funding for extra care sheltered housing. It was agreed that adult social services and health would work with the City Council to see if the deficit in funding that would arise if Option 2 was agreed would be at least partially met by funding from social care/health. The Supporting People team agreed to make an initial approach to Kent Adult Social Services to effect this. The health economy also needed to be regularly represented at meetings of both the Core Strategy Group and the Commissioning Body. The Supporting People team agreed to try and ensure that this could be achieved, although this has proved a challenge in the past.

(4) At the conclusion of discussion it was agreed that the principles of Option 2 should be accepted but that the Core Strategy Group should be asked to evaluate the impact assessment and that a further report would be made to the next meeting of the Commissioning Body in March.

15. Performance Management in 2011/12 & 2012/13

(Item 8– report by Angela Slaven, Director of Youth and Community Support Services)

(1) This report set out a proposal to the Commissioning Body to refine the management of performance within the Kent Supporting Programme. This would need to be developed within the context of the continued expectations of the Communities and Local Government Department in relation to performance and those of key stakeholders, providers and service users

(2) During the course of discussion it was said that a move to payment by results may put some providers off from wishing to continue providing a service. It was recognised that this could potentially be the case and therefore was an issue which would need to be considered within the implementation of the Programme. Other points made included the need to ensure providers complied with the Kent

procedures related to adult and child protection, and safeguarding issues and the need to keep performance mechanisms sharp and focused.

(3) The Commissioning Body then agreed that the Supporting People Team should work with key stakeholders, providers and service users in order to develop:

(a) a payment by results model across all services for implementation post April 2012

(b) a performance management framework which secures value for money and outcomes that meet the needs of commissioners and service users; and,

(c) a progress report be submitted to the next meeting .

16. Administration Grant

(Item 9– report by Angela Slaven, Director of Youth and Community Support Services)

(1) Kent Supporting People Programme Administration Grant funding of £735k was withdrawn by the Communities and Local Government Department in 2010/11 and the implications of that were discussed with the Commissioning Body in September 2010.

(2) This paper outlined the funding requirement from reserves to fund the Kent Supporting People Team in 2010/11 and sought the endorsement of the decision made by Kent County Council to utilise reserves to fund the team.

(3) The Commissioning Body noted the report and appendices and endorsed the decision of KCC to utilise the reserves to fund the Kent Supporting People Team in 2010/11.

EXEMPT ITEM

The following is an unrestricted minute of a matter which the Commissioning Body resolved was a matter that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting for on the grounds that the item of business involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act

17. Administration of the Supporting People Programme

(Item 13 – report by Angela Slaven, Director of Youth and Community Support Services)

(1) The Supporting People Programme would need to reduce its staffing numbers by the end of 2012/13 so as to reflect the anticipated 22% savings required within the Programme, whilst balancing the administrative requirements of the Programme. The

staffing reductions proposed would still allow the Supporting People Team to continue to deliver its core functions without detriment to the Programme.

(2) The Commissioning Body asked that there was due consideration given of the need to reflect the reduction in the funding of direct service delivery and therefore there needed to be a balance struck between the funding that should accrue to the administration of the Programme and the staffing complement required to achieve the work of the Programme. It was agreed that a revised proposal should be put to the next meeting of the Commissioning Body in March 2011 which duly reflected this.

This page is intentionally left blank

Core Strategy Group Minutes
Monday 28 February 2011
10am – 12noon, Pendragon room, Invicta House, Maidstone

Meeting	Core Strategy Group		
Date & Time:	28 February 2011	Meeting No:	
Meeting Place:	Pendragon room, IH	Minutes By:	Margaret Turner
Present:	Job Title:		
Angela Slaven	Director of Youth Offending and Substance Misuse		
Claire Martin	Head of Supporting People		
Joanna Wainwright	Director, Commissioning & Partnerships, CFE		
Sarah Lewis	Tonbridge Wells Borough Council (on behalf of Kevin Hetherington)		
Richard Robinson	Ashford Borough Council (on behalf of Tracey Kerly)		
Janet Walton	Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council		
Amber Christou	Swale Borough Council		
Bob Porter	Shepway District Council		
Gavin Missons	Sevenoaks District Council (on behalf of Pat Smith)		
Wale Adetoro	Gravesham Borough Council		
Peter Dosad	Dartford Borough Council		
Gary Peskett	Canterbury City Council		
Hud Manuel	Finance Manager		
Paul Whitfield	Dover District Council		
Howard Cohn	Kent Probation		
Tanya Wenham	Thanet District Council		
Margaret Howard	Director of Operations, KASS		
Sue Gratton	Eastern & Coastal Kent PCT		
John Roach	Supporting People Team		
Margaret Turner	Supporting People Team		
Apologies:			
Tracey Kerly	Ashford Borough Council		
John Littlemore	Maidstone Borough Council		
Pat Smith	Sevenoaks District Council		
Kevin Hetherington	Tonbridge Wells Borough Council		

Next Meeting:	Monday 23 May 2011, Pendragon room, Invicta House, Maidstone at 10am.
----------------------	--

Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
1.	<p>Welcome & Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were received from Tracey Kerly, John Littlemore, Pat Smith and Kevin Hetherington.</p> <p>Angela Slaven opened by apologising for the lateness in issuing the papers and bringing other papers for information to the meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of meeting – 16 December 2010</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as accurate.</p> <p>Matters arising:</p> <p>5) Information was requested about the review of Home Improvement Agency Services, and whether anyone from Kent Adult Social Services (KASS) had been consulted with. The group were advised that key stakeholders had been consulted with including representatives from KASS. The representatives were subsequently identified by email to Margaret Howard the representative for KASS.</p>	
Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
4a.	<p>Delivering the savings Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AS set out Options 1 and 2 for services and Districts and Boroughs. CM provided further detail pointing out the 3 Districts that will be impacted on the most by Option 2. There was a query over the figures provided against Community Alarms. The Supporting People team and HM agreed to review the figures set out for alarms in relation to Option 2 and to submit these to the C Commissioning Body. Concerns were raised over the impact on Extra Care Sheltered accommodation and whether or not funding would be available from health and/or KASS? There was a request made for a paragraph to be inserted in the report that is submitted to the Commissioning Body which outlines the process for consulting with key 	

	stakeholders, providers, relatives, carers and service users in relation to the reduction in funding. The paragraph would also be required to outline the process that would take place in order to evaluate the impact and to identify any mitigation in order to reduce the impact.	
Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
4a. cont.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reduction in floating support was commented on and a question asked about which services would be affected. The reduction has partly been achieved by not renewing District and Borough based floating support contracts. Further reductions are to be made and a commissioning framework is being prepared. A short briefing on the current investment in floating support, the investment in 2011/12 and the projected investment in 2012/13 would be distributed to the Core Strategy Group following the meeting. There was a desire expressed to ensure that service users are going to be consulted on the process in relation to the proposals for floating support. The Supporting People team will be adopting a process similar to the one utilised for the strategy in order to inform and discuss proposals with service users. The Strategy already identified the non renewal of District and Borough based floating support contracts. The remaining discussion relates to delivering the savings by 2012/13 and the consequent reduction in floating support to approximately £4m and approximately 1600 service users. The Supporting People contracts all come to an end in March 2011 but the majority will be extended by a year to March 2012. Providers whose contracts are not being extended are aware of the situation. The group's members were asked to keep the details confidential although it was accepted that they would need to discuss this with their Elected Members on the Commissioning Body ahead of the meeting in March. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HM will look at the figure identified for Community Alarms in 2012/13 under Option 2 and ensure that it is the right figure. The Supporting People team will draft a paragraph for the Commissioning Body report which outlines the process for implementing savings relating to Extra Care Sheltered and long term supported housing including any mitigation that can be delivered in order to reduce the impact of the savings on individual service users. The team will also meet with key stakeholders and providers in order to have initial discussions in relation to this. The Equality Impact Assessment will be adjusted in order to more accurately reflect the impact to service users in Extra Care sheltered and long term supported housing. There will also be reflection of the reduction in funding/numbers in floating support. 	<p>CM</p> <p>HM, JR</p> <p>CM</p> <p>CM</p> <p>CM</p>
4b.	<p>Delivering the savings Proposal – Administration of the Programme</p> <p>Restricted Item By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.</p>	

	The Supporting People team was thanked for bringing this paper to the meeting. The Core Strategy Group welcomed the revised proposals and the proactive attitude of the team in dealing with the delivering of savings in relation to administration.	
5.	<p>Memorandum of Understanding</p> <p>The Core Strategy Group had asked for a paper to go to the Commissioning Body requesting that the County Council agree to the delegation of authority for the programme to the Commissioning Body and that the Districts and Boroughs were able to have a greater role in setting the budget for the programme. The SP team has consulted with Legal & Democratic Services and it has been confirmed that the County Council is not prepared to delegate authority for the budget for the programme to the Commissioning Body but would agree to the Commissioning Body being advised in as timely a manner as possible the budget that was propose for the programme so that they would be able to comment on it prior to budgets being finally set by the County Council.</p>	
Item No	Details of the Item/decisions taken	CSG Member responsible for action
6.	<p>A.O.B.</p> <p>There was no other business.</p>	

By: Angela Slaven, Director, Youth and Community Support Services.

