

**HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**SUPPORTING PEOPLE SERVICE REVIEW**  
**REPORT**

**9<sup>th</sup> February 2006**

<b>PROVIDER</b>	<b>Three Rivers Housing Association</b>
<b>SERVICE NAME</b>	<b>Three Rivers Cat 1 Schemes</b>
<b>CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>SERVICE ID's</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>ANNUAL CONTRACT VALUE</b>	<b>£ 6,935.76</b>
<b>STAFFING</b>	<b>Community Alarm/Warden Only</b>
<b>UNITS OF SUPPORT</b>	<b>35</b>

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. STATUS AND PURPOSE OF REPORT</b>	Page 3
<b>2. INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	Page 3
<b>3. SERVICE DESCRIPTION</b>	Page 4
<b>4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS &amp; OUTCOMES</b>	Page 4
<b>5. ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY</b>	Page 4
<b>6. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE ASSESSMENT</b>	Page 5
<b>7. ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT</b>	Page 7
<b>8. QUALITY ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK LITE</b>	Page 8
<b>9. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK</b>	Page 9
<b>10. STAFF</b>	Page 9
<b>11. SERVICE USERS</b>	Page 9
<b>12. VALUE FOR MONEY &amp; CONTRACT PRICING</b>	Page 12
<b>13. CONTRACT COMPLIANCE</b>	Page 14
<b>14. COMMISSIONING OPTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCERNS</b>	Page 14
<b>15. REVIEW OUTCOMES ACCEPTANCE/DISPUTES PROCESS</b>	Page 15

## **1. STATUS AND PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report is the final report of the review and assessment of Three Rivers Housing Association Category 1 Schemes. The findings reported in this document will be used to inform decisions regarding future contracting arrangements made by the Supporting People Commissioning Body. Recommendations to the commissioning body can be found at the end of the report.

The purpose of the report is to inform the service provider of the outcome of the review and also as an information resource for the Administering Authority and the Supporting People Commissioning Body.

When this report is issued, the provider should already have been consulted on the main outcomes and have had an opportunity to discuss these with the reviewing officer.

If you have any objections to the findings and recommendations in this report, please refer to the Disputes and Appeals process outlined at the end of the document.

We can only enter into new contracts with Providers who have achieved the standard of the Quality Assessment Framework Lite, and who have satisfied the requirements for Accreditation.

## **2. INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Supporting People Service Review process involves the analysis of performance and other information returns at the review officers work base, and also a site visit to the service to validate evidence for the quality assessment framework and to speak with staff and service users. The validation visits for this service took place during the period March 2005 and March 2006.

Hartlepool Borough Council would like to thank all service users who participated in the review and also the key staff involved: -

Sandra Wyper – TRHA  
Dawn Murphy – TRHA  
Jayne Downes – TRHA  
Felicity Ashton – TRHA  
Gareth Heslington - TRHA

### **3. SERVICE DESCRIPTION**

Three Rivers Housing Association Category 1 Schemes are a community alarm based service with regular visit from peripatetic wardens. The service is aimed at older people with support needs. There are 35 units of accommodation provided by TRHA however, the alarm service is delivered by Housing Hartlepool from their response centre, Richard Court. The client manages the tenancy with reassurance of the alarm system.

### **4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & OUTCOMES**

Three Rivers Housing Association achieved the required standard of the Quality Assessment Framework's Lite version. They are accredited via pass porting through Durham County Council. The certificate expires on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008. At the time of writing this report, the date for returning Stakeholder feedback forms had expired. This will be viewed as positive as there is a disclaimer at the end of the document. Non returned feedback informs that there are no issues with the service provided. Staff are knowledgeable, committed and qualified to carry out their positions. Service User feedback is positive and it was clear that they were happy with the service provided. The service is strategically relevant and the need for the service is identified within the Supporting People Shadow Strategy.

### **5. ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENT SUMMARY**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>PASSPORTED</b>	<b>OTHERWISE SATISFIED</b>	<b>FURTHER ACTION</b>
<b>Financial Viability</b>	Yes. This service is pass-ported via Durham County Council. The certificate expires on 31st March 2008		None
<b>Ability to Handle &amp; Account for Supporting People</b>	As Above		

<b>Grant</b>			
<b>Effective Employment Policies</b>	As Above		
<b>Sufficiently Robust Management Procedures</b>	As Above		
<b>Competence or Track Record in Delivering Services</b>	As Above		

## **7. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE ASSESSMENT**

**S.R.1 - How does your service develop or sustain an individual's capacity to live independently in the accommodation or to gain access to appropriate accommodation?**

Regular contact with residents ensuring well-being enables them to access emergency services when required.

