Core Strategy Group Minutes Monday 23 May 2011 10am, Pendragon room, Invicta House, Maidstone

| Meeting | Core Strategy Group | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| Date & Time: | 23 May 2011 | Meeting No: | | | |
| Meeting Place: | Pendragon room, IH | Minutes By: | Margaret Turner | | |
| Present: | | Job Title: | | | |
| Angela Slaven | | KCC – Director Service Improvement (Customer & Communities) | | | |
| Claire Martin | | KCC - Custome | KCC - Customer & Communities, Supporting People team | | |
| Sue Gratton | | Eastern & Coastal Kent PCT | | | |
| Mike Dorman | | KCC - Families | KCC - Families and Social Care (on behalf of Margaret Howard) | | |
| Tracey Kerly | | Ashford Borough Council | | | |
| Madeline Homer | | Thanet District | Thanet District Council | | |
| Howard Cohn | | Kent Probation | | | |
| Gary Peskett | | Canterbury City Council | | | |
| Hud Manuel | | Finance Manager | | | |
| Janet Walton | | Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council | | | |
| Bob Porter | | Shepway District Council | | | |
| Paul Whitfield | | Dover District Council | | | |
| Kevin Hethe | erington | Tunbridge Wells Borough Council | | | |
| Jay Edwins | | NHS West Kent | | | |
| Melanie Anthony | | KCC - Customer & Communities, Supporting People team | | | |
| Margaret Turner | | KCC – Customer & Communities, Supporting People team | | | |
| Apologies | : | | | | |
| Richard Robinson | | Ashford Borough Council | | | |
| Pat Smith | | Sevenoaks District Council | | | |
| Peter Dosad | | Dartford Borough Council | | | |
| Amber Christou | | Swale Borough | Swale Borough Council | | |
| | | - | | | |
| Next Meetings: | Tuesday 13 September 2011, Medway room, Sessions House, Maidstone at 10am. Monday 5 December 2011, Pendragon room, Invicta House, Maidstone at 10am. | | | | |

| Item No | Details of the Item/decisions taken | CSG Member responsible for action |
|------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1 & 2. | Apologies & Introductions | |
| | Apologies were received from Richard Robinson, Pat Smith, Peter Dosad and Amber Christou. | |
| 3. | Minutes of meeting – 20 February 2011 | |
| | The minutes were agreed as accurate. | |
| | All Action Points have been dealt with and reported to Commissioning Body, as required. | |
| 4. | Performance Management | |
| | Summary of last four quarters data provided in the report. Clarification given that some of the information is local data that has been submitted to the CLG but not verified by them at this time. | |
| | Queries were raised over whether the current data tells the group/Supporting People sufficient to improve services. Is there comparative data? | |
| | The Districts and Boroughs would like more local data, how schemes in their areas are performing. | |
| | A report with more qualitative data was requested for future meetings. Details of providers that are not complying to be reported to the Core Strategy Group in future. | |
| | Action: | |
| | Establish a Task and Finish Group to evaluate current performance management data and to recommend to the Core Strategy Group and Commissioning Body a dataset for usage in 2012/2013. | SP team |
| Item No | Details of the Item/decisions taken | CSG Member responsible for action |
| 5. | Payment by Results | |
| | The group were advised of the current approach in relation to sheltered housing and the model being considered for Payment by Results for other services. The proposed model will reflect the performance management data information which has been collected within Kent over the last 2 years. | |
| | The Supporting People programme proposed running a pilot on payment by results without any payment restrictions in the period to test the model. There has been a lot of interest from providers and equally some | |

| Item No | Details of the Item/decisions taken | CSG Member responsible for action |
|------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Action: Floating support will be tendered without the payment by results model being included in July 2011 subject to the agreement of the Commissioning Body. | |
| | There were some questions over the client groups classed as generic and specialist and also the geographic areas set out in the report. | |
| | Summary of report provided including an explanation of the client groups that will be included within specialist or generic categories and the delivery of 2 hours per service user per week to all. Floating Support to be tendered for in July 2011. | |
| 6. | The Commissioning of Floating Support | |
| | Floating Support will be tendered without payment by results being included. | |
| | • There will be 2 Task and Finish Groups, one to look at the performance management framework and the other to look at a payment by results model. | |
| | Report to Commissioning Body to include an analysis of the impact of payment by results on the existing services commissioned by this method. | |
| | Action: | |
| | • There will be further work conducted as part of the pilot on assessing the potential model and the finance implications that might flow from that. There would be further report to the Core Strategy Group and Commissioning Body by the end of the financial year providing an evaluation of the risks and issues related to a potential payment by results model. | |
| | It was requested that the report to the Commissioning Body include an analysis of the impact of payment by results on the services commissioned since 2006 and already paid by this method. | |
| | concerns about the impact such a proposal will have. Discussions will be held with providers and service users. There were concerns within the group about how the model would be implemented; how would the performance framework be developed. The Core Strategy Group were reluctant to see payment by results utilised within a tendering process until the pilot had been completed and further evaluation had taken place of the added value of payment by results for floating support. There were also concerns about preventing any possibility of the programme breaching its funding envelope because all providers had achieved the required performance management standards. There were also issues raised about how high a performance standard was relevant and affordable. | SP team |
| | The approximate about the formant analysis and approximate the first term in the fir | |

| | Summary of report provided and proposal for Home Improvement Agencies and Handypersons services to be tendered. There was discussion around the funding figures provided in Table 2 and future funding options from PCTs and Districts/boroughs. Districts & Boroughs and PCTs to advise Supporting People what funding would be available and over what period of time. | |
|----|--|--|
| | TUPE may apply Action: A report will be submitted to the Commissioning Body in October 2011 following confirmation from the Districts & Boroughs relating to funding and the geographical areas that they wish to see the HIA/Handyperson operating in. | |
| 8. | Financial expenditure 2010/2011 Summary of 2010/2011 provided. Reports will be made to future CSG meetings. | |
| 9. | Any Other Business There was no other business. | |