To: Commissioning Body

Subject: Delivering the Savings Proposal – Impact Assessment

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary. The Commissioning Body asked the Core Strategy Group to assess its preferred option against its least preferred option to implement the savings required in 2012/13. The Core Strategy Group undertook that task and this report sets out the findings in relation to options one and two, and recommends option two as the least impactful to the majority of districts and boroughs, and the majority of service types.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Kent Supporting Programme took a report to the Commissioning Body following the confirmation of the allocation of resources from the Kent Revenue Formula Grant allocation. This presented the Commissioning Body with the considerable challenge of achieving a planned saving of £7 million between 2011 and 2013. The challenge has been initially softened by the retention of the reserves accumulated from the earlier ring fenced allocations. This provides an opportunity to deliver the required savings within a planned programme allowing for a period of notice being given to providers to prepare for the adjustment to the commissioning budget and to ensure that any impact on service users is managed and supported.

1.2 The Programme budget will need to reduce its overall expenditure to just over £25 million by 2012/2013. The Commissioning Body is required to deliver savings of £7 million over the next two years. The County Council requires the Programme to achieve savings of at least £3 million in 2011/12 and £4m in 2012/13. The Programme is proposing to make savings of £3.5 million in 2011/12 and £3.5 million in 2012/13, the savings in 2011/12 will be offset by the utilisation of £3.2 million of reserves. The Commissioning Body will need to ensure the delivery of £7 million of savings in 2012/13. This report sets out the action necessary to achieve the level of savings and aims to provide a detailed appraisal of the required activity and impact of a reduction in the funding allocation.

1.3 This report addresses the impact of the savings and the implications for the twenty one client groups across the Programme as reflected in the services where the client groups tend to cluster. It addresses the impact of the savings on the districts and boroughs. It should be noted that short term supported housing is accessible to anybody eligible who lives in Kent and in this context is demand led. The impact of the savings on short term supported housing is a specific challenge for all local authorities in Kent, and not just the hosting

authority. This is because short term supported housing does not have a local connection applied to it and is ostensibly open to anyone in Kent who is considered to require supported housing. This is further reinforced by the work of the Joint Policy and Planning Board (Housing) in relation to shared protocols, the move on strategy, and the reconnection policy (all of which are monitored by the JPPB (H)). The exceptions apply to people escaping domestic abuse and offenders.

1.4 The figures provided in this report set out a detailed assessment of the implications of option one and option two. Option One will deliver a 22% cut in funding across all services. Option Two is designed to deliver a more strategic approach to delivering the savings which maintains the financial viability of the vast majority of services, and honours the overall strategic direction of the Programme.

2.0 The Impact Assessment for Option One and Two in Relation to the Districts and Boroughs.

2.1 The first element of the impact assessment is to look on balance at whether or not option one or option two advantages or disadvantages districts and boroughs in relation to inward investment into their localities. Option one is more beneficial overall to Ashford Borough Council, Maidstone Borough Council, Sevenoaks District Council. The other districts and boroughs within Kent are benefited by Option Two.

2.2 The Supporting People Programme has sought to address the concerns that have been raised about the overall viability of alarm services by increasing the proposed weekly payment from the original £0.50 to £0.90. This will enable a service user to access a call centre and to have their line tested remotely. It should also enable quality standards to be maintained. There will be detailed discussions with providers to agree a specification which can be met in the light of the proposed reduction from £1.50 to £0.90.

2.3 It should be noted that there is already an impact in 2011/12 relating to the non-renewal of district and borough based floating support. This further reinforces the need to maintain the investment levels proposed within Option Two into the future if at all possible.

2.4 From the perspective of the districts and boroughs the recommendation remains that Option Two should be agreed, it delivers the strategic priorities and reinforces the overall direction of travel that the Programme is taking in relation to the Five Year Strategy.

3.0 The Impact Assessment for Option One and Two in Relation to the Services that the Programme Funds

3.1 Option One and Option Two. This evaluation is based on the indicative preference shown by the Commissioning Body for option two as opposed to option one prior to an impact assessment being demonstrated. This preference has been reinforced by the preference shown by the Core Strategy Group for Option Two. Option Two is also the financially most preferable solution.

3.3 Ashford Borough Council

Ashford Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, and long term supported housing. It is more disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to short-term supported housing, alarms, and marginally in relation to Home Improvement Agencies. The Programme would need to ensure that the impact in relation to option two was managed effectively by Ashford Borough Council, the Supporting People Programme, providers, and service users.

3.4 Canterbury City Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long term supported housing, and short term supported housing. It is not benefited by Option Two in relation to alarms, extra care sheltered and marginally its home improvement agency.

3.5 Dartford Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms. The HIA is only marginally impacted.

3.6 Dover District Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported, and short-term supported housing. Dover is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms, and marginally its home improvement agency.

3.7 Gravesham Borough Council is benefited by option two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. Gravesham is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms and marginally in relation to the HIA.

3.8 Maidstone Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to short-term supported housing. Maidstone is disadvantaged in relation to all other services, but only marginally as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.9 Sevenoaks District Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long term and short term supported housing. It is disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to alarms, and extra care sheltered housing.

3.10 Shepway Borough Council is benefited by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged by option two in relation to alarms, but only marginally as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.11 Swale Borough Council is potentially disadvantaged by option two in relation to sheltered housing. However a final discussion needs to take place about the overall level of investment required for sheltered housing in Swale between the Supporting People Programme and the provider. Swale is disadvantaged by option two in relation to alarms, marginally by long term

supported housing, and their HIA. It is benefited by option two as far as short-term supported housing is concerned.

3.12 Thanet is advantaged by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported housing, and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged in relation to alarms, extra care sheltered, and is marginally disadvantaged as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.13 Tonbridge and Malling is advantaged by option two in relation to sheltered housing, and short term supported housing. It is marginally disadvantaged by Option Two in relation to long term supported housing, alarms, and as far as the HIA is concerned.

3.14 Tunbridge Wells is advantaged by Option Two in relation to sheltered housing, long-term supported and short-term supported housing. It is disadvantaged in relation to alarms, and marginally in relation to the HIA.

3.15 Floating support would benefit from Option One more than Option Two. However the decision to benefit floating support by opting for Option One would lead to inevitable disinvestment elsewhere within the Programme.

4.0 Implementation

The Supporting People Programme will identify an officer to work with an identified officer within Kent Adult Social Services to undertake joint assessments in relation to extra care sheltered, and long term supported housing. The joint assessments of extra care sheltered will commence in April 2011, and once completed will be followed by joint assessments within long-term supported housing. The joint assessments will establish if the individuals require further social care interventions and if so of what nature. They will also identify if the service users need interventions from any other relevant agencies. The Supporting People Programme will work with the affected providers to establish a strategic and operational approach to delivering the savings options by 2012/13 and 2013/14 (the final deadline for delivering ten hours per service user per week in long term supported). The Programme will develop a time line with adult social services to deliver these objectives.

5.0 Conclusion.

5.1 This report sets out an impact assessment to better understand the implications of the proposals to deliver the savings within option one and option two. The Commissioning Body supported in principle the adoption of option two, following further consideration by the Core Strategy Group. The Core Strategy Group has now given its final endorsement, with two provisos that have been recognised within this report and its appendices. These relate to the implementation and the Equality Impact Assessment. The Supporting People Programme will ensure that the priorities of the CSG in relation to the implementation of the savings are delivered.

5.2 Option one will make the delivery of supported housing and floating support undeliverable. The Kent Supporting People Five Year Strategy indicated that certain client groups would be given priority, and that an overall direction of

travel that promotes independence and does not lead to dependency would be prioritised. The Programme proposes that Option Two delivers these objectives. The Programme seeks to ensure that investment in services continues to meet these criteria, remain viable and that services, demonstrate value for money. The Programme aims to fulfil its ambition to maximise the independence of service users, and to consider how the development of the concept of the Big Society can contribute towards bringing a range of services together to achieve the relevant outcomes.

Recommendations

The Commissioning Body is asked to agree;

1. The implementation of Option Two for the delivery of the £7 million savings on the Supporting People Programme between 2011/2012 and 2012/2013.