**S.R.2 - Does the service funded through supporting people grant include the provision of general health and social care services, or statutory personal care? If so what proportions of the service fall into these categories and is any other funding used to pay for them?**

Funding via SP does not cover any activities that are not eligible for supporting people.

**S.R.3 - Describe any counselling provided as part of your service? Is this specialist counselling? Is it funded from a source other than supporting people grant?**

No counselling services provided.

**S.R.4 - Describe how your service supports vulnerable people and how you can demonstrate that the people using the service need the support provided?**

As outlined in SR1, Support plans are completed to ensure that the level of support offered by the service is appropriate to clients needs and if additional support required, appropriate referrals are made. Clients are actively involved in process and agree to any action.

**S.R.5 - Does your support service discharge statutory duties under community care legislation? Please explain the duty being discharged and who has the statutory responsibility.**

No statutory duties discharged by the service.

**S.R.6 - Is your support service used to discharge statutory duties in relation to aftercare services as a result of hospital discharge?**

No statutory duties discharged by the service.

**S.R.7 - Does the level of Supporting People grant reflect the level of housing related support provided? This is particularly relevant where other services such as housing management social care or personal care are also provided.**

Supporting People funding reflects low level support/monitoring and does not include housing management costs, social or personal care.

**S.R.8 - How does your service contribute to the wider government agenda for preventative services (i.e. preventing service users from going into institutional care, becoming homeless or re-offending).**

Service provides vital monitoring with prompt response to any emergencies. Enables clients to remain living independently. Strong links with sheltered schemes enables clients to consider the move if appropriate.

**S.R.9 - How does your service meet local and national strategic priorities? Please refer to any relevant published strategies relevant to your service.**

The Governments agenda for older people and living independently

Local agenda for older people and independent living.

## **DEMAND CRITERIA**

**DEM 1 - Demonstrate that there is evidence of demand for the type of service from the target client group. Tell us about your referrals and waiting list and anything else that will help demonstrate demand.**

Waiting list demonstrates high level of interest in the scheme from the local community with very low turnover.

**DEM 2 - Demonstrate that there is evidence of a demand for the service being reviewed.**

Constant high level applicants on waiting list.

## **Strategic Significance**

Support services for older people are identified as a need in the Supporting People Shadow Strategy (6.1.4 – ‘Support services are important to enable people to have the choice of remaining in their own homes or moving into specialist accommodation. With a growing population of older people it will be vital to develop services to meet the growing demand for a wide range of services.’)

This also links with the Sloop Report (Supported Living Options for Older People) and the NSF (National Service Framework for Older People).

TRHA Cat 1 schemes are therefore deemed to be strategically significant in terms of local and national strategic priorities.

## **7. ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT**

**i Responsibility for occupancy: Service users are genuinely responsible, accountable and have control over their own home.**

Yes, service users occupy self-contained units and are responsible for all rent and utility payments and the running of their homes. These responsibilities may be met with support from the service but the reviewing officer was satisfied that service users have a full understanding of their responsibilities and work towards independence in fulfilling these.

**ii Discharge of Statutory Duty**

This service is not involved providing services required in the satisfaction of a statutory duty.

**iii Personal Care: Where personal care needs are identified service users should be assessed, funded and supported appropriately and not via staff hours funded through supporting people grant.**

There are no personal care needs provided by this service.

**iv General Social Care: Where social care needs are identified service users should be assessed, funded and supported appropriately and not via staff hours funded through supporting people grant**

There is no social care support delivered by this service.

**v Housing Management:**

This subject is not applicable due to the service being an alarm/warden only service.

**vi Housing Related Support:**

Demand evidenced as follows:

- Discussion with stakeholders.
- Discussion with service users.
- Continuing gap in supply of this type of service identified in the draft Five Year Supporting People Strategy.

Assessment of the service evidenced that support is given and delivered to service users with identified housing related support needs.

## **8. QUALITY ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK LITE**

### **Summary of Scores**

Core Objective 1:3 Security, Health & Safety	Required Standard reached
Core Objective 1:4	Required Standard

Protection From Abuse	reached
Core Objective 1:5 Fair Access & Diversity	Required Standard reached
Core Objective 1:6 Complaints	Required Standard reached

**The full validation report is attached to this document.**

## **9. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK**

.At the time of writing this report, the date for returning Stakeholder feedback forms had expired. This will be viewed as positive as there is a disclaimer at the end of the document. Non-returned feedback informs that there are no issues with the service provided.