Claire Martin
Head of Supporting People
Extension 1179

John Roach
Acting Contracts Manager
Extension 4547

Emily Matthews
Acting Contracts Officer
Extension 4877

Appendix One Equality Impact Assessment

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1 – DELIVERING THE SAVINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Supporting People - DRAFT Summary Allocations 2012/13				
District	(All)			
	Data			
2012-13 Service Type	Draft 2011/12 Base Budget	Option 1	Option 2	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2
Community Alarms	865,550	675,127	519,330	(155,797)
Extra Care	470,532	367,015	123,622	(243,393)
Floating Support Service	5,444,345	3,839,622	3,338,254	(501,368)
HIA	1,102,445	703,908	689,335	(14,573)
Long Term	5,680,500	4,422,441	4,502,721	80,280
Sheltered	3,946,862	3,078,553	3,074,689	(3,864)
Short Term Accommodation	13,466,436	10,786,052	12,183,351	1,397,299
Admin	659,000	540,000	540,000	0
Grand Total	31,635,669	24,412,718	24,971,302	558,584

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2 – DELIVERING THE SAVINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Supporting People - DRAFT Allocations 2012/13 by Service Type & District										
2012-13 Service Type	Data	District								
		Ashford	Canterbury	County	Dartford	Dartford & Gravesham	Dover	East Kent	Gravesham	Maidstone
Community Alarms	Option 1	49,901	51,609	82,049	32,332		66,616	1,037	66,616	78,085
	Option 2	38,385	39,699	63,115	24,871		51,243	798	51,243	60,065
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	(11,516)	(11,910)	(18,934)	(7,461)		(15,373)	(239)	(15,373)	(18,020)
Extra Care	Option 1		193,260							
	Option 2		59,840							
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2		(133,420)							
Floating Support Service	Option 1	0	0	739,657	0		0	1,851,550	0	0
	Option 2	0	0	707,331	0		0	1,519,939	0	0
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	0	0	(32,326)	0		0	(331,611)	0	0
HIA	Option 1	58,659	58,659	0		117,318	58,659			58,659
	Option 2	57,444	57,444	0		114,890	57,444			57,444
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	(1,215)	(1,215)	0		(2,428)	(1,215)			(1,215)
Long Term	Option 1	158,323	93,764	195,841	287,653		82,196		65,665	857,677
	Option 2	167,083	100,031	249,905	302,238		84,303		69,404	646,276
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	8,760	6,267	54,064	14,585		2,107		3,739	(211,401)
Sheltered	Option 1	171,240	143,676	446,282	261,715		161,284	7,080	195,733	389,770
	Option 2	183,666	148,224	444,689	280,263		172,988	7,304	201,928	418,054
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	12,426	4,548	(1,593)	18,548		11,704	224	6,195	28,284
Short Term Accommodation	Option 1	346,231	1,111,411	2,866,802	313,374		712,599		308,315	1,204,748
	Option 2	306,581	1,408,166	3,006,177	378,822		853,960		342,083	1,340,109
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	(39,650)	296,755	139,375	65,448		141,361		33,768	135,361
Admin	Option 1									
	Option 2									
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2									
Total Option 1		784,354	1,652,379	4,330,631	895,074	117,318	1,081,354	1,859,667	636,329	2,588,939
Total Option 2		753,160	1,813,405	4,471,217	986,193	114,890	1,219,939	1,528,041	664,658	2,521,949
Total Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2		(31,194)	161,026	140,586	91,119	(2,428)	138,585	(331,626)	28,329	(66,990)

APPENDIX 2 CONT. – DELIVERING THE SAVINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Supporting People - DRAFT Allocations 2012/13 by Service Type & District												
2012-13 Service Type	Data	Sevenoaks	Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling	Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells, Tonbridge and Malling	Shepway	Swale	Thanet	Tonbridge and Malling	Tunbridge Wells	West Kent	Commissioning Team	Grand Total
Community Alarms	Option 1	47,095			54,476	76,377	18,118	15,007	35,809			675,127
	Option 2	36,227			41,905	58,751	13,937	11,544	27,546			519,330
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	(10,868)			(12,571)	(17,626)	(4,181)	(3,463)	(8,263)			(155,797)
Extra Care	Option 1	140,553					33,202					367,015
	Option 2	51,256					12,526					123,622
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	(89,297)					(20,676)					(243,393)
Floating Support Service	Option 1	0		177,151	0	0	0	0	0	1,071,264		3,839,622
	Option 2	0		186,140	0	0	0	0	0	924,844		3,338,254
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	0		8,989	0	0	0	0	0	(146,420)		(501,368)
HIA	Option 1				58,659	58,659	58,659	58,659		117,318		703,908
	Option 2				57,444	57,444	57,444	57,444		114,890		689,335
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2				(1,215)	(1,215)	(1,215)	(1,215)		(2,428)		(14,573)
Long Term	Option 1	223,102			524,605	141,242	678,098	174,280	541,249	398,746		4,422,441
	Option 2	234,638			570,045	141,037	757,177	171,187	568,618	440,781		4,502,721
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	11,536			45,440	(205)	79,079	(3,093)	27,369	42,035		80,280
Sheltered	Option 1	314,236			262,945	318,586	120,731	115,488	169,787			3,078,553
	Option 2	336,545			281,735	170,852	127,149	123,868	177,424			3,074,689
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	22,309			18,790	(147,734)	6,418	8,380	7,637			(3,864)
Short Term Accommodation	Option 1	352,827	94,708		326,642	1,068,278	754,794	289,043	679,077	357,203		10,786,052
	Option 2	360,092	139,605		358,488	1,279,611	893,292	332,507	749,398	434,459		12,183,351
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2	7,265	44,897		31,846	211,333	138,498	43,464	70,321	77,256		1,397,299
Admin	Option 1										540,000	540,000
	Option 2										540,000	540,000
	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2										0	0
Total Option 1		1,077,813	94,708	177,151	1,227,327	1,663,142	1,663,602	652,477	1,425,922	1,944,531	540,000	24,412,718
Total Option 2		1,018,758	139,605	186,140	1,309,617	1,707,696	1,861,525	696,550	1,522,986	1,914,974	540,000	24,971,302
Total Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2		(59,055)	44,897	8,989	82,290	44,554	197,923	44,073	97,064	(29,557)	0	558,584

Supporting People - Draft Allocations 2012/13 by District & Service Type

District	2012-13 Service Type	Data			
		Draft 2011/12 Base Budget	Option 1	Option 2	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2
Ashford	Sheltered	219,539	171,240	183,666	12,426
	Community Alarms	63,976	49,901	38,385	(11,516)
	Long Term	202,978	158,323	167,083	8,760
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	443,886	346,231	306,581	(39,650)
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Ashford Total		1,005,582	784,354	753,160	(31,194)
Canterbury	Sheltered	184,200	143,676	148,224	4,548
	Community Alarms	66,166	51,609	39,699	(11,910)
	Extra Care	247,769	193,260	59,840	(133,420)
	Long Term	130,913	93,764	100,031	6,267
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	1,424,884	1,111,411	1,408,166	296,755
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Canterbury Total		2,129,136	1,652,379	1,813,405	161,026
County	Sheltered	572,157	446,282	444,689	(1,593)
	Community Alarms	105,192	82,049	63,115	(18,934)
	Long Term	251,078	195,841	249,905	54,064
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	3,313,553	2,866,802	3,006,177	139,375
	HIA	200,000	0	0	0
	Floating Support Service	948,277	739,657	707,331	(32,326)
County Total		5,390,258	4,330,631	4,471,217	140,586
Dartford	Sheltered	335,531	261,715	280,263	18,548
	Community Alarms	41,451	32,332	24,871	(7,461)
	Long Term	368,785	287,653	302,238	14,585
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	401,763	313,374	378,822	65,448
Dartford Total		1,147,530	895,074	986,193	91,119
Dartford & Gravesham	HIA	150,407	117,318	114,890	(2,428)
Dartford & Gravesham Total		150,407	117,318	114,890	(2,428)
Dover	Sheltered	206,775	161,284	172,988	11,704
	Community Alarms	85,405	66,616	51,243	(15,373)
	Long Term	105,379	82,196	84,303	2,107
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	913,588	712,599	853,960	141,361
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Dover Total		1,386,350	1,081,354	1,219,939	138,585
East Kent	Sheltered	9,077	7,080	7,304	224
	Community Alarms	1,330	1,037	798	(239)
	Floating Support Service	2,653,665	1,851,550	1,519,939	(331,611)
East Kent Total		2,664,071	1,859,667	1,528,041	(331,626)
Gravesham	Sheltered	250,939	195,733	201,928	6,195
	Community Alarms	85,405	66,616	51,243	(15,373)
	Long Term	84,185	65,665	69,404	3,739
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	395,276	308,315	342,083	33,768
Gravesham Total		815,806	636,329	664,658	28,329
Maidstone	Sheltered	499,706	389,770	418,054	28,284
	Community Alarms	100,109	78,085	60,065	(18,020)
	Long Term	1,099,588	857,677	646,276	(211,401)
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	1,544,547	1,204,748	1,340,109	135,361
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Maidstone Total		3,319,153	2,588,939	2,521,949	(66,990)
Sevenoaks	Sheltered	402,867	314,236	336,545	22,309
	Community Alarms	60,378	47,095	36,227	(10,868)
	Extra Care	180,196	140,553	51,256	(89,297)
	Long Term	286,028	223,102	234,638	11,536
	Short Term				
	Accommodation	452,343	352,827	360,092	7,265
Sevenoaks Total		1,381,811	1,077,813	1,018,758	(59,055)

APPENDIX 3 – DELIVERING THE SAVINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT

District	2012-13 Service Type	Data			
		Draft 2011/12 Base Budget	Option 1	Option 2	Sum of Diff Option 1 -V- 2
Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling	Short Term Accommodation	121,421	94,708	139,605	44,897
Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling Total		121,421	94,708	139,605	44,897
Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells, Tonbridge and Malling	Floating Support Service	227,117	177,151	186,140	8,989
Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells, Tonbridge and Malling Total		227,117	177,151	186,140	8,989
Shepway	Sheltered	337,108	262,945	281,735	18,790
	Community Alarms	69,842	54,476	41,905	(12,571)
	Long Term	672,572	524,605	570,045	45,440
	Short Term Accommodation	418,772	326,642	358,488	31,846
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Shepway Total		1,573,497	1,227,327	1,309,617	82,290
Swale	Sheltered	408,444	318,586	170,852	(147,734)
	Community Alarms	97,919	76,377	58,751	(17,626)
	Long Term	181,080	141,242	141,037	(205)
	Short Term Accommodation	1,369,588	1,068,278	1,279,611	211,333
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Swale Total		2,132,234	1,663,142	1,707,696	44,554
Thanet	Sheltered	154,783	120,731	127,149	6,418
	Community Alarms	23,228	18,118	13,937	(4,181)
	Extra Care	42,567	33,202	12,526	(20,676)
	Long Term	869,357	678,098	757,177	79,079
	Short Term Accommodation	967,683	754,794	893,292	138,498
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Thanet Total		2,132,822	1,663,602	1,861,525	197,923
Tonbridge and Malling	Sheltered	148,061	115,488	123,868	8,380
	Community Alarms	19,240	15,007	11,544	(3,463)
	Long Term	223,436	174,280	171,187	(3,093)
	Short Term Accommodation	370,568	289,043	332,507	43,464
	HIA	75,204	58,659	57,444	(1,215)
Tonbridge and Malling Total		836,508	652,477	696,550	44,073
Tunbridge Wells	Sheltered	217,676	169,787	177,424	7,637
	Community Alarms	45,909	35,809	27,546	(8,263)
	Long Term	693,909	541,249	568,618	27,369
	Short Term Accommodation	870,613	679,077	749,398	70,321
Tunbridge Wells Total		1,828,107	1,425,922	1,522,986	97,064
West Kent	Long Term	511,213	398,746	440,781	42,035
	Short Term Accommodation	457,952	357,203	434,459	77,256
	HIA	150,407	117,318	114,890	(2,428)
	Floating Support Service	1,615,285	1,071,264	924,844	(146,420)
	West Kent Total		2,734,857	1,944,531	1,914,974
Commissioning Team	Admin	659,000	540,000	540,000	0
Commissioning Team Total		659,000	540,000	540,000	0
Grand Total		31,635,669	24,412,718	24,971,302	558,584

**Appendix 4 Equality Impact Assessment and Action Plan
KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (REVIEW)

This form dated 17/12/2010 supersedes all previous EIA/ CIA forms

Directorate:

Communities

Name of policy, procedure, project or service

Delivering the Savings Proposals – Report (Review)

Type

The strategic level document sets out the way the Kent Supporting People Programme intends to achieve the savings asked for by the reduction in grant Allocation as well as implementing the priorities set in the Supporting People Strategy 2010-15.

Responsible Owner/ Senior Officer

Claire Martin, Head of Supporting People

Date of Initial Screening

14 February 2011

Date of Review

2 March 2011

Screening Grid

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service affect this group differently from others in Kent? YES/NO	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO	Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/ NONE/UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes, why? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? c) Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities
			Positive	Negative	
Age	<p>No – Current levels of accommodation based services, HIAs and handyperson services and community alarms are to be retained but at reduced cost.</p> <p>No – The QAF requires providers to meet equality & diversity in services, including fair access</p> <p>Yes – Bringing cost in extra care sheltered accommodation in line with cost in sheltered accommodation and reducing expenditure on community alarms might lead to access being dependent on individual ability to contribute more towards cost or to such services becoming unviable because other stakeholders being unable to fill the funding gap</p> <p>Yes – Reducing the level of floating support services and potentially restricting access could lead to less support being available to vulnerable people</p>	<p>Yes – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring services meet them as well as identifying gaps in services</p> <p>Yes - Commissioning of more services for young people at risk will prevent homelessness and enable more of them to stay in their areas of origin and near to their existing social networks.</p> <p>Yes – Retaining current levels of accommodation based services will continue to enable vulnerable people to have choice and live independently in the community.</p>	High	As yet unknown	<p>a) Internal action is required to assess the impact of reduction in unit numbers of floating support services. The proposed reductions have the potential to impact on access to services for older people with support needs as well as young people at risk.</p> <p>Other action will need to be taken with regard to the impact of bringing the expenditure per service user per week in extra care housing in line with that in sheltered accommodation and reducing expenditure on community alarms. This will have an impact on statutory stakeholders or service users themselves in having to fill the funding gap and there will be a dependency on eligibility criteria and an assessment in order to determine access. There will need to be a re-evaluation of the costs associated with service delivery.</p> <p>c) Supporting People continues to monitor and review services, including the age of those accessing them to ensure that older people with support needs and young people at risk can access the services they need</p>

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service affect this group differently from others in Kent? YES/NO	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO	Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/ NONE/UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes, why? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? c) Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities
			Positive	Negative	
Disability	Yes – Reducing the level of floating support services and potentially restricting access could lead to less support being available to vulnerable people Yes – Reducing support hours and hourly rates in long term supported accommodation is likely to affect people with learning disabilities, people with physical disabilities and people with mental health problems more than other client groups.	Yes – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring services meet them as well as identifying gaps in services Yes – Retaining current levels of accommodation based services will continue to enable vulnerable people to have choice and live independently in the community. Yes – Money saved through reduction in cost of long term supported accommodation will enable the Programme to be targeted at its core business of delivering housing related support across a broad range of services within the 21 client groups the programme delivers services to with the end result that vulnerable people who are not eligible to receive a statutory service are not marginalised and excluded from society.	High	As yet Unknown	a) b) Internal action is required to assess the impact of reduction in unit numbers of floating support services. The proposed reductions have the potential to impact on access to services for specific clients groups, such as people with sensory disabilities and people living with HIV/Aids. Other action will need to be taken with regard to the impact of reducing support hours and hourly rates in long term supported accommodation. This will have an impact on statutory stakeholders or service users themselves in having to fill the funding gap and there will be a dependency on eligibility criteria and an assessment in order to determine access. There will need to be a re-evaluation of the costs associated with service delivery. c) Under contractual obligations all providers have to meet the particular communication needs of clients and thus can meet the housing related support needs of a wide range of client groups.
Gender	Yes – Reducing the level of floating support services and potentially restricting access could lead to less support being available to vulnerable people	Yes – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring services meet them as well as identifying gaps in services	High	As yet unknown	a) and b) Internal action is required to assess the impact of reduction in unit numbers of floating support services. The proposed reductions have the potential to impact on access to services for specific clients groups, such as women fleeing domestic abuse and teenage parents.

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service affect this group differently from others in Kent? YES/NO	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO	Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/ NONE/UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes, why? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? c) Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities
			Positive	Negative	
Gender (Cont.)		Yes - Commissioning of more services for women fleeing domestic abuse and teenage parents will help more women to access safe and secure accommodation. Less teenage parents will become homelessness and more will be enabled to stay in their areas of origin and near social networks. Yes – Retaining current levels of accommodation based services will continue to enable vulnerable people to have choice and live independently in the community.	High	As yet unknown	c) Supporting People continues to monitor the housing related support needs of those fleeing domestic abuse and where shortage of resources poses potential risks to clients' safety, the case for additional services is made.
Gender identity	No – Supporting People contracts explicitly demand that providers deal with issues of Equalities and meet the diverse needs of service users.	YES – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring that services use best practice in meeting the needs of people with gender identity issues.	High		c) Supporting People continues to monitor and review services, including fair access to services and that services use best practice in meeting the needs of people with gender identity issues.
Race	No – Current levels of accommodation based services, HIAs and handyperson services and community alarms are to be retained but at reduced cost. Yes – Reducing the level of floating support services and potentially not re-commissioning a BME specific service could lead to less support being available to BME communities	YES – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring that those needs are met within existing services or, if need is evidenced, commissioning specific services for specific Ethnic groupings.	High	As yet unknown	a) b) Internal action is required to assess the impact of reduction in unit numbers of floating support services. The proposed reductions have the potential to impact on access to services for particular BME groups. c) Supporting People continues to monitor and review services, including fair access to services and that services use best practice in meeting the needs of members of minority ethnic groups.

Characteristic	Could this policy, procedure, project or service affect this group differently from others in Kent? YES/NO	Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO	Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW/ NONE/UNKNOWN		Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes, why? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? c) Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities
			Positive	Negative	
Religion or belief	No – The QAF requires providers to ensure that people’s beliefs are respected and that they are supported in accessing appropriate places of worship, where required	Yes – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring that those needs are met within existing services	High		c) Supporting People continues to monitor and review services, including fair access to services and that services use best practice in meeting the needs of members of minority ethnic groups.
Sexual orientation	No – The QAF requires providers to deal with issues of Equalities and meet the diverse needs of service users	YES – by identifying specific support needs and ensuring that services use best practice in meeting the needs of people with issues around sexual orientation	High		c) Supporting People continues to monitor and review services, including fair access to services and that services use best practice in meeting the needs of members of minority ethnic groups.
Pregnancy and maternity	See under gender	See under gender	High		

Part 1: INITIAL SCREENING

Context

The Programme commissions the provision of housing related support in a range of services including sheltered accommodation and floating support services. The programme is required to make savings of £7 million over the next two years in response to the adjustment of investment and the impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review 2010.