## **10. STAFF**

The staff member interviewed was knowledgeable, committed and suitably qualified to carry out his duties. He was very aware of the importance of health & safety and the value of a complaints system. He demonstrated personal and professional development in the training area and was comfortable with his professional boundaries. He was confident in approaching the subject of abuse in respect of both staff and service users. Fair access diversity and inclusion was practiced as standard in the allocations process. Staff Files were found to contain all relevant information including:-

- Employment Contract
- References
- CRB checks
- Appraisals/Competencies
- Training Information
- Staff Induction
- Job descriptions
- Application Forms (evidencing qualifications and relevant experience)
- Personal/Medical/Contacts Records
- Probationary Period Information

## **11. SERVICE USERS**

The emergency response alarm is provided by Housing Hartlepool's call centre based at Richard Court. Three Rivers Housing Association's Cat 1 tenants were consulted via a questionnaire about the alarm service. 31% of tenants responded and the overall feedback was positive. The information below compares the response from Three Rivers' tenants, to the overall general

response from tenants Hartlepool wide. From the questionnaires sent out in general, 52% were returned. The analysis below is based on these returns.

Just under half of the tenants claimed they were not consulted at sign up regarding the inclusion of the alarm service. This appears to be reflected by the fact that some of them have never used it. Very few of the tenants possessed written information about the service and just under half knew the procedure for making a complaint. It also appears at the time of this survey that some of the alarms were not in working order.

**TRHG have put in place a procedure to check that all alarms/telephones are working at the time of Tenancy Sign up, and that all tenants have written information regarding the alarms and their use. Documentary evidence clarifies that tenants are asked if they want/need the alarm at Tenancy sign up. The complaints procedure is issued at sign up only so as not to promote abuse of the system.**

More positively, in comparison to Hartlepool in general, quite high proportion of tenants felt they were getting value for money with this service and received a weekly visit from the warden. High proportions were happy with the service provided and none could highlight a way to improve it. Approximately half indicated that having the alarm made a lot of difference to their peace of mind. Nearly all telephones were working at the time of writing this report.

### Community Alarm Survey Analysis - Three Rivers Housing Association

#### Question

When you moved into your property, were you asked if you wanted/needed the alarm?	<u>Three Rivers H. A.</u>	%	<u>Hartlepool Overall</u>	%
Yes		55%	Yes	44%
No		45%	No	51%
No Response		0%	No Response	5%
In the past year, have you used your alarm?				
Never		27%	Never	23%
Once		27%	Once	35%
2-4 times		27%	2-4 times	22%
5-7 times		0%	5-7 times	1%
8 or more times		0%	8 or more times	7%
No Response		19%	No Response	12%
If you have not used your alarm in the past year, when did you last use it?				
Never		33%	Never	57%

1 year or more	0%	1 year or more	10%
3 years or more	0%	3 years or more	5%
5 years or more	33%	5 years or more	5%
No Response	34%	No Response	23%

**Alarm Response Time**

Under 1 minute	18%	Under 1 minute	17%
1-5 minutes	18%	1-5 minutes	31%
5 minutes or more	18%	5 minutes or more	12%
No Answer at all	0%	No Answer at all	0%
No Response	46%	No Response	40%

**Do you feel that you get a good service for the price you pay?**

Yes	82%	Yes	77%
No	9%	No	12%
No Response	9%	No Response	11%

**Do you have a regular visit from a warden?**

Yes	64%	Yes	66%
No	27%	No	30%
No Response	9%	No Response	4%

**If yes, how often?**

1-2 times	0%	1-2 times	12%
Weekly	71%	Weekly	42%
1-2 times per Month	0%	1-2 times per Month	3%
Monthly	0%	Monthly	5%
Less Often	0%	Less Often	4%
No Response	29%	No Response	34%

**Happy with service provided?**

Yes	82%	Yes	83%
No	9%	No	8.50%
No Response	9%	No Response	8.50%

**What could improve the service?**

Greater Choice of Alarm	0%	Greater Choice of Alarm	0%
Removal of Alarm	0%	Removal of Alarm	2%
Faster Response Time	0%	Faster Response Time	5%

Faster Repairs	0%	Faster Repairs	2%
Choice of Having Alarm	0%	Choice of Having Alarm	2%
Updated Alarm	0%	Updated Alarm	7%
Don't Know	9%	Don't Know	71%
No Response	91%	No Response	11%

**Written Info about the alarm?**

Yes	0%	Yes	21%
No	91%	No	73%
No Response	9%	No Response	6%

**Alarm in working order?**

Yes	55%	Yes	91%
No	9%	No	2%
No Response	36%	No Response	7%

**Know what to do about making complaint?**

Yes	45%	Yes	58%
No	27%	No	35%
No Response	28%	No Response	7%

**Difference to peace of mind?**

A lot	55%	A lot	60%
Some	9%	Some	24%
None	9%	None	9%
No Response	27%	No Response	7%

**Do you have a working telephone?**

Yes	64%	Yes	91%
No	9%	No	6%
No Response	27%	No Response	3%

## **12. VALUE FOR MONEY AND CONTRACT PRICING**

### **Contract Value Information**

The Tees Valley SP Subgroup liased to compile their own local benchmarking spreadsheet. The cost comparisons are below. It appears that the cost for this

service is slightly above the upper quartile at between £4.49 & £4.72 per unit. However, in comparison to the tables supplied by the ODPM, nationally and regionally, this service appears to offer value for money.