Achieving the savings involves reducing expenditure across all lines/services. At the same time, the Programme is implementing the priorities as set out in the Kent Supporting People Strategy 2010-2015. These priorities are confirmed as the following short term accommodation based services:

- Young people at risk schemes
- Refuges Single homeless scheme (Thanet)
- Substance misuse scheme
- Teenage parents

The majority of these schemes have floating support schemes that were commissioned in lieu of accommodation-based provision in order to safeguard investment for newly commissioned accommodation-based services. The Programme will ensure that the investment is secure for all of the schemes outlined above.

Aims and Objectives

The document proposes two options of which option two is recommended. Option one would have entailed a reduction in funding to all services of 22% irrespective of strategic priorities. This option could materially affect the viability of services within the Programme. The Commissioning Body supported in principle the adoption of Option Two, once the Core Strategy Group is satisfied that the impact assessment in relation to Option Two is satisfactory.

Option Two is a more strategic approach which reflects more accurately the outcomes that the Programme has been set up to achieve and includes a combination of efficiency measures as already identified in the Supporting People Strategy 2010-2015. In essence, applying efficiency measures means continuing to deliver services at the same level but with less money. The objectives guiding the proposals can be summed up as follows:

- To target funding at the Programme's core business which is housing related support and is primarily targeted at short term outcome focused interventions in order to facilitate re-engagement in the social fabric of the county;
- To target funding at the most vulnerable and those at greatest risk ;
- To maximise value for money including reducing provider cost and weekly support hours delivered;

- To minimise the impact on high cost statutory services where there is a reduction in the weekly support hours in long term services ;
- To ensure that strategically relevant accommodation-based services are not closed
- To ensure that floating support services are retained but at reduced capacity and cost ;
- To reconfigure the procurement of services for different client groups where appropriate to achieve economies of scale ;

A full impact assessment on the Supporting People Strategy 2010-2015 was carried out in 2010 and was signed of by the directorate lead for equalities. The Strategy (and the proposals contained within it) was widely consulted on, including with service users.

However, the savings proposals for reductions in the expenditure on extra care sheltered accommodation, community alarms, long term supported accommodation and reductions in the level of floating support services go beyond what was proposed in the strategy and had been consulted on then. Therefore there needs to be an additional consultation on the implementation of the savings proposals.

Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries of the Programme are vulnerable people in need of housing related support services in Kent as defined in the Kent Supporting People Eligibility Policy. They include:

- single homeless people with support needs and rough sleepers
- older people with support needs
- people with disabilities
- people with mental health problems
- families with support needs and teenage parents
- young people at risk and care leavers
- ex-offenders
- people at risk of domestic abuse
- people with alcohol and/or drug problems

More than half of grant is spent on older people with support needs, people with learning disabilities, people with mental health problems and people with physical/sensory disabilities. Currently, three of the four groups not only attract the three highest grant spends by client group but, excluding generic floating support services, also the highest contracted unit numbers. Support for both older people and people with learning disabilities is predominantly provided through accommodation based services.

Consultation and data

The proposals for efficiency measures already contained within the Kent Supporting People Strategy 2010-15 were widely consulted upon and included a wide range of data including client records, needs analysis and

outcomes of extensive consultation with key stakeholders including service users. This Equality Impact Assessment utilises the full customer impact assessment carried out on the strategy.

Any Provider commissioned by the SP Team to provide one or more of the proposed services will be awarded a contract which is monitored through the Quality Assessment Framework (QAF). The QAF has clear and explicit standards to ensure that all Supporting People -funded services are inclusive to all members of the community. All contracts have clauses requiring providers to work within the Equality act 2010 and the Human Rights Act 1998. Providers must all have an equal opportunities policy that complies with all statutory obligations as stipulated by the Equality and Human Rights Commission as far as possible.

The most recent consultations and discussions with key stakeholders about the savings proposals took place within the Provider Forum, the Core Strategy Group and the Commissioning Body. As already indicated elsewhere, the savings with regard to floating support go beyond what was agreed in the Kent Supporting People Strategy 2010-15.

The 'Delivering the Savings Proposals' report includes an Impact Assessment outlining the financial impact of the savings on services for the client groups the Programme provides a service to.

Potential Impact

In general terms, the initial screening shows that in relation to people with the protected characteristics there will be no impact on the level of service provision to the different client groups in accommodation based services, Home Improvement Services, handyperson services or community alarms. Services will continue to be delivered at current levels of unit numbers albeit at reduced cost and the proposed measures do not impact disproportionately on any groups of people with the protected characteristics.

In extra care sheltered accommodation it is proposed to bring costs in line with expenditure per service user per week in sheltered accommodation. It is also proposed to reduce expenditure on community alarms. These measures could impact on service users as well as other stakeholders in the Programme.

In long term housing it is proposed to adjust the number of weekly support hours down over a two year period. This reflects the Programme's need to target its resources on its core business of housing related support in order to continue supporting as wide a range of vulnerable people as possible. It also reflects a more realistic apportioning of cost between housing related support and care. This will affect services for people with disabilities. In addition, it is proposed to reduce hourly rates to bring them in line with the rates in short term accommodation based services. These measures might not only have an impact on service users themselves but also statutory services such as Adult Social Services.

Floating Support will be retendered in 2011/12 and is the only type of housing related support where the level of service provision will need to be reduced within the funding available in 2012/13. Reductions will affect all client groups. No detailed proposals as to the reduction of specific floating support services have as yet been made. A report setting out proposals will be submitted to the governing bodies in May and June 2011.

Adverse Impact:

1) Long term and short term accommodation based supported housing:

A review of the proposals has been considered and based on the information currently available in terms of overall level of service provision no adverse impacts have been identified that may affect one group of people with the protected characteristics disproportionately more than others.

However, there might be adverse impacts on individual service users and statutory services that might be required to fill the funding gap. Providers may need to rethink the nature of service delivery within services to meet these challenges.

2) Community alarms

A review of the proposals has been considered and based on the information currently available in terms of overall level of service provision no adverse impacts have been identified that may affect one group of people with the protected characteristics disproportionately more than others.

However, there might be adverse effects on the individual service users in terms of the levels of service delivery and the providers' ability to adhere to prescribed quality standards. This may lead to lines being remotely tested and quality standards being diluted.

3) Home Improvement Agencies and handyperson services:

A review of the proposals has been considered and based on the information currently available no adverse impacts have been identified that may affect one group of people with the protected characteristics disproportionately more than others.

3) Floating support services:

The savings proposals indicate a significant overall reduction in floating support services which could have an adverse impact that could affect some groups of people with the protected characteristics more than others. The Supporting People Programme monitors and reviews the services it commissions to ensure that they are accessible to the vulnerable people who need them irrespective of race, religion, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Therefore, potential adverse impacts could only affect the

protected characteristics of age, disability, race (where services are focused on particular BME groups) and gender (where services are focused on those fleeing domestic abuse and teenage parents).

Positive Impact:

The proposals are balanced between a need for achieving maximum value for money and ensuring that services remain viable. Where accommodation based services, Home Improvement Agencies, handyperson services and community alarms are concerned, services are being retained at current levels albeit at reduced cost. This ensures that the Programme will be able to retain floating support services albeit at a reduced level compared with historical investment.

There will be new commissioning of accommodation based services for young people at risk linking up supported housing services more flexibly as a unified service for vulnerable young people including care leavers and young offenders. Other new accommodation based services to be commissioned are for teenage parents, women fleeing domestic abuse, people misusing substances and single homeless people with support needs.

Supporting People continues to monitor and review services through the Quality Assessment Framework and contractual obligations which oblige providers to ensure that services are accessible to all who need them and do not discriminate against minorities such as people from Ethnic Minorities or lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LBGT) people.

JUDGEMENT

Option 2 – Internal Action Required YES

Where levels of service provision in long term supported accommodation, extra care sheltered accommodation and community alarms are concerned, strategically relevant services will continue to be delivered at current levels and therefore no groups are directly or indirectly excluded from benefitting, where applicable, from Supporting People services. Savings are to be made through efficiency measures such as value for money. Some of the measures were consulted on and agreed during the development of the Kent Supporting People Strategy 2010-15.

However, some of the proposed reductions in expenditure have the potential to impact on individual service users in terms of having to contribute more to the cost of their services or other stakeholders such as Adult Social Services being asked to fill the funding gap via individual assessment.

In relation to floating support, there is potential for adverse impact on particular groups and we have found scope to improve the proposal. The 'Delivering the Savings Proposals' report does not detail the reductions in

floating support services. The work is currently being undertaken and detailed proposals will be made in a report going to the governing bodies in May/June 2011.

The detailed proposals will need to be consulted on and a further screening will be carried out. The action plan is attached as appendix 1.

Sign Off

I have noted the content of the equality impact assessment and agree the actions to mitigate the adverse impact(s) that have been identified.

Senior Officer

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Claire Martin', written in a cursive style.

Date: 4 March 2011
Name: Claire Martin
Job Title: Head of Supporting People

Directorate Equality Lead

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Mary Blanche', written in a cursive style.

Date:
Name: Mary Blanche

Appendix One - Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

Protected Characteristic	Issues identified	Action to be taken	Expected outcomes	Owner	Timescale	Cost implications
Age	Reduction in overall provision of floating support services	Consultation with service users and providers	Agreed proposals	Supporting People	March/April 2011	None
		Equality Impact Assessment on detailed proposals for new floating support services to be commissioned	Agreed proposals	Supporting People	May 2011	None
	Reduction in expenditure per service user per week in extra care sheltered accommodation	Joint assessment of individual service users between Supporting People and Adult Social Services	Kent Adult Social Services will jointly assess service users with the SP Programme and will determine whether or not social care input can be increased or whether alternative interventions from the voluntary or health sectors can be delivered	Supporting People Adult Social Services Service Providers Health Voluntary Sector	March 2012	Additional hours from a member of the SP Team

Protected Characteristic	Issues identified	Action to be taken	Expected outcomes	Owner	Timescale	Cost implications
	Reduction in weekly payments in relation to community alarms	There have been initial discussions with providers and key stakeholders. Further work will be undertaken in order to adjust the expectations in terms of service delivery in relation to alarms.	Weekly expenditure will be reduced. There may be a remote service applied rather than weekly visits. The specification may no longer require specific quality standards.	Supporting People Key stakeholders Service providers	March 2012	None
Disability	Reduction in overall provision of floating support services	Consultation with service users and providers	Agreed proposals	Supporting People	March/April 2011	None
		Equality Impact Assessment on detailed proposals for new floating support services to be commissioned	Agreed proposals	Supporting People	May 2011	None
	Reductions in hourly rates and weekly support hours in long term supported accommodation	Joint assessment of individual service users between Supporting People and Adult Social Services	Adult Social services and Supporting People will conduct joint assessments to determine whether or not individuals	Supporting People Adult Social Services Service Providers	March 2012 and March 2013	Additional hours from a member of the SP Team

By: Angela Slaven, Director, Youth and Community Support Services.

To: Commissioning Body

Subject: Administration of the Programme

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary. The Commissioning Body asked the Kent Supporting People Team to replicate the 22% cut in funding in the main Programme in the administration of the Programme. This report sets out the proposal to do so.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 The Kent Supporting People Programme is required to deliver a 22% Savings target within the main programme. The Kent Supporting People Commissioning Body suggested that the team should commit to the same level or increased level of saving on the cost of the administration of the Programme. The saving will be delivered by the beginning of 2012/13 to achieve a full year effect. This report sets out the proposals for achieving this.

3.0 Relevant priority outcomes

3.1 The Kent Supporting People Programme is required to undertake the following;

- pay providers
- contract with providers
- commission services
- tender for services
- develop policy and strategy in relation to the Programme in conjunction with key stakeholders
- develop and maintain service user involvement and consultation
- performance manage providers (quality, performance indicators, client records, reconnection, move-on, outcomes, interface with the CLG)
- administer floating support referrals
- implement a payment by results model.

3.2 The Programme will support the development of a vehicle to reduce the investment required by the public sector in services from districts and boroughs, health, and the County Council in relation to handy person services.

4.0 Strategic Priorities

4.1 The team will deliver the requirements outlined above by reducing the administration of the centralised floating support referral mechanism and it will

achieve this through an electronic automated system. Work will be undertaken to manage the volume and the prioritisation of the Monitoring and Review Programme relating to the Quality Assessment Framework. This will be achieved by focussing on providers who seek to augment their QAF gradings, and providers that are a cause for concern in relation to their general performance. The new policies and procedures that are being introduced into the monitoring and review process will help to streamline the time and effort taken to undertake the QAF. There will be fewer floating support services to monitor by 2012/13, and, by utilising other quality standards some providers will cease to be within the QAF requirements leaving only supported housing and floating support subject to the QAF.

5.0 Financial Implications

5.1 The team will aim to achieve the savings through “natural wastage” and seek to reduce any compulsory redundancies. Redundancy costs will need to be factored into future financial reports and KCC have made provision to offset costs from services.

6.0 Legal Implications

6.1 The County Council will adhere to the appropriate personnel policies and procedures. This should exclude any legal challenge.

7.0 The rationale for the reduction in funding to administrate the Programme.

7.1 The Commissioning Body requested that the Kent Supporting People Team should meet the challenge of operating on the basis of a minimum of a 22% reduction in the cost of administering the Programme. Achieving a 22% reduction will result in a team structure:

Head of Supporting People (One)
Performance and Review Manager (One) and Officer (One)
Contracts Manager (One) and Officer (One)
Policy and Strategy Officer (One)
Monitoring and Review Officer (One)
Service User Involvement and Consultation Officer (One)
Support Officer (One)

The staff complement would consequently reduce from twelve posts to nine.

8.0 Options Appraisal.

There has been a commitment made to reduce the costs of delivering the programme within Kent. There needs to be a careful balance between delivering the savings and ensuring that the Programme can still function and deliver the core essentials outlined above. The Programme is still required to deliver information to the Communities and Local Government department, and to ensure that services are delivered that are efficient, effective, and economic. It is proposed that the posts retained in the above structure are

essential to delivering the core services of the administration of the Programme. The projected funding envelope enables the Programme to continue to do this.

9.0 Consultation and Communication

9.1 The Programme will enter into a formal consultation process with staff at an appropriate point in time. The rationale for the changes will be set out clearly, the process will be explained, and the staff will have an opportunity to comment on the changes that are being proposed.

10.0 Risk and Business Continuity Management

10.1 The Programme will need to undertake a risk and business continuity evaluation to ensure that the core essentials of the service can still be delivered.

11.0 The County Council will need to maintain the confidence of the Commissioning Body, Core Strategy Group, Executive Forum of providers, and Service User Panel in delivering this proposal.

12.0 Sustainability Implications

12.1 The Programme will need to ensure that the service delivered by the team reflects the needs of vulnerable service users and ensures that as many vulnerable people as possible are able to continue to access efficient, effective, and economic housing related support services.

13.0 Conclusion

13.1 The Supporting People Programme must ensure that the administration of the Programme is achieved within a framework that delivers high quality and effective management of the programme. A reduction of 22% will result in a total cost of the programme being £540K by the beginning of the financial year 2012/13.

1. Recommendations

The Kent Supporting People Programme Commissioning Body is asked to agree;

1. That the Kent Supporting People Programme delivers a saving of 22% in administration by reducing the number of staff within the team and other on costs associated with the administration of the Programme. The administration costs of the team will reduce to £540K per annum from 2012/13. The staffing numbers would reduce from twelve to nine.

Background Documents

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT

By: Angela Slaven – Director of Youth and Community Support Services, Communities Directorate

To: Supporting People in Kent Commissioning Body
17 March 2011

Subject: Finance Report

Classification:- Unrestricted

For Information

Summary. This report sets out the financial position in relation to the administration of the programme and commissioned services within the Programme.

1. Introduction

1.0 This report provides details of the anticipated outturn in relation to the administration of the Programme and the commissioned services within the Programme. There will be a report presented once the current financial year is over, which provides a final financial position for the current financial year.

2.0 The Administration of the Programme

2.1 The administration grant which amounted to £735k was removed by the Communities and Local Government Department in June 2010 with the expectation that these costs are managed within the overall Local Authority funding for the Supporting People Programme. The forecast expenditure at January for 2010/11 is £690.6k and is funded in full through reserves. A summary of the Supporting People team expenditure is provided in Appendix One. The expenditure includes non staffing costs relating to the administration of the programme.

3.0 The Main Programme

3.1 The forecast expenditure for 2010/11 for commissioned services is £ 35.2m. This is set against an anticipated budget of £32.3m. The balance of the expenditure which is £2.9m is funded through reserves. A summary of the expenditure by District is also provided in Appendix One.

4.0 The Reserves

4.1 The total drawdown on reserves is therefore estimated to be £3.6m. This comprises £0.691m for administration and £2.9m for the direct delivery of services for 2010/11.

5.0 Conclusion

This report provides a summary overview of the forecast outturn for the Kent Supporting People Programme. As at January 2011 the projected spend for the 12 months to 31 March 2011 is £35.9m including the Supporting People team, and the draw down on reserves is estimated at £3.6m to balance the budget at £32.3m.

Recommendations

The Commissioning Body is asked to note:

1. The report and the attached at Appendix 1
2. The drawdown on reserves is estimated at £3,604k for 2010/11
3. To receive an updated finance outturn report for 2010/11 at the next Commissioning Body meeting

Author:

Hud Manuel

**Finance Manager – KCC Finance Manager: Kent Drug and Alcohol Action Team,
Youth Offending Service, and Supporting People.**

Extension 4285

Hud.manuel@kent.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1 – FINANCE REPORT

Forecast Outturn 2010/11 for the Supporting People team

	Actual To Date £	Forecast Outturn £
Staff Pay	445,407	588,849
Premises	2,507	2,507
Third Party Payments (Public)	6,453	189
Fees - Private Sector Contracts	13,567	16,317
Internal Recharges	6,795	42,743
Other Running Costs	25,022	40,041
Total Expenditure	499,750	690,644

Forecast Outturn 2010/11 for the Supporting People Programme

District Expenditure	Actual To Date £	Forecast Outturn £
Ashford	790,582	1,059,190
Canterbury	1,856,696	2,524,444
County	3,253,210	4,665,055
Dartford	818,950	1,159,407
Dartford & Gravesham	177,104	229,781
Dartford, Gravesham & Sevenoaks	26,307	70,089
Dover	1,162,458	1,585,145
East Kent	2,636,513	3,499,743
Gravesham	680,838	896,209
Maidstone	3,003,780	3,943,258
Sevenoaks	1,341,081	1,680,666
Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling	109,336	149,264
Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells, Tonbridge and Malling	172,360	227,117
Shepway	1,260,349	1,749,829
Swale	1,919,791	2,527,726
Thanet	1,665,240	2,205,184
Tonbridge and Malling	1,748,249	2,304,617
Tunbridge Wells	1,411,654	1,856,271
West Kent	2,140,203	2,894,061
Total Expenditure	26,174,702	35,227,056

<u>Funding:</u>	£
KCC Budget Allocation	32,094,000
Handy Persons Grant	220,000
<u>Draw down on Reserves</u>	
Commissioned Services	2,913,056
Total Funding	35,227,056

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Angela Slaven, Director, Youth and Community Support Services.