Supported Housing	Annual Contract Value		Cost Per Unit Per Week
Min	£304.80	2	£0.13
Max	£523,885.44	2416	£8.34
Average	£25,881.95	134	£3.36
Median	£2,055.04	13	£2.96
Lower quartile	£1,140.36	8	£2.32
Upper quartile	£6,714.24	42.3	£3.90

Assessment of value for money is based on benchmarking service costs against similar services Regionally. The regional table for comparison provided by the ODPM below, indicates that this service appears to offer Value for Money with a unit cost of between £4.49 & £4.72 per week depending on the service offered.

Supported Housing		
Number of Services		45
Mean		£7.30
Median		£3.48
Std. Deviation		£10.17
Minimum		£0.60
Maximum		£59.09
Quartiles	Lower	£2.26
	Upper	£7.65

The national table for comparison provided by the ODPM below, indicates that this service appears to offer Value for Money with a unit cost of between £4.49 & £4.72 per week depending on the service offered.

Supported Housing		
Number of Services		£623.00
Mean		£20.29
Median		£4.16
Std. Deviation		£54.95
Minimum		£0.29
Maximum		£697.53
Quartiles	Lower	£2.30

### **13. CONTRACT COMPLIANCE**

#### **A. Housing related Support WTE frontline staff**

**i Contract – N/A as there are no front line staff**

**ii Actual –N/A as there are no front line staff**

#### **B. Housing related support WTE frontline managers**

**i Contract - N/A as there are no front line managers**

**ii Actual - N/A as there are no front line managers**

#### **D. Contract Price**

**i Contract - £ 6,935.76**

**ii Actual - £3,295.17**

#### **E. Primary Client Group**

**i Contract – Older People with support needs**

**ii Actual – Older People with support needs**

#### **F. Units/Capacity**

**i Contract - 35**

**ii Actual – 35**

Contract compliance agreed.

### **14. COMMISSIONING OPTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCERNS**

TRHG need to ensure that all policies and procedures now in place are used consistently within the organisation. All procedures should be documented appropriately if the service is to continue to meet the objectives of the Quality Assessment Framework. The reviewing officer recommends issuing a 12-month contract and that a further VFM analysis is carried out during that time. Also, the

applications process will need to be monitored for eligibility purposes ensuring that tenants are actually assessed as needing this service.

Reviewing Officer Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewing Officer Name \_\_\_\_\_

Supervising Officer Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Supervising Officer Name \_\_\_\_\_

### **15. REVIEW OUTCOMES ACCEPTANCE/DISPUTES PROCESS**

1. If the Provider agrees with the report they will sign and return the Acceptance/Dispute form and return it to the Supporting People Team. The report will then become final and will be submitted to the Commissioning Body with a recommendation for approval. In the event that the Commissioning Body propose different outcomes a further report will be issued to the Provider to which they may object in accordance with 2 below.
2. It is hoped that any potentially contentious issues will have been discussed and resolved prior to the issue of the report, however If the Provider disagrees with the report they should sign and return the Acceptance/Dispute form indicating that they intend to dispute the report and or it's recommendations and must set out their objections in full giving reasons within 20 days of receipt of the report (receipt will be assumed to take place the second day after the date on the accompanying letter). Objections may be to correct or dispute factual errors or to challenge commissioning recommendations. If it is likely that the disputed issue can be resolved quickly, for example by correction of a factual error, the Supporting People Team would encourage the Provider to contact them by telephone as soon as possible so that the issue can be resolved as soon as possible.
3. Where an outcome is disputed the review report together with the Providers written objections will be submitted to the Supporting People Commissioning Body. The Chair of the Commissioning Body may arrange a hearing so that the provider can detail their objections in person. The Provider can bring independent representation to this meeting if they wish.
4. The decision of the Commissioning Body or a sub-committee thereof will be final and outcomes will be issues as a final report within 5 working days. Providers may of course seek independent advice on further options

for challenge at any time and may use the Council's Complaints Procedure should they be unhappy with this process or any other issue in their dealings with the Administering Authority.

Hartlepool Supporting People  
November 2005

Supporting People Team  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Neighbourhood Services  
Level Three  
Civic Centre  
Hartlepool  
TS24 8AY  
01429 284263

**Wendy Ashcroft**  
**Reviewing Officer**  
**Supporting People Team**  
**Hartlepool Borough Council**  
**Civic Centre**  
**Hartlepool**  
**TS24 8AY**