To: Core Strategy Group

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary The Commissioning Body asked whether or not they could have delegated authority in relation to the Supporting People Programme budget and could have some jurisdiction over the setting of the budget in relation to the Programme. This report sets out the response to that request.

1 Introduction

(1) The Commissioning Body agreed a revised Memorandum of Understanding at the meeting on the 20 January 2011. The Commissioning Body asked the Supporting People Team to seek a legal opinion on whether or not the budget for the Supporting People Programme could be formally delegated to the Commissioning Body, and the Commissioning Body could have some jurisdiction over the budget setting for the Programme.

2 Relevant priority outcomes

(1) The Commissioning Body sought to ensure that the Commissioning Body and the Supporting People Programme be given some formal status in determining the allocation of its annual budget.

3 Financial Implications

(1) The Supporting People Programme funding has been amalgamated into formula funding allocated to the County Council. The administration and the costs of the administration of the Programme has been managed by Kent County Council since 2000. The principle of pooling the funding for administration was achieved prior to the precursor to the CLG awarding the administration grant to the County Council. In 2010 the Administration Grant for the management of the Programme was deleted and the costs were subsumed within the overall funding allocation.

(2) The ultimate responsibility and jurisdiction for the management of the Programme remains with the County Council.

4 Legal Implications

(1) The Memorandum of Understanding does not have any legal status and it was never intended to have any legal status. Its purpose has been to try to articulate the "rules" of engagement between the membership.

The meetings of the Commissioning Body are operated on the principles of best practice. The meetings are operated to the principles of this being a

"Committee". However this is only in terms of house keeping for example ensuring the timely despatch of agendas etc. The Commissioning Body fulfils the aim of the County to achieve an effective and efficient management of the pooled financial resource.

5 The Role and Responsibilities of the Commissioning Body

(1) The Commissioning Body is consulted on the allocation and utilisation of the funding within the Programme. The Commissioning Body's views are taken into account in the decision-making processes within the Programme. The County Council is the contract holder and is financially responsible for the Programme.

6 Options

(1) The Commissioning Body has been the decision-making body for the Programme prior to the Supporting People Programme "going live" in April 2003. The Memorandum of Understanding has worked well. The only other option that would seek to alter this arrangement is to make the Commissioning Body a joint committee under the auspices of the Local Government Act. It is questionable whether or not this would improve the current situation, nor given the County Council's legal, financial, and contractual obligations would it necessarily be appropriate. This could potentially leave every district and borough with a joint legal, financial and contractual liability together with the County Council.

7 Consultation and Communication

(1) The Supporting People Programme has sought the legal opinion of the County Council, and is now taking the substance of the legal opinion to the Core Strategy Group, and subsequently the Commissioning Body, in order to come to an accommodation that reflects the spirit of the working relationship and partnership that has been the hallmark of the Supporting People Programme in Kent.

8 Risk and Business Continuity Management

(1) It is important that at a time of significant challenge for the Programme and the key stakeholders engaged within the Programme that there is no destabilisation of the excellent partnership that has been developed. It would therefore seem appropriate to minimise risk and ensure business continuity by retaining the relationships that exist at the moment and that are enshrined within the Memorandum of Understanding.

9 Strategic, Operational or Reputational Risks.

(1) The strategic and operational functionality are dependent on the Core Strategy Group and the Commissioning Body in order to consider, recommend and make decisions relating to the Programme's investment and development. This enables providers and service users to feel a degree of

confidence in the Programme. The Kent Programme has a good reputation, and the strength of the partnerships within Kent is an element of this.

11 Sustainability Implications

(1) The Programme will continue to deliver needs led, targeted, and prioritised services that can contribute significantly to the well-being of the most vulnerable people in Kent within a robust partnership.

12 Conclusion

(1) This report concludes that the Commissioning Body should remain in place and adopt the revised Memorandum of Understanding agreed on the 20 January 2011 as the operational manual for the Body. The County Council will ensure that there is an acknowledgement of the wish of the Commissioning Body to be given information relating to budget setting for the Programme in a timely fashion. Advice would suggest that there are no benefits or need for the County Council to formally delegate the budget to the Commissioning Body, nor to give the Commissioning Body any jurisdiction over how much money is allocated to the Programme.

13 Recommendations

1. The Memorandum of Understanding agreed on 20 January 2011 remains in place and the Commissioning Body is not given a delegated power relating to the Programme.
2. The Commissioning Body will be advised in good time of the indicative budget allocation to be made to the Programme by the County Council.

14 Background Documents

Memorandum of Understanding 20 January 2011

Claire Martin
Head of Supporting People
Extension 1179
claire.martin@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Supporting People in Kent – Glossary of Terms

Abbreviation or Term	Description
Accommodation based	The housing related support being delivered is linked to specific properties with a service. These properties may include self-contained or shared accommodation. It may also include staff based in an office or a visiting arrangement. Accommodation based services are also known as “Supported Housing”
Accreditation	This is a regular assessment of a support provider to check if they are able to provide a good quality Supporting People service
Administering Authority (AA) or Administering Local Authority (ALA)	The local authority which receives the Supporting People (SP) grant and administers contracts for the SP services on behalf of the Commissioning Body
Area-Based Grant (ABG)	Area Based Grant is a general grant allocated directly to local authorities as revenue funding to areas. It is allocated according to specific policy criteria rather than general formulae. Local authorities are free to use the all of this non-ringfenced funding as they see fit to support the delivery of local, regional and national priorities in their areas.
Audit Commission	An independent body responsible for ensuring that public money is used responsibly, economically and effectively
Banding	All floating support applications received onto the central waiting list by the Supporting People team are prioritised or banded according to the needs of the individual who needs support. There are 3 bands A, B and C and they are described in the Floating Support protocols
Band A	Those individuals who are in highest need of floating support are banded A on the central waiting list. They include those who <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are under threat of eviction • Experiencing domestic abuse or harassment • Are under 18 • Sleeping rough, in their first tenancy, setting up a new dwelling or going to move-on accommodation after a period in an accommodation-based service • Are vulnerable due to having been institutionalised
Band B	Those individuals who are in medium need of floating support are banded B on the centralised waiting list. They include those who <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need help managing finances • Lack parenting skills or life skills
Band C	Those individuals who are in lowest need of floating support are banded C on the central waiting list. They include those who <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need advocacy, advice and assistance with liaison • Are unable to maintain themselves or their property
Benchmarking	A comparison of similar services by quality, performance and cost. This is one of the ways of ensuring the quality of services provided in Kent
Best Value	A duty on local authorities to assess and review the services they provide for local people and improve them by the best means available. This must be done in consultation with the people who use the services and the wider local community
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
Block Contract	The purchase of support services for more than one person, usually before the service is delivered
Block Gross Contract	A contract for a support service which is delivered for a short period, i.e. less than two years. Payments are made for a fixed number of service users. Service users are not charged for the support.
Block Subsidy Contract	A contract for a support service which is usually long-term or permanent e.g. sheltered housing. Grant payments to the provider will vary, depending on how many people receiving the support service qualify for the subsidy at any given time.

Abbreviation or Term	Description
	Providers tell the SP team on a monthly basis who has moved in and out of their service, and the subsidy payment is adjusted accordingly. Some service users may be charged for this service. In Kent there are very few of these contracts, having largely been replaced by <i>fixed capacity contracts</i>
Capacity	The total number of support packages or accommodation with support units deliverable at any one time.
Choice Based Lettings (CBL)	A new system in the allocation of social housing designed to offer more choice and involvement for customers in selecting a new home. Available social rented housing is let by being openly advertised, allowing customers to 'bid' or 'register an interest' in those homes which are advertised widely in the neighbourhood (e.g. in the local newspaper or on a website).
Client Record Form	Forms used to monitor all new clients who use Supporting People services. The statistics are then collated by The Centre for Housing Research (CHR) and data is used to help SP teams identify needs. Details available at www.spclientrecord.org.uk These are completed by providers each time they take on a new client. Details such as previous type of accommodation, client group and ethnicity are recorded so Supporting People teams can monitor who is using the services. No personally identifying details are recorded
Commissioning Body	The group is made up of representatives from all of the partners involved in Supporting People, such as Housing, Social Services, Health (PCT) and Probation. Its role is to strategically direct and scrutinise the programme.
Contract Monitoring	Contract monitoring is the regular process undertaken by Administering Authorities to ensure that providers comply with the requirements of the contract and are performing effectively. Contract monitoring is an extremely important process as it provides regular information to update authorities' understanding of the quality and effectiveness of Supporting People services and the Value for Money the programme achieves. In Kent, much of the contract monitoring is conducted by local Monitoring and Review (M & R) Officers.
Contract Schedules	These are part of the Supporting People contract and contain details of the services to be provided in the contract and the cost of each service
Core Strategy Development Group	This multi agency group provides a strategic steer to the programme and report to the Commissioning Body. Membership includes provider and service user representation.
Cross Authority Group (CAG)	Neighbouring AA's working together to plan and develop policies and services across the group
Cross Authority Provision	A service designated by the CLG to provide support for service users originating from another Administering Authority (AA)
CLG	Department for Communities and Local Government (formerly the ODPM)
Direct Payment	Direct payments are paid to people who have been assessed as needing help from social services, and who would like to arrange and pay for their own care and support services instead of receiving them directly from council commissioned services. A person must be able to give their consent to getting direct payments and manage them, even if they need daily help to do this.
DV/DA	Domestic Violence/Domestic Abuse
Eligibility Criteria (EC)	A document that sets out what tasks Supporting People money can pay for and those it cannot.
Essential Role of Sheltered Housing (EROSH)	EROSH is the national consortium for sheltered and retirement housing working on behalf of residents and providers of these services.
Fixed Capacity Contracts	A contract under which the units to be paid Supporting People grant are fixed at a number agreeable to both the Provider and the Supporting People team. The number of units relates to housing benefit claimants. The contract changes from a block subsidy model to a block gross model to assist with budget monitoring and budget setting for both the Provider and the Supporting People team. The contract value agreed is subject to review should the amount of units available fall below

Abbreviation or Term	Description
	10% of the capped amount.
Floating Support	This kind of support is "attached" to the person, not the property and can follow a service user if they move to another address. It only lasts for as long as the client needs it and then "floats" away to the next person in need. The service user does not need to live at a certain address to receive the support.
Floating Support protocols	This countywide agreement describes how the waiting list for floating support will be administered.
Foundations	The national co-ordinating body for Home Improvements Agencies (HIA)
Grant Condition	Produced by CLG, these conditions set out how the money paid to the AA is to be spent and how the programme is to be managed.
Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)	The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) is the national housing and regeneration agency for England, with an annual investment budget of more than £5bn. The HCA was formed on 1 December 2008 along with the <i>Tenant Services Authority</i> and is a non-departmental public body, sponsored by Communities and Local Government (CLG).
Home improvements Agency (HIA)	An agency which enables vulnerable people to maintain their independence in their chosen home for the foreseeable future. "Vulnerable people" may include older people, people on low incomes, disabled people etc.. Their homes would usually be private rented leasehold or owner occupied.
Housing Benefit (HB)	A means tested benefit paid to council or private tenants who need help paying their rent
Housing Related Support (HRS)	Support specifically aimed at helping people to establish themselves, or to stay in their own homes. Examples of housing related support include helping people learn to manage their own money, apply for benefits, keep their home secure, access to other services
Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)	The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 combines a number of indicators, chosen to cover a range of economic, social and housing issues, into a single deprivation score for each small area in England. This allows each area to be ranked relative to one another according to their level of deprivation. Together these various Indices make up the Indices of Deprivation 2007.
Individual budget	Funding from a variety of sources that is brought together into one bank account. This allows greater choice and control over many aspects of life e.g. housing, community care, health, benefits, income, grants etc. The person can choose to use their individual budget themselves or a third party can manage the funds for them.
KASS	Kent Adult Social Services
LSVT	Large scale voluntary transfers of council housing. This could be to a private company or to a registered social landlord.
Managing Agent	A managing agent is an organisation providing housing management services (such as collecting rent) on behalf of another body, often a Registered Social Landlord (RSL). The managing agent may also provide the support services.
NHF - National Housing Federation	The NHF provides advice and support for not-for-profit housing providers. Their website address is www.housing.org.uk

Abbreviation or Term	Description
Primary Care Trusts (PCT)	Primary Care Trusts are responsible for planning and providing healthcare services. In Kent there are 2 PCTs: West Kent, and Eastern and Coastal Kent, both are partners in the SP programme.
Performance Indicators (PI's)	Performance statistics submitted to the Supporting People teams by Providers. They are used as part of contracts and monitoring Key Performance Indicator 1 (KPI1) measures the percentage of people who have maintained independence Key Performance Indicator 2(KPI2)measures the percentage of service users who have moved on in a planned way from temporary living arrangements
Procurement	The process to obtain materials, supplies and contracts, obtaining best value through open and fair competition
Quality Assessment Framework (QAF)	Quality assessment framework. Providers self assess their service against national objectives (such as consulting service users on how they want the service to be run). The Supporting People team use the results as part of the benchmarking process with the aim of continually improving the quality of services in Kent.
Registered Social Landlord (RSL)	A non profit making voluntary group, generally a housing association, formed to provide affordable housing
Scheme Manager	A scheme manager is the support worker who manages a housing related support service. The term is also used to describe the support worker within a sheltered scheme (may have been termed a 'warden' previously).
Service Review	A service review examines the support provided to see if there is a need for it, if it is good quality support, if it gives value for money and if there needs to be any changes.
Service Users	The term "service users" is used to refer to people who use Supporting People services and also to carers and advocates where applicable. It is important that, in consulting and involving service users, providers also seek the views of carers and advocates where service users may not be able to participate fully.
Service User Involvement	The processes and mechanisms by which the AA consults and engages with people who use the service, or who may use the service and ensures that their views are reflected in the programme. It is good practice and a grant condition that providers involve service users.
Sheltered Housing	Housing specifically for older and or disabled people. Includes a block or group of houses with resident or visiting warden and individual house, bungalow and flats which receive support from a mobile warden or pendant (emergency) alarm
SPLS	Supporting People Local System. A local authority computer system used to hold service provider, payment and client details for the Supporting People programme
SERIG	South East Regional Implementation Group This group comprises the Lead Officers of Supporting People programmes across the region. They meet to consider issues of national and regional policy and liaise with CLG
SPkweb	The Supporting People Knowledge website (published by CLG) - this is accessible to all by logging onto www.spkweb.org.uk The SPkweb contains all the guidance and related documents on the Supporting People programme
Supported Housing	These are services that provide both accommodation and support together to enable people to live independently. Examples of supported housing services include women's refuges, sheltered housing and homeless hostels
Stakeholders	People or organisations that form part of the SP programme. Stakeholders share or contribute to the aim of the SP programme

Abbreviation or Term	Description
Supporting People Distribution Formula	A formula developed by the CLG to decide how much Supporting People grant each Administering Authority will be allocated
Supporting People Grant	Money from the government to pay for the housing related support services under the Supporting People programme
Supporting People	The programme came into effect on the 1st April 2003 to deliver housing-related support services to vulnerable people through a single funding stream, administered by local authorities according to the needs of people in their area
Supporting People Five Year Strategy	The strategy is a five year plan giving detailed supply and needs mapping information across the county in relation to the various vulnerable client groups that the Supporting People programme assists
Support Provider	The organisation providing housing related support services paid for by Supporting People. Organisation types include registered social landlords, voluntary sector organisations, local authorities, charities and the private sector
Support Service	A service eligible for funding through Supporting People. This could include advice on maintaining a tenancy, help with filling in forms, help with keeping accommodation safe and secure etc.
Tenant Services Authority (TSA)	The TSA is the regulatory body for social housing. Having formed on 1 December 2008, the TSA took over the regulatory powers of the Housing Corporation.
Tenure neutral	Tenure neutral floating support services means that support can be offered to an individual regardless of the sort of housing they live in e.g. private rented, social housing, owner occupied.
Triple Aim	<p>Triple Aim is a concept led by the NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement. It is designed to optimise the health system by taking into account three dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experience of the individual • The health of a defined population • Per capita cost for the population <p>NHS Eastern and Coastal Kent have adopted this approach to tackle health inequalities in two deprived wards in Thanet, Margate Central and Cliftonville West</p>
Total Place	<p>Total Place is a new initiative that looks at how a 'whole area' approach to public services can lead to better services at less cost. It seeks to identify and avoid overlap and duplication between organisations – delivering a step change in both service improvement and efficiency at the local level, as well as across Whitehall.</p> <p>Kent is one of the thirteen local authorities which have been selected as Total Place Initiative pilots. The aim of the pilots is to develop and test methodologies that will enable all partners in a 'whole place' simultaneously to deliver improved outcomes and greater efficiencies across the whole of the public realm.</p>
Workbook	The workbook is completed on a quarterly basis by each service (except community alarms) under contract with the Supporting People team. It is the means by which the Supporting People team gathers Performance Indicator information required by central government
Validation Visit	A reality check by a SP Local Monitoring and Review Officer to a support service to establish whether the Provider is achieving the standards they are contracted to deliver. Supporting People team members will also consult with service users and staff and stakeholders to find out their views of the service. The aim of these visits is to work with providers to improve the quality of the services in Kent, and for the findings feed into strategic decision making

Links

The following links may provide further insight into the programme.

- www.communities.gov.uk
- www.spkweb.org.uk
- www.spdirectory.org.uk/DirectoryServices
- www.sitra.org.uk
- www.housing.org.uk
- www.kent.gov.uk/supportingpeople

Contact the Kent Supporting People team supportingpeopleteam@kent.gov.uk

Please tell us if you think that any other terms or links should be included in this glossary